

Support Effects on CO Oxidation on Metal-supported Ultrathin FeO(111) Films

Xuefei Weng⁺, Ke Zhang⁺, Qiushi Pan, Yulia Martynova, Shamil Shaikhutdinov,* and Hans-Joachim Freund^[a]

FeO(111) films grown on a Au(111) substrate were studied in the low temperature CO oxidation reaction at near-atmospheric pressure. Enhanced reactivity over the otherwise inert Au(111) surface was only observed if the iron oxide films possessed so-called "weakly bound oxygen" (WBO) species upon oxidation at elevated pressures. The reaction rate measured under O-rich conditions $(CO/O_2 = 1/5, \text{ totally 60 mbar}, \text{ He bal$ ance to 1 bar) was found to correlate with the total amount ofWBO measured in the "oxidized" films by temperature programmed desorption. The initial reaction rate measured asa function of the film coverage showed a maximum at about $one monolayer (ML), in contrast to <math>\approx 0.4 \text{ ML}$ obtained for the Pt(111)-supported FeO(111) films measured with the same setup. When compared to FeO(111)/Pt(111), WBO species on FeO(111)/Au(111) desorb at a much lower (i.e., by $\approx 200 \text{ K}$) temperature, but also in much smaller amounts. Scanning tunneling microscopy studies showed that the FeO(111) layer on Au(111) is fairly stable towards high pressure oxidation in the low coverage regime, but undergoes substantial reconstruction at near-monolayer coverages, thus resulting in poorly-defined structures. Comparison of structure-reactivity relationships observed for Au(111) and Pt(111) supported FeO(111) films revealed the complex role of a metal support on reactivity. Although a strong interaction with the Pt(111) surface stabilizes a planar FeO(111)-derived structure for the active oxide phase, in the case of a more weakly interacting Au(111) surface, the reaction atmosphere induces structural transformations governed by the thermodynamic phase diagram of the iron oxide, albeit it seems crucial to have a dense FeO(111) film as the precursor.

Introduction

Ultrathin oxide films grown on metal substrates receive much attention as advanced materials with superior functional properties in modern technological applications.^[1] In particular for catalysis, well-ordered oxide films were recognized as suitable models for elucidating the atomic structure and mechanisms of chemical reactions on oxide surfaces and oxide supported metal nanoparticles.^[1c,2] Recently, ultrathin transition-metal oxide films have been invoked to rationalize the so-called Strong Metal/Support Interaction which often results in an encapsulation of metal particles by a thin oxide overlayer stemming from the support.^[3] In addition, the systems consisting of oxide nanostructures (primarily, as two-dimensional islands) grown on a metal surface have been studied to address reactions that may occur at the metal/oxide interface in conventional, oxide-supported metal catalysts.^[1b,4]

| [a] | X. Weng, ⁺ K. Zhang, ⁺ Q. Pan, Dr. Y. Martynova, Dr. S. Shaikhutdinov, |
|-----|--|
| | Prof. HJ. Freund |
| | Abteilung Chemische Physik |
| | Fritz-Haber-Institut der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft |
| | Faradayweg 4-6 |
| | 14195 Berlin (Germany) |
| | E-mail: shaikhutdinov@fhi-berlin.mpg.de |
| [+] | These authors contributed equally to this work. |
| | Supporting information for this article can be found under: |

http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cctc.201601447.

This manuscript is part of a Special Issue to celebrate the 50th annual meeting of the German Catalysis Society.

Our recent studies of various metal-supported ultrathin films in CO oxidation revealed an inverse relationship between the reaction rate and the binding energy of the most weakly bound oxygen (WBO) species which was suggested as a good descriptor for CO oxidation on continuous (dense) films.^[5] Those WBO species were detected via temperature programmed desorption (TPD) measurements of the films exposed to pure oxygen (typically 10 mbar) at the reaction temperature. Although the precise mechanism of O₂ desorption from such films remains unknown, the desorption temperature can be used as a qualitative measure of the WBO binding energy.

If the oxide film partially covers a metal substrate, CO adsorption on such systems becomes crucial as well. Indeed, the CO oxidation rate on ZnO(0001) films increased considerably at sub-monolayer (sub-ML) coverages when grown on Pt(111), but not on Ag(111).^[6] The effect was reasonably explained by a much stronger CO adsorption on Pt(111) as compared to Ag(111) which, in turn, increases the residence time for adsorbed CO to react with WBO supplied by ZnO. Therefore, the CO adsorption energy can be considered as another descriptor for the reaction, which may even dominate at sub-ML oxide coverages. This has recently been demonstrated for FeO(111) islands deposited on Pt(111).^[7] Both experimental and theoretical results provided strong evidence that, in addition to the reaction pathway on the oxide surface as observed on a continuous film, the reaction primarily occurs between CO adsorbing

Wiley Online Library



on Pt and WBO species at the island edge. Note that WBO species were only observed at a high chemical potential of oxygen (i.e. elevated oxygen pressures). Once formed, they readily react with CO even under UHV conditions thanks to the strong CO adsorption on the Pt sites available at sub-ML coverages.

