

AD-A160 522

CO HYDROGENATION AND ADSORPTION STUDIES ON SUPPORTED  
NICKEL SMSI CATALYSTS(U) TEXAS UNIV AT AUSTIN DEPT OF  
CHEMISTRY S M FANG ET AL. 1985 N00014-83-K-0582

1/1

UNCLASSIFIED


F/G 7/2

NL

END

FILMED

DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS - 1963 - A

AD-A160 522

12

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Contract No. N00014-83-K-0582

Task No. NR 056-578

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 42

CO Hydrogenation and Adsorption Studies on Supported Nickel SMSI Catalysts

by

Shiu-Min Fang, J. M. White, T. J. Campione and J. G. Ekerdt

Prepared for publication

in

The Journal of Catalysis

Department of Chemistry

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

DTIC  
ELECTE  
OCT 23 1985  
S D  
B

DTIC FILE COPY

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

85 10 23 03 4

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	AD-A160 522	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) CO Hydrogenation and Adsorption Studies on Supported Nickel SMSI Catalysts		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report 42 January 1 - December 31, 1985
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) SHiu-Min Fang, J. M. White, T. Campione and J. G. Ekerdt		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-83-K-0582
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS J. M. White, Department of Chemistry University of Texas Austin, TX 78712		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Project No. NR-056-578
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Department of the Navy Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217		12. REPORT DATE October 15, 1985
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 8
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Journal of Catalysis (in press)		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) CO uptake by Ni/TiO <sub>2</sub> and Ni/Ti <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> was studied at 25 and 125°C following low (LT) and high temperature (HT) reduction. IR spectroscopy identified the onset of nickel carbonyl formation at various pressures and temperatures. CO uptake data were modeled using the Langmuir equation of isothermal adsorption. CO monolayer coverages were unaffected by the reduction temperature of either Ni/TiO <sub>2</sub> or Ni/Ti <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> . Methanation activity at 275°C was a factor of 2 greater for the LT than the HT Ni/TiO <sub>2</sub> catalyst. This correlated well with the relative strength of the CO-metal surface bond, which also decreased by a factor of 2. This suggests that the enhanced methanation rate on TiO <sub>2</sub> supported catalysts is not due to presence or absence of an SMSI condition, but to other properties of TiO <sub>2</sub> as compared to other supports.		

## CO Hydrogenation and Adsorption Studies on Supported-Nickel SMSI Catalysts

SHIU-MIN FANG,\*<sup>1</sup> J. M. WHITE,\* T. J. CAMPIONE,† AND JOHN G. EKERTT†

\*Department of Chemistry and †Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712

Received December 6, 1983; revised March 15, 1985

The uptake of CO by Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> and Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> was investigated at 25 and 125°C following low-temperature (LT = 250°C) and high-temperature (HT = 450°C) reduction. Infrared spectroscopy was used to identify the onset of nickel carbonyl (Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub>) formation under various conditions of temperature and pressure. The CO uptake data were modeled using the Langmuir equation for isothermal adsorption. Monolayer coverages and equilibrium constants for CO adsorption were obtained from the uptake data. Carbon monoxide monolayer coverages were not affected by the reduction temperature of either Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> or Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. Methanation activity at 275°C was approximately a factor of 2 greater for the Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) than the Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (HT) catalyst. This correlated well with the relative strength of the CO-metal surface bond, which also decreased by a factor of approximately 2. These findings suggest that the enhanced methanation rate observed on TiO<sub>2</sub>-supported catalysts is not due to the presence or absence of a strong metal-support interaction condition of the TiO<sub>2</sub> but to other properties of TiO<sub>2</sub> as compared to other supports. © 1985 Academic Press, Inc.

### INTRODUCTION

The marked decrease in carbon monoxide and hydrogen chemisorption capacity and, in some cases, the vastly different catalytic properties of TiO<sub>2</sub>-supported group VIII transition metal catalysts have been topics of great interest since Tauster and co-workers reported a strong metal-support interaction (SMSI) in 1978 (1). Initially, many models for the SMSI effect were put forward, but only recently has evidence been reported for the observed SMSI phenomenon on TiO<sub>2</sub>-supported nickel (2-4).

