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The etch decoration-transmission electron microscopy technique (EDTEM), first developed by Henning [1], has been used to obtain important results in advancing our understanding on the kinetics and mechanisms of the gas-carbon reactions, by Hennig, Thomas, et al. [2], Feates, et al. [3] and more recently in this laboratory [3,4].

Both $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ create round pits on the basal plane of graphite. Interpretation of the rates on these reactions have been made [3,4].

The $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ reaction produced hexagonal pits, bounded by zig-zag faces. The turnover frequegcies for the reaction $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{H}_{2}$ at $700 \mathrm{O}, 800$ and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are shown in ${ }^{\circ}$ Figure 1. ${ }^{2}$ These were rates with no hydrogen added. With added hydrogen in the gas phase, the reaction rates were substantially lowered. The rate equation fitted by the turnover rate data was:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Rate }=\frac{k_{1} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}}{1+\mathrm{k}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{n}+k_{2} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }^{n}=0.50$ at $700^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; $\mathrm{n}=0.85$ at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; and $\mathrm{n}=1.0$ at $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

The following mechanism, Mechanism B , was proposed for ${ }_{i}$ the rate equation in which $n=1$ :

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{f}}  \tag{2}\\
\mathrm{i}_{1}  \tag{3}\\
\mathrm{i}(0)+\mathrm{H}_{2} \\
\mathrm{C}(0) \rightarrow \mathrm{CO}
\end{gather*}
$$

whereas another mechanism, Mechanism C, was proposed for the case when $n=0.5$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{C}+\mathrm{H}_{2}{ }^{\mathrm{i}} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}(0)+\mathrm{H}_{2}  \tag{4}\\
& C+\frac{1}{2} \underset{i_{2}}{\mathrm{H}_{2} \stackrel{i_{2}}{\vec{j}}} C(\mathrm{H})  \tag{5}\\
& \begin{array}{c}
\stackrel{1}{3} 3 \\
C(0) \\
+C 0
\end{array} \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

It should be pointed out that the values of $i_{3}$, calculated from data for the separate reactions with $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, were surprisingly close [3].

Using the EDTEM technique, strong evidence has been provided by several independent experiments to
show that the dissociative chemisorption of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$, taking place preferentially on zig-zag faces (as opposed to armchair faces), plays a key role in the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ reaction mechanism. Before a detailed discussion of these experiments, the results are summarized below:

1. The $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ reaction with added $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ : With trace amounts of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ added in $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, the etch pits all became hexagohal bounded by zig-zag faces. The $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ reaction was strongly inhibited by $\mathrm{H}_{2}$.
2. Mixed reactions with $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ : The etch pits were all hexagonal, bounded by zig-zag faces, in both of the following reaction sequences: first, etching by $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ followed by $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$; and in the reverse order.

It has long been known that, qualitatively, the inhibition of the $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ reaction by $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is much stronger than that of the $\mathrm{C}^{2}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ reaction by CO .


Fig. 1. Turnover frequencies of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ reaction at $700^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(0) ; 800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}(\nabla)$ and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
 ), with no hydrogen added.

The work by Biederman, et al. [5] further showed that $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ has a very strong inhibition effect on the $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ reaction. The proposed mechanism for the reaction $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}+\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is: Reactions (2),(5),(3), (Mechanism D).

It is seen that the inhibition by CO and that by $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ are entirely different in nature; but the inhifitions by $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ in the reactions $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ seem to be the same (compared Mechanisms C and D).

As mentioned, the reaction $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ produces round pits [3,4]. However, with the addition of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ in the gas phase, the pits became hexagonal, and their growth rate was substantially lowered.

The turnover frequency at $700^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, is lowered by $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ from the $\mathrm{H}_{2}$-free value of 0.51 s to 0.048 $\mathrm{s}^{-1}$ This strong inhibition was apparently caused by the dissociative chemisorption

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}+\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{H}_{2} \underset{\mathrm{j}_{2}}{\stackrel{1}{{\underset{j}{2}}_{2}^{2}} \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{H}) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the rate data, the adsorption constant is, at $700^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
K=\frac{i_{2}}{\mathrm{j}_{2}}=96 \mathrm{~atm}^{-1 / 2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The above results further indicated that the dissociative chemisorption was preferred on the zig-zag \{1010\} face, which caused the change of the pit conformation. In other words, the K value shown in Eq. 7 was for zig-zag face, which was higher than that on the armchair face. The stronger chemisorption on the zig-zag face would result in the observed anisotropy in reactivities between the two edge planes.

The rate of the reaction $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}+\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Rate }=\frac{k_{1} P^{P} \mathrm{CO}_{2}}{1+k_{2} P_{C O}+k_{3} P_{C_{2}}+K P_{H_{2}}^{1 / 2}} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

as can be derived from Mechanism $D$.
Our data on the effects of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ inhibition on
the $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ reaction yielded the following value for the inhibition constant [3]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{2}=i_{2} / j_{2}=71 \mathrm{~atm}^{-1 / 2} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

This value, according to Mechanism C, would be the dissociative chemisorption constant of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ on the zig-zag face. Comparison of the values in Eqs. 7 and 9 , obtained from two independent experiments, was indeed satisfactory.

Another conclusion may be drawn from the above results regarding the mechanism of the $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ reaction with no added $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ in the gas phase (i.e., $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}=0$ ). The pits etched by $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (with $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}=0$ ) are also hexagonal with zig-zag faces. Sifce this hexagonal conformation appears to be caused by chemisorbed hydrogen on the zig-zag faces, the mechanism for the $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ reaction should be more reasonably written as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{f}}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{O})+2 \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{H}) \\
& 2 \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{H})+\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{f}}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \\
& \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{O}) \rightarrow \mathrm{CO}
\end{aligned}
$$
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