Previous studies including density functional theory (DFT) calculations showed that, under reaction conditions, an FeO(111) monolayer film on Pt(111) transforms into an "Orich" FeO_{2-x} structure which can be described, for simplicity, as an O-Fe-O trilayer,^[3d] although the precise structure appears to be more complex, owing to the Moire superstructure caused by the lattice mismatch between the oxide layer and the support. According to our TPD study,^[7] the same transformation occurs for FeO(111) films at sub-ML coverages. However, in their studies, Bao and co-workers concluded that the FeO₂-like structures are inert,^[8] and the reactivity must be linked to coordinatively unsaturated Fe cations at the edges of pristine FeO(111) islands which dissociate O_2 .^[9] Oxygen ions, which bind both to Pt and Fe, are responsible for the facile CO oxidation.

In attempts to shed more light on the reactivity of metal supported ultrathin films and elucidate the role of a metal support, in this work we address the reactivity of the FeO(111) films on Au(111) and compare the results with those from the previously studied FeO(111)/Pt(111) system. In principle, gold is the most inert noble metal with respect to both CO and O_{27} and therefore, one can readily assign the observed reactivity (if any) to the iron oxide phase. In addition, the Au(111) surface has a surface lattice constant and a work function quite different from those of Pt(111). Both parameters may be crucial for the phase stability and oxygen induced phase transformations.

The preparation of an FeO(111) film on Au(111) has first been reported by Matranga and co-workers^[10] by oxidation of Fe deposits with molecular O2. A combined scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) and x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) study showed the formation of FeO(111) monolayer islands and a continuous film exhibiting a Moire structure very similar to that previously observed for FeO(111)/Pt(111). Under certain preparation conditions using NO₂ as an oxidizing agent, other iron oxide structures can be formed, which were assigned to Fe₂O₃(0001)^[11] and Fe₃O₄(111).^[12] Interestingly, ambient pressure XPS studies revealed that a continuous Fe₂O₃ film showed a different response to elevated pressures of CO (0.2 torr) as compared to nanoparticulate Fe₂O₃.^[13] Recently, Fe₂O₃/Au(111) model catalysts have been examined by Yan et al.^[14] in the CO oxidation reaction at pressures between 4 and 100 torr and temperatures from 400 to 670 K. The authors observed a maximum rate at 0.4 ML coverage (as determined by Auger electron spectroscopy, AES), suggesting the active cites to be located at the Fe₂O₃/Au(111) perimeter. Yu et al.^[15] compared the activities of differently prepared iron oxide/ Au(111) model catalysts, which were characterized by XPS before and after the reaction in the mixture of 5 torr CO and 5 torr O₂ at 575 K. The results showed that neither FeO nor Fe₂O₃ is stable under the reaction conditions used, and both transform into the Fe₃O₄-like phase. Interestingly, the initial reaction rate was found to be the highest on FeO(111)/Au(111) as a starting material.

Results and Discussion

As the reactivity studies were carried out in the UHV setup which was not equipped with STM to measure the FeO(111) coverage directly, we first address coverage calibration which is, in fact, not a trivial issue. Film thicknesses estimated from XPS and/or AES measurements using tabulated values for fitting parameters (such as a mean free path of electrons and a cross section) which are commonly derived from experiments performed on few nanometers thick films becomes rather inaccurate in the case of ultrathin, that is, monolayer films (see, for instance, ref. [17]).

In our previous study of FeO(111) films supported by Pt(111), the oxide coverage in the sub-monolayer range could be determined by CO titration of the bare Pt surface with TPD since FeO(111) does not chemisorb CO.^[7] Precise morphology of the islands should not affect the CO uptake results as the DFT calculations showed only small changes of the CO adsorption energy for the Pt sites close to FeO(111) islands as compared to the regular sites. Figure 1a demonstrates that the intensity ratio of the O (at 512 eV) and Pt (at 237 eV) Auger electrons is linearly proportional to the FeO coverage measured by CO uptake. In the case of Au(111) as a substrate, the metal surface could hardly be titrated by CO and other probe molecules. All desorption signals on Au(111) at temperatures above 90 K (only accessible with our setup) are commonly associated with the surface defects. On the other hand, Au and Pt, being neighbors in the Periodic Table, exhibit similar fingerprints in AES (and XPS). A very small kinetic energy difference of Auger electrons in Au and Pt (239 and 237 eV, respectively) implies the same mean free path. Also, the elemental sensitivity of the corresponding Auger line in Au is only $\approx 5\%$ higher than in Pt.^[17] Moreover, since the measurements on both systems were carried out with the same spectrometer and the same parameters (e.g. excitation energy, oscillation voltage, acquisition time, etc) all apparatus effects are self-cancelled. Therefore, the FeO(111) coverage on Au(111) can fairly well be determined by measuring the intensity (I) of the O(512 eV) and Au(241 eV) signals taking into account a 5% higher elemental sensitivity of Au as compared to Pt. This finally results in the FeO(111) coverage (θ_{FeO} , in ML) on Au(111) as: $\theta_{\text{FeO}} = A \times I(O_{512 \text{ eV}})/I$ $I(Au_{239 \text{ eV}})$, with a scaling factor A = 0.95(±0.1).

