

Coadsorption of NRR and HER intermediates determines the performance of Ru-N₄ towards electrocatalytic N₂ reduction

Tongwei Wu,^{†, ‡, Δ} Marko M. Melander,^{, †} Karoliina Honkala^{*, †}*

[†]Department of Chemistry, Nanoscience Center, University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014
Jyväskylä, Finland,

[‡]State Key Laboratory of Electronic Thin Films and Integrated Devices, University of Electronic
Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 610054, Sichuan, China,

^ΔInstitute of Fundamental and Frontier Sciences, University of Electronic Science and
Technology of China, Chengdu 610054, Sichuan, China

Corresponding Author

*E-mail: marko.m.melander@jyu.fi; karoliina.honkala@jyu.fi

ABSTRACT

Efficiency of the electrochemical N_2 reduction reaction (NRR) to ammonia is seriously limited by the competing hydrogen evolution reaction (HER) but our current atomic-scale insight on the factors controlling HER/NRR competition are unknown. Herein we unveil the elementary mechanism, thermodynamics, and kinetics determining the HER/NRR selectivity on the state-of-the-art NRR electrocatalyst, Ru-N₄ using constant potential density functional theory calculations (DFT). The calculations show that NRR and HER intermediates coadsorb on the catalyst where HER is greatly suppressed by the NRR intermediates. The first reaction step leading to either *NNH or *H determines the selectivity towards NRR or HER. Our results also demonstrate that an explicitly potential-dependent treatment of reaction kinetics is needed to understand NRR selectivity. We provide crucial insight into the complex NRR/HER competition and the role of non-innocent adsorbates, show the necessity of constant potential DFT calculations, and suggest that interfacial proton donors will improve NRR selectivity.

TOC GRAPHICS



Ammonia is one of the most important chemicals in modern industries and agriculture. The Haber–Bosch process was developed to industrially reduce N_2 to NH_3 in the early 1900s.¹⁻⁴ This process, however, has a large carbon footprint, causing 1- 2% of the world’s annual energy consumption and CO_2 emissions.⁵⁻⁷ The high environmental cost is in large part due to the production of pure hydrogen through methane steam-reforming at high reaction temperatures and pressures. Electrochemical N_2 reduction reaction (NRR) in aqueous electrolytes emerges as an attractive environmental-friendly alternative for sustainable ammonia production.^{6,7} Nevertheless, NRR is seriously limited by the strong $\text{N}\equiv\text{N}$ bond, low solubility of N_2 in water, slow reaction kinetics, and the competing hydrogen evolution reaction (HER).⁶⁻⁹

Presently, various strategies such as catalyst design, electrolyte modulation, and reactor optimization⁶⁻¹⁷ are being investigated as means to improve NRR activity and to limit the HER in aqueous electrolytes. Although the most significant improvements in NRR performance have been achieved through the electrocatalyst design approach,⁸ it is hindered by simultaneously requiring strong N_2 adsorption and limited HER activity.¹⁸⁻²² Often, catalyst design is based on thermodynamic principles but scaling relations between HER and NRR intermediates indicate that HER cannot be satisfactorily suppressed through thermodynamic control.²¹⁻²⁶ An alternative approach optimizes NRR by controlling reaction kinetics but this is also difficult because the free energy scaling relations indicate that the NRR is kinetically slower than the HER.²⁶⁻²⁹

Modulating the reaction environment through electrolyte design and limiting hydrogen transport to the active site has also been recognized as an efficient strategy to selectively facilitate NRR.^{9,22} A recent study on the role of different electrolyte counterions (Li^+ , Na^+ , and K^+) showed that the interaction between Li^+ and N_2 molecules can markedly enhance N_2 concentration at the electrode surface.¹⁰ The regulation of proton and nitrogen diffusion was also shown as a viable scheme to

reach higher activity and selectivity for NRR.²³ Recently, the combination of electrolyte design and controlled hydrogen transport through “molecular crowding” was identified as a promising approach to suppress HER and enhance NRR.¹⁶

Despite this progress, the competing HER still limits overall NRR performance^{8,10,25-29} and low selectivity, current density, and energy efficiency of present electrocatalysts make NRR unviable at the industrial scale.³⁰ Current state-of-the-art catalysts are still far away from the performance of ideal catalysts or that of naturally occurring nitrogenase enzymes, which catalyze the N_2 to NH_3 reaction with high activity and selectivity under mild reaction conditions.³⁰ The near-ideal performance of nitrogenases³⁰ can be attributed to the combination of an active NRR catalytic site and the limited number of protons near this site.^{25,32} This implies that in addition to the NRR catalytically active site, the reaction environment plays an integral part in NRR. Transferring this inspiration to catalyst design requires better understanding of the factors controlling HER/NRR competition at the atomic level.³⁰

It is well known that the competing NRR and HER reaction steps may take place on a single common active site or on two separate sites,^{33,34} where the former offers a more well-defined reaction environment. In contrast, extended surfaces are non-uniform and have multiple active sites for competing reactions which limits the achievable selectivity. Single-atom nanocatalysts (SACs) provide a more restricted reaction environment as the presence of a single metal active center confines NRR and HER to the same site. Therefore, SACs are among the best catalysts to address the competition between NRR and HER.^{35,36} Moreover, various SACs, such as transition metals/g-C₃N₄, Mo-BN, Single-boron, Mo(Cr)/N₃-G, and Ru-N₄-G,^{17,18,37-39} have proven to be efficient for NRR. Among the different SACs, the Ru single-atom anchored on nitrogen-doped graphene (Ru-N₄) exhibits the highest experimentally verified NRR performance with 30%

selectivity towards NRR at $-0.2 V_{\text{RHE}}$.³⁸ The atomistic origins of the promising activity and selectivity of Ru-N₄, however, are not currently understood, limiting further improvements of SACs for NRR and other electrocatalytic reactions.

