The Predominance of Hydrogen Evolution on Transition Metal Sulfides and Phosphides Under CO₂ Reduction Conditions: An Experimental and Theoretical Study
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Abstract

A combination of experiment and theory has been used to understand the relationship between the hydrogen evolution reaction (HER) and CO$_2$ reduction (CO$_2$R) on transition metal phosphide and transition metal sulfide catalysts. Although multifunctional active sites in these materials could potentially improve their CO$_2$R activity relative to pure transition metal electrocatalysts, under aqueous testing conditions, these materials showed a high selectivity for the HER relative to CO$_2$R. Computational results supported these findings, indicating that a limitation of the metal phosphide catalysts is that the HER is favored thermodynamically over CO$_2$R. On Ni-MoS$_2$, a limitation is the kinetic barrier for the proton-electron transfer to *CO. These theoretical and experimental results demonstrate that selective CO$_2$R requires electrocatalysts that possess both favorable thermodynamic pathways and surmountable kinetic barriers.
Electrochemical carbon dioxide reduction (CO$_2$R) has drawn interest for converting CO$_2$ into energy dense fuels such as ethanol, thereby providing an option for sustainable chemically based energy storage and building blocks for the chemical industry.$^{1-6}$ In aqueous solutions, CO$_2$R must compete with the kinetically more facile hydrogen evolution reaction (HER). The relative Faradaic efficiencies for the two reactions reflect the low ratio between the concentration of dissolved CO$_2$ in water and the concentration of protons and/or water that are the reactants for CO$_2$R and the HER, respectively, as well as the lower kinetic barriers for the two-electron reduction of water to H$_2$ relative to the multi-electron reduction of CO$_2$ to alcohols, olefins, or hydrocarbons. These factors generally lead to low selectivity for CO$_2$R. Understanding the competition between these reactions is critical to the development of more effective catalysts for CO$_2$R.

To facilitate large-scale adoption, CO$_2$R catalysts need to be developed that can selectively synthesize high value products at low overpotentials.$^{2-3}$ Polycrystalline copper electrocatalysts can reduce CO$_2$ to desirable products such as ethanol but also produce at least fifteen other products.$^7$ Competition between CO$_2$R and the HER further reduces the overall Faradaic efficiency toward any specific CO$_2$R product.$^{4,8}$ In addition to selectivity challenges, at present CO$_2$R electrocatalysts require substantial overpotentials to directly reduce CO$_2$ beyond CO or formate, leading to poor energy efficiency.$^{1,4,7}$ On transition metal (TM) electrocatalysts, thermodynamic calculations suggest that the high overpotential needed to drive CO$_2$ reduction beyond CO results in part from the linear scaling between the CO and CHO binding energies.$^9$ Subsequent $ab$ initio calculations of the energetics of CO reduction to CH$_4$ show that the linear scaling between the CO binding energy and the transition state energy for proton-electron transfer to CO creates additional kinetic limitations on the activity of TM electrocatalysts for CO or CO$_2$ reduction.$^{10,11}$ These studies
indicate that favorable thermodynamics for the binding of reaction intermediates are necessary but perhaps insufficient criteria for achieving high activity and selectivity for CO$_2$R. Thus, obtaining a deeper understanding of the competition between CO$_2$R and the HER will require analyzing both the thermodynamics and the kinetics of reaction pathways.

The multifunctional active sites in TM phosphides or TM sulfides could serve as possible motifs for circumventing the aforementioned scaling relations.$^{9,12}$ In the context of hydrotreating reactions, the behavior of phosphide surfaces can be described by acidic functionality that is associated with phosphorus sites, in addition to metallic catalytic functionality associated with the metal sites.$^{13}$ This bifunctional characteristic, along with the high degree of polarity between the cationic and anionic constituents, could, through secondary bonding interactions, selectively stabilize the H-CO transition state relative to adsorbed CO. Interaction with S or P non-metal sites also could produce differences in reactivity relative to TM electrocatalysts. For example, calculations indicate that the P atoms in MoP can stabilize adsorbate species by shifting between hybridization states.$^{14}$ Thermodynamic calculations on TM-doped molybdenum sulfide (TM-MoS$_2$) materials have indicated that CO prefers to adsorb on TM sites, whereas CHO prefers to adsorb on the sulfur sites.$^{15-16}$ Consequently, the *CO and *CHO scaling relation might be circumvented on these materials because the intermediates adsorb on fundamentally different catalytic sites. These materials could therefore potentially be more active for CO$_2$R than TM catalysts, which motivates further studies using ab initio calculations to determine whether the H-CO transition state is also stabilized in such systems. Notably, high Faradaic efficiencies have been reported for CO production using MoS$_2$ and related TM dichalcogenide electrocatalysts.$^{17-19}$ However, these studies use the ionic liquid EMIMBF$_4$ (1-ethyl-3-methylimidazolium tetrafluoroborate) as an additive, and ionic liquid additives can lower the overpotential needed to
reduce CO₂ to CO.²⁰-²² Another study on MoP nanoparticles supported on In-doped carbon showed high Faradaic efficiencies toward formate production.²³ This study used the ionic liquid BMIMPF₆ (1-butyl-3-methylimidazolium hexafluorophosphate) in a mixture of acetonitrile and water as the electrolyte. Deconvoluting the role of the ionic liquid additive from the intrinsic activity of the TM sulfide and phosphide materials requires further fundamental studies in aqueous electrolytes.

