# **Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI)**

# Revealing the intrinsic nature of Ni-, Mn-, and Y-doped CeO<sub>2</sub> catalysts with positive, additive, and negative effects for CO oxidation using *operando* DRIFTS-MS

Shiyu Fang<sup>a</sup>, Yan Sun<sup>a</sup>, Jiacheng Xu<sup>a,b</sup>, Tiantian Zhang<sup>a</sup>, Zuliang Wu<sup>a,c</sup>, Jing Li<sup>a,c</sup>, Erhao Gao<sup>a,c</sup>, Wei Wang<sup>a,c</sup>, Jiali Zhu<sup>a,c</sup>, Lianxin Dai<sup>d</sup>, Weihua Liu<sup>d</sup>, Buhe Zhang<sup>d</sup>, Junwei Zhang<sup>d</sup>, Shuiliang Yao<sup>a,b,c,\*</sup> \*Corresponding author. Email: yaos@cczu.edu.cn

 <sup>a</sup> Address here. 1School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Changzhou University, Changzhou 213164, China
 <sup>b</sup> School of Material Science and Engineering, Changzhou University, Changzhou 213164, China
 <sup>c</sup> Key Laboratory of Advanced Plasma Catalysis Engineering for China Petrochemical Industry, Changzhou 213164, China
 <sup>d</sup> Jiangxi Xintai Functional Materials Technology Co., Ltd., Ji'an 343100, China

## S1. Supplementary information

S1.1 Catalyst preparation
S1.2 Catalyst characterization
S2. Supplementary Figures
S3. Tables

Fig. S1-S9 Table S1-S2

#### **S1.** Supplementary information

#### S1.1 Catalyst preparation

 $Ni(NO_3)_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ ,  $Y(NO_3)_3 \cdot 6H_2O$ , and  $Ce(NO_3)_3 \cdot 6H_2O$  were purchased from Shanghai Macklin (China).  $Mn(NO_3)_2$  was obtained from Aladdin (China). Those nitrates were used as the precursors of Ni, Y, Ce, and Mn, respectively.

The atomic ratio of dopants (Ni, Mn, or Y) to Ce (host) was 1:1 by controlling the amounts of cerium nitrate and dopant metal nitrate precursors. The obtained catalysts were named Ni-CeO<sub>2</sub>, Mn-CeO<sub>2</sub>, Y-CeO<sub>2</sub> respectively. NiO, Mn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, Y<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, CeO<sub>2</sub>, Ni-doped, Mn-doped, and Y-doped CeO<sub>2</sub> catalysts were prepared at decomposition temperature of 600 °C using the aerosol pyrolysis method.<sup>1</sup>

#### S1.2 Catalyst characterization

The crystal form and crystallinity of the catalyst were determined by XRD (Rigaku Ultimate IV type, Rigaku, Japan) operated at 40 mA, 40 kV, 10~80°, and 5 °/min.

X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS, Thermo Scientific K-Alpha, Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA) was used to measure element distribution and oxidation states on the catalyst surfaces under conditions: Al K $\alpha$  ray: hv=1486.6 eV, beam spot: 400  $\mu$ m, chamber vacuum: better than 5.0E-7 mBar, working voltage: 12 kV, filament current: 6 mA.

A fully automatic specific surface and porosity analyzer (Micromeritics ASAP2460, Micromeritics, USA) was used to measure the specific surface areas, pore diameters, and pore volumes. All catalyst samples were dried at 150°C for 6 h, degassed at 300°C for 8 h. Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) was used to calculate specific surface areas of the catalysts. The pore diameter and pore volume of the samples were determined using Barrett-Joyner-Halenda (BJH) calculation.

The surface morphologies of the catalysts were observed using a scanning electron microscope (SEM, Hitachi Regulus 8100, Hitachi, Japan) with a SE2 secondary electron detector. The lattice stripes and elements distribution on the catalyst surfaces were detected with a high-resolution electric field emission transmission electron microscope (HRTEM, FEITecnaiF20, USA).

Diffuse reflectance infrared Fourier transform spectroscopy (DRIFTS, Nicolet IS50, Thermo Scientific, USA) equipped with a temperature-programmed reaction (TPR) cell (HVC-DRP-5, Harrick, USA), narrow-band mercury cadmium telluride (MCT-A) detector with liquid nitrogen cooling in collecting DRIFTS spectra between 4000 and 650 cm<sup>-1</sup>, and mass spectrometer (MS, Tilon LC-D200M, Ametek, USA) was used to monitor surface species on each catalyst and gas signals during CO oxidation. <sup>1</sup> The Kubelka-Munk function was used to convert the obtained spectra into absorption spectra.

S2. Figures



Fig. S1 XRD patterns.



