## **Supplementary Information**

# Interesting influence of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> on the catalytic stability of Co<sub>2</sub>P, MoP and CoMoP catalysts for dry reforming of methane

Shuo Chen, Qingshan Rong, Dongmei Liu,\* Na Sun and Zhiwei Yao\*

School of Petrochemical Engineering, Liaoning Petrochemical University, Fushun,

113001, P.R. China.

Corresponding author:

Dongmei Liu (E-mail: ldmwain1234@163.com)

Zhiwei Yao (E-mail: mezhiwei@163.com)

#### **1. Experimental Section**

#### 1.1 Sample preparation

The unsupported oxide precursors were prepared by stirring an aqueous solution of Co(CH<sub>3</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>·4H<sub>2</sub>O, (NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>6</sub>Mo<sub>7</sub>O<sub>24</sub>·4H<sub>2</sub>O and (NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>HPO<sub>4</sub> with a given molar ratio of Co:Mo:P=x:y:1 (x=2, y=0; x=0, y=1; x=1, y=1) at room temperature (RT) for 0.5 h. The alumina-supported oxide precursors were prepared by the incipient wetness method using the solutions mentioned above and commercial Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> ( $\gamma$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, 99.99%, purchased from Shanghai Macklin Biochemical Technology Co. Ltd.) with theoretical loading of 30 wt.% M (M=Co for Co<sub>2</sub>P and M=Mo for MoP and CoMoP). All the oxide precursors followed by a long time drying at 110 °C and 3 h-calcination at 500 °C. The metal phosphides were prepared from unsupported and alumina-supported oxide precursors via H<sub>2</sub>-reduction method described in our previous study.<sup>24</sup> The final reduction tempretures were 850 °C for  $Co_2P$  and CoMoP phosphides, and 950 °C for MoP phosphides.

#### 1.2 Sample characterization

X-ray diffraction (XRD) examinations were conducted using an X-ray diffractometer (X'Pert Pro MPD) with a Cu Ka radiation. The BET surface areas were measured on a NOVA4200 instrument. Carbon content was determinded using an elemental analyzer (Euro EA3000). The scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX) element mapping images were obtained on Hitachi S-4800. The H<sub>2</sub>-TPR analysis was performed in a quartz tube microreactor and the effluent gases were monitored using a thermal conductivity detector. Prior to the H<sub>2</sub>-TPR run, the unsupported (0.05 g) and supported (0.1 g) oxide precursors were initially pretreated in Ar flow at 300 °C for 0.5 h. After being cooled to RT, the samples were heated from RT to 900 °C using 10%H<sub>2</sub>/Ar (30 ml min<sup>-1</sup>) at a rate of 4 °C min<sup>-1</sup>. CO<sub>2</sub> (CH<sub>4</sub>) dissociation study was performed with 6%CO<sub>2</sub>(6%CH<sub>4</sub>)/Ar mixture flowing at a rate of 50 ml min<sup>-1</sup>. Before the dissociation reaction, the sample (0.1 g) was preheated at 850 or 900 °C under an  $H_2$  flow for 0.5 h and then cooled to 800 °C in Ar. Then the gas mixture was allowed to pass through the sample. The change of CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> during reaction was monitored using gas chromatography (GC).

#### 1.3 Catalytic performance tests

The DRM reaction was carried out in a fixed-bed flow system and the catalytic activity of catalyst was tested in a micro-reactor (id: 8 mm) at atmospheric pressure.

The feed gas consisted of 10 ml min<sup>-1</sup> of 50%CH<sub>4</sub> and 50%CO<sub>2</sub>. The pretreatment process and gas detection device were similar to those in CO<sub>2</sub> (CH<sub>4</sub>) dissociation study. The CH<sub>4</sub> conversion, CO<sub>2</sub> conversion and carbon balance were defined as follows ( $n_{i,in}$  = the initial molar fraction of component *i* in the feed,  $n_{i,out}$  = the final molar fraction of component *i* in the gaseous effluent):

$$\begin{split} X_{CH_4}(\%) &= \frac{n_{CH_4,in} - n_{CH_4,out}}{n_{CH_4,in}} \times 100 \\ X_{CO_2}(\%) &= \frac{n_{CO_2,in} - n_{CO_2,out}}{n_{CO_2,in}} \times 100 \\ B_C &= \frac{\left(n_{CO,out} + n_{CH_4,out} + n_{CO_2,out}\right)}{\left(n_{CH_4,in} + n_{CO_2,in}\right)} \end{split}$$

### 2. Results



Fig. S1 XRD patterns of fresh  $\gamma$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and the  $\gamma$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> heated in H<sub>2</sub> at 850 °C.



Fig. S2 Carbon balance value versus reaction time.

Catalyst	CO chemisorption (µmol g <sup>-1</sup> ) –	CH <sub>4</sub> conversion rate ( $\mu$ mol g <sub>cat</sub> <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> )		Specific activity (s <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>a</sup>	
		1 h	10 h	1 h	10 h
Co <sub>2</sub> P	2.2	21.42	21.06	9.74	9.57
MoP	2.8	33.17	33.05	11.85	11.8
СоМоР	3.4	29.36	26.60	8.64	7.82
Co <sub>2</sub> P/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	31.3	33.40	33.54	1.07	1.07
MoP/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	35.4	13.24	$2.53^{b}$	0.37	0.07
CoMoP/Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	36.8	31.00	29.77	0.84	0.81

Table S1 CH<sub>4</sub> conversion rate and specific activity of phosphide catalysts for DRM.

 $\overline{a(CH_4 \text{ conversion rate})/(\text{chemisorbed CO})}$ 

<sup>b</sup>CH<sub>4</sub> conversion rate at 4 h