Herein, we address the HER/NRR competition in the Ru-N₄ with constant potential, grand canonical ensemble density functional theory (GCE-DFT) simulations⁴⁰⁻⁴² using a hybrid explicit/implicit solvation treatment as detailed in the Supporting Information section S1. This advanced computational approach allows us to consider both thermodynamic and kinetic factors for competing NRR and HER pathways as function of the electrode potential while properly accounting for solvent interactions. We observed that a GCE-DFT treatment is crucial for correctly capturing the reaction and transition state energies activity, and that canonical constant charge DFT calculations cannot even qualitatively explain the selectivity of Ru-N₄ towards NRR. Our results show that the interaction between coadsorbed hydrogen and NRR intermediates determines the NRR/HER selectivity on the Ru-N₄ catalyst. Specifically, we found the first proton-coupled electron transfer (PCET) step in NRR to control the selectivity indicating that research efforts should therefore focus on facilitating this step.

First, we considered the interaction between H₂ and the active site. The adsorbed H₂ molecule was found to be unstable on the Ru-N₄ site decomposing spontaneously into two H atoms as shown in Figure S2. This indicates that the Heyrovsky step ($2\text{H}^* \rightarrow \text{H}_2$) is difficult and the catalyst's NRR selectivity is promising. To understand HER on the catalyst studied, we examined the electrochemical Volmer reaction ($\text{H}_3\text{O}^+ + \text{e}^- \rightarrow \text{H}^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}$). This reaction is a fundamental step in HER and generally used to determine HER activity.^{43,44} Because the Ru-N₄ exhibits high NRR performance under acidic conditions,³⁸ we studied the acidic Volmer step from a H₃O⁺ ion solvated in a water layer near the catalyst surface. Figure 1a and Table S3 show that, according to the

constant potential GCE-DFT calculations, the Volmer reaction has a high activation energy of 1.32 eV at 0 V_{SHE} but is thermodynamically feasible as seen from the exergonic reaction free energies (ΔE_r). The reaction becomes both thermodynamically and kinetically more accessible as the electrode potential decreases. The comparison of canonical fixed charge or constant potential GCE-DFT calculations clearly shows that the activation and reaction energies are potential-dependent and that the two methods yield similar results only at $U=-0.2V_{SHE}$ for the Volmer reaction.




Figure 1. (a) The Volmer reaction ($H_3O^++e^- \rightarrow *H+H_2O$) and (b) the N_2 adsorption on bare Ru-N₄ site. In (a), IS, TS, and FS represent initial, transition, and final states of the Volmer reaction, respectively. In (b) IS corresponds to $N_2(g)$ and FS to $*N_2$.

The first NRR step, N_2 adsorption on the active site, is nominally a chemical reaction and expected to be independent of the electrode potential. Figure 1b along with Tables S2-3, however, show that N_2 adsorbs strongly at the Ru-N₄ site, and the adsorption energy depends on the electrode

potential. The constant potential treatment predicts stronger adsorption than the constant charge calculation by approximately 0.5 eV. The large difference in adsorption energies between the two methods is due to the $\Phi_e \Delta N_e$ term in the definition of grand free energies as discussed in the Supporting Information Section S1 (Φ_e is the absolute electrode potential and ΔN_e the change in the number of electrons in the system). The potential-dependency of N_2 adsorption can be understood by analyzing the Bader charges given in Figure 2. The Bader charge analysis reveals that an electron transfer from Ru to $*N_2$ forming a π backbond^{17,18,45} occurs during adsorption. This leads to stronger N_2 adsorption and activation. Figure 2a shows that the Ru- N_4 site can promote N_2 activation through electron donation at reducing potentials and, in particular, the charge transfer between Ru and N_2 depends on the electrode potential. The explicit potential dependency of the adsorption energy and charge transfer also demonstrates that using GCE-DFT is warranted even for nominally chemical steps.




Figure 2. (a) The charge variation ($\Delta\rho = \rho_{N_2(\text{adsorption})} - \rho_{N_2(\text{gas})}$) of the adsorbed $*N_2$ on Ru- N_4 site and the corresponding $\Delta\rho$ ($\Delta\rho = \rho_{Ru(Ru@N_2)} - \rho_{Ru(\text{bare})}$) of the Ru site occupied by $*N_2$ intermediate species ($Ru@N_2$) with fixed-charge and constant-potential(U). (b) The $\Delta\rho$ ($\Delta\rho = \rho_{Ru(Ru@N_xH_y)} - \rho_{Ru(\text{bare})}$) of the Ru site occupied by NRR intermediate species ($Ru@N_xH_y$) at different electrode potentials. Positive values correspond to accumulation of charge.

The results in Figure 1 and Tables S2-3, show that the adsorption energy of N_2 is more exothermic than the Volmer reaction energy at all considered potentials. HER is also kinetically limited as the Volmer reaction has a sizeable barrier compared to, *e.g.*, platinum⁴⁶ where the Volmer reaction has low barriers and the HER is limited by the Heyrovsky step. On Ru-N₄ the N_2 adsorption is favored over H adsorption, at least when transport limitations are omitted and given the high Volmer barrier it is unlikely that the Ru-N₄ is active towards HER under the considered reaction conditions. Instead, NRR and HER may proceed simultaneously having coadsorbed *H and *N_xH_y intermediates present and interacting with each other.⁴⁷ Therefore, we addressed HER along the NRR pathway, with different possible coadsorption configurations shown in Figures 3 and 4.




Figure 3. (a) The possible pathways for the first PCET in NRR. (b-d) Corresponding energy diagrams.

