Effect of Cu modification to Ru/HZSM-5 catalysts on the catalytic combustion of vinyl chloride

Mingqi Li, Yunyun Wang, Min Ding, Wangcheng Zhan, Li Wang, Qiguang Dai, Yun Guo, Aiyong Wang*, Yanglong Guo*

State Key Laboratory of Green Chemical Engineering and Industrial Catalysis, Research Institute of Industrial Catalysis, School of Chemistry and Molecular Engineering, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, P. R. China

* Corresponding Author:

E-mail: wangaiyong@ecust.edu.cn (A. Wang); ylguo@ecust.edu.cn (Y. Guo)

Catalysts characterization

The chemical compositions of all catalysts were measured quantitatively using inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) on an Agilent 725 spectrometer. Prior to the measurement, each sample was dissolved in a mixed solution of hydrofluoric acid and aqua regia and then diluted before measurement.

To obtain X-ray diffraction (XRD) measurements, we used a Bruker D8 Focus diffractometer with Cu K α radiation (40 kV, 40 mA, λ = 1.5406 Å) and a scanning rate of 6°/min at 2 θ = 5-80°.

Nitrogen adsorption and desorption isotherms were recorded at low temperatures (77 K) using a Micromeritics ASAP 2020 M instrument after degassing the sample at 180 °C for 1 hour prior to analysis. The specific surface area was determined by the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) method, and pore size distribution was calculated using the Barrett-Joyner-Halanda (BJH) method.

Scanning transmission electron microscopy (STEM) was recorded with a ThermoFisher Talos F200X (FETEM, 200 kV), and high angle annular dark field (HAADF)-STEM images were acquired with a convergence semi-angle of 11 mrad, and inner- and outer collection angles of 59 and 200 mrad, respectively. Energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) was carried out using 4 in-column Super-X detectors.

The analysis of X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) was conducted on a Thermo Scientific ESCALAB 250Xi electron spectrometer. Al K α (hv = 1486.6 eV) radiation was used as the excitation source in ultra-high vacuum (6.7×10^{-8} Pa), and a pass energy of 30 eV was applied. The C1s peak (284.8 eV) originating from the adventitious carbon was used as a reference.

Ultraviolet and visible diffuse reflectance spectroscopy (UV-vis) were determined on a Lambda 950 UV-vis spectrophotometer.

The temperature-programmed reduction of hydrogen (H₂-TPR) was performed in a PX 200 apparatus (Tianjin Pengxiang Technology Co., Ltd.) equipped with a thermal conductivity detector (TCD). A total of 40 mg of the catalyst was loaded into a quartz reactor and gradually heated from 30 °C to 800 °C at a rate of 10 °C/min while being exposed to a flow of 10 vol.% H₂/N₂ gas mixture, flowing at a flow rate of 40 mL/min. The amount of H₂ consumed was quantified by utilizing high purity CuO as a reference sample.

The PX 200 apparatus, manufactured by Tianjin Pengxiang Technology Co., Ltd., was used for the temperature-programmed desorption of ammonia (NH₃-TPD). Initially, 50 mg of the catalyst

was placed in a quartz reactor and treated with Ar for 1 hour at 450 °C with a flow rate of 50 mL/min. Following cooling down to 90 °C, the adsorption of ammonia was executed in a flow of 10 vol.% NH₃/Ar at a flow rate of 50 mL/min and preserved at 90 °C for 30 minutes. Desorption was carried out by ramping the temperature from 90 °C to 600 °C at a rate of 10 °C /min. A TCD detected the corresponding NH₃ desorption signal.

Temperature-programmed desorption of oxygen (O₂-TPD) was conducted using a Micromeritics AutoChem II 2920 chemisorption analyzer. A mass of 50 mg of the catalyst underwent pretreatment at 400 °C for 1 hour in 3 vol.% O₂/He gas with a flow rate of 40 mL/min. Upon cooling to room temperature, the catalyst was purged with pure He at a flow rate of 40 mL/min for 40 minutes. The reactor was then heated from room temperature to 800 °C at a rate of 10 °C/min. The Hiden HPR20 mass spectrometer (MS) was used to record the signal.

The in-situ DRIFT measurement of VC oxidation was performed on a Nicolet Nexus 6700 FT-IR spectrometer with an MCT detector, and the sample cell was equipped with BaF_2 windows and a heating chamber. The sample was pretreated at 300 °C for 1 hour in O₂/Ar at a 40 mL/min flow rate, then cooled to 60 °C to collect the backgrounds at 40 °C intervals. Subsequently, the gas flow consisting of stoichiometric VC/O₂ mixture was introduced into the IR cell at 60 °C and the infrared signals were collected after stabilizing for 30 minutes. Then the temperature was increased, and the spectra of VC oxidation were collected at 40 °C intervals.

Catalyst performance evaluation for EDC oxidation

The catalytic activity of EDC oxidation was evaluated by a fixed bed reactor. 100 mg of the catalysts were placed in a quartz tube with an inner diameter of 6 mm. A mixture of EDC and air, with a concentration of 1000 ppm of EDC, was passed through the tube with a weight hourly space velocity (WHSV) of 30,000 mL·h⁻¹·g_{cat}⁻¹. The outlet gas was detected online using a GC2060 gas chromatography. It equipped a flame ionization detector (FID) to test EDC and the organic by-products of the reaction. The conversion of EDC was calculated by the following equation:

$$X_{EDC}(\%) = \frac{[EDC]_{in} - [EDC]_{out}}{[EDC]_{in}} \times 100\%$$

Where [EDC]_{in} and [EDC]_{out} represent the concentrations of EDC at the inlet and outlet, respectively.



