Selective formic acid dehydrogenation at low temperature over RuO$_2$/COF pre-catalyst synthesized on the gram scale
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CHEMICALS

Hexamethylenetetramine, o-tolidine, and anhydrous phloroglucinol were purchased from TCI Chemicals, and RuCl$_x$·xH$_2$O was purchased from Alfa Aesar. All other reagents and solvents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and Fisher Scientific. Commercial reagents and solvents were used as received. Ultrapure water was produced by Milli-Q Advantage A10 system (Millipore; resistivity = 18.2 MΩ cm$^{-1}$). Reduced 5%Ru on activated carbon control catalyst was purchased from Alfa Aesar (11748). The S$_{BET}$ of the catalyst is 720 m$^2$/g.

SYNTHESIS

Triformylphloroglucinol (Tp), was synthesized as follows:

22 hexamethylenetetramine (15.10 g, 108 mmol) and phloroglucinol (6.01 g, 49 mmol) were placed in a three-necked round-bottom flask under N$_2$ and 90 mL of trifluoroacetic acid was added. The solution was heated to 100 °C for 2.5 h under inert atmosphere. Approximately 150 mL of aq. 3 M HCl was added and the solution was heated to 100 ºC for 1 h. After cooling to room temperature, the solution was filtered and extracted with dichloromethane, dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate, filtered, and dried in a rotary evaporator.

For the synthesis of TpBD-Me$_2$ COF, Tp (1.50 g, 7.14 mmol) and o-tolidine (1.52 g, 7.14 mmol) were placed in a pressure tube (ACE glass, bushing type back seal, 100 mL) under N$_2$ and then 60 mL of anhydrous 1,4-dioxane were added. The mixture was sonicated to obtain a homogeneous dispersion. Then, aq. 6 M acetic acid (4.16 mL, 25.0 mmol) was added to the mixture. The tube was flushed with N$_2$,
closed, and heated in an oil bath to 120 °C for 3 days. The precipitate was collected by centrifugation (4400 rpm, 15 min), washed with acetone four times and collected by centrifugation (4400 rpm, 15 min), and washed with tetrahydrofuran by stirring the COF dispersed in the solvent and filtering under vacuum until the washing solvent was colorless. Finally, the material was dried at 120 °C under vacuum for 2 h to yield TpBD-Me₂ COF as ∼2 g of orange powder.

The Ru-COF pre-catalyst was prepared by precipitation of RuO₂ nanoparticles on TpBD-Me₂ COF support as follows:²³ the support (1.22 g) was suspended in aq. RuClₓ·ₓH₂O solution (71.5 mL, 0.6 mmol Ru, 8.3 mM). The mixture was left stirring at room temperature for 15 min in order to impregnate the precursor on the support. Then, aq. 1 M NaOH solution (14 mL) was added and the stirring continued for 18 h. Finally, the sample was filtered, washed with water until the filtrates were colorless, and dried under vacuum at 120 °C.

CHARACTERIZATION METHODS

**N₂ Physisorption**

The N₂ adsorption–desorption isotherms at −196 °C were recorded using a Quantachrome Autosorb IQ2 multi-station apparatus. Approximately 100 mg of sample was placed in the sample holder tube. The sample was degassed at 120 °C for 180 min. After that, the sample holder tube was placed into liquid nitrogen bath and the analysis was started. The specific surface area of the materials was determined by the BET method, and the total pore volume is calculated using the amount of vapor adsorbed at relative pressure close to unity (P/P₀ = 0.97) by assuming that the pores were filled with liquid adsorbate, and thus, converting the adsorbed volume in volume of liquid nitrogen. The pore size distribution was estimated using quenched solid density functional theory (QSDFT) approach for slit/cylindrical pores while treating the adsorption branch of the isotherm.

**Small-Angle X-ray Scattering (SAXS)**

The crystallinity of the material was evaluated by SAXS performed on an Anton Paar SAXSess mc² instrument operating at 40 kV and 50 mA. The samples were placed in a holder with Mylar windows for the measurement and the data was collected with an image plate detector. All data are background corrected.