Initially, we considered three distinct elementary steps from an adsorbed $*N_2$ configuration towards a NNH intermediate, shown in Figure 3a. These steps are the NNH step the Volmer step and the Volmer-NNH step. Both NNH and Volmer steps are electrochemical PCET reactions depending strongly on the electrode potential (see Figure 3), whereas the Volmer-NNH step is a chemical reaction step. Figure 3b shows that the NNH step is highly unfavored with $E_a > 1.75\text{eV}$ and $\Delta E_f = 0.5\text{ eV}$ even at $-0.5\text{ V}_{\text{SHE}}$. The high barrier and endothermicity are in line with the general understanding that the first PCET step producing $*NNH$ hinders NRR kinetically.⁸

The Volmer step leading to coadsorbed $*N_2$ and $*H$ is thermoneutral at $-0.5\text{ V}_{\text{SHE}}$ (see Figure 3c) due to the presence of $*N_2$ and the decreased charge on the Ru center. According to the commonly applied Volcano analysis,⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰ nearly thermoneutral hydrogen adsorption indicates that $*N_2\text{-Ru-N}_4$ is close to an ideal HER catalyst. Interestingly, the presence of $*N_2$ significantly increases the reaction barrier for the Volmer step compared to the barrier on the empty Ru-N₄ site as can be seen by comparing the grand free energy profiles in Figures 1a and 3c. For instance, at $-0.2\text{ V}_{\text{RHE}}$, $*N_2$ increases the Volmer barrier from 0.85 to 1.85 eV and makes the reaction thermodynamically unfavorable by changing the reaction energy from -1.0 eV to 0.4 eV . This comparison clearly demonstrates that NRR/HER competition cannot be explained by reaction thermodynamics alone or a simple description for the active site. The Volmer reaction barriers also exemplify the importance of GCE-DFT as the constant charge barriers with and without $*N_2$ differ by 0.25 eV whereas constant potential barriers show a $\sim 0.75\text{ eV}$ energy span.

Comparison of the grand free energy profiles in Figures 3b) and 3c) shows that the coadsorption of $*N_2+*H$ is both kinetically and thermodynamically more favorable than direct formation of $*NNH$. The alternative mechanism leading to $*NNH$ through coadsorbed $*H$ and $*N_2$, the Volmer-NNH step, is highly unfavorable and the activation barrier is higher than 2 eV. The first PCET step

is therefore the Volmer step despite a sizable barrier. The coadsorbed ($*N_2 + *H$) structure is expected exist on the Ru-N₄ site without proceeding to $*NNH$ through the Volmer-NNH step

We examined alternative PCET pathways to form $*NNH$ and other NRR intermediates as shown in Figure 4a. The second PCET step leads to $*NNH$ via the N₂ hydrogenation step ($*N_2 + *H + H_3O^+ + e^- \rightarrow *NNH + *H + H_2O$) or H₂ via the Heyrovsky step ($*N_2 + *H + H_3O^+ + e^- \rightarrow *N_2 + H_{2(g)} + H_2O$). In the presence of $*H$, the reduction of $*N_2$ to $*NNH$ is slightly thermodynamically and kinetically favored over the reduction without adsorbed $*H$ as can be seen by comparing the energy profiles in Figures 3b and 4b. The Heyrovsky step, however, is both kinetically and thermodynamically more feasible than the N₂ hydrogenation step, as shown in Figure 4b, and thus H₂ is readily formed (see Figure S3 for atomic structures).

At 0 V_{SHE}, the Heyrovsky step is already highly exergonic but there is a large activation energy of 1.4 eV. Decreasing the potential to -0.5 V_{SHE} makes the step even more exergonic and lowers the activation energy below 0.75 eV. These results demonstrate that the adsorbed $*N_2$ facilitates the Heyrovsky step compared to the empty Ru-N₄ site where it is unfeasible due to spontaneous H₂ dissociation. The effect of $*N_2$ can again be understood by considering the Bader charges given in Figure 2b. The charge analysis shows that the Ru atom becomes more positively charged upon $*N_2$ adsorption, which in turn hinders H₂ dissociation. More specifically, the π back donation from Ru to N₂ leads to vacant d-states thereby decreasing the electron transfer to the σ^* orbital of H₂ and consequently stabilizing the formation of the H-H bond.^{20,51,52}




Figure 4. (a) The competing NRR (blue) and HER (green) pathways and (b) the associated grand free energies

The results in Figures 2-3 and Tables S2-S3 show that HER proceeds more easily than NRR both in the presence and absence of $*N_2$ on the Ru-N₄ site. The Volmer reaction has a much higher barrier than the Heyrovsky step indicating that NRR/HER selectivity depends on whether $*H$ or $*N_xH_y$ is formed. We therefore compared further PCET steps leading to either $*H$ or various nitrogen-containing intermediates on the Ru-N₄ site along the pathways displayed in Figure 4a.

The result in Figure 4b and Table S2 show that forming $*NNH$ is more demanding than $*H$ and H_2 . On the other hand, once $*NNH$ is formed, then NRR is at least thermodynamically more

favorable than HER as shown in Figure 4b. Figures 4b and 5 show that the formation of any NRR reaction intermediate after *NNH is highly exergonic and has a lower barrier than the corresponding Volmer step. While we have not computed Volmer barriers in the presence of all *N_xH_y intermediates, Figure S9 shows a strong correlation between the Volmer reaction energies and barriers. This allows us to estimate the Volmer reaction barrier which is ~1.75 eV when the step is thermoneutral. At 0V_{SHE} the Volmer barriers are higher or equal to the NRR barriers (apart from *NNH formation) whereas at -0.5V_{SHE} NRR has lower barriers for all steps after *NNH. Combining the thermodynamic and kinetic data in Figures 4b, 5, and S9 shows that all PCET steps after *NNH favor the formation of NRR intermediates such as *NHNH, *NHNH₂, *NH₂NH₂, *NH₂, and *NH₃ rather than *H. This demonstrates that the Volmer step limits HER activity of the Ru-N₄ hosting any *N_xH_y intermediate. The weakened hydrogen adsorption in the presence of *N_xH_y species is caused by the accumulation of positive charge on the Ru atom as shown in Figures 2b and S3.