Herein, we demonstrate the process of catalyst screening by using both experiment and theory to evaluate a range of TM sulfide and phosphide materials as CO₂R catalysts in aqueous electrolyte solutions. Both thin film and nanoparticle catalyst morphologies investigated herein showed a high Faradaic efficiency for the HER relative to CO₂R; hence these systems form a primary focus for the combined theoretical and experimental investigations described herein. A thermodynamic analysis indicated that the TM phosphides are selective for the HER relative to CO₂R, due to large differences in their limiting potentials (Uₖ). While Ni-MoS₂ appears to be promising from a thermodynamic perspective for CO₂R, this sulfide does not sufficiently stabilize the *CO to *CHO transition state energy to allow for high CO₂R activity. These results provide insight into the competition between the HER and CO₂R on TM phosphide and TM sulfide surfaces and highlight the importance of understanding both thermodynamics and kinetics to design more active and selective catalysts for CO₂R.

Nine TM phosphide and five TM sulfide materials were tested as CO₂R catalysts. The thin film catalysts were synthesized by deposition of a thin TM layer on a silicon substrate, followed by vapor-assisted conversion to the phosphide or sulfide.²⁴⁻²⁵ SnS films were produced by spin coating FTO (fluorine-doped Sn oxide) substrates with a solution of SnS powder in a mixture of ethylenediamine and 1,2-ethanediithiol.²⁶⁻²⁷ TM phosphide nanoparticles were synthesized from tri-n-octylphosphine (TOP) and metallic nanoparticles.²⁸⁻³⁰ Characterization of these materials can
be found in the Supporting Information. The CO₂R activity of these electrocatalysts was evaluated under 1 atm of CO₂ in 0.10 M potassium bicarbonate at pH 6.8. Current densities greater than 0.1 mA cm⁻² were investigated to understand the intrinsic catalytic activity of these materials in aqueous electrolytes.

Each of the tested catalysts exhibited a high Faradaic efficiency for H₂ evolution relative to CO₂R. Although the intermittent release of hydrogen bubbles led to error in the quantification of evolved H₂ and, thus, sometimes resulted in the calculation of Faradaic efficiencies exceeding 100 percent, this error does not affect the robustness of the conclusions regarding selectivity because H₂ was the dominant product formed by these systems in all cases. Several materials produced trace amounts of methane or small quantities of CO. However, the Faradaic efficiency for all CO₂R products was less than 3.5 percent for each tested material (Table 1), with the HER accounting for the majority of the charge passed during the electrolysis.

Figure 1. Faradaic efficiency for H₂ production under CO₂R conditions for representative transition metal phosphide and sulfide materials. Less than 3.5 percent of the current
density went towards CO₂ reduction products on these materials. Square symbols denote thin film catalysts while asterisk symbols denote nanoparticle catalysts. The color of the symbol corresponds to the material composition.