It has been shown that TiO<sub>x</sub> (1 < x < 2) species are present on supported-nickel surfaces in the SMSI state (3, 4). Raupp and Dumesic (2) have demonstrated that adsorbed TiO<sub>x</sub> gives rise to the reduced CO coverage over a nickel foil, a phenomenon characteristic of SMSI. Kao *et al.* (5) have

demonstrated that extensive Ni-titania interdiffusion takes place at temperatures as low as 300°C. Taken together, these observations suggest that TiO<sub>x</sub> migration to the surface of bulk Ni particles plays an important role in the SMSI phenomenon on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub>.

The studies reported here were conducted to establish the correlation, if any, between the adsorptive and the catalytic properties of nickel supported on TiO<sub>2</sub> and Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> reduced at low (250°C) and high (450°C) temperatures. Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> was chosen to test the importance of the bulk Ti<sup>3+</sup> concentration, since reduced forms of titania are thought to play a role in the SMSI state.

### EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

#### Materials

Catalysts were prepared by the impregnation method using reagent-grade Ni(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> · 6H<sub>2</sub>O obtained from Fisher Scientific Company. The supports used in this work were TiO<sub>2</sub> (Matheson, Coleman, &

<sup>1</sup> Present address: Department of Chemistry, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15260.

Bell, Inc.; 75% anatase and 25% rutile; 10 m<sup>2</sup>/g), and Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (Alfa Products; 5.4 m<sup>2</sup>/g). The surface area was estimated by the BET method with N<sub>2</sub> as the adsorbate. After impregnation, the samples were dried in air at 110–120°C for 2 hr and then calcined in air at 450°C overnight. Nickel weight loading was 10% for all catalysts.

Ultrahigh-purity hydrogen (99.999%) was further purified by passing it through a Deoxo purifier (Matheson Corp.). Carbon monoxide (99.99% purity, Matheson) was passed through a molecular sieve trap at 155°C to remove any carbonyls. Helium (99.9999% purity) flowed through an alumina trap before use.

#### *Apparatus and Procedure*

Adsorption measurements were performed in a conventional glass vacuum system capable of achieving a dynamic vacuum of 10<sup>-5</sup> Torr. Pressures were measured with a MKS Baratron capacitance manometer to determine the amount of CO adsorption.

Approximately 0.3 g of catalyst was placed in a Pyrex adsorption cell and evacuated while heating to 200°C for 45 min at a pressure of less than one millitorricelli. The catalyst was then reduced *in situ* for 2 hr using 760 Torr hydrogen at either 250°C (LT) or 450°C (HT). During this period the H<sub>2</sub> was changed three times. The temperature was then lowered to 200°C while evacuating for 30 min to a pressure of less than one millitorricelli.

CO uptake studies were performed at 25 and 125°C. Fifteen to thirty min were allowed for equilibrium before each new measurement. For the 25°C study, the dual-isotherm technique (6) was used to determine the amount of strongly held CO adsorbed at different coverages. Two isotherms were measured, with a brief evacuation between them, and then subtracted to account for only the strongly held species. At 125°C, only one isotherm was measured for each catalyst since adsorption by the support

materials was insignificant and Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> formation was strongly suppressed.

The procedures for IR experiments were similar to those reported in a previous paper from this laboratory (7). Infrared spectra were taken on a Nicolet 7199 FT-IR spectrometer and recorded in absorbance with 2 cm<sup>-1</sup> resolution. Absorption due to the CaF<sub>2</sub> windows, gas phase, and the disk background were subtracted. The catalyst disks, 20–30 mg/cm<sup>2</sup>, were pressed between two pieces of paraffin paper.

