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ABSTRACT

Catalytic hydrogenation of CO₂ to methanol has gained considerable interest for its significant role in CO₂ utilization using heterogeneous catalysts. This study is the first to propose a kinetic model based on Langmuir-Hinshelwood-Hougen-Watson (LHHW) mechanism for CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol over a highly effective indium oxide (In₂O₃) catalyst. The work focuses on different reaction conditions mainly revolving around the variation of operating temperature, total reactor pressure, H₂/CO₂ molar feed ratio and weight hourly space velocity (WHSV) of the system. The experimental data were modeled using a competitive single-site kinetic model based on LHHW rate equations. A parameter optimization procedure was undertaken to determine the kinetic parameters of the developed rate equations. The model predicts that when the methanol synthesis reaction becomes equilibrium limited, the progress of the RWGS reaction forces the methanol yield to decrease due to the reversal of the methanol synthesis reaction. A mixture of CO₂ and H₂ has been used as the reactor feed in all the cases. Significantly w.r.t. the CO₂ partial pressure, the reaction rate for methanol synthesis initially increased and then slightly decreased indicating a varying order. The single-site model accurately predicted the trends in the experimental data which would enable the development of reliable reactor and process designs.

1. Introduction

Growing energy demand, depletion of fossil fuel reserves and increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentrations call for the usage of renewable energy resources such as solar, wind and biomass. However, the widespread utilization of these sustainable energy sources is currently limited by their intermittent and fluctuating nature. Carbon capture and utilization (CCU) have been proposed as the ultimate way to manage global CO₂ levels. However, CO₂ is a thermally stable and chemically inert molecule with a standard enthalpy of formation of −396.0 kJ mol⁻¹ and hence a large energy input is necessary for its chemical transformation [1,2]. In this context, the catalytic conversion of CO₂ to value-added chemicals and fuels by using energy-rich hydrogen obtained sustainably from biomass reforming and water splitting is a promising solution for future energy demand. Methanol synthesis by catalytic reduction of CO₂ is highly attractive as the produced methanol can be a fuel itself or used for the well-known methanol-to-hydrocarbon (MTH) reaction process to produce hydrocarbon fuels. Commercially, methanol is produced from a mixture of CO/CO₂/H₂ (synthesis gas containing ca. 3 vol% CO₂) [3] using a Cu/ZnO/Al₂O₃ catalyst at typical reaction conditions of 230–280 °C and 50–120 atm pressure [2,4]. Several experimental studies reveal that CO₂ in the synthesis gas is an important carbon source for methanol synthesis [5]. Catalytic hydrogenation of CO₂ mainly involves the following reversible reactions [6]

\[ CO₂ + 3H₂ \rightleftharpoons CH₄OH + H₂O \quad ΔG(25 °C) = -0.47 \text{kJ mol}^{-1} \quad (1) \]

\[ CO₂ + H₂ \rightleftharpoons CO + H₂O \quad ΔG(25 °C) = 23.4 \text{kJ mol}^{-1} \quad (2) \]

\[ CO₂ + 4H₂ \rightleftharpoons CH₄ + 2H₂O \quad ΔG(25 °C) = -130.8 \text{kJ mol}^{-1} \quad (3) \]

Eq. (1) corresponds to the methanol synthesis reaction, eq. (2) is the Reverse Water-Gas Shift (RWGS) reaction and eq. (3) stands for the CO₂ methanation reaction (also called the Sabatier reaction). Thermodynamically, eq. (3) is the most thermodynamically favored with ΔG (25 °C) = -130.8 kJ mol⁻¹ [7]. The desired reaction is, of course, methanol synthesis reaction but the RWGS reaction producing CO and methanation reaction producing CH₄ are considered as significant side reactions and hence these byproducts have also been considered in this study. The RWGS reaction is an endothermic reaction facilitated by high...
temperatures [2]. Reactions involving eq. (1) and eq. (3) are exothermic, and particularly for the less thermodynamically favorable methanol synthesis, a tradeoff temperature is required to maximize the CO₂ conversion to methanol [8].

Kinetic modeling finds wide applications in biomass utilization [9–11]. Among the different catalytic materials investigated so far for CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol, Cu-based catalysts have attracted much attention due to the high intrinsic activity of Cu [4,12–16]. Therefore, most of the kinetic models for methanol synthesis are centered on Cu-based catalysts. A model obtained for a Cu/ZnO catalyst presented by Klier et al. showed that the rate of methanol conversion significantly increased with the addition of CO₂ along with CO and H₂ in the feed [17]. A Langmuir-Hinshelwood-Hougen-Watson (LHHW) rate expression was applied by Villa et al. for a commercial Cu/ZnO/Al₂O₃ catalyst both for methanol synthesis as well as the RWGS reaction. The mechanism was based on the non-dissociative adsorption of CO and H₂ [18]. These kinetic studies were based on a single-site model. Later, a dual-site model based on an LHHW rate expression was proposed by Graaf et al. by considering dissociative adsorption of H₂ over Cu/ZnO/Al₂O₃. The feed gas was a mixture of CO/CO₂/H₂ gas. On one site CO and CO₂ could competitively adsorb, while the other site was dedicated to the competitive adsorption of H₂ and H₂O. The adsorption of methanol was assumed to be negligible on these sites [19–21]. In Cu/ZnO catalysts, adsorption and dissociation of H₂ are considered to occur on the Cu-sites, whereas, ZnO is responsible for CO₂ adsorption as biconnate species [22]. The model of Graaf et al. has later been validated and extended for use for a wider range of reaction conditions in several other kinetic modeling studies focused on the hydrogenation of CO₂ to methanol [8,23–27]. However, the Cu-based catalysts have certain limitations. For instance, the industrial Cu/ZnO/Al₂O₃ catalyst is less selective towards methanol directly from CO₂ owing to its high activity towards the RWGS reaction when a mixed syngas (CO/CO₂/H₂) is used as feed and it is also less stable due to the deactivating effect of the additional H₂O produced as a byproduct of the RWGS reaction [3,28].

Recent studies have shown that InO₃ based catalysts are highly selective for methanol from CO₂ via its direct hydrogenation [28,29]. The high selectivity of the catalyst was attributed to its ability to inhibit the RWGS reaction. Based on density functional theory (DFT) studies on a model (1 1 0) surface of InO₃, methanol formation proceeds through the surface formate (HCOO) species [30], where the surface oxygen vacancies act as active sites for CO₂ activation and hydrogenation to form methanol [31]. A microkinetic analysis was performed by Frei et al. for InO₃ using Arrhenius and reaction order plots [3]. In addition, a mechanistic model with corresponding energy levels was developed based on DFT simulations over the (1 1 1) plane of InO₃ [3].