Table 1. Summary of Product Distributions for All Tested Materials at a Fixed Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>material</th>
<th>morphology</th>
<th>potential (V vs. RHE)</th>
<th>current density (mA cm⁻²)</th>
<th>H₂ FE⁻¹ (%)</th>
<th>CO FE⁻¹ (%)</th>
<th>CH₄ FE⁻¹ (%)</th>
<th>HCOO⁻ FE⁻¹ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Thin film</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-5.1 (±2.8)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>Thin film</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-4.0 (±2.6)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NiₓP</td>
<td>Thin film</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-3.6 (±2.1)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Trace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoS₂</td>
<td>Thin film</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-4.7 (±1.5)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni-MoSₓ</td>
<td>Thin film</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-3.4 (±0.9)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-MoSₓ</td>
<td>Thin film</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-4.0 (±0.2)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-MoSₓ</td>
<td>Thin film</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-4.9 (±0.4)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SnS</td>
<td>Thin film</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-1.3 (±0.3)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Nanoparticles</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-4.0 (±0.5)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Trace</td>
<td>Trace</td>
<td>Trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni₂P</td>
<td>Nanoparticles</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-9.7 (±1.5)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>Nanoparticles</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-12.0 (±2.0)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Trace</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Nanoparticles</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-6.2 (±0.8)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Trace</td>
<td>Trace</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IrP</td>
<td>Nanoparticles</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-11.9 (±2.2)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RhP</td>
<td>Nanoparticles</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-11.4 (±2.5)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Trace</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. FE refers to Faradaic efficiency.

While the phosphides and sulfides showed high selectivity for H₂ production, these catalysts also exhibited a substantial increase in the overpotential needed to drive the HER under CO₂R testing conditions relative to the overpotential measured under traditional HER conditions, such as H₂ purged, 0.50 M H₂SO₄ (Figure 2).²⁴-²⁵ On Au (111), Pt (111), and polycrystalline Ir rotating disk electrodes in 0.10 M HClO₄ and KClO₄ electrolytes, an additional 350 to 750 mV of overpotential on an RHE scale was required to reach a current density of 10 mA cm⁻² in a pH 7
electrolyte compared to a pH 1 electrolyte.\textsuperscript{31} This shift in HER activity was attributed to a difference in proton donating species, with hydronium acting as the proton donor in acidic pH and water donating protons in neutral pH.\textsuperscript{31} However, in a neutral phosphate electrolyte, CoP and FeP electrocatalysts needed only an additional 40 to 50 mV on an RHE scale to produce a cathodic current density of 10 mA cm\textsuperscript{-2}, relative to the overpotentials for the HER in 0.50 M H\textsubscript{2}SO\textsubscript{4}.\textsuperscript{29,32} This result highlights the role of buffering species as potential proton donors, and phosphate species likely contribute to the HER activity in these studies.\textsuperscript{33} Under the near-neutral pH CO\textsubscript{2}R conditions shown in Figure 2, both bicarbonate and water could act as potential sources of protons for the HER.\textsuperscript{34} Much remains to be learned regarding the mechanism of proton transfer from buffering anions such as bicarbonate and phosphate to the catalyst surface during the HER, and it is noted that mass transfer could limit the activity at potentials where water cannot be reduced. Further CV experiments using a rotating disk electrode could help elucidate the role of the mass transport of buffer species on HER activity as well as simplify the comparison between the LSV data collected in H\textsubscript{2}SO\textsubscript{4} and the steady state chronoamperometric measurements in KHCO\textsubscript{3} presented in Figure 2. Nevertheless, in addition to pH effects, additional phenomena could be impacting the activity of catalysts under CO\textsubscript{2}R conditions.