In addition, Figure 1 b shows that the Auger O/Au ratio is linearly proportional to the Auger Fe(653 eV)/Au(241 eV) intensity ratio measured before the oxidation step, thus suggesting that the compositional stoichiometry of the FeO(111) film remains unchanged in this coverage regime. At high coverages the results scatter most likely due to the formation of different iron oxide domains.^[10]

Furthermore, AES measurements in another chamber, additionally equipped with STM that allowed measuring the FeO(111) coverage directly (see images below), showed a similar linear relationship, although yielding a lower scaling factor $A = 0.75(\pm 0.15)$. Note, however, that STM as a local probe tech-



CHEMCATCHEM Full Papers



Figure 1. a) The relationship between the Auger O(512 eV)/Pt(237 eV) signal ratio and film coverage obtained for FeO(111)/Pt(111) films and measured by CO titration. (NB: The sample at 1.1 ML showed no CO uptake and the coverage was determined by extrapolation using the Fe deposition time). b) The relation-ship between the Auger Fe(653 eV)/Au(239 eV) signal ratio obtained after Fe deposition on Au(111) and the O(512 eV)/Au(239 eV) signal ratio measured after oxidation step. The opened and filled symbols show data for the samples used for reactivity studies and structural characterization upon high pressure oxygen treatment, respectively (see text).

nique inspects a relatively lower surface area as compared to the TPD technique that averages over the entire sample surface.

Shown in Figure 2a are the typical kinetics of CO₂ production measured in the circulating mixture of 10 mbar of CO and 50 mbar of O₂ (He balance to 1 bar) on the pristine and FeO(111) covered Au(111) surfaces at 480 K. The reaction was performed in excess of oxygen in order to prevent film dewetting that occurred in stoichiometric (CO/O $_2$ =2:1) and CO-rich conditions on the Pt(111) supported films.^[3b, 18] As expected, the clean Au(111) surface is, in essence, inert in this reaction. (Some CO₂ production can be attributed to reactions on the sample holder and heating wires). Clearly, the iron oxide overlayer considerably promotes the reaction which, however, slows down in time. Therefore, we focus solely on the initial reaction rate, that is, measured within the first 10-15 minutes. The rate strongly depends on the FeO(111) coverage and shows a maximum at about 1 ML (Figure 2b). Data scatter at high coverages where iron oxide phases other than monolayer FeO(111) can readily be formed^[10] (see also Figure 1b). Such a volcano-type curve has previously been observed in our experiments on FeO(111)/Pt(111).^[7] However, the rate was the highest at the sub-monolayer coverage (\approx 0.4 ML), so that the promotional effect could straightforwardly be attributed to the reaction at the oxide/metal perimeter sites. Apparently, for the FeO(111) films on Au(111), the reaction is proportional to the total surface area of the FeO(111) phase. These results suggest that: 1) the reaction primarily occurs on oxide surface rather than at oxide/metal interfacial sites; 2) at nominal film thickness above 1 ML, other structures start to form which are inactive in this reaction, but dominate at high film thicknesses. Both conclusions well agree with the general picture developed for the Pt(111) supported films as discussed above. Indeed, CO very weakly adsorbs on the Au(111) surface in contrast to Pt(111), and hence the reaction on Au supported islands does not benefit from having the oxide/metal interface. With increasing nominal film thickness above one monolayer, FeO(111) transforms into another phase such as Fe₃O₄(111) which shows no rate enhancement.^[3b]

Since the CO oxidation reaction was performed in the O_2 -rich atmosphere, any structural transformations that occur on FeO(111)/Au(111) under reaction conditions are likely governed by oxygen ambient as it was previously shown for FeO(111)/Pt(111).^[19] Therefore, in the next set of experiments, we performed structural characterization of the freshly prepared films after exposure to 20 mbar of O_2 at 480 K for 10 min. The samples were cooled down to 350 K before pumping oxygen out.

The low energy electron diffraction (LEED) pattern of an 1 ML FeO(111)/Au(111) film is shown in Figure 3 a. Similarly to



Figure 2. a) Kinetics of CO_2 production in the circulating mixture of 10 mbar of CO and 50 mbar of O_2 (He balance to 1 bar) on the pristine and FeO(111) covered Au(111) surfaces at 480 K. b) The initial rate (normalized to the maximum) as a function of the FeO(111) coverage measured by AES.

ChemCatChem 2017, 9, 705-712

www.chemcatchem.org



Figure 3. Inverse contrast LEED patterns (at 60 eV) of 1 ML FeO(111) film on Au(111) (a,b) and Pt(111) (c,d) before (a,c) and after (b,d) exposure to 20 mbar of O_2 at 480 K for 10 min. The insets in panels (a,b) zoom in the same Figure portion for direct comparison.