However, to the best of our knowledge, there are no results of kinetic models based on the LHHW mechanism published that describe CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol over InO₃, which is the objective of the current work. Herein, a fundamental understanding of the kinetics of methanol (CH₃OH) synthesis from CO₂ hydrogenation is studied over an unsupported InO₃ catalyst to develop an effective, robust and practical LHHW kinetic model. An understanding of the kinetic and thermodynamic coupling of the CO₂ hydrogenation to methanol and the RWGS reactions by a modeling technique is presented here. A comparative study between single-site and dual-site kinetic models is also performed to evaluate their consistencies with the experimental data. An isothermal fixed bed reactor was used to execute the catalytic reactions with a temperature ranging between 200 and 400 °C, a total pressure between 20 and 40 bar, varying H₂:CO₂ molar feed ratios (2.1–6.1) and a range of WHSV (weight hourly space velocity) from 6000 to 16000 mL gcat h⁻¹. The developed set of optimized kinetic parameters from this model could enable the design of reactors for this catalytic system.

2. Experimental

2.1. Catalyst preparation

Indium hydroxide, In(OH)₃, was first synthesized by the standard precipitation method. An aqueous solution of Na₂CO₃ (10 g, Sigma Aldrich, ≥99.5%) was slowly added dropwise to the aqueous solution of Indium (III) nitrate hydrate (7.7 g, Sigma Aldrich, 99.99%) under magnetic stirring until the pH reached ~ 9.2. The resulting solution was aged for 1 h under continuous stirring and then filtered and washed profusely with deionized water. The sample was then collected and dried in a vacuum oven overnight at 60 °C. The resultant white In(OH)₃ powder was then calcined by heating at a ramp rate of 2 °C min⁻¹ and maintained at 300 °C for 3 h, to obtain crystalline InO₃ powder [32]. The InO₃ powder thus obtained was pressed, crushed and sieved to granules with a size range of 350 to 500 µm. As a diluent to ensure isothermal conditions in the reactor, these InO₃ granules were mixed with commercial SiO₂ granules of the same size range by mechanical shaking in a 2:1 mass ratio of InO₃ and SiO₂.

2.2. Catalyst characterization

The morphology of the catalyst was examined using Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and Transmission electron microscopy (TEM). SEM analysis was performed using JEOL 7800F Prime and TEM was done using an FEI Titan 80–300 instrument having an accelerating voltage of 300 kV. The lattice spacing was measured using Gatan Digital Micrograph software. The crystalline nature of the sample was analyzed from the X-Ray diffraction (XRD) pattern that was obtained using a Bruker D8 X-ray Diffractometer with CuKα (λ = 1.54 Å) radiation within a scanning angle of 20 from 20 to 80. The specific surface area and pore size distribution were measured from nitrogen physisorption isotherm analysis carried out using a Micromeritics Tristar 3000 surface area and porosity analyzer. The catalyst was degassed at 300 °C for 3 h under nitrogen flow before the analysis. The specific surface area was calculated using the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) equation and the pore size was estimated using the Barrett-Joyner-Halenda (BJH) equation. X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS) studies were performed using a PerkinElmer PHI 5000 VersaProbe III Scanning XPS Microprobe. The sample was irradiated with a monochromatic Al-Kα source with a binding energy of 1486.6 eV in a vacuum chamber. The data obtained were analyzed by using Multispect software and with CasaXPS.

2.3. Catalytic tests

The CO₂ hydrogenation kinetic experiments were performed in a high pressure fixed-bed vertically positioned tubular stainless steel reactor (VINCI Technologies, France) having an inner diameter of 1.27 cm and length of 21.5 cm. 1.0 g of the composite catalyst (2:1 mass ratio of InO₃ and commercial Silica mixture) was packed inside the reactor which was equipped with a thermocouple and held in place by thin layers of quartz wool both up- and downstream from the catalyst. The catalyst was positioned at the vertical center position of the reactor such that the thermocouple tip was in contact with the catalyst bed. The total depth of the composite catalyst bed was 1.4 cm. The remaining portions of the reactor were filled with SiC (500 µm size particles). The total volume of the reactor was 12.1 cm³. The reactor was placed inside a furnace. H₂ and CO₂ were fed through separate mass flow controllers upstream from the reactor. Before reaction, the catalyst was pretreated by heating at a ramp rate of 5 °C min⁻¹ and maintained at 400 °C for 1 h in Ar flow at 150 NmL min⁻¹. The reactor was then allowed to cool down to the desired reaction temperature in Ar flow before the feed gas was switched to CO₂ and H₂ and pressurized to the desired total pressure. Tests were conducted at a temperature of 200–400 °C, a total pressure of 20–40 bar and with different H₂:CO₂ molar feed ratios from 2:1–6:1. By varying the total molar feed rate, the resulting variation in Weight
Hourly Space Velocity (WHSV) was from 6000 to 16000 mL g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\). The effluent gas from the reactor was quantitatively analyzed online using a gas chromatograph (GC, SCION 456) equipped with both thermal conductivity (TCD) and flame ionization detectors (FID). Immediately downstream from the reactor, a back pressure regulating valve reduced the pressure of the gas to near atmospheric pressure before it flowed into a condenser at room temperature. If the partial pressure of water exceeded its vapor pressure, water condensed and the effluent gas after the condenser was saturated with water. Based on mass balance calculations, it was found that water condensation occurred only at conditions with the conversion of CO\(_2\) exceeding ca. 10%. Partial pressures of methanol in the effluent gas were always well below its vapor pressure. The possible condensation of water was accounted for, in order to rectify the simulated effluent gas composition with the experimental measurements. The GC was calibrated with varying concentrations of absolute methanol, CO\(_2\), CO and CH\(_4\). The calibration curves of CO\(_2\) and methanol are presented in Supplementary Information (SI). All calculations were performed with the data collected after the steady-state conditions were obtained. Carbon balances calculated were all greater than 95% for each experiment. The experimental error range was measured by repeating certain experimental reaction conditions. The selectivities to the main product methanol (S\(_{\text{MeOH}}\)) and side products CO\(_2\) (S\(_{\text{CO}}\)) and CH\(_4\) (S\(_{\text{CH4}}\)) are calculated as follows:

\[
S_{\text{MeOH}} = \frac{F_{\text{MeOH,in}} - F_{\text{MeOH,out}}}{F_{\text{MeOH,in}}} \times 100\% 
\]

(4)

where \(F_{\text{MeOH,in}}\) and \(F_{\text{MeOH,out}}\) are the molar CO\(_2\) flow rates at the inlet and outlet respectively.