CO hydrogenation was carried out in a quartz, fixed-bed reactor operating in a differential mode at low conversions. Samples of 0.2–0.4 g were pretreated *in situ* in flowing H<sub>2</sub> at either 250°C (LT) or 450°C (HT) for 2 hr. Reaction temperatures ranged from 200 to 300°C. The reactant gas composition ranged from 3:1 to 15:1 (H<sub>2</sub>:CO) and CO pressures ranged from 0.05 to 0.25 atm; He was used to adjust the total pressure to 1 atm. Space velocities were varied from 18,000 to 54,000 hr<sup>-1</sup> to maintain differential conditions. A procedure similar to that used by Sinfelt (8) was employed to maintain catalytic activity as the total time on-stream increased. This consisted of cyclic 30-min purges in pure H<sub>2</sub> between 10-min H<sub>2</sub>/CO exposures.

The details of the product analysis have been described elsewhere (9). A Varian 3700 gas chromatograph was used with two packed columns (¼ in. o.d. stainless-steel columns of Chromosorb 106 and 20% OV-101 on Chromosorb P-AW). Product gas concentrations were determined with a Hewlett-Packard 3390A integrator by comparing the product peak areas to those for a standard mixture.

X-ray powder diffraction patterns were recorded by a General Electric Model XRD-5 diffractometer using Cu(Kα) radiation. The average Ni particle size was estimated by X-ray line broadening techniques. All the catalysts were prereduced in H<sub>2</sub> and then exposed to air at room temperature. The calculated average particle size for each of the four catalysts was 20 nm.




FIG. 1. Langmuir plots of the different isotherms for CO chemisorption at 25°C: (a) (●) on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT), (b) (■) on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (HT), (c) (Δ) on Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (LT), and (d) (□) on Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (HT).

## RESULTS

### Results at 25°C

The CO isotherms (dual and subtracted) at 25°C on 10% Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT), (HT) and 10% Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (LT), (HT) catalysts are shown in Fig. 1. To make comparisons, these results were all fit using the Langmuir model for associative adsorption:

$$\frac{1}{N} = \frac{1}{N_s} + \frac{1}{N_s K_{CO}} \frac{1}{P}$$

where  $N$  = moles of CO adsorbed/g catalyst,  $N_s$  = moles of CO adsorbed/g catalyst at saturation coverage,  $K_{CO}$  = equilibrium constant for CO adsorption, and  $P$  = gas phase pressure. Values for  $N_s$  for the Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> catalysts were determined by extrapolating the low-pressure linear section of the isotherms. The constants are listed in Table I.

Hydrogen uptake values for each of the catalysts are presented in Table I. Since H<sub>2</sub> adsorbs onto the surface dissociatively, sat-

uration coverage values reflect the amount of atomic hydrogen adsorbed.

Infrared spectra for CO adsorption at 25°C on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) and (HT) are pre-




FIG. 2. IR spectra of CO chemisorption on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) at 25°C: (a)  $P_{CO} = 0.9$  Torr, (b)  $P_{CO} = 65.9$  Torr, (c)  $P_{CO} = 284$  Torr, (d)  $P_{CO} = 418$  Torr, and (e) evacuation at 25°C for 5 min after (d).

TABLE I  
Uptake and Reaction Data

	CO uptake			H <sub>2</sub> uptake N <sub>s</sub> <sup>b</sup> (25°C)	Ni(CO) <sub>4</sub> formation P <sub>CO</sub> (Torr)	Methanation	
	N <sub>s</sub> <sup>a</sup> (25°C)	N <sub>s</sub> (125°C)	K <sub>CO</sub> × 10 <sup>3</sup> (125°C)			E <sub>act</sub> (kcal/mole)	TON × 10 <sup>3</sup> (275°C)
10 wt% Ni/TiO <sub>2</sub> (LT)	26	26	238	78	50	33 ± 2	76
10 wt% Ni/TiO <sub>2</sub> (HT)	15	25	90	36	200	33 ± 2	35
10 wt% Ni/Ti <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (LT)	15	9.5	48	14	500	27 ± 2	14
10 wt% Ni/Ti <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (HT)	12.5	8	21	8		31 ± 3	22

Note. N<sub>s</sub> = μ moles of gas adsorbed per gram of nickel catalyst at saturation coverage. TON = moles of CH<sub>4</sub> formed per second per active nickel site, based on CO uptake at 125°C.