**Inductively Coupled Plasma–Optical Emission Spectroscopy (ICP–OES)**

The ruthenium content was determined by ICP–OES using an ICPE-9000 Multitype ICP Emission Spectrometer from Shimadzu, equipped with a nebulizing system and using optical emission spectroscopy for detection. Samples were digested by dispersing 20 mg in 12 g of concentrated HNO₃ (65%) in an autoclave, which was kept in the oven at 180 °C for 12 h to completely decompose the sample. Subsequently, the acidic solution was diluted in a 50 mL volumetric flask and subjected to the chemical analysis. Measurements were repeated three times and the results are the mean value with relative standard deviation.

**X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS)**

XPS measurements were performed using a monochromated microfocused Al Kα X-ray source that defined an analysis spot of ca. 650 × 400 μm². The binding energy (BE) scale of the analyzer had been calibrated based on Au 4f₇/₂ reference BE value of 83.95 eV. All spectra were acquired in normal emission
with an enabled magnetic lens, producing an effective analyzer collection angle of ca. 30°. Powdered samples were pressed into carbon tape, which was directly attached to the sample holder.

Charge neutralization was provided by beams of low-energy (≤10 eV) Ar\(^+\) ions and electrons guided by the magnetic lens. For the complex powder of nanoporous COF, charge neutralization was challenging. Nevertheless, the standard acquisition conditions produced a local maximum in the neutralizer efficiency. For metallic Ru signal, the measured BEs were within 0.1–0.3 eV from the published reference values:\(^{29}\) Ru 3d\(_{5/2}\) at 280.0 (Figure S3c) vs 279.9 eV and Ru 3p\(_{3/2}\) at 461.5 (Figure 1b) vs 461.2 eV, respectively. Accordingly, the BE values are reported as measured and assumed to be within <0.3 eV from values that could be obtained under perfect charge neutralization.

A convolution of Lorentzian and Gaussian lineshapes on a linear combination of Shirley and linear backgrounds was used to fit the individual components, choosing the minimal number of self-consistent components that were able to fit spectra across all the samples. The number of components for C 1s, N 1s, and O 1s spectra was fixed based on the fits for pristine COF sample (Figure S3a); the positions of C 1s components were constrained to small variations from their positions in the COF sample, when necessary for disambiguation of the fits for Ru 3d peaks.

The reported elemental ratios were estimated from the standard “atomic %” elemental compositions that were quantified using calibrated analyzer transmission functions, Scofield sensitivity factors, and TPP-2M effective attenuation lengths for photoelectrons, as implemented in Avantage software (Thermo Scientific).

**Annular dark-field scanning transmission electron microscopy (ADF–STEM)**

ADF–STEM and energy dispersive X-Ray spectroscopy in STEM mode (STEM–EDX) experiments were carried out using two FEI Titan transmission electron microscopes operated at an accelerating voltages of 200 kV (in the case of STEM–EDX mapping)\(^{25,26}\) and 300 kV (in the case of high resolution imaging)\(^{27}\) and both equipped with a probe spherical aberration corrector unit and one equipped with a Super-X EDX system. The samples were prepared by dispersing powder samples in ethanol and dropping the dispersion onto a carbon coated copper grid. The average particle size was determined before and after the catalytic testing by measuring at least 50 nanoparticles.

**Catalytic Experiments**

In order to test the performance of Ru-COF for formic acid dehydrogenation, 50 cm\(^3\) min\(^{-1}\) of N\(_2\) saturated with formic acid (roughly 10% FA) was passed over 10 mg of the catalyst. The catalyst was mixed with 90 mg of quartz (350–700 μm) to prevent the sample from clogging the system and the sample was heated and cooled at 1 °C min\(^{-1}\) in two cycles from 100 °C to 200 °C. CO\(_2\) and CO content was measured using a Rosemount BINOS 100 detector.