The selectivities to the main product methanol (S\(_{\text{MeOH,OH}}\)) and side products CO (S\(_{\text{CO}}\)) and CH\(_4\) (S\(_{\text{CH4}}\)) are calculated as follows:

\[
S_{\text{MeOH,OH}} = \frac{F_{\text{MeOH,OH,in}} - F_{\text{MeOH,OH,out}}}{F_{\text{MeOH,OH,in}}} \times 100\% 
\]

(5)

\[
S_{\text{CO}} = \frac{F_{\text{CO,in}} - F_{\text{CO,out}}}{F_{\text{CO,in}}} \times 100\% 
\]

(6)

\[
S_{\text{CH4}} = \frac{F_{\text{CH4,in}} - F_{\text{CH4,out}}}{F_{\text{CH4,in}}} \times 100\% 
\]

(7)

where \(F_{\text{MeOH,OH,in}}\), \(F_{\text{MeOH,OH,out}}\), \(F_{\text{CO,in}}\), \(F_{\text{CO,out}}\) and \(F_{\text{CH4,in}}\), \(F_{\text{CH4,out}}\) are the corresponding outlet molar flow rates of methanol, CO and CH\(_4\) respectively. The component molar flow rates were calculated from the measured gas compositions by mass balance calculations and accounting for the possible condensation of H\(_2\)O as explained above.

2.4. Modeling methods

2.4.1. Kinetic modeling

Single-site (competitive) and dual-site Langmuir–Hinshelwood kinetic models have been evaluated as alternatives. For the single-site model, it is assumed that the catalyst has only one type of active site (mainly the oxygen vacancies of In\(_2\)O\(_3\)) where both CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\) competitively adsorb [33]. H\(_2\) is believed to adsorb dissociatively and the adsorption of methanol was assumed to be negligible. For comparison, a dual-site model has been considered to have two different sites for CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\) adsorption. The motivation behind considering a dual-site model is that the main active sites for CO\(_2\) hydrogenation at a microscopic level are considered to be oxygen vacancies of In\(_2\)O\(_3\), whereas, dissociative adsorption of H\(_2\) can occur on In sites as shown in the DFT study by Ye et al. [31].

The model is based on three equilibrium reactions for (i) methanol synthesis (Eq. (1)), (ii) RWGS (Eq. (2)) and (iii) CO\(_2\) methanation (Eq. (3)). Based on the reaction mechanism shown in Supplementary Information, the corresponding general kinetic rate expressions are given as:

\[
r_{\text{MeOH}} = \frac{k_1 F_{\text{CO2,in}}^{\frac{1}{2}} F_{\text{MeOH,out}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{P_{\text{H2}}} 
\]

(8)

\[
r_{\text{RWGS}} = \frac{k_2 F_{\text{CO2,in}}^{\frac{1}{2}} F_{\text{H2O,in}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{P_{\text{H2}}}} 
\]

(9)

\[
r_{\text{CH4}} = k_3 F_{\text{CO,in}} F_{\text{H2,in}} \left( \frac{1 - F_{\text{MeOH,in}}}{P_{\text{MeOH,in}}^{\frac{1}{2}} P_{\text{H2,in}}^{\frac{1}{2}} P_{\text{MeOH,in}}^{\frac{1}{2}} P_{\text{H2,in}}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) 
\]

(10)

where \(r_{\text{MeOH}}\), \(r_{\text{RWGS}}\) and \(r_{\text{CH4}}\) are the reaction rates for methanol synthesis, RWGS and methanation reactions respectively. \(k_1\), \(k_2\) and \(k_3\) (in mol s\(^{-1}\) bar\(^{-1}\) kg\(_{\text{cat}}\)\(^{-1}\)) respectively represent the rate constants of the corresponding equations and \(K_{\text{eq, MeOH}}\), \(K_{\text{eq, RWGS}}\) and \(K_{\text{eq, CH4}}\) (in bar\(^{-1}\)) are the equilibrium constants for each of the reactions. The values of the reaction equilibrium constants are calculated at the particular reaction temperatures from the Gibbs free energy of formation values reported in literature and correlations of heat capacities of the components. \(P_j\) corresponds to the partial pressure of each species \(j\). The denominators of the rate equations are referred to as the inhibition terms. These reaction rates (Eq. 8–10) are applied for both the single- and dual-site models but using different inhibition terms, which are shown in Table 1. \(K_{\text{CO2}}\) and \(K_{\text{H2}}\) represent the adsorption equilibrium constants for CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\) respectively.

2.4.2. Reactor modeling technique

For the kinetic modeling, the reactor has been represented by a one-dimensional pseudo-homogeneous plug flow model considering the following assumptions: isothermal and isobaric conditions, steady-state regime, absence of axial dispersion and negligible mass transfer limitations. At low temperatures, the adiabatic temperature increase was a maximum of 13 °C, whereas, at the highest temperature, where the RWGS reaction was dominant, the adiabatic temperature decrease was up to 55 °C. However, during experiments, no deviations between the control temperature and the measured catalyst bed temperature were observed and hence heat transport was adequate to maintain isothermal reactor condition. The pressure drop in the reactor was calculated at typical conditions using the Ergun equation [34] and was in all conditions found to be less than a negligible value of ~ 0.04 Pa, allowing the reactor to be considered as isobaric. The mass transfer resistances of the reactants from the bulk gas to the catalyst particle surfaces and thereafter through the pores of the catalyst particles were evaluated by the Mears parameter (MP) and the Weiss-Prater parameter (WP) respectively. It was found that for all the reaction temperatures, MP was less than 0.0015 (MP < 0.0015) indicating that the external mass transfer could be neglected. In addition, the values of WP only approached 0.1 at the highest reaction temperature (WP < 0.1), and thus also internal diffusion resistance could be neglected. The variation of WP and MP with reaction temperatures (Fig. S2) and details regarding their calculations are given in the supplementary information.

The corresponding mass balance equation [8] is given by:

\[
dF_i \frac{dW}{dw} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} v_{ij} F_j \]

(11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Inhibition term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-site</td>
<td>((1 + K_{\text{CO2}} P_{\text{CO2}} + \sqrt{K_{\text{H2}} P_{\text{H2}}})^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-site</td>
<td>((1 + K_{\text{CO2}} P_{\text{CO2}})(1 + \sqrt{K_{\text{H2}} P_{\text{H2}}}))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where \( w \) represents the catalyst weight, \( F_j \) the molar flow rate of species \( j \), \( v_{ij} \) the stoichiometric coefficient of species \( j \) in reaction \( i \) and \( r_i \) the rate of the reaction \( i \).

### 2.4.3. Parameter optimization for the kinetic model

To minimize the high correlation between the pre-exponential factor and the activation energy, the reparametrized form of the Arrhenius equation has been used:

\[
k_i = k_{i,\text{ref}} \exp \left( \frac{E_i}{R \left( \frac{1}{T_{\text{ref}}} - \frac{1}{T} \right)} \right)
\]

(12)

where \( k_{i,\text{ref}} \) is the reaction rate constant at the reference temperature \( T_{\text{ref}} \) and \( E_i \) is the activation energy. Also, to minimize the correlation between the adsorption equilibrium constants and the enthalpy of adsorption, the reparameterized form of the Van’t Hoff equation was used:

\[
K_i = K_{i,\text{ref}} \exp \left( \frac{\Delta H_i}{R \left( \frac{1}{T_{\text{ref}}} - \frac{1}{T} \right)} \right)
\]

(13)

where \( K_{i,\text{ref}} \) is the equilibrium constant at the reference temperature \( T_{\text{ref}} \) and \( \Delta H_i \) is the enthalpy change.