Previous reports suggest that adsorbed CO can significantly affect the HER activity of metals, since adsorbed CO not only blocks H adsorption sites but also weakens the H binding energy of the surface.\textsuperscript{35-37} On metals with CO binding energies stronger than -1 eV, the equilibrium coverage of CO weakens the $\Delta G$ of hydrogen adsorption ($\Delta G_H$) by $\sim 0.5$ eV.\textsuperscript{36} Preliminary calculations on CoP (see Supporting Information) suggest that several of the tested materials should have substantial CO coverage at potentials where CO\textsubscript{2}R ought to occur. This high CO coverage could weaken the $\Delta G_H$ and alter the HER activity on these materials.
To examine this possibility, we tested CoP and MoS$_2$ thin film electrodes in an Ar, saturated 0.10 M KHCO$_3$ electrolyte. Because this electrolyte is a higher pH (~9.0) than the CO$_2$ saturated electrolyte (~6.8), we plot the data on both an RHE (Figure 2a) and an SHE (Figure 2b) potential scale. Calculations (see below) suggest CO binds strongly to CoP while MoS$_2$ binds CO more weakly. Thus, we would expect the effect of CO adsorption to be greater on CoP than on MoS$_2$. Indeed, at potentials negative of -0.8 V vs. SHE, the HER activity of CoP appears higher in Ar saturated electrolyte than in CO$_2$ saturated electrolyte. Additionally, the HER activity for CoP in CO$_2$ saturated electrolyte shows a significantly different slope than in Ar saturated 0.10 M KHCO$_3$. While ascribing this change in slope to specific mechanistic changes requires further experiment and theory, adsorbed CO has been reported to increase the Tafel slope for the HER on Pt catalysts.$^{38}$ This effect will be investigated further in a future work. On MoS$_2$, however, the HER activity is comparable between CO$_2$ saturated KHCO$_3$ and Ar saturated electrolyte on an SHE scale. These results suggest that the HER activity on strong CO binding catalysts, such as CoP, is being altered by adsorbed CO; this effect is not observed on weaker CO binding catalysts such as MoS$_2$. While, the suppression of the HER activity under CO$_2$R conditions is promising, the low selectivity towards CO$_2$R suggests that much remains to be learned regarding the competition between these reactions.
Figure 2. Current density of CoP and MoS$_2$ thin films under different electrochemical conditions. Sister samples are shown for the Ar and CO$_2$ saturated electrolytes. Figure 2a is plotted on an RHE potential scale while Figure 2b is plotted on an SHE potential scale. Linear sweep voltammograms in H$_2$ saturated 0.50 M H$_2$SO$_4$ are shown as solid lines. Steady state measurements in CO$_2$ saturated 0.10 M KHCO$_3$ are denoted as squares and with a dashed line to guide the eye while steady state measurements in Ar saturated 0.10 M KHCO$_3$ are denoted as triangles with a dotted line to guide the eye. Red lines and symbols correspond to measurements using CoP as an electrocatalyst while blue lines and symbols represent measurements using MoS$_2$.

To understand these experimental results, *ab initio* simulations were performed to gain insight into the selectivity of these materials towards the HER. Determination of electrochemical transition states requires explicit consideration of potential, ions, and solvating water molecules, all of which present open challenges.$^{39-40}$ Consequently, we describe herein an iterative computational screening process, beginning with an idealized thermodynamic analysis of the CO to CHO and HER steps$^9$ and subsequently pursuing computationally intensive determinations of the associated activation barriers for the most promising electrocatalyst candidates.
In previous studies on TM catalysts, thermodynamic calculations of the *CO to *CHO step provided a useful first description of the theoretical overpotential needed to reduce CO$_2$ past *CO.$^9$ On Cu, for example, *CO and *CHO have comparable and moderate binding energies, leading to moderate overpotentials for CO$_2$R to hydrocarbons and oxygenates. For TM phosphide and sulfide surfaces, *CO and *CHO preferentially bind to metal and phosphorus/sulfur sites, respectively. This behavior may in part be attributed to the bifunctional nature of these surfaces. The lone pair of CO acts as a Lewis base and back-bonds with metals upon adsorption.$^{13,41}$ Therefore, if both metal and phosphorous/sulfur sites are exposed on a facet, the *CO intermediate tends to preferentially bind to the metal (Supporting Information).

**Figure 3a** presents the bifunctional stabilization of these intermediates by plotting the binding energy of CHO vs. CO. This benchmark serves as a simple means to compare the behavior of different electrocatalysts. The *CHO intermediate is stabilized when bound to undercoordinated S-edge sites. On MoS$_2$ and doped MoS$_2$, this stabilization at edges pushes these catalysts into a region of thermodynamic interest, where *CO is bound moderately and comparably to *CHO. Unlike these sulfides, most phosphides fall near the (211) and (111) TM scaling lines. For these surfaces, even though *CHO preferentially binds to P-sites, the stabilization of P-*CHO relative to M-*CHO is marginal. Based on thermodynamic criteria alone and assuming that the activation energies scale with the difference between the initial and final state energies, phosphides are therefore unlikely to yield reduced overpotentials for CO$_2$R.$^{42}$
Figure 3. a. Traditional thermodynamic screening criteria for CO$_2$R, showing the binding energy of CHO versus CO on surfaces at equilibrium hydrogen coverage. b. Corresponding theoretical $U_L$ for HER and CO$_2$R, calculated as the free energy difference of the *CO to *CHO step for strong binding surfaces, and the free energy difference of the *COOH to *CO step for weak binding surfaces (MoP).

