## **Electronic Supplementary Information**

## Metal-Support Interaction Induced ZnO Overlayer in Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> Catalysts toward Low-Temperature Water Gas Shift Reaction

Zhiyuan Li,<sup>1</sup>\* Na Li,<sup>1</sup> Nan Wang,<sup>1</sup> Bing Zhou,<sup>1</sup> Jun Yu,<sup>2</sup> Boyu Song,<sup>2</sup> Pan Yin,<sup>2</sup> Yusen Yang<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Stated Grid Integrated Energy Service Group Co., LTD, Beijing 100052, P. R. China

<sup>2</sup> State Key Laboratory of Chemical Resource Engineering, Beijing Advanced Innovation Center for Soft Matter Science and Engineering, Beijing University of Chemical Technology, Beijing 100029, P. R. China

\* Corresponding author. Tel: +86-10-63505060; Fax: +86-10-63505555.

E-mail address: <u>sailorlzy@163.com</u> (Zhiyuan Li).



Figure S1. (A–B) TEM images of Cu<sub>2</sub>Zn<sub>1</sub>Al-LDHs.



Figure S2. SEM image of  $Cu_2Zn_1Al$ -LDHs and the corresponding element EDS mapping of Cu, Zn, Al, and O.



Figure S3. TEM images of Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300R.



**Figure S4.** SEM image of Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300R and the corresponding element EDS mapping of Cu, Zn, Al, and O.



Figure S5. SEM image of  $Cu@ZnO/Al_2O_3$ -350R and the corresponding element EDS mapping of Cu, Zn, Al, and O.

![](_page_3_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S6.** SEM image of Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-400R and the corresponding element EDS mapping of Cu, Zn, Al, and O.

![](_page_4_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S7.** (A) CO conversion as a function of reaction temperature over the Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalysts (WGS reaction conditions: 6% CO, 25% H<sub>2</sub>O, 69% Ar; WHSV: 15700 mL  $g_{cat}^{-1}$  h<sup>-1</sup>). (B) Reaction rates of Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300R, Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-250R and Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-200R catalysts at 175 °C.

![](_page_4_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S8. Arrhenius plots of WGS reaction over the commercial Cu/ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalyst. (WGS reaction conditions: 6% CO, 25% H<sub>2</sub>O, 69% Ar)

![](_page_5_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S9.** CO conversion as a function of reaction temperature over the Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300R catalyst (WGS reaction conditions: 6% CO, 25% H<sub>2</sub>O, 69% Ar; WHSV: 15700 mL  $g_{cat}^{-1}$  h<sup>-1</sup>).

![](_page_5_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S10.** (A) XRD patterns of the Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300R catalyst: (a) the fresh catalyst (b) the used catalyst after five cycles test. (B) TEM images of the used Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300R catalyst after five cycles test.

![](_page_6_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S11.** (A) XAES spectra of Cu LMM for Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300R, Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-350R, and Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-400R. (B) Reaction rate as a function of surface Cu<sup>+</sup> concentration.

test

catalysts	Cu species content <sup>a</sup> (wt %)	Zn species content <sup>a</sup> (wt %)	Al species content <sup>a</sup> (wt %)	Cu crystallite size <sup>b</sup> (nm)	mean Cu particle size <sup>c</sup> (nm)
Cu@ZnO/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300R (fresh)	27.5	13.9	47.1	7.6	5.4
Cu@ZnO/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300R (used)	27.1	13.6	47.0	7.9	5.6

<sup>*a*</sup> Element content was determined by inductively coupled plasma–atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP–AES). <sup>*b*</sup> Crystallite size of Cu was determined by XRD with the Scherrer equation. <sup>*c*</sup>Mean particle size of Cu was determined by TEM.

catalysts	Cu species content <sup>a</sup> (wt %)	Zn species content <sup>a</sup> (wt %)	Al species content <sup>a</sup> (wt %)	Cu crystallite size <sup>b</sup> (nm)	mean Cu particle size <sup>c</sup> (nm)
Cu@ZnO/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300R (fresh)	27.5	13.9	47.1	7.6	5.4
Cu@ZnO/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300R (used)	27.7	14.3	47.4	8.0	5.8

Table S2. Physicochemical properties of Cu@ZnO/Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300R catalyst before and after stability test

<sup>*a*</sup>Element content was determined by inductively coupled plasma–atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP–AES). <sup>*b*</sup> Crystallite size of Cu was determined by XRD with the Scherrer equation. <sup>*c*</sup>Mean particle size of Cu was determined by TEM.

Catalyst	Reaction Temperatu re (°C)	<b>Reaction Condition</b>	Reaction Rate (µmol <sub>CO</sub> g <sub>cat</sub> <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )	Ref.
Cu@ZnO/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300R	175	6%CO-25%H <sub>2</sub> O-Ar	19.47	This work
Cu@ZnO/Al2O3-350R	175	6%CO-25%H <sub>2</sub> O-Ar	12.83	This work
Cu@ZnO/Al2O3-400R	175	6%CO-25%H <sub>2</sub> O-Ar	10.31	This work
Cu/ZnO/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	175	6%CO-25%H <sub>2</sub> O-Ar	3.58	This work
Cu <sub>8.9</sub> /CeO <sub>2</sub>	300	10% CO, $20%$ H <sub>2</sub> O, balance He	16.7	Catal. Today 2008, 137, 29
Cu/CeO <sub>2</sub>	200	1.0 vol.% CO, 3.0 vol.% H <sub>2</sub> O/He	4.0	Nat. Catal. 2019, 2, 334
ZnO/c-Cu	225	$5\%$ CO, $10\%$ H_2O, balance Ar	1.2	Nat. Commun. 2017, 8, 488
Cu/ZnO/La	230	7% CO, 8.5% CO <sub>2</sub> , 23% H <sub>2</sub> O,	11.7	J. Catal. 2010, 273, 73
		$37.5\%~H_2$ and $25\%~N_2$		
$Ce_{0.75}Cu_{0.1}Ni_{0.15}O_{2-\delta}$	240	1.3% CO, 35% H <sub>2</sub> O	2.2	Appl. Catal. B: Environ. <b>2012</b> , 123, 367
Cu <sub>4</sub> Ni <sub>16</sub> /CeLaO <sub>x</sub>	275	$10\%$ CO, $20\%$ $\rm H_2O,$ balance He	15.6	Appl. Catal., A 2010, 387, 87
Au@TiO <sub>2-x</sub> /ZnO(H300)	250	6%CO-25%H2O-Ar	15.2	ACS Catal. 2019, 9, 2707
Au/CeO <sub>2</sub>	150	2%CO-10%H <sub>2</sub> O-He	2.38	Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. <b>2008</b> , 47, 2884
Au/CeFeAl	180	4.5%CO-30%H <sub>2</sub> O-N <sub>2</sub>	1.98	J. Catal. 2014, 314, 1

Table S3. Comparison of catalytic performances for WGSR over various catalysts