<sup>a</sup> Measured using the dual-isotherm technique.

<sup>b</sup> Based on the adsorption of atomic hydrogen.

<sup>c</sup> Nickel carbonyl (Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub>) was not observed to form at 125°C and P<sub>CO</sub> up to 550 Torr.

sented in Figs. 2 and 3. Notice that in the Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) study, a significant amount of the CO in the 2030–2090 cm<sup>-1</sup> range (linearly bonded, subcarbonyl or carbonyl CO (10–12)) is removed by a brief evacuation (compare curves (d) and (e)), but that the intensity of the lower wavenumber, more strongly held bridge-bonded CO (1875–1960 cm<sup>-1</sup> (10–12)) is undiminished. Also note the development of the distinctive nickel carbonyl band at ~2057 cm<sup>-1</sup> (12–15) as the CO pressure is increased. This band was observed on the catalyst surface as well as in the gas phase. The IR spectra for the Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (HT) case (Fig. 3) also demonstrates that the species giving rise to the band at 2050–2085 cm<sup>-1</sup> is removed by a brief evacuation (compare curves (b) and (c)).




FIG. 3. IR spectra of CO chemisorption on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (HT) at 25°C: (a) P<sub>CO</sub> = 0.3 Torr, (b) P<sub>CO</sub> = 10 Torr, and (c) evacuation at 25°C for 5 min after exposure to P<sub>CO</sub> of 368 Torr.

### Results at 125°C

Langmuir isotherms were used to model the adsorption of CO at 125°C and are presented in Figs. 4 and 5. Uptake for pure TiO<sub>2</sub> and Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> at this temperature was negligible; therefore only one series of uptake measurements was performed on each catalyst. Since this procedure did not involve an evacuation step, the resultant data account for both strongly and weakly adsorbed CO. Table I includes N<sub>s</sub> and K<sub>CO</sub> values for this series of experiments.




FIG. 4. Langmuir plots for CO chemisorption at 125°C: (a) (●) on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) and (b) (▲) on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (HT). (The open symbols (○ and △) correspond to uptake measurements influenced by the formation of Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub>. The solid lines represent approximations to the slope of the isotherms.)






FIG. 5. Langmuir plots for CO chemisorption at 125°C: (a) (●) on Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (LT) and (b) (▲) on Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (HT). (The open symbol (○) corresponds to the uptake measurement influenced by the formation of Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub>.)

The open symbols in Figs. 4 and 5 represent data influenced by the formation of Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub>. Infrared techniques were used to verify the onset of carbonyl formation corresponding to the departures from linearity in the isotherm data. The minimum pressures at which the incipient formation of Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> occurred on each of the catalysts are listed in Table 1.

In order to determine whether CO disproportionation or Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> formation would be a problem if the uptake studies were performed at 125°C, an infrared study was undertaken on the Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) catalyst. Stretching frequencies for CO<sub>2</sub> (~2330 cm<sup>-1</sup>) and Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> (2057 cm<sup>-1</sup>) were not observed at 400 Torr of CO. Evidence for linear and bridge-bonded chemisorbed CO was found in the absorbances centered at 2050 and 1915 cm<sup>-1</sup>, respectively.

#### Methanation Activity

The kinetic data for CO methanation on Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (LT), (HT) are listed in Table 1.

Methanation studies were performed at 275°C using a H<sub>2</sub>/CO ratio of 3:1. Turnover numbers (TON's) were defined as the number of moles of CH<sub>4</sub> formed per second per active Ni site for CO chemisorption at 125°C (i.e., *N<sub>s</sub>* at 125°C). Activation energies for methanation were calculated from the rate data and are included in Table 1 (last two columns).