One deviation from thermodynamic scaling in Figure 3a requires further discussion. The (001) MoP surface is P-terminated, and geometric constraints prevent any direct binding between adsorbates and metal sites. The P-sites interact with *CO weakly and *CHO strongly, differentiating between the two adsorbates and leading to the apparent deviation from the thermodynamic scaling line. This weakened interaction has been ascribed to shifts in hybridization of the P-site as well as possible lone pair repulsion of CO.$^{14}$ However, CO binding is very weak on MoP, and hence desorption is favored relative to further reduction of *CO.

Thermodynamic screening criteria for CO$_2$R indicate that TM sulfides are promising electrocatalyst candidates, but the CO$_2$R pathway must be compared to the competing HER. Hence, theoretical $U_L$ values were calculated for the HER and CO$_2$R (Figure 3b). The $U_L$ is a
theoretical estimation of the minimum voltage which must be applied for a reaction step to become downhill in free energy and is defined as the min(-\Delta G(U=0)/e) of all elementary steps along a reduction path.\textsuperscript{36} For TM surfaces, on which the activation and reaction energies scale, this measure has been a useful descriptor of activity,\textsuperscript{43-46} with trends in selectivity also shown to follow the difference in HER and CO\textsubscript{2}R $U_L$.\textsuperscript{15,36} Previously, a value of $|U_{L \text{ CO}_2 R} - U_{L \text{ HER}}| < 0.5$ V was experimentally associated with metals for which the HER activity does not dominate relative to CO\textsubscript{2}R.\textsuperscript{15} For all the phosphides considered, the difference in $U_L$ is 0.6 V or greater, suggesting that a high selectivity for CO\textsubscript{2}R is unlikely without substantial suppression of the HER, a major challenge.\textsuperscript{47} This expectation is supported by the experimentally measured Faradaic efficiencies, which show a high selectivity for H\textsubscript{2} production relative to CO\textsubscript{2}R. However, this limiting potential criterion suggests that Ni-MoS\textsubscript{2} holds potential for high activity and selectivity for CO\textsubscript{2}R.
Figure 4. The charge density differences for *CO (Figure 4a), H-CO (Figure 4b), and *CHO (Figure 4c) on MoS$_2$. The blue and magenta isosurfaces correspond to charge densities of –0.001 e Bohr$^{-3}$ and 0.001 e Bohr$^{-3}$, respectively. d. Potential-dependent barriers for CO→CHO on MoS$_2$ and Ni-MoS$_2$ at 0V vs RHE and pH 7, with respect to a threshold value of 0.75 eV. e. The barrier for CO→CHO on MoS$_2$ and Ni-MoS$_2$ compared to face-centered cubic transition metal (111) and (211) facets.

Having passed this “first round” of thermodynamics-based screening criteria, Ni-MoS$_2$ was further investigated for its corresponding electrochemical activation energies. MoS$_2$ was also examined as a point of comparison. Figure 4a-c shows the charge density isosurfaces for the *CO→*CHO barrier on MoS$_2$ and illustrates the shift in charge density within the cell during the proton-electron transfer. The constant potential activation free energies were determined from these constant-charge calculations, using a charge-extrapolation scheme based on a capacitor model of the interface.$^{39,48}$ The resulting barriers are shown as a function of potential in Figure 4d.

The incorporation of kinetic criteria leads to an improved estimation of the catalytic activity relative to that obtained by thermodynamic predictions alone. The kinetic barriers at 0 V vs. RHE for CO protonation at the MoS$_2$ and Ni-MoS$_2$ edge sites were calculated to be 1.09 eV and 1.35 eV, respectively. As indicated in Figure 4d, a barrier of 0.75 eV, equivalent to a turnover frequency of one per site per second at room temperature, was defined as the threshold for facile kinetics. Given a transfer coefficient of 0.47 for MoS$_2$ and 0.35 for Ni-MoS$_2$ (See SI for $\beta$ calculation details), overcoming the kinetic barriers to produce CO$_2$R products becomes facile at potentials of -0.72 V and -1.71 V vs. RHE, respectively.
MoS$_2$ was calculated to possess a surmountable kinetic barrier for CO protonation, but the calculated $\Delta G_{CO}$ is weak (0.1 eV), which should limit formation of further reduced products. Furthermore, the $|U_{L \ CO_2R} - U_{L \ HER}|$ for MoS$_2$ lies above the 0.5 V threshold above which on transition metals the HER dominates over CO$_2$R. For Ni-MoS$_2$, the $\Delta G_{CO}$ is calculated to be -0.20 eV, similar to that of Cu (211); sufficiently negative free energies favor *CO coverage over desorption, allowing for further reduction. However, the activation barrier remains prohibitively high. The physical rationale behind this high barrier lies in the transition state geometry. At the transition and final states, the S-C distance is calculated to be 2.2 Å and 1.8 Å, respectively, which suggests a loosely bound transition state. Therefore, the stabilization imparted from S-sites on *CHO binding does not necessarily stabilize the transition state energy.