FeO(111) films on Pt(111), the "flower"-like diffraction spots are indicative of a Moire-like coincidence structure that was observed by STM,^[10] (see also below). The FeO(111) integer spots are almost aligned with those of Pt(111). Therefore, in the first approximation, we assume no rotation of the FeO(111) layer with respect to Au(111). Using the surface lattice constant of Au(111) ($a_{Au(111)} = 2.88$ Å) as an internal reference, we obtained the value $3.14(\pm 0.04)$ Å, on average, for the lattice constant of FeO(111). For comparison, the measurements on the Pt(111) supported films performed with the same LEED apparatus yielded 3.06(\pm 0.03) Å, on average (Figure 3 c). The latter value is considerably lower than 3.11 Å reported by Weiss et al.,^[20] who employed a more precise spot profile analysis LEED technique, which is in turn very close to 3.13 Å calculated on the basis of a coincidence structure where eight unit cells of FeO(111) coincide with nine unit cells of Pt(111) ($a_{Pt(111)} = 2.78$ Å). To some extent, the observed discrepancy on FeO/Pt samples (3.06 vs. 3.11 Å) could be assigned to imperfection of our LEED optics. Using 1.016 (=3.11/3.06) as the scaling factor, we can recalculate the lattice constant of the FeO(111) layer on Au(111) that yields 3.19 Å. Again, the latter value nicely agrees with 3.20 Å obtained for the situation when nine unit cells of FeO(111) coincide with ten unit cells of Au(111). In fact, such coincidence structure is favored by atomically resolved STM images presented by Khan et al. (see Figures 8 and 9d in ref. [11]), although the authors themselves preferred the value 3.3(\pm 0.3) Å) on the basis of interatomic distances directly measured by STM.

Displayed in Figure 3 b is the LEED pattern of the film upon high-pressure oxygen treatment. The diffraction spots become weaker and broader, thus suggesting certain disordering caused by oxidation. Nonetheless, we found that the film lattice constant is reduced substantially, that is, from 3.19 to \approx 3.08 Å. Such a response is very different from that observed on FeO(111)/Pt(111) under the same treatment (see Figures 3 c,d). In the latter case, the film remains highly ordered and no considerable changes in the lattice parameter are detected.

Further AES inspection of the oxygen treated FeO(111)/Au(111) films showed that the Auger O/Fe ratio in the monolayer film increased by \approx 50% (at most), that is considerably smaller than > 80% observed for the 0.6 ML and 1 ML FeO/Pt films after exposure to the same conditions.

Finally, the samples were studied by TPD in order to see whether WBO species are formed under high pressure oxygen conditions. Figure 4a shows a series of O₂ (32 amu) desorption spectra recorded on films of different thicknesses as indicated. Note, that the end temperature was limited to ≈ 1000 K to avoid a risk of damaging (e.g. melting) the Au crystal at higher temperatures. A sharp desorption O₂ peak is observed at 635 K which was missing on the "as prepared" FeO(111)/Au(111) surface and on the clean Au(111) surface after the same treatment. Therefore, this signal can straightforwardly be assigned to WBO species which are only formed at elevated oxygen pressures. Interestingly, the total amounts of WBO follow the same volcano-type curve as the reaction rate, both showing a maximum at ≈ 1 ML coverage (cf. Figures 4b and 2b).

To shed more light on the structural transformations induced by oxidation at high pressures, we carried out STM studies in another UHV setup. Figure 5 a shows large-scale STM



Figure 4. a) 32 amu (O_2) signal in TPD spectra of FeO(111)/Au(111) films exposed to 20 mbar O_2 at 480 K for 10 min. The heating rate is 3 Ks⁻¹. b) The integral intensity of the desorption peak at 635 K plotted as a function of the nominal film thickness.

ChemCatChem 2017, 9, 705-712

www.chemcatchem.org



ChemPubSoc

Figure 5. STM images of an 0.5 ML FeO(111) film: (a,b) as-prepared and (c) exposed to 10 mbar O_2 at 470 K for 10 min. The inset shows a close-up image. (Sample bias and tunneling current are: -0.06 V, 0.1 nA (a); -0.7 V, 0.15 nA (b); -1.0 V, 0.14 nA (c); -0.9 V, 0.08 nA (inset)).

image of the "as prepared" film at the ≈ 0.5 ML coverage. As in the previously reported STM study by Khan et al.,^[10] FeO(111) islands are readily identified by the Moire structure with a ≈ 30 Å periodicity. The islands are surrounded by the clean Au(111) surface showing a "herring-bone" reconstruction (Figure 5 b). The apparent height of the islands is about 0.8 Å (depending on the tunneling conditions, though), which can, therefore, be assigned to a single FeO(111) layer. Note also, that under certain tunneling conditions the island edges look much higher than the interior region, thus indicating very different electronic structure of the step edges. In addition, a few particles about 6 Å in height can also be observed on this surface.

An STM image of the film exposed to 10 mbar of O_2 at 470 K is displayed in Figure 5 c. Basically, the film morphology remains the same: The lateral size and shape of oxide islands are not changed, and the "herring bone" Au(111) surface between islands can still be resolved. However, the Moire periodicity on the islands increased from \approx 30 to \approx 45 Å. This finding well agrees with the LEED results (Figure 3) showing that the lattice constant considerably decreases upon high-pressure oxidation. Indeed, a shortening of the FeO(111) lattice constant reduces the mismatch with the Au(111) surface and hence increases the periodicity of the coincidence structure, which can be described as $14 \times a_{FeOx} - 15 \times a_{Au(111)} = 43.2$ Å, using $a_{FeOx} = 3.08$ Å as

suggested by LEED. In addition, the islands height increased from initial 0.8 to 1.5 Å, albeit both affected by the tip conditions and tunneling parameters.