Fig. S1 EDS mapping images of Ru/HZSM-5 catalyst.



Fig. S2 EDS mapping images of Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5 catalyst.



Fig. S3 Ru 3d XPS spectra of zeolite-based catalyst.



Fig. S4 H_2 -TPR profiles of CuO sample.



Fig. S5 CO_2 yields of the Ru/HZSM-5 and Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5 catalysts in the catalytic combustion of VC.



Fig. S6 Relationship between surface oxygen desorption peak area and T_{90} values over Ru/HZSM-5 and Ru-xCu/HZSM-5 catalysts.



Fig. S7 The concentrations of chlorinated by-products as a function of temperature for VC oxidation over the zeolite-based catalysts. The reaction conditions were 1000 ppm VC, and air balance, and the WHSV was 30,000 mL·h⁻¹·g_{cat}⁻¹.



Fig. S8 (a) Catalytic activity of VC for the Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5 and Ru-5Cu/HZSM-5 catalysts. (b) The concentrations of chlorinated byproducts as a function of temperature over the Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5 and Ru-5Cu/HZSM-5 catalysts.



Fig. S9 The concentrations of chlorinated by-products as a function of temperature for EDC oxidation over (a) Ru/HZSM-5 and (b) Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5 catalysts. The reaction conditions were 1000 ppm EDC, and air balance, and the WHSV was 30,000 mL·h⁻¹· g_{cat}^{-1} .



Fig. S10 Catalytic stability for VC oxidation of Ru/HZSM-5 and Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5 catalysts at 320 °C.



Fig. S11 The concentrations of chlorinated by-products as a function of temperature for VC oxidation over the zeolite-based catalysts under dry and wet conditions.



Fig. S12 In situ DRIFTS of VC oxidation over (a) Ru/HZSM-5 and (b) Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5 catalysts in the wavenumber range of 2500-4000 cm⁻¹ at different temperatures.

			5		
	Catalysts	H_2 consumption (mmol/g)	NH ₃ desorption (mmol/g)		
		$RuO_2 \rightarrow Ru$	Weak	Strong	Total
	Ru/HZSM-5	0.110	0.28	1.11	1.39
	Ru-0.5Cu/HZSM-5	0.118	0.20	0.20	0.40
	Ru-1Cu/HZSM-5	0.123	0.23	0.17	0.40
	Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5	0.136	0.26	0.13	0.39
	Ku-2Cu/11ZSWI-5	0.150	0.20	0.15	0.59

Table S1 Calculation results of H_2 -TPR and NH_3 -TPD for the catalysts

in those catalysis reported in the interatures								
Catalysta	VC concentration	WHSV	T ₉₀	Deference				
Catalysis	(ppm)	$(mL \cdot h^{-1} \cdot g_{cat}^{-1})$	(°C)	Reference				
Mn _{0.4} Ti _{0.6} O _x	1000	15,000	262	[1]				
$Co(0.7)CeO_x$	1000	15,000	282	[2]				
Ru-CeO ₂	1000	30,000	262	[3]				
0.5% Ru/Co ₃ O ₄ -F-10	1000	30,000	251	[4]				
1% RuO _x /HZ5-3d	1000	30,000	297	[5]				
1% Ru/CoPO-MCF	1000	48,000	313	[6]				
Ru/Sn-MFI	1000	30,000	306	[7]				
Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5	1000	30,000	257	This work				

Table S2 Comparison of the catalytic activity of the Ru-2Cu/HZSM-5 catalyst for VC oxidation with those catalysts reported in the literatures

Reference

[1] H. Liu, X. Li, Q.G. Dai, H.L. Zhao, G.T. Chai, Y.L. Guo, Y. Guo, L. Wang and W.C. Zhan, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*, 2021, 282, 119577.

- [2] C. Wang, C.H. Zhang, W.C. Hua, Y.L. Guo, G.Z. Lu, S. Gil and A. Giroir-Fendler, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2017, **315**, 392-402.
- [3] B.C. Xie, Z.J. Wei, M. Ding, M.X.Z. Gao, L. Wang, W.C. Zhan, Q.G. Dai, Y. Guo, A.Y. Wang, and Y.L. Guo, *Appl. Catal. B Environ.*, 2024, **350**, 392-402.
- [4] H. Liu, J. Yang, Y.Y. Jia, Z.Q. Wang, M.X. Jiang, K. Shen, H.L. Zhao, Y.L. Guo, Y. Guo, L. Wang, S. Dai and W.C. Zhan, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2021, 40, 817-827.
- [5] S.M. Wang, H.L. Zhang, M.J. Wang, X.H. Liu, S.Q. Shang, Z. Wang and C.H. Zhang, *Appl. Surf. Sci.*, 2022, 606, 154906.
- [6] C. Wang, C.C. Tian, Y.L. Guo, Z.D. Zhang, W.C. Hua, W.C. Zhan, Y. Guo and G.Z. Lu, J. Hazard. Mater., 2018, 342, 290-296.
- [7] M.Q. Li, Y.A. Cai, W.C. Zhan, L. Wang, Q.G. Dai, Y. Guo, A.Y. Wang and Y.L. Guo, Sep. Purif. Technol., 2024, 340, 126773.