Calculations indicate that CO rotates to expose the carbon during proton-electron transfer, and the activation energy would therefore decrease with weaker *CO binding (Figure 4e). Neither MoS$_2$ nor Ni-MoS$_2$ exhibit a substantial deviation from the activation energy scaling lines characteristic of TM electrocatalysts, illustrating that the activation energy is determined by *CO binding rather than *CHO binding. Achieving lower kinetic barriers for CO protonation will thus require exploration of a narrower window of CO binding energies, between Ni-MoS$_2$ and MoS$_2$, or unique sites with more rotational degrees of freedom. The calculations indicate that the considered TM phosphides and sulfides do not meet these criteria, in accord with the experimentally observed Faradaic efficiencies favoring the HER relative to CO$_2$R. These observations emphasize the importance of considering activation energies in the search for new CO$_2$R catalysts, and indicate that surmountable thermodynamic pathways alone, while necessary, are not a sufficient criterion for high activity.
Having explored a range of metal phosphide and sulfide catalysts, all were found to be more selective for the HER than for CO₂R. We provide one possible explanation for this low CO₂R selectivity using computational insights. Calculations indicate that strong binding transition metal phosphides, like their transition metal counterparts, show a substantially smaller Uₘ for the HER than for CO₂R. Microkinetic modeling of the full path should be undertaken to draw concrete conclusions about whether this phenomenological criterion holds for transition metal phosphides and sulfides, as well. Binding energy and Uₘ calculations suggest that Ni-MoS₂ could be a promising CO₂R catalyst; however, the calculated kinetic barrier for the proton-electron transfer to *CO is too high to allow for facile kinetics. The combination of experiment and theory provides a more complete understanding of the competition between the HER and CO₂R for these systems and motivates the exploration of methods to suppress the HER during CO₂R.⁴⁷
Experimental Methods

Molybdenum sulfide and TM phosphide thin films were synthesized as described previously.\textsuperscript{24-25} A thin film of the TM was deposited onto a silicon substrate using electron beam physical vapor deposition. The metal thin films were then converted to the phosphide or sulfide through a vapor-assisted process in a tube furnace. Thin films of SnS were produced by spin coating a solution of SnS powder onto FTO.\textsuperscript{26-27} The nanoparticle catalysts were synthesized by heating metallic nanoparticles in a mixture of tri-\textit{n}-octyphosphine, \textit{l}-octadecene, and oleylamine was heated for 1 h under vacuum (\textit{Caution:} All nanoparticle synthesis was performed in a fume hood to limit exposure to reagents such as trioctylphosphine and oleylamine, which can cause chemical burns).\textsuperscript{28,30,49} The materials were evaluated for CO\textsubscript{2}R activity in a flow cell that contained CO\textsubscript{2}-sparged 0.10 M KHCO\textsubscript{3}.\textsuperscript{7} The experimental methodology is described in more detail in the Supporting Information.

The lattice constants and optimization parameters for DFT calculations have been described previously,\textsuperscript{10,16,50} with further calculation details provided in the Supporting Information. A Bravais-Friedel-Donnay-Harker crystal morphology algorithm identified the most probable facets based on geometric considerations.\textsuperscript{51-52} On each of these low index surface terminations, free energy adsorption analysis was used to identify the most active facet, providing an estimate for the peak activity that may be observed experimentally. All reported free energies ($G = E + E_{ZPE} - TS$) are estimated by including zero point energies and entropy contributions calculated in the harmonic approximation. The free energy and electronic binding energies of adsorption for all intermediates are referenced to their gas phase counterparts. For example, $\Delta G_{\text{CO}} = G_{\text{ads}} - (G_{\text{slab}} + G_{\text{CO(g)}})$. 
Supporting Information

Expanded details on synthesis, experimental methods, and computational methods; X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy of synthesized phosphides and sulfides; calculation of CO coverage on CoP; CO binding and charge density differences; complete product distribution for catalysts studied; and the tabulated values used to prepare figures.
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