The reference temperature for all the calculations is 300 °C, which is the average experimental temperature.

The nonlinear least square function ‘lsqnonlin’ subroutine, based on the Levenberg-Marquardt method, in Matlab (MathWorks, Inc.) R2019b’s optimization package was used for carrying out non-linear regression. This non-linear least square solver uses a gradient-based optimization method to minimize the residual sum of squares (SSR) function between the experimental and simulated results as shown in eq. 14 to optimize the kinetic parameters to find the best fit of model predictions to experimental measurements.

\[
\text{SSR} = \sum_j \sum_i w_i (y_{ij}^{\exp} - y_{ij}^{\text{sim}})^2
\]

(14)

where \( y_{ij}^{\exp} \) represents the experimental mole fractions of the species \( i \) in experiment \( j \) and \( y_{ij}^{\text{sim}} \) represents those calculated by numerical solution of the system of ordinary differential equations (Eq. (11)) that are solved by the ode15s solver using Matlab. \( w_i \) represents the weighting factor used typically to weigh up the residuals of species having lower concentrations. All components except \( \text{H}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) were included in the optimization.

Normalized sensitivity coefficients (S) for the parameters are calculated using eq. (15):

\[
S = \beta_0 \sum \left( \frac{\Delta y^m}{\Delta \beta} \right)^2
\]

(15)

where,

- \( \beta_0 \) = parameter at its optimal value
- \( \Delta \beta \) = change in parameter from optimal value
- \( y_{ij}^m \) = simulated mole fraction value at an optimal value of the parameter
- \( \Delta y^m \) = change in simulated mole fraction due to change in the parameter value

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Catalyst characterization

Fig. 1a shows the XRD pattern of the as-prepared \( \text{In}_2\text{O}_3 \) catalyst. Distinct peaks corresponding to body-centered cubic \( \text{In}_2\text{O}_3 \) confirm the crystalline nature of the sample. The diffraction peaks at 21.5°, 30.7°, 35.5°, 37.8°, 41.9°, 45.8°, 51.0°, 56.1°, 60.8°, 63.7°, 68.0° and 76.3° correspond to the lattice planes (211), (400), (422), (440), (622), (624), (721), and (741) respectively.

Fig. 1 shows the XRD pattern, BET adsorption–desorption isotherm and (c) pore size distribution of \( \text{In}_2\text{O}_3 \) catalyst.
A particle size distribution is shown in Fig. 2, where the average crystallite size of 10 nm was calculated using the Scherrer equation from the (2 2 2) diffraction peak. The specific surface area of the In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst as measured from the nitrogen adsorption–desorption isotherm was 112 m$^2$ g$^{-1}$ (Fig. 1b). An average pore size of 9.5 nm and a total pore volume of 0.34 cm$^3$ g$^{-1}$ was obtained (Fig. 1c). The adsorption–desorption curve shows type IV isotherm characteristics having a prominent hysteresis loop in the relative pressure ($P/P_0$) range of 0.6–1, signifying its mesoporous structure.

To get a deeper insight into the morphology of the as-prepared In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst, a high resolution TEM analysis has been performed (Fig. 2a-c). The lattice fringes with an interplanar spacing of 0.291 nm corresponding to the (2 2 2) plane agree with the reported literature (Fig. 2d). A particle size distribution is shown in Fig. 2e, where the average diameter of the In$_2$O$_3$ particles (as estimated from the TEM image shown in Fig. 2b) is approximately 16.4 nm. However, some of the 10–20 nm particles shown in TEM have aggregated together to form larger particles which appear to be 30 nm or more. These large agglomerates were not included in the estimation of the average particle size. The SEM images of In$_2$O$_3$ are shown in Fig. S3 in the Supplementary Information, which also shows large aggregated clusters with the aggregates varying in sizes up to at least 1 μm. The as-prepared and spent In$_2$O$_3$ catalysts were analyzed using TEM and XPS, to determine chemical and morphological differences before and after the reaction. These results are shown in Figs. S4 and S5 in the Supplementary Information. The average particle size slightly increased from 16.4 nm (before reaction) to 17.7 nm (after reaction) as can be seen from the TEM particle size distribution graphs (Figs. S4c and f). XPS was performed on the argon pretreated In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst to study the possible change in reactivity due to oxygen vacancies before and after the CO$_2$ hydrogenation reaction. The catalyst pretreatment was done at 400 ℃ for 1 h in Ar atmosphere before CO$_2$ hydrogenation activity measurements because it has been reported in the literature that this thermal treatment can favorably lead to the formation of oxygen vacancies on the catalyst [35]. From the deconvoluted O1s XPS spectra shown in Fig. S5, it was found that the fresh catalyst has 22% oxygen vacancies which reduced to 16.5% after CO$_2$ hydrogenation in the spent catalyst. Our results are consistent with those reported by Martin et al. [28] where they have mentioned that a substantial drop in the surface area and noticeable sintering can be the probable reasons behind the reduction in the number of oxygen defects after CO$_2$ hydrogenation over the In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst [28,36].

3.2. Kinetic analysis

To study the kinetics of the reaction mechanism, a series of experiments have been carried out. All the kinetic experiments were carried out under steady-state conditions. A broad range of experimental conditions was examined to provide a good basis for data for the kinetic model. The reaction conditions and the corresponding CO$_2$ conversions and product selectivities for the catalytic hydrogenation of CO$_2$ are summarized in Table 2. Here the four main experimental conditions that have been varied are a) temperature (Exp. 1a–1e), b) pressure (Exp. 2a–2c), c) H$_2$:CO$_2$ molar feed ratio (Exp. 3a–3e) and d) WHSV (Exp. 4a–4d). Experiments 5a–5o investigated the simultaneous variation of temperature and molar feed ratio. The standard reaction conditions are defined as T = 300 ℃, P = 40 bar, WHSV = 9000 mL g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ and molar H$_2$:CO$_2$ = 3:1. These conditions were repeated periodically throughout the experimental study in each experiment set (i.e. experiments 1c, 2c, 3b, 4b and 5 h). There were only small variations in the measured methanol conversion and product selectivities for these repeated experiments, which indicates the stability of the catalyst. From the catalyst characterization results in Section 3.1 above, it was observed that exposure of the catalyst to reaction conditions caused a slight increase in average particle size and a small decrease in the number of oxygen vacancies. Apparently, these changes occurred in the catalyst either very early after exposure to the reaction conditions or they were not sufficient to cause any significant changes in the catalyst performance. The small
deviations at the repeated standard reaction conditions were used to provide an estimate of the purely experimental variation of the results (Section 3.5 Figs. 5, 7, 8 and 9 show error bars for the experimental results). It was confirmed from the experimental findings that no dimethyl ether (DME) was formed under any conditions.