Further TPD and AES measurements on this sample revealed a very small O_2 desorption peak at $\approx\!635$ K in TPD spectra, but almost no oxygen enrichment in Auger spectra, in fairly good agreement with the results obtained on low coverage samples in the "first" UHV chamber.

Shown in Figure 6a is an STM image of a sample, which was prepared by deposition of enough Fe amount to form a continuous FeO(111) film. The metal and oxide surfaces in the film displayed in Figure 6a can clearly be distinguished by the "herring-bone" (on Au) and Moire (on FeO) patterns. In contrast to the low coverage regime, Au(111) ad-islands are observed which are surrounded by the FeO(111)/Au(111) surface, thus resulting in the film coverage equivalent to ≈ 0.7 ML. To some extent, the formation of Au(111) ad-islands can be attributed to the $\approx 4\%$ excess of the Au atoms accommodated in the topmost layer of the reconstructed Au(111) surface, which transforms into the Au(111)–(1×1) structure underneath the FeO(111) layer. In addition, at near-monolayer coverages, some iron is involved in the formation of thicker iron oxide islands also seen in Figure 6a.

Subsequent oxidation in 10 mbar O_2 at 470 K results in substantial surface reconstruction as shown in Figures 6 (b,c), which is again in contrast to the low coverage regime. The terraces now expose such a rough surface that oxide and metal phases can hardly be differentiated. Nonetheless, this sample showed an amount of WBO a factor of 2 higher than on the 0.5 ML sample, still by an order of magnitude smaller than measured under the same conditions over Pt(111)-supported films. Therefore, the results obtained in two different experimental setups well agree with each other.

To rationalize the promotional effect of FeO(111) on reactivity of Au(111) in CO oxidation at near realistic pressure and temperature conditions, let us summarize the key experimental findings as follows:

- 1) The reaction rate vs. coverage plot shows a volcano-type curve with a maximum at ≈ 1 ML coverage;
- The reaction rate correlates with the integral amount of WBO species formed in pure oxygen ambient at the reaction pressures and temperatures;



Figure 6. STM images of 1 ML FeO(111)/Au(111) film before (a) and after exposure to 10 mbar O_2 at 470 K (b,c). Tunneling parameters are -1.0 V, 1.2 nA (a,b); -2.1 V, 0.5 nA (c).

ChemCatChem 2017, 9, 705 – 712

www.chemcatchem.org

When compared to the Pt(111)-supported films, WBO species on FeO(111)/Au(111) desorb at a much lower temperature (635 vs. 850 K) and in amounts by an order of a magnitude smaller (see direct comparison in Figure S1 in the Supporting Information, SI);

ChemPubSoc

4) The morphology of the FeO(111)/Au(111) films oxidized at high oxygen pressures depends on the film coverage: At low coverages, the morphology of islands remains basically the same, although the surface lattice constant decreases from 3.2 to 3.08 Å. At close to monolayer coverages, the films undergo massive reconstruction resulting in poorly defined structures.

Following general considerations discussed in the Introduction, result (1) favors the conclusion that the reaction occurs primarily on iron oxide phase rather than at the oxide/metal interface. Finding (2) further validates this conclusion and suggests that the WBO formation and its replenishment in the catalytic cycle is the rate limiting step. Comparison with the FeO(111)/Pt(111) system shows that WBO species on Au(111) supported films must be more active towards CO. Indeed, temperature dependence for the reaction rate measured on (the most active) 1 ML FeO(111)/Au(111) surface at temperatures between 450 and 500 K revealed the Arrhenius plot (see Figure S2 in SI) corresponding to the apparent activation energy of 58 kJ mol⁻¹. This value is much lower than 113 kJ mol⁻¹ previously reported for 1 ML FeO(111)/Pt(111), although in stoichiometric CO/O₂ mixture.^[3b]

On FeO(111)/Pt(111), weakly bound oxygen atoms were identified with the topmost O-layer in a "trilayer" O-Fe-O structure only formed at high chemical potential of oxygen. However, for the FeO(111)/Au(111) system, one encounters certain difficulties to invoke such transformations as the total amounts of WBO measured by TPD is very low. Also a comparative STM study of the FeO(111) islands before and after high pressure exposure (Figure 5) does not provide compelling evidence for the formation of a trilayer structure clearly observed on FeO(111)/Pt(111).^[3d] Instead, the smooth and wave-like longrange periodic surface structure of FeO(111) is maintained. However, there is a certain effect of high pressure oxygen treatment on FeO(111) islands, ultimately causing changes in the surface lattice parameter and island height. On the one hand, such a "thickening" would be consistent with the formation of additional O-layer in the structure. On the other hand, the amount of WBO measured by TPD is equivalent to about 8 additional oxygen atoms that have to be distributed in the entire Moire supercell, which in turn consists of \approx 80 FeO(111) unit cells. In principle, a shortening of the surface lattice constant could readily increase the surface rumpling^[21] and hence the apparent height.