The NRR/HER selectivity for the PCET steps in Figure 5a is further analyzed by comparing the reaction free energies ($\Delta\Omega$) between NRR and Volmer steps in the presence of different N_xH_y intermediates. We hypothesize that there exists a window of reaction energies where HER is thermodynamically preferred. If reaction energy difference, $\Delta\Delta\Omega$, between NRR and Volmer steps is > 0 , HER is preferred as the Volmer reaction is thermodynamically more favorable than the hydrogenation of a nitrogen species. Conversely, when $\Delta\Delta\Omega < 0$, NRR is preferred. Figure 5c shows that $\Delta\Delta\Omega > 0$ only for the first PCET step at potentials relevant for NRR. This indicates that the first PCET step before *NNH formation determines thermodynamic selectivity towards NRR or HER. This conclusion is also supported by the computed and estimated activation energies

Tables S2-S3 and Figure S9, which show the HER is the kinetically preferred step only before *NNH formation.




Figure 5. (a) The competing PCET steps in NRR and HER, and (b) the corresponding reaction energies. The black dashed line depicts optimal HER ($\Delta\Omega=0$). The dark cyan solid and dashed lines are $\Delta\Omega$ value of Volmer reaction on pure Ru-N₄ site at 0V_{SHE} and -0.5V_{SHE}, respectively. (c) The thermodynamic selectivity between NRR and HER. The selectivity refers to the reaction energy difference ($\Delta\Delta\Omega$) between NRR and Volmer steps. The numbering in (b) and (c) corresponds to the steps in (a). The atom configurations are displayed in Figure S4.

The first PCET forming *NNH is clearly the rate limiting step and the Volmer step is more facile. Our results, however, indicate that the Volmer barrier increases when the catalyst is less negatively charged due to *N₂ withdrawing electrons from the active site. A recent DFT study suggests that

“non-innocent” spectators adsorbed on single-atom catalysts can profoundly affect their catalytic performance.⁵³ To see if these spectators modify NRR efficiency, we tested the influence of *N₂ on the “unreactive side” of Ru-N₄. The results given in Figure S6 show that adding another *N₂ is thermodynamically favorable. The additional *N₂ increases the activation barriers for both Volmer and *NNH formation steps making them less thermodynamically favored as shown in Figures S8 and Table S2. We note that the constant charge and constant potential barriers and reaction energies for a given step can differ by up to ~1 eV making the use of GCE-DFT a necessity. Most importantly, the reaction barrier difference ($\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger = \Delta\Omega_{NNH}^\ddagger - \Delta\Omega_{Volmer}^\ddagger$) at -0.2 V_{RHE} decreases from 0.27 eV to 0.16 eV when a “non-innocent” *N₂ ligand is present. These results indicate that the second *N₂ will decrease the overall activity but increase selectivity towards NRR since *NNH formation kinetics becomes more competitive with HER.

We found that HER/NRR competition on the Ru-N₄ catalyst is complex and sensitive to the presence of NRR intermediates at the active site. N₂ adsorbs strongly and more favorably than H at the active Ru-N₄ site. The unusually strong N₂ adsorption on Ru-N₄ distinguishes this catalyst from the widely studied Fe-N₄ catalyst where weak N₂ and stronger H adsorption under reducing conditions lead to poor NRR selectivity.⁵³ All our computed thermodynamic and kinetic data for Ru-N₄ support that, among different NRR steps, the first PCET step leading to *NNH is clearly the rate and selectivity limiting step. The reacting *N₂ also has a profound effect on the HER kinetics as its presence increases the Volmer barrier from ~0.75eV to ~1.9 eV at -0.2 V_{RHE}. In fact, the presence of any *N_xH_y species at the active site suppresses *H formation by making the Volmer step kinetically and thermodynamically more difficult than without co-adsorbates. The Heyrovsky step, on the other hand, is facilitated by the presence of NRR intermediates and additional *N₂ underneath the active site makes NRR kinetics competitive with HER. Thus, it is crucial to

consider the impact of $*N_xH_y$ intermediates on HER energetics when assessing the competition between HER and NRR. The charge analysis in Figure 2 also shows that the charge transfer from Ru plays an important, potential-dependent role on thermodynamics and kinetics warranting the use of GCE-DFT.

If we assume that the experimentally observed³⁸ 30% selectivity at $-0.2V_{RHE}$ on Ru-N₄ can be attributed to competition between $*NNH$ and $*H$ rates formation (k_{NNH} and k_{Volmer}), the Faradaic efficiency (FE) can be approximated as

$$FE = \frac{j_{NRR}}{j_{HER} + j_{NRR}} \approx \frac{k_{NNH}n_{e,NRR}}{k_{NNH}n_{e,NRR} + k_{Volmer}n_{e,NRR}} \quad (1)$$

where $n_{e,NRR} = 6$ and $n_{e,HER} = 2$ are the number of electrons transferred in the total NRR and HER processes, respectively. The $*NNH$ and $*H$ formation rates can be computed using the GCE transition station theory⁵⁴ as

