TEMPERATURE DEPENDENCE OF CO ADSORPTION IN H-FER ZEOLITE



Miroslav Rubeš, Michal Trachta, Eva Koudelková, Roman Bulánek and Ota Bludský





Motivation

- Obvious discrepancy between calorimetry and VT-IR
 - VT-IR one IR band for all sites average
 - Calorimetry distinguishes between sites of different adsorption enthalpy
- The apparent agreement between theory and experiment was rather fortuitous:
 - Neglect of dispersion partially compensated by PBE overestimation
 - Thermal correction of $\frac{7}{2}$ RT
 - wrong sign!!!

HOW TO DO IT RIGHT

- Account for E_{disp} FER...CO TRICKY
- Correcting Brønsted-CO interaction
- Thermal correction from AIMD



Nachtigall *et al.*, PCCP **11**, 791 (2009) Arean *et al.*, PCCP **16**, 10129 (2014)

Take home message



Change of CO isosteric heat 200/300 K



Adsorption Models

Ideal gas	- thermal correction of 7/2 RT used by Nachtigall <i>et al</i> . ¹					
Localized	- localized adsorption of diatomic molecule at high τ_{vg} (=T/ Φ_{vg}). ²					
Non-localized - non-localized (mobile) adsorption at high τ_{vg} . ²						
Gaussian	- thermal correction evaluated from Gaussian thermochemistry. ³					
AIMD	- evaluated from ab initio molecular dynamics simulation (T_1 site).					
Experiment	- measured by microcalorimetry (this work).					



b-axis view



Lattice parameters
a= 19.018 Å
b= 14.303 Å
c= 7.541 Å
α=β=γ= 90°



Synthesis

- Typical Si/Al=8.6, 27.5
- Fully siliceous FER synthesized from amorphous silica
 problematic (HF needs to be present)



Performance of ab-initio methods in siliceous FER

Binding energies in kJ/mol

<u>Cluster models & DFT/CC modeling</u>

Binding energies in kJ/mol

model	CCSD(T)	RSE(RPA)	PBE/CC	DFT-D	Δ _{max} [DFT-D – CCSD(T)]
1TCO	5.7	5.6 (4.4)	5.7	6.0 - 7.1	1.4
2TCO	6.9	6.9 (5.6)	7.0	7.5 - 9.1	2.2
3TCO	8.6	8.6 (7.4)	8.6	9.2 - 11.5	¥ 2.9







Brønsted-CO interaction

- DFT errors associated with this type of local interaction is an area, where DFT/CC performs quite well.
- Note obvious advantage of using interpolation instead of fitting on dispersion type functional forms.
- Using hybrid func. is better, but still does not fix the problem.



Binding energies in kJ/mol

model	PBE	PBEO	CCSD(T)	RSE(RPA)	PBE/CC	DFT-D	Δ_{max} [DFT-D – CCSD(T)]
2T-HBCO	26.4	24.2	25.7	26.1 (21.0)	25.7	27.9 - 11.5	6.7

H-FER models



Main ch.

Nachtigall et al., PCCP 11, 791 (2009)

Performance of ab-initio methods in H-FER

Binding energies in kJ/mol excluding deformation energy



<u>Temperature dependence of adsorption enthalpy</u>

In kJ/mol

Ads. site	F	-Λ <i>Η</i> (0K)	-Л <i>Н</i> (200К)	-Л <i>Н</i> (300К)	coverage (-)
	- bind	2.7(01)			0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0
T1	36.7	33.6	33.0 (34.2)	26.0 (33.5)	200К 34 34
T2	31.7	28.5	27.7	22.9	
Т3	34.6	30.4	28.4	21.9	o 28.4 ± 2 kJ/mol 곳 28
T4'	23.9	20.1	17.4	x	300K 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 26 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
T4"	35.2	32.3	30.0	28.4	25.4 kJ/mol 0 - 24



Atomistic insight from MD & limits of the model



T4" 300 K simulation - shows confined space effect, thus 200K \rightarrow 300K behaviour is less prounouced



Conclusions

- Describing the CO energetics with Brønsted acid sites in zeolites is still quite challenging for contemporary computational chemistry
- The following effects needs to be addressed as accurately as possible:
 - CO interaction with the framework (i.e. dispersion)
 - Errors of functional itself upon CO interaction with Brønsted cannot be ignored
 - Thermal effects needs to described via MD rather than using vibrational partition functions or equipartition theorem -> especially at higher temperatures
- Possible generalization?





I would like to acknowledge my colleagues:

- Dr. Ota Bludský
- Msc. Michal Trachta
- Prof. Roman Bulánek (exp.)
- Dr. Eva Koudelková (exp.).
- Dr. Jiří Klimeš (RPA)



EXPERIMENT