Fig. S2 EDS mapping images of Ni, Mn, and Y doped CeO<sub>2</sub> catalysts.



Fig. S3 TG profiles of different nitrate precursors.



Fig. S4  $N_2$  adsorption/desorption isotherms of the catalysts (insert: BJH pore diameter distribution).



Fig. S5 XPS spectra of as-prepared catalysts: (a) Ce 3d and (b) O 1s.



Fig. S6 XPS spectra of Mn2p, Ni2p, and Y3d.



Fig. S7 (a) MS-CO intake  $T_{50}$ , (b) M=O consumption  $T_{50}$ , and (c) top temperature for bidentate carbonate accumulation  $(T_p)$ .



Fig. S8 Correlations of CO oxidation activity  $T_{50}$  and intrinsic, surface, structure factors of the catalysts.



Fig. S9. Correlations of CO oxidation activity  $T_{50}$  and carbonate decomposition  $T_{50}$  (°C), data from Table S2.

#### S3. Tables

| $Mn^{3+}/(Mn^{2+}+Mn^{3+}+Mn^{4+})$ | $Mn^{4+}/(Mn^{2+}+Mn^{3+}+Mn^{4+})$  | Ni <sup>3+</sup> /(Ni <sup>2+</sup> +Ni <sup>3+</sup> ) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| (%)                                 | (%)  | (%)   |
| 47.3                                | 32   |   |
| 43.5                                | 26.2   |   |
|                                     |  | 72  |
|                                     |  | 69.4  |
|                                     | Mn <sup>3+</sup> /(Mn <sup>2+</sup> +Mn <sup>3+</sup> +Mn <sup>4+</sup> )<br>(%)<br>47.3<br>43.5 | $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$    |

Table S1 Mn<sup>3+</sup>, Mn<sup>4+</sup>, and Ni<sup>3+</sup> ratios

Table S2. Decomposition temperatures of different carbonates

| Carbonate*                  | Carbonate decomposition $T_{-}(\alpha C)$ **       | Catalyst                       | CO oxidation $T_{(0C)}$     | Reference |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
|                             | $I_{50}({}^{\circ}{}^{\circ}{}^{\circ}{}^{\circ})$ |                                | $I_{50}(^{\circ}C)^{\circ}$ |           |
| $NiC_2O_4 \cdot 2H_2O$      | 340  | NiO                            | 182                         | 2         |
| $CuCO_3 \cdot H_2O$         | 280  | CuO                            | 70                          | 3         |
| CuCO <sub>3</sub>           | 270  | CuO                            | 70                          | 4         |
| Ce(CO <sub>3</sub> )(OH)    | 530  | CeO <sub>2</sub>               | 339                         | 5         |
| MnCO <sub>3</sub>           | 230  | $Mn_2O_3$                      | 106                         | 6         |
| FeCO <sub>3</sub>           | 360  | Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> | 182                         | 7         |
| YOHCO <sub>3</sub>          | 570  | Y <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>  | 368                         | 8         |
| $Y_2(CO_3)_3 \cdot 2.5H_2O$ | 520  |                                |                             |           |

\* Raw materials used to measure the decomposition features.

\*\* The reported temperature at which 50% carbonate decomposed during thermogravimetry analysis.

\*\*\* Data obtained in this study.

### References

- X. Gong, J. Xu, T. Zhang, Y. Sun, S. Fang, N. Li, J. Zhu, Z. Wu, J. Li and E. Gao, *Molecules*, 2023, 28, 3511.
- 2 B. Małecka, A. Małecki, E. Drożdż-Cieśla, L. Tortet, P. Llewellyn and F. Rouquerol, *Thermochim. Acta*, 2007, **466**, 57-62.
- 3 M. H. Habibi and B. Karimi, J. Ind. Eng. Chem., 2014, 20, 925-929.
- 4 W. Shaheen and I. H. Abd El Maksod, J. Alloys Compd., 2009, 476, 366-372.
- 5 K. Li and P. Zhao, Mater. Res. Bull., 2010, 45, 243-246.
- 6 S. M. Pourmortazavi, M. Rahimi-Nasrabadi, A. A. Davoudi-Dehaghani, A. Javidan, M. M. Zahedi and S. S. Hajimirsadeghi, *Mater. Res. Bull.*, 2012, **47**, 1045-1050.
- 7 S. Xuan, M. Chen, L. Hao, W. Jiang, X. Gong, Y. Hu and Z. Chen, J. Magn. Magn. Mater., 2008, 320, 164-170.
- 8 Y. Zhang, M. Gao, K. Han, Z. Fang, X. Yin and Z. Xu, J. Alloys Compd., 2009, 474, 598-604.