$$k_i(U) = \frac{k_B T}{h} \exp \left[-\frac{\Delta\Omega^\ddagger(U)}{k_B T} \right] \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta\Omega^\ddagger(U)$ is the potential-dependent grand free energy barrier. After inserting Eq. (2) into Eq. (1), we can evaluate which barrier difference, $\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger = \Delta\Omega_{NNH}^\ddagger - \Delta\Omega_{Volmer}^\ddagger$, leads to a given FE. Evaluation of $\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger$ for FE=30% measured at $T=298$ K, gives $\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger(U = 0.2V_{SHE}) \approx 0.06$ eV. By comparing this effective barrier to our computed reaction barriers for $*NNH$ formation and the Volmer steps allows inferring the importance of $*N_2+*H$ coadsorption and the $*N_2$ ligand. Including both coadsorbed $*N_2+*H$ and another $*N_2$ ligand gives $\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger = 0.16$ eV while neglecting these effects gives $\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger = 0.75$ eV. This comparison shows that accounting for both coadsorption and the additional $*N_2$ ligand is required to properly explain the experimental NRR selectivity. We note that $\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger = 0.16$ eV is already close to the typical GGA-DFT error of ~ 0.15 eV for ammonia synthesis.⁵⁵ The difference between the computed $\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger$ value and the

experimental effective barrier ($\Delta\Delta\Omega^\ddagger \approx 0.06$ eV) can also result from a simplified solvent model used in calculations or omission of electrolyte ions, which are known to affect NRR selectivity and activity in experiments as discussed in the introduction. Despite the limitations in the computational model, our results unequivocally show that coadsorbed $^*\text{N}_x\text{H}_y$ and $^*\text{N}_2$ -ligand suppress HER and that even modest selectivity towards NRR cannot be achieved without the presence of N_2 -derived species at the Ru- N_4 active site.

Our results can also guide the search for more selective and active NRR catalyst: higher NRR activity and selectivity requires suppressing hydrogen adsorption (Volmer step) at the active site occupied by $^*\text{N}_2$ while simultaneously enhancing $^*\text{N}_2$ protonation. On the catalyst studied, this cannot be achieved by only restricting the transport of protons because steps leading to either $^*\text{N}_2 + ^*\text{H}$ or H_2 are easier than N_2 hydrogenation. Instead, NRR enhancement requires controlling the PCET kinetics and thermodynamics of the step leading to either $^*\text{H}$ or $^*\text{NNH}$. Such selective control over the PCET NRR chemistry could be achieved by depositing hydrogen bonding moieties or proton donors that are *spatially distant* from the Ru- N_4 center to either selectively stabilize $^*\text{NNH}$ or favor hydrogenation of $^*\text{N}_2$, respectively. Similar strategies to selectively facilitate NRR are employed by a natural nitrogenase enzyme,³² in the promising molecular crowding approach,¹⁶ methanol-mediated NRR,⁵⁶ and suggested for Li^+ -mediated NRR in a “solid electrolyte interface”-like layer near the electrode.⁵⁷ For other electrocatalytic reactions, such as O_2 ⁵⁸ and CO_2 ⁵⁹ reduction, molecular modifiers bound to the surface have been found to efficiently control the interfacial microenvironment and the PCET chemistry.^{60,61}

In summary, we studied computationally the competition between NRR and HER on the promising Ru- N_4 SAC using constant potential DFT simulations and a hybrid solvent model. Our results show that the catalyst studied exhibits stronger affinity towards N_2 than H adsorption,

suggesting that NRR could be preferred. The N_2 adsorption hinders hydrogen deposition through the Volmer step compared to the empty Ru-N₄ site. However, the first Volmer step after N_2 adsorption is still more favorable than N_2 hydrogenation. Once *N₂ and *H are coadsorbed, H₂ is easily generated through the Heyrovsky step whereas the formation of the first NRR intermediate, *NNH, is kinetically and thermodynamically more difficult limiting the overall NRR activity and selectivity. If one can overcome the bottleneck of *NNH formation, HER is significantly suppressed until NH₃ is released. The presence of *N₂ and NRR species significantly suppresses HER activity and we suggest that the experimentally observed 30% selectivity towards NRR on Ru-N₄ results from the hindered Volmer step in the presence of adsorbed NRR intermediates and a “non-innocent” *N₂ ligand. Overall, our results reveal the complex competition between NRR and HER, the role of coadsorption on SACs, the *N₂ ligand, and the importance of potential-dependent thermodynamics, kinetics, and charge transfer captured with GCE-DFT. Based on this detailed insight we propose that the NRR selectivity can be increased by restricting N₂ and H coadsorption on SACs through spatially distant proton-donating or hydrogen-bonding moieties to favor *NNH formation.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

S1: Calculation details. S2: Structure diagrams. S3: Vibrational Frequencies. S4: Additional results for the systems with two adsorbed N₂. S5: Tabulated reaction energies and barrier heights

AUTHOR INFORMATION

*E-mail:marko.m.melander@jyu.fi; karoliina.honkala@jyu.fi

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

TW acknowledges the support by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11874005), the China National Postdoctoral Program for Innovative Talents (No. BX2021053) and China Scholarship Council (No. 201906070128). TW also thanks for the support of Shang Hai Tong Ji Gao Ting Yao Environment Science and Technology Development Foundation. MMM and KH gratefully acknowledge support by the Academy of Finland (grant numbers 317739 and 338228), and the Jane and Aatos Erkkö Foundation (funding to the LACOR project). We thank Dr Laura Laverdure for careful reading of the manuscript. The computational resources were provided by the CSC—IT Center for Science, Espoo, Finland (<https://www.csc.fi/en/>) and the FGCI - Finnish Grid and Cloud Infrastructure.