Nonetheless, the most active, that is, close to a monolayer, film substantially reconstructs under the reaction conditions resulting in a structure which is difficult to assign to a particular iron oxide phase (Figure 6), which, however, possesses the highest amounts of WBO. Taking into account the arguments presented above for the sub-ML films, it seems plausible that the iron oxide phase on Au(111) that becomes active in the CO oxidation reaction, is not represented by a planar, slightly O-rich FeO_{1+x} (111)-derived structure, but yet ill-defined nanoparticulate iron oxide, which has weakly bound oxygen in the structure.

The reaction induced film transformations observed here agree well with the XPS results of Yu et al.^[15] who showed that FeO(111) is unstable and transforms into the Fe₃O₄-like phase under applied reaction conditions (although quite different from those used in our work). On the basis of DFT calculations of various iron oxides/metal interfaces, the authors came to the conclusion that Fe₃O₄ is the only active iron oxide phase as it allows O₂ dissociation on active Fe²⁺ sites, available at the particle edge, and subsequent facile reaction with CO. The role of Au in this reaction is to adsorb CO and to provide moderate binding to dissociated O₂, that is similar to the mechanism first put forward by Sun et al. for the case of FeO(111) layer supported on Pt(111).^[9b]

While performing reactions at elevated pressures, one has to take precautions with respect to the traces of water in the feedstock. Indeed, recent ambient pressure XPS studies of FeO(111)/Pt(111) provided evidence for the formation of considerable amounts of hydroxyl species even in pure O₂ in the mbar range,^[22] in agreement with previous results showing the formation of an FeO(OH)-like film upon water exposure.^[23] The dissociation of H₂O resulting in hydroxyl groups at Au(111)-supported FeO(111) island edges was also observed by STM and XPS at water pressures ranging from 3×10^{-8} to 0.1 torr.^[24] Although lattice oxygen in bilayer FeO(111) on Pt(111) does not participate in CO oxidation, CO₂ can readily be formed by CO reacting with such hydroxyl groups as shown by isotopic labelling experiments by Huang and co-workers.^[25]

In principle, unsupported nanoparticulate iron oxides are known as good CO oxidation catalysts. For example, a high activity and a low activation energy (\approx 70 kJ mol⁻¹, compare to 60 kJ mol⁻¹ in our work) was reported for 3 nm in average size Fe₂O₃ nanoparticles in CO oxidation under O₂ rich conditions at \approx 570 K.^[26] Zheng et al.^[27] found that quasi-cubic Fe₂O₃ nanoparticles, mainly exposing (110) facets, are even more active, likely due to a higher density of the surface Fe atoms than on the conventionally prepared nanoparticles.

Conclusions

FeO(111) films grown on a Au(111) substrate showed a promotional effect on the reactivity of the otherwise inert Au(111) surface in the low temperature CO oxidation reaction. The reactivity was only observed if the prepared iron oxide films show weakly bound oxygen species upon oxidation at elevated pressures. The reaction rate measured under O-rich conditions (CO/O₂=1/5) was found to correlate with the total amount of WBO measured in the "oxidized" film. The initial reaction rate measured as a function of the film coverage showed a maximum at about 1 ML, in contrast to ≈ 0.4 ML obtained for the Pt(111)-supported FeO(111) films measured with the same setup. When compared to FeO(111)/Pt(111), WBO species on FeO(111)/Au(111) desorb at a much lower (i.e., by ≈ 200 K) temperature, but also in much smaller



amounts. STM studies showed that the FeO(111) layer on Au(111) is fairly stable towards high pressure oxidation in the low coverage regime, but undergoes substantial reconstruction at near-monolayer coverages, thus resulting in poorly-defined structures.

Comparison of structure-reactivity relationships observed for Au(111) and Pt(111) supported FeO(111) films revealed the complex role of a metal support on the reaction. Although a strong interaction with the Pt(111) surface stabilizes a planar, FeO(111)-derived structure for the active oxide phase, in the case of a more weakly interacting Au(111) surface, the reaction atmosphere induces structural transformations governed by the thermodynamic phase diagram of the iron oxide, albeit it seems crucial to have a dense FeO(111) film as the precursor. Furthermore, the CO oxidation reaction on the Pt(111) supported films may benefit from the strong CO adsorption on Pt in proximity to the oxygen providing FeO_{2-x} phase, whereas such a mechanism is hardly possible for the Au(111) support, owing to a very weak CO adsorption.

The results also show that using the "inert" metal support does not solely imply that the reaction occurs only on oxide phase. In fact, the inert support may dramatically affect the reaction through structural transformations, otherwise impossible for the more strongly interacting oxide/metal systems.