Control 5 wt% Ru on activated carbon catalyst (Ru-C) was also tested under the same conditions as a comparison for our catalyst. To compensate for the difference in Ru loading, only 6 mg of the commercial Ru-C was used for the cycle experiments and 18 mg for the stability and plateau experiments, thereby keeping the amount of Ru equivalent.

Additionally, stability tests were performed under the same conditions, with the difference that, in this case, 30 mg of Ru-COF were used in order to obtain a reasonable yield. Note that due to the relatively low flow, few minutes are needed for the measured gas stream to reflect the change in the system when increasing the temperature.
The choice of temperature for the stability tests was made based on another set of experiments, in which the activity of the samples was determined at 120, 140, 160, 180, and 200 °C (Figure S7c). Results indicated that significant deactivation occurred at higher temperatures, and therefore the stability tests were carried out at 120 °C.

Conversion of formic acid \((X)\), yield to hydrogen \((Y_{H2})\), and selectivity to hydrogen \((S_{H2})\) were calculated as follows, considering that the amount of \(H_2\) formed corresponds to the amount of \(CO_2\) formed \((HCOOH \rightarrow H_2 + CO_2)\):

\[
S_{H2} = \frac{[CO_2]_{out}}{[CO_2]_{out} + [CO]_{out}} \times 100 \tag{S1}
\]

\[
Y_{H2} = \frac{[CO_2]_{out}}{[HCOOH]_m} \times 100 \tag{S2}
\]

\[
X = \frac{Y_{H2}}{S_{H2}} \times 100 \tag{S3}
\]

The dispersion of the sample was calculated to be ≈100%, as follows:\(^{35}\)

\[
D(\%) = 6 \left( \frac{v_m/a_m}{d_p} \right) \tag{S4}
\]

Where, \(D\) is the dispersion, \(d_p\) is the mean particle size, \(v_m\) is the volume occupied by an atom in bulk metal and \(a_m\) is the surface area occupied by an atom of metal on a polycrystalline surface.

CHARACTERIZATION RESULTS

**COF structure**

![Figure S1](image)

**Figure S1.** Photograph (a) and the chemical structure (b) of the synthesized ca. 2 g of TpBD-Me, COF powder.
N₂ physisorption

Figure S2. (a) N₂ adsorption–desorption isotherms and (b) pore size distribution of COF and Ru-COF.

Table S1. Textural properties of COF and Ru-COF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>( S_{\text{BET}} ) (m² g⁻¹)</th>
<th>( d_p ) (nm)</th>
<th>( V_p ) (cm³ g⁻¹)</th>
<th>( V_{\text{micro}} ) (cm³ g⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COF</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-COF</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy

The method for the RuO₂ NPs precipitation used in this work has been extensively reported in the literature and it has been proposed that the precipitated NPs are distinct in structure and composition from anhydrous RuO₂ and have been designated as “hydrated RuO₂” or “Ru hydroxide”. After extensive XPS analysis (Figure 1b), we conclude that our as-synthesized catalyst is predominantly composed of hydrated RuO₂.

Based on BEs of Ru in the XPS data, it is not possible to distinguish the hydrated and anhydrous forms of RuO₂, as has been demonstrated previously using different combinations of reference samples. Techniques complementary to XPS have revealed that hydrated RuO₂ includes Ru with hydroxyl ligands, however, stoichiometric Ru(OH)₃ would have the Ru 3p₃/₂ peak at BE ca. 1.5 eV higher than that in Figure 1b. The combination of literature results and our XPS data (Figure 1b and S3) thus indicates that Ru particles in the as-synthesized pre-catalyst are predominantly composed of hydrated RuO₂, which is characterized by the Ru chemical environment similar to, yet distinct from, Ru hydroxide.