3.3. Analysis of experimental results

Although the methanation reaction (eq. (3)) is strongly thermodynamically favored, it can be seen from Table 2 that it is only a minor reaction at these conditions over In$_2$O$_3$, with a selectivity only reaching up to about 2.3%. Hydrogenation of CO$_2$ to methanol (eq. (1)) is an exothermic process, hence low temperature and high pressure thermodynamically favor the production of methanol. But at high temperatures, the RWGS reaction is both thermodynamically and kinetically favored as it is an endothermic reaction (eq. (2)). It has been observed that methanol synthesis from CO$_2$ hydrogenation over the In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst is usually accompanied by undesirable CO formation, specifically at higher temperatures [35]. Calculations for the simultaneous equilibrium for the methanol synthesis and RWGS reactions from CO$_2$ reveal that equilibrium CO selectivity reaches around 99.2% at 400 ºC with the methanol selectivity dropping to around 0.77% (Fig. 3a). The experimental data also shows a similar trend for CO selectivity reaching as high as 97.3% with methanol selectivity dropping to 1.3% at 400 ºC (Fig. 3b). However, due to kinetic limitations, the experimental CO$_2$ conversion is always lower than the thermodynamic values, even at higher temperatures, indicating that simultaneous equilibrium was never reached for these two reactions. Another significant observation is

Table 2
Overview of reaction conditions and results of the catalytic hydrogenation of CO$_2$ over In$_2$O$_3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>P (bar)</th>
<th>T (ºC)</th>
<th>WHSV (mL g$_{cat}^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>H$_2$:CO$_2$</th>
<th>X$_{CO2}$ (%)</th>
<th>S$_{CH3OH}$ (%)</th>
<th>S$_{CO}$ (%)</th>
<th>S$_{CH4}$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>79.70</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>66.31</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>97.26</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>57.23</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>62.54</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>66.24</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>65.61</td>
<td>33.81</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>66.02</td>
<td>33.36</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>66.76</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>67.40</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>67.99</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>64.99</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2k</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>65.87</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2l</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>34.18</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>73.13</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>78.29</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>61.61</td>
<td>37.84</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>66.54</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>69.79</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>71.06</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3k</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3l</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>62.59</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3n</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>95.83</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3o</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>4:1</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>94.87</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X$_{CO2}$ = CO$_2$ Conversion; S$_{i}$ = Selectivity for product i (calculated using eqs. (4) through (7))

Fig. 3. (a) Calculated equilibrium conversion and selectivity for simultaneous methanol synthesis and RWGS reactions and (b) experimental data of CO$_2$ hydrogenation over In$_2$O$_3$ for varying temperatures at P = 40 bar, WHSV = 9000 mL g$_{cat}^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ and molar H$_2$:CO$_2$ = 3:1.
that the 50% selectivity point for methanol and CO shifts to a higher temperature (320 °C) for the experimental data points when compared to the thermodynamic calculation (260 °C). So, as the reaction temperature increases from 200 °C to 400 °C, methanol selectivity decreases significantly from 100% to 1.3% although CO2 conversion increases simultaneously. We have observed a similar trend for our experimental data as that shown by Sun et al. with their spherical cubic-In2O3 nanoparticle catalyst [35].

When the H2:CO2 ratio is increased from 2:1 to 6:1, the methanol selectivity reaches 68.0% at a CO2 conversion of 10.3% (Fig. 4a). On the other hand, the higher the molar feed ratio, the higher is the CO2 conversion but it is just the reverse in the case of increasing WHSV. As WHSV increases, CO2 conversion reduces gradually. Methanol selectivity reaches 65.2% for WHSV of 16000 mL gcat h⁻¹ with a CO2 conversion of 3.4% (Fig. 4b). Methanol selectivity enhances and CO selectivity diminishes with the increased molar H2:CO2 feed ratio at all reaction temperatures above 200 °C as shown in Fig. 4c. At any given temperature e.g. 300 °C, the methanol selectivity increases from 61.6% to 69.8% and the CO selectivity drops from 37.8% to 29.6% when the molar flow ratio of H2:CO2 increases from 2:1 to 4:1. This implies that a higher concentration of hydrogen in the feed gas relative to CO2 promotes methanol formation. But for very high as well as very low temperatures, this effect is less clear.

The catalytic hydrogenation of carbon monoxide is another possible route of methanol formation according to the reaction shown in eq. (16):

\[
CO + 2H_2 \rightarrow CH_3OH
\]

(16)

However, for our reaction conditions, we expect that it should be negligible because the amount of CO2 is always much more than CO. At the reactor outlet, for reaction temperatures less than 350 °C, the concentration of CO2 is about 150 times more than CO and it decreases to about 3.5 times the amount of CO at the highest temperature of 400 °C when the RWGS becomes the dominating reaction. Therefore, we can consider that the dominating portion of methanol formed at these reaction conditions originates directly from CO2 hydrogenation. In this work, we have not investigated the direct effect of water on the In2O3 catalyst since the presence of water in the feed is unlikely under practical conditions as mentioned by Frei et al. [3].

### 3.4. Determination of kinetic parameters

The optimization procedure described in Section 2.4.3 was used to determine the values of the kinetic parameters in the rate equations (8) to (10) using the single- and dual-site kinetic models. Only the optimized parameters resulting from the single-site model will be shown and discussed in depth in this section because it was found to be superior for describing the experimental data. A comparison of the performance of the kinetic models will be shown and discussed later in section 3.6. From a series of simulations, 10 parameters were estimated for each kinetic model: 3 rate constants \((k_{cat})\), 3 activation energies \((E_a)\), 2 equilibrium adsorption constants \((K_{cat})\) and 2 heat of adsorptions \((\Delta H_a)\) pertaining to the methanol synthesis, RWGS and methanation reactions. The rate constants and equilibrium adsorption constants are determined at the reference temperature \(T_{ref}(300 °C)\). The optimized parameter values are listed in Tables 3 and 4 for the single-site model. The corresponding parameters for the dual-site model are listed in Tables S1 and S2 in Supplementary Information.

As shown in Table 2, the series 1 experiments (varying temperature) were important to obtain the rate constants and activation energies. The series 2 and 3 experiments (varying pressure and molar feed ratio) were important for determining the adsorption equilibrium constants and in turn their values established the effective order of the reactions.
Fig. 5. Effect of temperature on the outlet mole fractions of (a) CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\), (b) CH\(_3\)OH and CO and (c) CH\(_4\) as a function of catalyst weight at 400 °C. Standard reaction conditions: 40 bar, WHSV = 9000 mL g\(_{\text{cat}}^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) and molar H\(_2\):CO\(_2\) = 3:1. The experimental results are shown with symbols and the modeling results with lines.