Experimental Section

The experiments were performed in two UHV chambers (base pressures $\approx 2 \times 10^{-10}$ mbar). The first chamber is equipped with LEED, AES (both from Specs), and differentially pumped quadrupole mass-spectrometer (QMS, from Hiden) used for TPD experiments. The Au(111) single crystal (from MaTeck) was spot-welded to the two Ta wires for resistive heating and cooling by filling the manipulator rod with liquid nitrogen. The sample temperature was measured by a K-type thermocouple inserted into a small hole in the edge of the crystal. The chamber houses a gold plated high-pressure (HP) cell (\approx 30 mL) for performing reactivity studies at near atmospheric pressures using a gas chromatograph (GC, from Agilent). For reaction tests, the reaction mixture consisting of 10 mbar CO and 50 mbar O₂, balanced by He to 1 bar, was introduced into the HP cell at room temperature and circulated using a membrane pump for ca 20 min to rich constant flow conditions. Then the sample was heated to the reaction temperature with a rate of 1 Ks⁻¹. After the reaction, the sample was cooled down to 300 K while pumping the HP cell out down to 10⁻⁶ mbar before transferring into the main chamber for the post-characterization.

The second chamber is equipped with LEED/AES (Specs), QMS (Hiden) and STM (Omicron). The Au(111) crystal was mounted on the Omicron sample holder and could be heated by electron bombardment from the backside of the crystal. The temperature was measured by a K-type thermocouple at the edge of the crystal. For high pressure treatments, the sample was transferred into the HP cell (base pressure 10^{-8} mbar) separated by a gate valve from the main chamber. The heating in the HP cell was achieved by illuminating the sample with a halogen lamp through the quartz window.

In both chambers, the Au(111) surface was cleaned by cycles of Ar⁺ ion sputtering and annealing in UHV at 700 K. Residual carbon was removed by oxidation at 700 K in 10^{-6} mbar O₂. The surface

cleanness was checked by AES and LEED (STM) prior to the film growth.

The preparation of an FeO(111) film on Au(111) followed the one reported by Khan et al.^[10] Iron was vapor-deposited from a Fe rod (99.99%, Goodfellow) using an e-beam assisted evaporator (Omicron EMT3) at 300 K and then oxidized at 323 K in 3×10^{-7} mbar O₂ for 8 min. The sample was annealed in UHV at 700 K for 10 min.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge Cluster of Excellence UNICAT administered by TU Berlin and Fonds der Chemischen Industrie for financial support.

Keywords: CO \cdot iron oxides \cdot oxidation \cdot support effects \cdot ultrathin films

- a) G. Pacchioni, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2012**, *18*, 10144–10158; b) F. P. Netzer, F. Allegretti, S. Surnev, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B* **2010**, *28*, 1–16; c) L. Giordano, G. Pacchioni, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2011**, *44*, 1244–1252; d) H.-J. Freund, G. Pacchioni, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2008**, *37*, 2224–2242.
- [2] a) H. Kuhlenbeck, S. Shaikhutdinov, H.-J. Freund, *Chem. Rev.* 2013, *113*, 3986–4034; b) W. Weiss, W. Ranke, *Prog. Surf. Sci.* 2002, *70*, 1–151; c) S. A. Chambers, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* 2000, *39*, 105–180; d) N. Nilius, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* 2009, *64*, 595–659; e) J. Libuda, H. J. Freund, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* 2005, *57*, 157–298; f) C. R. Henry, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* 1998, *31*, 231–325; g) M. Bäumer, H.-J. Freund, *Prog. Surf. Sci.* 1999, *61*, 127–198; h) D. R. Rainer, D. W. Goodman, *J. Mol. Catal. A* 1998, *131*, 259–283; i) R. Franchy, *Surf. Sci. Rep.* 2000, *38*, 195–294; j) H.-J. Freund, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* 1997, *36*, 452–475; *Angew. Chem.* 1997, *109*, 444–468.
- [3] a) S. Shaikhutdinov, H.-J. Freund, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. 2012, 63, 619–633; b) Y. N. Sun, Z. H. Qin, M. Lewandowski, E. Carrasco, M. Sterrer, S. Shaikhutdinov, H.-J. Freund, J. Catal. 2009, 266, 359–368; c) Z. H. Qin, M. Lewandowski, Y. N. Sun, S. Shaikhutdinov, H.-J. Freund, J. Phys. Chem. C 2008, 112, 10209–10213; d) Y.-N. Sun, L. Giordano, J. Goniakowski, M. Lewandowski, Z.-H. Qin, C. Noguera, S. Shaikhutdinov, G. Pacchioni, H.-J. Freund, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2010, 49, 4418–4421; Angew. Chem. 2010, 122, 4520–4523.
- [4] a) K. Hayek, B. Jenewein, B. Klötzer, W. Reichl, *Top. Catal.* 2000, *14*, 25–33; b) J. A. Rodriguez, P. Liu, J. Graciani, S. D. Senanayake, D. C. Grinter, D. Stacchiola, J. Hrbek, J. Fernández-Sanz, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* 2016, *7*, 2627–2639.
- [5] Y. Martynova, S. Shaikhutdinov, H.-J. Freund, ChemCatChem 2013, 5, 2162–2166.
- [6] a) Y. Martynova, B. H. Liu, M. E. McBriarty, I. M. N. Groot, M. J. Bedzyk, S. Shaikhutdinov, H. J. Freund, *J. Catal.* **2013**, *301*, 227–232; b) Q. Pan, B. H. Liu, M. E. McBriarty, Y. Martynova, I. M. N. Groot, S. Wang, M. J. Bedzyk, S. Shaikhutdinov, H. J. Freund, *Catal. Lett.* **2014**, *144*, 648–655.
- [7] Q. Pan, X. Weng, M. Chen, L. Giordano, G. Pacchioni, C. Noguera, J. Goniakowski, S. Shaikhutdinov, H.-J. Freund, *ChemCatChem* 2015, 7, 2620– 2627.
- [8] Q. Fu, Y. Yao, X. Guo, M. Wei, Y. Ning, H. Liu, F. Yang, Z. Liu, X. Bao, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 2013, 15, 14708-14714.
- [9] a) Q. Fu, F. Yang, X. Bao, Acc. Chem. Res. 2013, 46, 1692–1701; b) D. Sun, X.-K. Gu, R. Ouyang, H.-Y. Su, Q. Fu, X. Bao, W.-X. Li, J. Phys. Chem. C 2012, 116, 7491–7498; c) Q. Fu, W.-X. Li, Y. Yao, H. Liu, H.-Y. Su, D. Ma, X.-K. Gu, L. Chen, Z. Wang, H. Zhang, B. Wang, X. Bao, Science 2010, 328, 1141–1144.
- [10] N. A. Khan, C. Matranga, Surf. Sci. 2008, 602, 932-942.
- [11] X. Deng, C. Matranga, J. Phys. Chem. C 2009, 113, 11104-11109.
- [12] X. Deng, J. Lee, C. Matranga, Surf. Sci. 2010, 604, 627-632.
- [13] X. Deng, J. Lee, C. Wang, C. Matranga, F. Aksoy, Z. Liu, J. Phys. Chem. C 2010, 114, 22619–22623.
- [14] T. Yan, D. W. Redman, W.-Y. Yu, D. W. Flaherty, J. A. Rodriguez, C. B. Mullins, J. Catal. 2012, 294, 216–222.