#### DISCUSSION

At room temperature, the tendency for Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> to form when a supported-nickel catalyst is exposed to carbon monoxide is well documented (12, 14, 16, 17). Even though carbonyl formation on Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-supported nickel is somewhat suppressed in comparison to Ni/SiO<sub>2</sub> or Ni/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (18), it remains a problem in obtaining accurate CO uptake data and infrared spectra of chemisorbed CO. The IR data in Fig. 2 for CO uptake at 25°C on 10% Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> catalysts clearly indicates the formation of Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> as CO pressure is increased. This is respon-

sible for the significant departure from linearity of the isotherms for the Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) and (HT) catalysts (see Fig. 1), even though the dual-isotherm technique of Yates and Sinfelt (6) was used. With this method, a brief evacuation between the collection of data for the two isotherms is used to remove weakly bound species. Apparently Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> effects were not completely removed by the application of this technique and uptake results were adversely affected. In addition to influencing uptake results, Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> formation may strip the catalyst surface of nickel and redistribute it on the infrared cell or on the catalyst itself. Thus, the formation of Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> should be avoided if possible.

The dual-isotherm technique also assumes that only weakly held CO (mainly on the support) is removed during the evacuation step (1). However, our infrared evidence (Fig. 2) shows that a significant amount of chemisorbed CO is removed from the metal. For weakly adsorbing catalysts (as reflected by a relatively low value of  $K_{CO}$ ) such as Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (HT) and Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (LT) and (HT), a brief evacuation may remove the majority of the CO initially adsorbed on the metal. Therefore, another technique was sought that would accurately measure CO uptake and account for both the strongly and weakly chemisorbed CO.

It was with this motivation that single-isotherm adsorption studies were conducted at 125°C, a temperature at which, thermodynamically, Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> formation is suppressed to a tolerable level and at which CO dissociation is not a problem. This was verified using IR spectroscopy. No infrared stretching frequencies for CO<sub>2</sub> (indicating CO dissociation) or Ni(CO)<sub>4</sub> were observed at 125°C and CO pressures up to 400 Torr. The onset of carbonyl formation was determined by noting deviations from linearity in the uptake isotherms (see Figs. 4 and 5). It was also determined that adsorption of CO by the pure support material was negligible at 125°C.

Using the 125°C single-isotherm uptake

technique, it was possible to obtain accurate values for the equilibrium constant for CO adsorption ( $K_{CO}$ ) and saturation coverage numbers ( $N_s$ ) which accounted for the adsorption of both strongly and weakly held CO.

$K_{CO}$  can be thought of as a relative measure of the average strength of CO-metal bonding; the larger  $K_{CO}$ , the more strongly the CO molecule is held to the surface. It is evident from Table I that there is a trend of decreasing  $K_{CO}$  as one progresses from TiO<sub>2</sub>- to Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-based catalysts. For the TiO<sub>2</sub>-supported cases, the results are in agreement with the work by Raupp and Dumesic (2), Jiang *et al.* (16), and Vannice and Garten (18), who found that the strength of the metal-CO bond is significantly weakened on TiO<sub>2</sub>-supported catalysts in the SMSI state. This trend, however, is not reflected in the saturation coverage values ( $N_s$ ). In fact,  $N_s$  values at 125°C for Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) and (HT) and for Ni/Ti<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (LT) and (HT) are approximately equal. This is surprising since it has been reported that H<sub>2</sub> and CO uptake at 25°C are suppressed on Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (3, 16, 18, 19, 20).

In light of the above discussion we believe that significant amounts of weakly chemisorbed CO may have been overlooked. All of the procedures in question included an evacuation step which can lead to the underestimation of the amount of CO adsorbed. For example, compare  $N_s$  (25°C) to  $N_s$  (125°C) for Ni/TiO<sub>2</sub> (LT) and (HT) (Table I). Particularly for the (HT) data, the 25°C estimates are too low because, as indicated in the IR data (Figs. 2 and 3), a significant amount of the total adsorbed CO was removed by evacuation. In the (LT) case, bridge-bonded CO (1875–1960 cm<sup>-1</sup>) is not removed and the linear-bonded CO (2030–2090 cm<sup>-1</sup>) is only partially removed by the evacuation step. Thus, the monolayer coverage values compare favorably. The amount of chemisorbed CO may also be underestimated in work done using high-vacuum photoelectron and Auger spectroscopies where a catalyst surface is dosed with

CO and then evacuated before any measurements are taken (see, for example, the Auger work by Takatani and Chung (3)). Our 125°C uptake studies provide no evidence for the suppression of CO uptake (i.e.,  $N_s$ ) on the  $Ti_xO_y$ -supported catalysts, even though  $K_{CO}$  values for the (LT) and (HT) cases differ by a factor of 2 or more.