REFERENCES

1. Schlögl, R. Catalytic Synthesis of Ammonia—A “Never-Ending Story”. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2003**, 42, 2004–2008.
2. Smil, V. Detonator of the Population Explosion. *Nature* **1999**, 400, 415.
3. Hellman, A.; Honkala, K.; Dahl, S.; Christensen, C.H.; Nørskov, J.K. Ammonia Synthesis: State of the Bellwether Reaction in Comprehensive Inorganic Chemistry II (Second Edition): From Elements to Applications. *Elsevier* **2013**, p. 459-474.
4. Smith, C.; Hill, A. K.; Torrente-Murciano, L. Current and Future Role of Haber-Bosch Ammonia in a Carbon-free Energy Landscape. *Energ. Environ. Sci.* **2020**, 13, 331-344.
5. Chen, J. G.; Crooks, R. M.; Seefeldt, L. C.; Seefeldt, L.C.; Bren, K.L.; Bullock, R.M.; Darensbourg, R.Y.; Holland, P.L.; Hoffman, B.; Janik, M.J.; Schrock, R.R. Beyond Fossil Fuel-driven Nitrogen Transformations. *Science* **2018**, 25, 360.
6. Qing, G.; Ghazfar, R.; Jackowski, S. T.; Habibzadeh, F.; Ashtiani, M.M.; Chen, C.-P.; Smith III, M.R.; Hamann, T.W. Recent Advances and Challenges of Electrocatalytic N₂ Reduction to Ammonia. *Chem. Rev.* **2020**, 120, 5437-5516.
7. Wu, T.; Zhu, X.; Xing, Z.; Mou, S.; Li, C.; Qiao, Y.; Liu, Q.; Luo, Y. Si, X.; Zhang, Y.; Sun, X. Greatly Improving Electrochemical N₂ Reduction over TiO₂ Nanoparticles by Iron Doping. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2019**, 58, 18449-18453.
8. Ren, Y.; Yu, C.; Tan, X.; Huang, H.; Wei, Q.; Qiu, J. Strategies to Suppress Hydrogen Evolution for Highly Selective Electrocatalytic Nitrogen Reduction: Challenges and Perspectives. *Energ. Environ. Sci.* **2021**, 14, 1176-1193.

9. Kibsgaard, J.; Nørskov, J. K.; Chorkendorff, I. The Difficulty of Proving Electrochemical Ammonia Synthesis. *ACS Energy Lett.* **2019**, *4*, 2986-2988.
10. Song, Y.; Johnson, D.; Peng, R.; Hensley, D.K.; Bonnesen, P.V.; Liang, L.; Huang, J.; Yang, F.; Zhang, F.; Baddorf, A.P.; Tschaplinski, T.J.; Engle, N.L.; Hatzell, M.C.; Wu, Z.; Cullen, D.A.; Meyer III, H.M. A Physical Catalyst for the Electrolysis of Nitrogen to Ammonia. *Sci. Adv.* **2018**, *4*, e1700336.
11. Wu, T.; Zhao, H.; Zhu, X.; Zhe, X.; Liu, Q.; Liu, T.; Gao, S.; Lu, S.; Chen, G.; Asiri, A.M.; Zhang, Y.; Sun, X. Identifying the Origin of Ti^{3+} Activity toward Enhanced Electrocatalytic N_2 Reduction over TiO_2 Nanoparticles Modulated by Mixed-Valent Copper *Adv. Mater.* **2020**, *32*, 2000299.
12. Zhang, L.; Ding, L.-X.; Chen, G.-F.; Yang, X.; Wang, H. Ammonia Synthesis Under Ambient Conditions: Selective Electroreduction of Dinitrogen to Ammonia on Black Phosphorus Nanosheets. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2019**, *58*, 2612–2616.
13. Yu, X.; Han, P.; Wei, Z.; Huang, L.; Gu, Z.; Peng, S.; Ma, J.; Zheng, G. Boron-Doped Graphene for Electrocatalytic N_2 Reduction. *Joule* **2018**, *2*, 1610-1622.
14. Tang, C.; Qiao, S. Z. How to Explore Ambient Electrocatalytic Nitrogen Reduction Reliably and Insightfully. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2019**, *48*, 3166-3180.
15. Xue, Z.-H.; Zhang, S.-N.; Lin, Y.-X.; Su, H.; Zhai, G.-Y.; Han, J.-T.; Yu, Q.-Y.; Li, X.-H.; Antonetti, M.; Chen, J.-S. Electrochemical Reduction of N_2 into NH_3 by Donor–acceptor Couples of Ni and Au Nanoparticles with a 67.8% Faradaic Efficiency. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2019**, *141*, 14976-14980.

16. Guo, Y.; Gu, J.; Zhang, R.; Zhang, S.; Li, Z.; Zhao, Y.; Huang, Z.; Fan, J.; Chen, Z.; Zhi, C. Molecular Crowding Effect in Aqueous Electrolytes to Suppress Hydrogen Reduction Reaction and Enhance Electrochemical Nitrogen Reduction. *Adv. Energy Mater.* 2101699. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/aenm.202101699>
17. Liu, X.; Jiao, Y.; Zheng, Y.; Jaroniek, M.; Qiao, S.-Z. Building Up a Picture of the Electrocatalytic Nitrogen Reduction Activity of Transition Metal Single-Atom Catalysts. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2019**, 141, 9664-9672.
18. Liu, C.; Li, Q.; Wu, C.; Zhang, J.; Jin, Y.; MacFarlane, D.R.; Sun, C. Single-Boron Catalysts for Nitrogen Reduction Reaction. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2019**, 141, 2884-2888.
19. Lv, X.; Wei, W.; Huang, B.; Dai, Y.; Frauenheim, T. High-throughput Screening of Synergistic Transition Metal Dual-atom Catalysts for Efficient Nitrogen Fixation. *Nano Lett.* **2021**, 21, 1871-1878.
20. Choi, C.; Back, S.; Kim, N.-Y.; Lim, Y.; Kim, Y.-H.; Jung, Y. Suppression of Hydrogen Evolution Reaction in Electrochemical N₂ Reduction using Single-atom Catalysts: a Computational Guideline. *ACS Catal.* **2018**, 8, 7517-7525.
21. Montoya, J. H.; Tsai, C.; Vojvodic, A.; Nørskov, J.K. The Challenge of Electrochemical Ammonia Synthesis: A New Perspective on the Role of Nitrogen Scaling Relations. *ChemSusChem* **2015**, 8, 2180-2186.
22. Singh, A. R.; Rohr, B. A.; Statt, M. J.; Schwalbe, J.A.; Cargnello, M.; Nørskov, J.K. Strategies toward Selective Electrochemical Ammonia Synthesis. *ACS Catal.* **2019**, 9, 8316-8324.