The details of the spectra in C 1s (Ru 3d), N 1s, and O 1s regions in Figure S3 provide information about the chemistry of both the COF support and Ru-COF. The significant overlap between the peaks associated with COF and Ru-COF in both C 1s (Ru 3d) and O 1s regions highlights the importance of developing a self-consistent fitting model for the spectra of the “witness” COF sample, which has been treated with NaOH, to simulate preparing the Ru-COF but in absence of the catalyst precursors. The fitting model for this COF support (Figure S3a) is then used as the baseline for the interpretation of the spectra of the supported Ru-COF samples (Figure S3b and c).
Fitting the C 1s spectrum of the COF support in Figure S3a requires a minimum of three components and a $\pi-\pi^*$ shakeup feature. While, in principle, adding one or two more components to the fit does improve the randomness of the fit residuals, it is difficult to maintain consistent fits across all three materials with so many components, without artificially restricting them. The minimal fit shown in Figure S3a, in contrast, is partially constrained by features in the raw data and results in a typical FWHM for each of the components for organic systems.\textsuperscript{32} In agreement with the literature,\textsuperscript{32} the three components correspond to (aromatic) C–C (BE = 283.9 ± 0.1 eV, FWHM = 1.4 ± 0.1 eV), a combination of C–N, C–O, C–CO (BE = 285.0 ± 0.1 eV), and C=O (BE = 287.2 ± 0.2 eV); the last two components are constrained to have identical FWHM, which in all the fits expanded to the upper limit of 1.9 eV. Without extensive additional characterization by complementary methods, the fit of the $\pi-\pi^*$ shakeup feature is necessarily indicative and unstructured, with a single broad component at BE of 289.4–289.9 eV, consistent with the typical values for aromatic shakeup features.\textsuperscript{32}

The spectra in the N 1s region in Figure S3 are particularly important as signatures of COF-specific molecular chemistry. In all cases, the spectrum includes the single primary peak at BE = 399.2 ± 0.1 eV (FWHM = 1.5 ± 0.1 eV) and two broad low-intensity shakeup features at 403.1 ± 0.3 eV and 406.0 ± 0.5 eV.

The minimal changes in the aromatic C–C and the imine N 1s peaks across all three samples provide evidence that no major chemical degradation (e.g., ring opening, oxidation, bond cleavage) of COF occurs during the synthesis of the Ru-COF or during the catalytic testing. The shakeup features in both C 1s and N 1s regions are even more sensitive to the molecular structure of the COF at the level of its unit cell and beyond, because resonant shakeup features require the presence of uniform and spatially ordered HOMO and LUMO energy bands. The clear presence of the shakeup features after the catalytic testing, therefore, provides strong evidence that the lateral chemical structure and ordering of the COF does not suffer significant degradation in the process.

Inferences about the chemistry of the Ru-COF from the spectra in Figure S3 are complementary to those discussed in the main text and Figure 1b. As-synthesized pre-catalyst produces the primary Ru 3d$_{5/2}$ peak at 281.0 eV (Figure S3b), which is in excellent agreement with the value of 280.8 eV reported for hydrated RuO$_2$.\textsuperscript{29} The additional Ru 3d$_{5/2}$ component at 282.0 eV (Figure S3b) is just below the value of 282.3 eV reported for Ru(OH)$_3$,\textsuperscript{29} in agreement with the expected presence of some OH ligands in the hydrated RuO$_2$.\textsuperscript{28} The interpretation of complementary evidence from the O 1s region is only semi-quantitative, because the O 1s lineshape measured for the COF support (Figure S3a) is nearly identical, for example, to that reported for electrochemically grown hydrated RuO$_2$.\textsuperscript{34} This unusual spectral overlap is partly the result of the intrinsic oxygen signal from C–O groups in the COF (confirmed by ca. 1:1 ratio to the C–O component in C 1s region) being at an unusually low (for oxygen in organic molecules) BE of 530.1 ± 0.1 eV, i.e., overlapping with the typical metal-oxide BE range. Nevertheless, the standard protocol for generating hydrated RuO$_2$ from RuCl$_3$ is expected to produce O 1s components at 530.4 and 532.7 eV,\textsuperscript{28} which is reflected in the corresponding increase of O 1s components at 530.1 and 532.8 eV in the fits between Figure S3a and b. After the catalytic testing, the Ru 3d$_{5/2}$ components shift to 280.0 and 281.5 eV (Figure S3c), the lower-BE one being in perfect agreement with BE = 279.9 eV expected for metallic Ru\textsuperscript{28} and the higher-BE one corresponding to the remnants of the original hydrated RuO$_2$. Observing relatively stronger signals from the minority components in Ru 3d vs 3p region (the latter has a shallower sampling depth) also suggests that the corresponding chemical states of Ru are nonuniformly distributed, e.g., between the core and surface regions of the Ru catalyst particles.