Fig. 6. Surface plots showing the change in mole fractions of (a) CH\(_3\)OH and (b) CO along the catalyst bed at varying temperatures and (c) thermodynamic coupling between the CO\(_2\) hydrogenation to methanol and the RWGS reactions.
the series 5 experiments (both varying molar feed ratio and temperature) were important for determining the heats of adsorption ($\Delta H_a$). There was also a correlation between parameters like for example between the rate constants and the adsorption equilibrium constants.

The parameter sensitivities in Tables 3 and 4, measure the influence that a parameter has on the model predictions. The sensitivities are obtained from a 0.1% change in each parameter and they are normalized with respect to the value of the parameter so that the sensitivities for each parameter can be compared (eq. (15)). A high sensitivity indicates that the experiments were appropriate to successfully resolve the value of a parameter. Whereas, a low sensitivity indicates the parameter value is more uncertain and it may even be excluded from the model. As we can see from Table 4, the sensitivity of the heat of adsorption value for $H_2$ was very low and as well the adsorption equilibrium constant for $H_2$ was less sensitive than that for $CO_2$. This indicates that the inhibiting effects of $CO_2$ were of greater importance for the predictions of the model than that of $H_2$ and the inhibiting effects for $H_2$ varied negligibly over the temperature range investigated when the molar feed ratios were simultaneously varied. It can also be noted that among the activation energies in Table 3, the activation energy for methanol synthesis had the lowest sensitivity. This is because, as will be shown below in section 3.5.1, the methanol synthesis reaction became equilibrium limited at higher reaction temperatures.

$CO_2$ hydrogenation over a defective $In_2O_3$ (1 1 0) surface with oxygen vacancies for methanol synthesis was investigated using DFT calculations as mentioned before. The adsorption energy of $CO_2$ was reported to be $-0.61$ eV ($-56.8$ kJ mol$^{-1}$) and that of $H_2$ to be $-0.44$ eV ($-42.4$ kJ mol$^{-1}$) [31]. The heat of adsorption ($\Delta H_a$) values observed from our single-site model are $-12.5$ and $-25.9$ kJ mol$^{-1}$ for $CO_2$ and $H_2$ respectively. These values are considerably lower than those reported by Ge et al. [31]. The probable reason behind this is that for the kinetic model reported here, the parameters for $CO_2$ and $H_2$ adsorption on the surface, must in fact account for the influence of many other adsorbed species like $H_2O$, $CO$, formate and other intermediate species formed from the reactants. Moreover, Frei et al. have derived apparent activation energies of $1.73$ eV ($166$ kJ mol$^{-1}$) and $1.96$ eV ($189$ kJ mol$^{-1}$) for $CO_2$ hydrogenation to methanol and the RWGS reaction respectively over $In_2O_3$ based on DFT simulations [3]. Our values of activation energies from the single-site model are lower (35.7 and 54.5 kJ mol$^{-1}$ respectively) for these two reactions. In the formulation of an LHHW overall rate equation, the rate constants, shown here in eqs. (8) to (10), are lumped parameters that are a product of the rate constant of the rate-determining step and the adsorption equilibrium constants. As a result, these activation energies do not reflect the apparent activation energies of the reaction. Later in section 3.7, from an analysis of the experimental data, it can be shown that the apparent activation energies are greater (90 and 110 kJ mol$^{-1}$) than those in the single-site rate expressions but still lower than those reported by Frei et al. There could be different reasons for the differences, such as the DFT simulations were performed on (1 1 1) plane of $In_2O_3$, while our catalyst exhibited many different crystal planes and where (2 2 2) was dominating (as shown in Fig. 1a).

3.5. Comparison of experiments and kinetic model predictions

The developed single-site model was based on the effects of different reaction conditions (as shown in Table 2) in terms of temperature, pressure, molar feed ratio and WHSV on the catalytic performance of $In_2O_3$. All the plots in the following sections (Figs. 5 and 7-10) contain both the experimental data points (represented by symbols) as well as the simulation data (represented by lines) obtained from the model predictions.

![Fig. 7. Effect of total reactor pressure on the outlet mole fractions of (a) $CO_2$ and $H_2$, (b) $CH_3OH$ and $CO$ and (c) $CH_4$. Standard reaction conditions: 300 $^\circ$C, WHSV = 9000 mL g$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ and molar $H_2$:$CO_2$ = 3:1. The experimental results are shown with symbols and the modeling results with lines.](image-url)
3.5.1. Effect of temperature

The reaction temperature has been varied between 200 and 400 °C mainly to investigate how the methanol synthesis and the competitive RWGS reactions (eqs. (1) and (2)) occur on the In_{2}O_{3} surface over this range of temperature. Low temperature and high pressure favor methanol synthesis as the RWGS reaction is suppressed under these reaction conditions. At higher temperatures, the methanol selectivity largely reduces as the RWGS starts becoming more prominent. Fig. 5 shows the variation in outlet mole fractions of CO\(_{2}\), CH\(_{3}\)OH, CO and CH\(_{4}\) w.r.t. the reaction temperature. Both the outlet reactant concentrations (H\(_{2}\) and CO\(_{2}\)) were found to reduce with the increase in temperature (Fig. 5a). The temperature has a considerable effect on the equilibrium conversion of CO\(_{2}\) to methanol over the In_{2}O_{3} catalyst. Our model shows that as temperature increases from 200 °C, methanol concentration initially increases up to around 330 °C, after which the methanol synthesis reaction reaches equilibrium and therefore the methanol concentration begins to drop (Fig. 5b). The equilibrium outlet methanol concentration from 235 to 400 °C is also shown for comparison (dotted line in Fig. 5b). It represents how much more methanol could have been produced, before thermodynamic equilibrium for methanol synthesis is reached, given the amount of CO already present from the RWGS reaction. It can be seen that below 330 °C, the methanol synthesis reaction is kinetically limited whereas above 330 °C it reaches thermodynamic equilibrium. The same equilibrium calculation was done for the RWGS reaction, i.e. how much more CO could have been produced was calculated given the amount of methanol already present. This result is not shown in Fig. 5b, but these amounts were in all cases well above the experimental outlet CO mole fractions. On the other hand, temperature favors the RWGS reaction as it is an endothermic reaction and therefore our model shows that with the increase in temperature, at least up to 400 °C, the concentration of CO in the outlet increases and remains within the kinetic regime rather than reaching thermodynamic equilibrium (Fig. 5b). The error bars around the experimental data points in Fig. 5 indicate the estimated variation in the experimental measurements from repeated experiments. A strength of this single-site kinetic model is that the deviations of the model predictions are largely always within the range of the estimated experimental variation. The model also shows that the methanation reaction is also favored with the increase in temperature (Fig. 5c). According to the model, initially, the rate of methanol synthesis is almost equal to that of RWGS at 400 °C (Fig. 5d). But then eventually after a small amount of catalyst mass (1 × 10^{-4} kg), the methanol synthesis reaches equilibrium in the simulations, but the RWGS reaction continues. So, at 400 °C it could be possible to achieve a higher selectivity for methanol, with a higher WHSV.