23. Hao, Y.-C.; Guo, Y.; Chen, L.-W.; Shu, M.; Wang, X.-U.; Bu, T.-A.; Gao, W.-Y.; Zhang, N.; Su, X.; Xiao, F.; Zhou, J.-W.; Wang, B.; Hu, C.-W.; Yu, A.-X.; Si, R.; Zhang, Y.-W.; Yan, C.-H. Promoting nitrogen electroreduction to ammonia with bismuth nanocrystals and potassium cations in water. *Nat. Catal.* **2019**, *2*, 448-456.
24. Drazevic, E; Skúlason, E.; Are There Any Overlooked Catalysts for Electrochemical NH₃ Synthesis – New Insights from Analysis of Thermochemical Data, *iScience*, **2020**, *23*, 101803
25. Van der Ham, C. J.; Koper, M. T.; Hetterscheid, D. G. Challenges in Reduction of Dinitrogen by Proton and Electron Transfer. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2014**, *43*, 5183-5191.
26. Bagger, A.; Wan, H.; Stephens, I. E.; Rossmeisl, J.; Role of Catalyst in Controlling N₂ Reduction Selectivity: A Unified View of Nitrogenase and Solid Electrodes. *ACS Catal.* **2021**, *11*, 6596-6601.
27. Hou, J.; Yang, M.; Zhang, J. Recent Advances in Catalysts, Electrolytes and Electrode Engineering for the Nitrogen Reduction Reaction under Ambient Conditions. *Nanoscale* **2020**, *12*, 6900-6920.
28. Suryanto, B. H.; Matuszek, K.; Choi, J.; Hodgetts, R.Y.; Du, H.-L.; Bakker, J.M.; Kang, C.S.; Cherepanov, P.V.; Simonov, A.N.; MacFarlane, D.R. Nitrogen Reduction to Ammonia at High Efficiency and Rates Based on a Phosphonium Proton Shuttle. *Science* **2021**, *372*, 1187-1191.
29. Hu, L.; Xing, Z.; Feng, X. Understanding the Electrocatalytic Interface for Ambient Ammonia Synthesis. *ACS Energy Lett.* **2020**, *5*, 430-436.

30. Nilsson, A; Stephens, I.; Sustainable ammonia production in Energy-X research report: “Research needs towards sustainable production of fuels and chemicals”, Ed. Nørksov, J.K., <https://www.energy-x.eu/research-needs-report/> (accessed November 11th 2021)
31. Qiu, W.; Xie, X.-Y.; Qiu, J.; Fang, W.-H.; Liang, R.; Ren, X.; Ji, X.; Cui, G.; Asiri, A.M.; Cui, G.; Tang, B.; Sun, X. High-performance Artificial Nitrogen Fixation at Ambient Conditions using a Metal-free Electrocatalyst. *Nat. Commun.* **2018**, 9, 1-8.
32. Kang, W.; Lee, C. C.; Jasniowski, A. J.; Ribbe, M.W.; Hu, Y. Structural Evidence for a Dynamic Metallocofactor during N₂ Reduction by Mo-nitrogenase. *Science* **2020**, 368, 1381-1385.
33. Zhang, R.; Wang, Q. H.; Luo, Z. Y.; Fang, M.X.; Cen, K.F. Competition and Inhibition Effects during Coal Char Gasification in the Mixture of H₂O and CO₂. *Energy fuel.* **2013**, 27, 5107-5115.
34. Chevillard, C.; Cárdenas, M. L.; Cornish-Bowden, A. The Competition Plot: a Simple Test of Whether two Reactions Occur at the Same Active Site. *Biochem. J.* **1993**, 289, 599-604.
35. Qiu, Y.; Peng, X.; Lü, F.; Mi, Y.; Zhuo, L.; Ren, J.; Liu, X.; Luo, J. Single-Atom Catalysts for the Electrocatalytic Reduction of Nitrogen to Ammonia under Ambient Conditions. *Chem-Asian J.* **2019**, 14, 2770-2779.
36. Jiao, D.; Liu, Y.; Cai, Q.; Zhao, J.. Coordination Tunes the Activity and Selectivity of the Nitrogen Reduction Reaction on Single-atom Iron catalysts: A Computational Study. *J. Mater. Chem. A* **2021**, 1240-1251.