- [15] L. Yu, Y. Liu, F. Yang, J. Evans, J. A. Rodriguez, P. Liu, J. Phys. Chem. C 2015, 119, 16614–16622.
- [16] a) S. Hofmann, Auger- and X-Ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy in Materials Science, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2013; b) M. P. Seah, S. J. Spencer, F. Bensebaa, I. Vickridge, H. Danzebrink, M. Krumrey, T. Gross, W. Oesterle, E. Wendler, B. Rheinländer, Y. Azuma, I. Kojima, N. Suzuki, M. Suzuki, S. Tanuma, D. W. Moon, H. J. Lee, H. M. Cho, H. Y. Chen, A. T. S. Wee, T. Osipowicz, J. S. Pan, W. A. Jordaan, R. Hauert, U. Klotz, C. van der Marel, M. Verheijen, Y. Tamminga, C. Jeynes, P. Bailey, S. Biswas, U. Falke, N. V. Nguyen, D. Chandler-Horowitz, J. R. Ehrstein, D. Muller, J. A. Dura, Surf. Interface Anal. 2004, 36, 1269–1303.
- [17] L. E. Davis, N. C. MacDonald, P. W. Palmberg, G. E. Riach, R. E. Weber, Handbook of Auger Electron Spectroscopy, Perkin Elmer Corp., Eden Prairie, Minnesota, 1977.
- [18] Y.-N. Sun, Z.-H. Qin, M. Lewandowski, S. Kaya, S. Shaikhutdinov, H.-J. Freund, *Catal. Lett.* **2008**, *126*, 31–35.
- [19] L. Giordano, M. Lewandowski, I. M. N. Groot, Y. N. Sun, J. Goniakowski, C. Noguera, S. Shaikhutdinov, G. Pacchioni, H. J. Freund, J. Phys. Chem. C 2010, 114, 21504–21509.
- [20] M. Ritter, W. Ranke, W. Weiss, Phys. Rev. B 1998, 57, 7240-7251.

- [21] J. Goniakowski, C. Noguera, Phys. Rev. B 2009, 79, 155433.
- [22] N. Johansson, L. R. Merte, E. Grånäs, S. Wendt, J. N. Andersen, J. Schnadt, J. Knudsen, *Top. Catal.* 2016, *59*, 506–515.
- [23] F. Ringleb, Y. Fujimori, H. F. Wang, H. Ariga, E. Carrasco, M. Sterrer, H. J. Freund, L. Giordano, G. Pacchioni, J. Goniakowski, J. Phys. Chem. C 2011, 115, 19328–19335.
- [24] X. Deng, J. Lee, C. Wang, C. Matranga, F. Aksoy, Z. Liu, Langmuir 2011, 27, 2146–2149.
- [25] Y. Jin, G. Sun, F. Xiong, L. Ding, W. Huang, J. Phys. Chem. C 2016, 120, 9845–9851.
- [26] P. Li, D. E. Miser, S. Rabiei, R. T. Yadav, M. R. Hajaligol, Appl. Catal. 2003, 43, 151–162.
- [27] Y. Zheng, Y. Cheng, Y. Wang, F. Bao, L. Zhou, X. Wei, Y. Zhang, Q. Zheng, J. Phys. Chem. B 2006, 110, 3093–3097.

Manuscript received: November 14, 2016 Revised: January 4, 2017 Accepted Article published: January 4, 2017 Final Article published: January 23, 2017