The surface plots, shown in Fig. 6, give a clearer picture of the variation of methanol and CO concentrations along the catalyst bed at varying temperatures as discussed in Fig. 5b. Our single-site model shows that methanol concentration increases with catalyst mass up to about 330 °C after which it reaches a maximum, then it remains constant till 350 °C as it reaches thermodynamic equilibrium, and finally, above 350 °C its concentration decreases with high catalyst mass. This is because simultaneously the concentration of CO is increasing and the RWGS reaction causes CO\(_{2}\) to decrease and H\(_{2}\)O to increase. This H\(_{2}\)O produced from the RWGS reaction can further react with the methanol formed already from the CO\(_{2}\) hydrogenation reaction and can shift the equilibrium for CH\(_{3}\)OH synthesis backward. So, at high temperature, the progress of the RWGS reaction causes the methanol synthesis reaction to reverse, so that methanol steam reforming begins to occur as CO concentration increases (Fig. 6a). The CO\(_{2}\) formed from methanol steam reforming can either help in the forward reaction of methanol synthesis again or can also assist RWGS reaction. On the other hand, the CO concentration at all temperatures simply always increases with the...
catalyst mass (Fig. 6b). This result corroborates with observations that In$_2$O$_3$ is highly active and selective toward CO$_2$ in methanol steam reforming [37]. Fig. 6c illustrates how the RWGS and methanol synthesis reactions are thermodynamically and also kinetically coupled through CO$_2$ and H$_2$O concentrations.

3.5.2. Effect of pressure

Reaction pressure also plays a significant role in methanol synthesis from CO$_2$ hydrogenation over the In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst. The pressure effect was investigated in the 20–40 bar range with the reactor operating at a constant temperature of 300 °C, WHSV of 9000 mL g$^{-1}$ cat h$^{-1}$ and molar H$_2$:CO$_2$ = 3:1 (as shown in Fig. 7). An increase in total pressure thermodynamically favors CO$_2$ conversion to methanol, whereas, the equilibrium for the RWGS reaction is unaffected by pressure. As can be seen from Fig. 5b, at 300 °C and the highest pressure (40 bar), both reactions are still operating within the kinetic regime. We have calculated that at 40 bar, the outlet methanol reaches 13% of the equilibrium, whereas at 20 bar it reaches 34% of equilibrium for methanol synthesis. Thus, the experiments in Fig. 7 are all within the kinetic regime for methanol synthesis. As a result, the improved selectivity for methanol at higher pressure, as evident from Fig. 7b, is not purely a result of thermodynamic effects, and instead, some kinetic effect must be present. Apparently, an increase in the total pressure results in higher adsorption of CO$_2$ and H$_2$ on the In$_2$O$_3$ surface and this favors higher methanol production. The simulated data points from the model fitted well with the experimental data. The model shows that CO production is less affected by the enhancement in pressure, but CH$_4$ concentration substantially increases with an increase in total pressure (Fig. 7c), although still at low levels.

3.5.3. Effect of molar feed ratio

Since both H$_2$ and CO$_2$ at different stoichiometric ratios are the main reactants for both the CO$_2$ hydrogenation to methanol and the RWGS reactions, the variation in the H$_2$:CO$_2$ molar feed ratio can significantly affect the kinetics of both reactions. The H$_2$:CO$_2$ molar feed ratio was varied from 2:1 to 6:1 with a constant reactor temperature of 300 °C, at a pressure of 40 bar and WHSV 9000 mL g$^{-1}$ cat h$^{-1}$ as shown in Fig. 8. The model and experiments show that increasing the H$_2$ partial pressure while decreasing CO$_2$ partial pressure, favors CO$_2$ hydrogenation to

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Reactions & $k_{ref}$ (mol s$^{-1}$ bar$^{-n}$ kg$^{-1}$ cat) at 300 °C & Normalized sensitivity & $E_a$ (kJ mol$^{-1}$) & Normalized sensitivity \\
\hline
CH$_3$OH & $6.9 \times 10^{-4}$ & 0.022 & 35.7 & 0.012 \\
RWGS & $1.8 \times 10^{-3}$ & 0.038 & 54.5 & 0.059 \\
Methanation & $1.1 \times 10^{-4}$ & 0.032 & 42.5 & 0.026 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Optimized rate constants and activation energies along with their sensitivity coefficients obtained from the single-site kinetic model for the In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst.}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Parameters & H$_2$ & Normalized sensitivity & CO$_2$ & Normalized sensitivity \\
\hline
$K_{ref}$ (bar$^{-1}$) at 300 °C & 0.76 & 0.013 & 0.79 & 0.129 \\
$\Delta H_a$ (kJ mol$^{-1}$) & $-12.5$ & $8.0 \times 10^{-4}$ & $-25.9$ & 0.053 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Adsorption constants and enthalpy of adsorption along with their sensitivity coefficients obtained from the single-site model for the In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst.}
\end{table}
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3.6. Comparison with a dual-site model

A dual-site Langmuir Hinshelwood model was also examined. However, the dual-site model was less effective than the single-site model for reproducing, in particular, the experimental data involving variations in total pressure and the molar feed ratios. The model predictions for these experiments are most sensitive to the adsorption equilibrium constants and the resulting effective order of the reactions with respect to CO2 and H2. In the single-site model, both CO2 and H2 molecules competitively adsorb at a single site on the catalyst surface. As mentioned before, DFT studies show that the oxygen vacancy sites on

A higher WHSV corresponds to a lower residence time of the reactants inside the reactor. The experimental results that are shown here agree with observations in literature that selectivity for methanol can be tuned by adjusting the WHSV [28]. The WHSV has been varied from 6000 to 16000 mL g−1 h−1 by varying the flow rates of the reactants (Fig. 9). An increase in WHSV results in a decrease in the outlet mole fraction of both CH3OH and CO, with a slight reduction in the selectivity for methanol. Our model predicts well the experimental data obtained by the variation of WHSV. It also reproduces the observed reduction in the yield of methane.

3.5.4. Effect of WHSV

A higher WHSV corresponds to a lower residence time of the reactants inside the reactor. The experimental results that are shown here agree with observations in literature that selectivity for methanol can be tuned by adjusting the WHSV [28]. The WHSV has been varied from 6000 to 16000 mL g−1 h−1 by varying the flow rates of the reactants (Fig. 9). An increase in WHSV results in a decrease in the outlet mole fraction of both CH3OH and CO, with a slight reduction in the selectivity for methanol. Our model predicts well the experimental data obtained by the variation of WHSV. It also reproduces the observed reduction in the yield of methane.