A correlation was found between the relative value of  $K_{CO}$  for each of the catalysts and the onset of  $Ni(CO)_4$  formation. As the strength of CO adsorption decreases and the overall intensity of the CO stretching frequency shifts to higher wavenumbers, the propensity for nickel carbonyl formation decreases. This is in agreement with the work of Jiang *et al.* (16) and Raupp and Dumesic (2).

For the titania-based systems studied here, there was no correlation between the  $CH_4$  turnover number (TON) and either  $N_s$  or  $K_{CO}$ . However, we did find a significant decrease in the TON for  $Ni/TiO_2$  (HT) (SMSI state) as compared to  $Ni/TiO_2$  (LT) (non-SMSI state), in agreement with the findings of Burch and Flambard (21) and with single crystal studies by Chung *et al.* (4). This suggests that the enhanced methanation activity of  $Ni/TiO_2$  over  $Ni/SiO_2$  (TON = 3 orders of magnitude less) (21) is a characteristic of  $Ti_xO_y$ -supported metals in general and not the direct consequence of an SMSI effect. Finally, it is clear that the presence of bulk  $Ti^{3+}$  does not enhance methanation activity since the  $Ni/Ti_2O_3$  TONs were significantly lower than those for  $Ni/TiO_2$ .

#### CONCLUSIONS

(1) The enhanced methanation activity of  $Ni/TiO_2$  is not strongly correlated to the presence of an SMSI condition.

(2) The effect of (HT) reduction (SMSI) of  $Ni$ /titania catalysts is described better in terms of the strength of CO and  $H_2$  adsorption rather than in terms of the inhibition of the chemisorption of these molecules.

(3) Techniques involving an evacuation procedure to determine the amount and/or strength of chemisorbed CO on a supported-metal catalyst surface should not be used unless it is verified that the weakly held CO, removed from the surface during the evacuation step, does not desorb from metal sites. Such a procedure will underestimate the number of active metal surface sites.

(4) Bulk  $Ti^{3+}$  does not enhance the methanation activity.

(5) Nickel carbonyl formation on the  $Ni/Ti_xO_y$  catalysts studied is inhibited as the strength of the CO-nickel surface bond decreases.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research (JMW) and the National Science Foundation, Grant CPE-8319494 (JGE).

#### REFERENCES

1. Tauster, S. J., Fung, S. C., and Garten, R. L., *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* **100**, 170 (1978).
2. Raupp, G. B., and Dumesic, J. A., *J. Phys. Chem.* **88**, 660 (1984).
3. Takatani, S., and Chung, Y.-W., *J. Catal.* **90**, 75 (1984).
4. Chung, Y.-W., Xiong, G., and Kao, C. C., *J. Catal.* **85**, 237 (1984).
5. Kao, C. C., Tsai, S. C., Bahl, M. K., Chung, Y.-W., and Lo, W. J., *Surf. Sci.* **95**, 1 (1980).
6. Yates, D. J. C., and Sinfelt, J. H., *J. Catal.* **8**, 348 (1967).
7. Tanaka, K., and White, J. M., *J. Catal.* **79**, 81 (1983).
8. Sinfelt, J. H., *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **23**, 1181 (1968).
9. Wang, C. J., and Ekerdt, J. G., *J. Catal.* **80**, 172 (1983).
10. Primet, M., Dalmon, J. A., and Martin, G. A., *J. Catal.* **46**, 25 (1977).
11. Rochester, C. H., and Terrell, R. J., *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. I* **73**, 609 (1977).
12. Yates, J. T., and Garland, C. W., *J. Phys. Chem.* **65**, 617 (1961).
13. Ludlum, K. H., and Eischens, R. P., *Surf. Sci.* **40**, 397 (1973).
14. Heal, M. J., Leisegang, E. C., and Torrington, R. G., *J. Catal.* **42**, 10 (1976).
15. Van Hardeveld, R., and Hartog, F., "Advances in