XPS analysis of the sample after the catalytic testing (Figure1b and S3c) indicates that the chemical structure of the COF support remains largely unchanged. This is evidenced by the minimal changes in
the resonant shakeup features in the C 1s, N 1s, and O 1s spectra (Figure S3), which are produced by the combination of HOMO and LUMO bands specific to the molecular structure of the COF.

Based on the SAXS (Figure 1a) and XPS (Figure 1b and Figure S3) data, we believe that the loss of crystallinity is due to delamination of the COF into sheets, rather than a modification of its chemical structure. This phenomenon has been previously observed with COF catalysts, and has been attributed to weak interlayer interactions within the materials. The presence of strong in-plane bonds and weaker van der Waals interactions between the layers in 2D COFs leads to the possibility of chemical or mechanical delamination and random displacement of 1D COF layers, which is reflected in the reduction of intensity of the main reflection observed in the SAXS pattern.

After the catalytic testing the initial RuO$_2$ NPs undergo a dramatic transformation: the Ru 3d$_{5/2}$ components shift to 280.0 and 281.5 eV (Figure S3c), the lower-BE one being in perfect agreement with BE = 279.9 eV expected for metallic Ru$^{29,34}$ and the higher-BE one corresponding to the remnants of the original hydrated RuO$_2$. Observing relatively stronger signals from the minority components in Ru 3d vs 3p region (the latter has a shallower sampling depth) also suggests that the corresponding chemical states of Ru are non-uniformly distributed, e.g., between the core and surface regions of the Ru catalyst particles. Some of the hydrated RuO$_2$, perhaps in the core of the particles, is not reduced during the catalytic testing.

Table S2 presents the elemental composition determined by XPS for COF, Ru-COF, and Ru-COF after catalytic testing. We note that for comparison with literature in the main text, the 8.9 atomic % of N in the COF was converted to 9.9 weight %, which is approximately correct because the atomic weights of C, N, an O (present in the COF support) are similar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C (at%)</th>
<th>O (at%)</th>
<th>N (at%)</th>
<th>Ru (at%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COF</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-COF</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-COF after catalytic testing</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S3. High-resolution XPS data for O 1s, N 1s and C1s/Ru 3d regions of (a) COF treated with NaOH, (b) Ru-COF, and (c) Ru-COF after stability test. Symbols: raw data; black lines: overall fits; colored lines: fits of individual components; grey dashed lines: background.
**Electron microscopy**

**Figure S4.** ADF–STEM image of Ru-COF showing the agglomerates found in the sample, composed by nanoparticles with ≈1.2 nm in diameter.

**Figure S5.** ADF–STEM image of Ru-COF with simultaneously collected EDX maps of Ru, C, O, and N.
The morphology and chemical composition of Ru-COF after the catalytic test (Figure S6) were analysed and the distribution of C, O, and N in the COF support remains homogeneous and the Ru NPs are decorating the COF support. Furthermore, we note that after catalysis the diameter of the Ru NPs increases up to $\approx$2.4 nm (Figure S6).
CATALYTIC EXPERIMENTS

Figure S7. Comparison of catalytic performance of our catalyst and a commercial Ru-C catalyst in the dehydrogenation of formic acid. (a) Light-off curve for the conversion of formic acid ($X$) as a function of reaction temperature, (b) light-off curve for the selectivity to H$_2$ ($S_{H_2}$) as a function of reaction temperature and (c) H$_2$ yield ($Y_{H_2}$) as a function of time for different temperature steps (120, 140, 160, 180, and 200 °C). Green line: Ru-COF; brown line: Ru-C; solid line: first cycle; dashed line: second cycle; black line: temperature.