37. Zhao, J.; Chen, Z. Single Mo Atom Supported on Defective Boron Nitride Monolayer as an Efficient Electrocatalyst for Nitrogen Fixation: A Computational Study. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2017**, *139*, 12480-12487.
38. Geng, Z.; Liu, Y.; Kong, X.; Li, P.; Liu, Z.; Du, J.; Shu, M.; Si, R.; Zeng, J. Achieving a Record-high Yield Rate of 120.9 for N₂ Electrochemical Reduction over Ru Single-atom Catalysts. *Adv. Mater.* **2018**, *30*, 1803498.
39. Zhao, W.; Zhang, L.; Luo, Q.; Hu, Z.; Zhang, W.; Smith, S.; Yang, J. Single Mo₁ (Cr₁) Atom on Nitrogen-doped Graphene Enables Highly Selective Electroreduction of Nitrogen into Ammonia. *ACS Catal.* **2019**, *9*, 3419-3425.
40. Melander, M. M. Grand Canonical Ensemble Approach to Electrochemical Thermodynamics, Kinetics, and Model Hamiltonians. *Current Opinion in Electrochemistry*, 2021, p. 100749.
41. Schwarz, K.; Sundararaman, R. The Electrochemical Interface in First-principles Calculations. *Surf. Sci. Rep.* **2020**, *75*, 100492.
42. Melander M. M.; Kuisma, M. J.; Christensen, T.E.K; Honkala, K. Grand-canonical Approach to Density Functional Theory of Electrocatalytic Systems: Thermodynamics of Solid-liquid Interfaces at Constant Ion and Electrode Potentials. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2019**, *150*, 041706.
43. Tang, Q.; Jiang, D. E. Mechanism of Hydrogen Evolution Reaction on 1T-MoS₂ from First Principles. *ACS Catal.* **2016**, *6*, 4953-4961.

44. Liu, X.; Jiao, Y.; Zheng, Y.; Davey, K.; Qiao, S.-Z. A Computational Study on Pt and Ru Dimers Supported on Graphene for the Hydrogen Evolution Reaction: New Insight into the Alkaline Mechanism. *J. Mater. Chem. A* **2019**, *7*, 3648-3654.
45. Légaré, M. A.; Bélanger-Chabot, G.; Dewhurst, R. D.; Welz, E.; Krummenacher, I.; Engels, B.; Braun-Schweig, H. Nitrogen Fixation and Reduction at Boron. *Science* **2018**, *359*, 896.
46. Lindgren, P.; Kastlunger, G.; Peterson, A: A Challenge to the $\Delta G \sim 0$ Interpretation of Hydrogen Evolution, *ACS Catal.*, **2020**, *10*, 121-128
47. Jain, A; Bar Sadan, M; Ramasubramaniam, Identifying a New Pathway for Nitrogen Reduction Reaction on Fe-Doped MoS₂ by the Coadsorption of Hydrogen and N₂. *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2021, *125*, 19980-19990
48. Deng, J.; Li, H.; Wang, S.; Ding, D.; Chen, M.; Liu, C.; Tian, Z.; Novoselov, K.S.; Ma, C.; Deng, D.; Bao, X. Multiscale Structural and Electronic Control of Molybdenum Disulfide Foam for Highly Efficient Hydrogen Production. *Nat. Commun.* 2017, *8*, 14430.
49. Exner, K. S. Paradigm Change in Hydrogen Electrocatalysis: The Volcano's Apex is Located at Weak Bonding of the Reaction Intermediate. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energ.* **2020**, *45*, 27221-27229.
50. Nørskov, J. K.; Bligaard, T.; Logadottir, A.; Kitchin, J.R.; Chen, J.G.; Pandelov, S.; Stimming, U. Trends in the Exchange Current for Hydrogen Evolution. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* **2005**, *152*, J23.
51. Yin, H.; Gan, L. Y.; Wang, P. The Identification of Optimal Active Boron Sites for N₂ Reduction. *J. Mater. Chem. A* **2020**, *8*, 3910-3917.

52. Lei, Y.; Wang, Y.; Liu, Y.; Song, C.; Li, Q.; Wang, D.; Li, Y. Designing Atomic Active Centers for Hydrogen Evolution Electrocatalysts. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2020**, *59*, 20794-20781.
53. Choi, C; Gu, G.H; Noh, J.; Park, H.S.; Jung, Y. Understanding potential-dependent competition between electrocatalytic dinitrogen and proton reduction reactions, *Nat. Commun.*, **2021**, *12*. 4353
54. Melander, M.M.; Grand Canonical Rate Theory for Electrochemical and Electrocatalytic Systems I: General Formulation and Proton-coupled Electron Transfer Reactions, *J. El. Chem. Soc.*, **2020**, *167*, 116518
55. Medford, A.J.; Wellendorff, J.; Vojvodic, A.; Studt, F.; Abild-Pedersen, F.; Jacobsen, K.W.; Bligaard, T.; Nørskov, J.K. Assessing the reliability of calculated ammonia synthesis rates, *Science*, **2014**, *345*, 197-200
56. Ren, Y.; Yu, C.; Han, X.; Tan, X.; Wei, Q.; Li, W.; Han, Y.; Yang, L.; Qiu, J. Methanol-Mediated Electrosynthesis of Ammonia, *ACS Energy Lett.*, **2021**, *6*, 3844-3850
57. Westhead, O.; Jervis, R.; Stephens, I. E. Is Lithium the Key for Nitrogen Electroreduction?. *Science* **2021**, *372*, 1149-1150.
58. Wang, T; Zhang, Y; Huang, B; Cai, B.; Rao, R.R.; Giordano, L.; Sun, S.-G.; Shao-Horn, Y. Enhancing Oxygen Reduction Electrocatalysis by Tuning Interfacial Hydrogen Bonds, *Nat. Catal.*, **2021**, *4*, 753-762

59. Wagner, A; Sahm, C.D.; Reisner, E; Towards Molecular Understanding of Local Chemical Environment Effects in Electro- and Photocatalytic CO₂ Reduction, *Nat. Catal.*, **2020**, 3, 775-786
60. Wuttig, A; Toste, F.D.; The Interface is a Tunable Dimension in Electricity-Driven Organic Synthesis, *Nat. Sci.*, **2021**, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ntls.20210036>
61. Zhang, X.; Xue, D.; Jiang, S.; Xia, H.; Yang, Y.; Yan, W.; Hu, J.; Zhang, J. Rational Confinement Engineering of MOF-derived Carbon-based Electrocatalysts toward CO₂ Reduction and O₂ Reduction Reactions. *InfoMat* 2021, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/inf2.12257>