- Catalysis," Vol. 22, p. 75, 1972; "Proceedings, 4th International Congress on Catalysis, Moscow, 1968" (B. A. Kazansky, Ed.). Adler, New York, 1968.
16. Jiang, X.-Z., Hayden, T. F., and Dumesic, J. A., *J. Catal.* 83, 168 (1983).
17. Bartholomew, C. H., and Pannell, R. B., *J. Catal.* 65, 390 (1980).
18. Vannice, M. A., and Garten, R. L., *J. Catal.* 56, 236 (1979).
19. Smith, J. S., Thrower, P. A., and Vannice, M. A., *J. Catal.* 68, 270 (1981).
20. Bartholomew, C. H., Pannell, R. B., and Butler, J. L., *J. Catal.* 65, 335 (1980).
21. Burch, R., and Flambard, A. R., *J. Catal.* 78, 389 (1982).



Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist _____	
A-1	

This is a technical report per Dr. David Nelson, ONR/Code 413

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

	<u>No. Copies</u>	<u>No. Copies</u>
Office of Naval Research Attn: Code 413 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	2	Dr. David Young Code 334 NORDA NSTL, Mississippi 39529
Dr. Bernard Daida Naval Weapons Support Center Code 5042 Crane, Indiana 47522	1	Naval Weapons Center Attn: Dr. Ron Atkins Chemistry Division China Lake, California 93555
Commander, Naval Air Systems Command Attn: Code 310C (H. Rosenwasser) Washington, D.C. 20360	1	Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps Code RD-1 Washington, D.C. 20380
Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Attn: Dr. R. W. Drisko Port Huene, California 93401	1	U.S. Army Research Office Attn: CRD-AA-IP P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12	Mr. John Boyle Materials Branch Naval Ship Engineering Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112
DTNSRDC Attn: Dr. G. Bosmajian Applied Chemistry Division Annapolis, Maryland 21401	1	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Dr. S. Yamamoto Marine Sciences Division San Diego, California 91232
Dr. William Tolles Superintendent Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375	1	

## ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. F. Carter  
Code 6132  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375

Dr. Richard Colton  
Code 6112  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375

Dr. Dan Pierce  
National Bureau of Standards  
Optical Physics Division  
Washington, D.C. 20234

Dr. R. Stanley Williams  
Department of Chemistry  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dr. R. P. Messmer  
Materials Characterization Lab.  
General Electric Company  
Schenectady, New York 22217

Dr. Robert Gomer  
Department of Chemistry  
James Franck Institute  
5640 Ellis Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dr. Ronald Lee  
R301  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dr. Paul Schoen  
Code 5570  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375

Dr. John T. Yates  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

Dr. Richard Greene  
Code 5230  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375

Dr. L. Kesmodel  
Department of Physics  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana 47403

Dr. K. C. Janda  
California Institute of Technology  
Division of Chemistry and Chemical  
Engineering  
Pasadena, California 91125

Dr. E. A. Irene  
Department of Chemistry  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Dr. Adam Heller  
Bell Laboratories  
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974

Dr. Martin Fleischmann  
Department of Chemistry  
Southampton University  
Southampton SO9 5NH  
Hampshire, England

Dr. John W. Wilkins  
Cornell University  
Laboratory of Atomic and  
Solid State Physics  
Ithaca, New York 14853

Dr. Richard Smardzewski  
Code 6130  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375

Dr. H. Tachikawa  
Chemistry Department  
Jackson State University  
Jackson, Mississippi 39217

## ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. G. A. Somorjai  
Department of Chemistry  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. J. Murday  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Surface Chemistry Division (6170)  
455 Overlook Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20375

Dr. J. B. Hudson  
Materials Division  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. Theodore E. Madey  
Surface Chemistry Section  
Department of Commerce  
National Bureau of Standards  
Washington, D.C. 20234

Dr. J. E. Demuth  
IBM Corporation  
Thomas J. Watson Research Center  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Dr. M. G. Lagally  
Department of Metallurgical  
and Mining Engineering  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dr. R. P. Van Duyne  
Chemistry Department  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois 60637

Dr. J. M. White  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Texas  
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. D. E. Harrison  
Department of Physics  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California 93940

Dr. W. Kohn  
Department of Physics  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, California 92037

Dr. R. L. Park  
Director, Center of Materials  
Research  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dr. W. T. Perla  
Electrical Engineering Department  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dr. Keith H. Johnson  
Department of Metallurgy and  
Materials Science  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Dr. S. Sibener  
Department of Chemistry  
James Franck Institute  
5640 Ellis Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dr. Arnold Green  
Quantum Surface Dynamics Branch  
Code 3817  
Naval Weapons Center  
China Lake, California 93555

Dr. A. Wold  
Department of Chemistry  
Brown University  
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Dr. S. L. Bernasek  
Department of Chemistry  
Princeton University  
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

Dr. P. Lund  
Department of Chemistry  
Howard University  
Washington, D.C. 20059

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. J. E. Jensen  
Hughes Research Laboratory  
3011 Malibu Canyon Road  
Malibu, California 90265

Dr. J. H. Weaver  
Department of Chemical Engineering  
and Materials Science  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dr. W. Goddard  
Division of Chemistry  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California 91125

Dr. A. Reisman  
Microelectronics Center of North Carolina  
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina  
27709

Dr. M. Grunze  
Laboratory for Surface Science and  
Technology  
University of Maine  
Orono, Maine 04469

Dr. J. Butler  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 6115  
Washington D.C. 20375

Dr. L. Interante  
Chemistry Department  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. Irvin Heard  
Chemistry and Physics Department  
Lincoln University  
Lincoln University, Pennsylvania 19352

Dr. K.J. Klaubunde  
Department of Chemistry  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Dr. W. Knauer  
Hughes Research Laboratory  
3011 Malibu Canyon Road  
Malibu, California 90265

Dr. C. B. Harris  
Department of Chemistry  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. F. Kutzler  
Department of Chemistry  
Box 5055  
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Dr. D. DiLella  
Chemistry Department  
George Washington University  
Washington D.C. 20052

Dr. R. Reeves  
Chemistry Department  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
Troy, New York 12181

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. R. G. Wallis  
Department of Physics  
University of California  
Irvine, California 92664

Dr. D. Ramaker  
Chemistry Department  
George Washington University  
Washington, D.C. 20052

Dr. J. C. Heminger  
Chemistry Department  
University of California  
Irvine, California 92717

Dr. T. F. George  
Chemistry Department  
University of Rochester  
Rochester, New York 14627

Dr. G. Rubloff  
IBM  
Thomas J. Watson Research Center  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Dr. Horia Metiu  
Chemistry Department  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Dr. M. Goddard  
Division of Chemistry  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California 91125

Dr. J. T. Keiser  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Richmond  
Richmond, Virginia 23173

Dr. R. W. Plummer  
Department of Physics  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dr. E. Yeager  
Department of Chemistry  
Case Western Reserve University  
Cleveland, Ohio 41106

Dr. M. Winograd  
Department of Chemistry  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Dr. Roald Hoffmann  
Department of Chemistry  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York 14853

Dr. A. Steckl  
Department of Electrical and  
Systems Engineering  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. G. H. Morrison  
Department of Chemistry  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York 14853

Dr. P. Hansma  
Physics Department  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Dr. J. Baldeschwiler  
California Institute of Technology  
Division of Chemistry  
Pasadena, California 91125

**END**

**FILMED**

**12-85**

**DTIC**