3.6. Comparison with a dual-site model

A dual-site Langmuir Hinshelwood model was also examined. However, the dual-site model was less effective than the single-site model for reproducing, in particular, the experimental data involving variations in total pressure and the molar feed ratios. The model predictions for these experiments are most sensitive to the adsorption equilibrium constants and the resulting effective order of the reactions with respect to CO2 and H2. In the single-site model, both CO2 and H2 molecules competitively adsorb at a single site on the catalyst surface. As mentioned before, DFT studies show that the oxygen vacancy sites on defective In2O3(1 1 0) surface assists CO2 activation and hydrogenation to form methanol, whereas H2 helps to generate the vacancies [31]. This was our motivation to compare the single-site and dual-site models.

Fig. 10 shows the optimized predictions of the dual-site model. As can be seen from Fig. 10 w.r.t. the total pressure and molar feed ratio, the dual-site model predictions did not correlate as well with the experiments compared to the single-site model as shown in Fig. 7b and Fig. 8b. The Pearson correlation coefficient (R-Pearson) and the weighted SSR values as shown in Table 5 indicate that the predictions of the single-site model are only very slightly better correlated to experimental results than those of the dual-site model. Except for the results shown in Fig. 10, the quality of fit of the models to other results was comparable.

3.7. Kinetic analysis

The apparent reaction orders were calculated from the reaction rates predicted by the optimized single-site kinetic model at varying conditions of partial pressures of the reactants (Fig. 11a and b). The absolute partial pressures of H2 and CO2 were varied about mean values (P(H2,mean) and P(CO2,mean) of 30.8 and 10.3 bars respectively, which are comparable to their feed partial pressures at 40 bar (gauge) experiments with a 3:1 molar feed ratio. The methanol and RWGS reaction orders were found to be 0.6 and 0.1 respectively w.r.t. hydrogen, whereas, w.r.t. CO2 the orders of these reactions were nearly zero. Significantly w.r.t. the CO2 partial pressure, the reaction rates initially increase and then slightly decrease indicating a varying order. This varying dependence is possible for a Langmuir Hinshelwood model, but not a power-law model. In particular with the single-site model, as opposed to the dual-site model, the reaction rates can first increase and later decrease with increasing P(CO2), with a sufficiently high value for the adsorption equilibrium constant for CO2 (K(CO2)). This suggests that initially at low P(CO2), there is an abundance of free sites on the surface of In2O3 and as P(CO2) increases, the coverage of CO2 on the surface increases without affecting the coverage of H2, which leads to higher reaction rates. However gradually with increasing P(CO2), the availability of free sites becomes scarce and then at even higher P(CO2), the surface coverage of H2 may be forced to decrease as CO2 becomes the dominant adsorbent. The better fit of the single-site kinetic model and the apparent reaction orders observed here suggest that high CO2 partial pressures can have an inhibiting effect on the reaction rates. Fig. 11c shows how the reaction rates for the single-site kinetic model vary with the molar feed ratio of H2:CO2. The reaction rates are nearly constant for molar H2:CO2 ratios greater than 4:1, but then more sharply decrease for lower ratios. It is demonstrated that the methanol and CO concentrations in Fig. 8b vary exactly in a similar way as the rate of the reaction w.r.t. the molar feed ratio as shown in Fig. 11c. These results suggest that the resulting effective reaction orders, possible
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with the single-site model, were important for reproducing the variation in selectivity with the molar feed ratio. The superiority of the single-site model could be because, for the single-site model, the reaction rates for methanol synthesis and the RWGS reaction first increase and then decrease at different ranges of the partial pressure of CO$_2$ (Fig. 11b), resulting in a variable order w.r.t. CO$_2$ that is not possible with the dual-site model. However, the single-site model does not disprove the theory that CO$_2$ reacts on the oxygen vacancies as predicted by DFT simulation studies. It might be possible that CO$_2$ and H$_2$ can compete for adsorption on most of the sites and then CO$_2$ preferentially reacts further on the oxygen vacancy sites to form methanol. To estimate the apparent activation energies for CO$_2$ hydrogenation to methanol and RWGS reactions, the Arrhenius plot is presented based on the experimental reaction rates. Apparent activation energies of 90 kJ mol$^{-1}$ and 110 kJ mol$^{-1}$ were derived for the methanol synthesis and RWGS reactions respectively (Fig. 11d). Some of the points in Fig. 11d for the methanol synthesis at the highest temperatures are not linear. This is because the methanol synthesis became equilibrium limited at high temperatures. As a result, the activation energy for methanol synthesis is only calculated from the 200–300 °C temperature range. The lower activation energy for methanol synthesis indicates that the In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst mediates methanol synthesis over the RWGS reaction [38]. The reaction rates, in this case, have been directly calculated from the experimental data. These results are very close to those obtained by Frei et al. from their experiments with the In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst. They have reported, apparent activation energies of 103 kJ mol$^{-1}$ and 117 kJ mol$^{-1}$ for methanol synthesis and RWGS reactions respectively [3]. The activation energies obtained from the kinetic model are much lower (35.7 and 54.5 kJ mol$^{-1}$ respectively), although the activation energy for methanol synthesis is lower than the RWGS reaction. This is because in the LHHW kinetic model there are inhibition terms that decrease with temperature due to $\Delta H_a$ values, which also effectively increase the reaction rates with temperature.

Fig. 11 shows a series of parity plots for the outlet mole fractions of CO$_2$, CH$_3$OH, CO and CH$_4$ comparing the experimental data with the corresponding simulated results. The experimental data set consists of all the experimental data from 1a to 4d as shown in Table 2, used for optimizing the kinetic model. The experimental data points corresponding to (□) are the additional validation experiments listed in Table S3 in the Supplementary Information at other varying conditions that are not used for model optimization. The parity plots showed good agreement between the experimental mole fractions of each of these species and those calculated by the model, thereby showing that the single-site kinetic model predicts the data with good accuracy.

4. Conclusions

This work includes a kinetic study of CO$_2$ hydrogenation to methanol over an In$_2$O$_3$ catalyst taking into consideration two significant competitive reactions, namely the RWGS and methanation reactions. The catalytic reactions have been performed in an isothermal fixed-bed stainless steel tube reactor with a temperature ranging between 200 and 400 °C, a total pressure between 20 and 40 bar and for varying H$_2$:CO$_2$ molar ratios (2:1–6:1) and different WHSV (6000–16000 mL g$_{cat}^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$). A single-site kinetic model based on the LHHW rate equations is presented assuming that both CO$_2$ and H$_2$ can competitively adsorb on the same site that can predict the trends in the experimental data very well. The model predicts that at high temperature the progress of the RWGS reaction causes the methanol synthesis reaction to reverse, so that
methanol steam reforming begins to occur as CO concentration increases. To establish the superiority of the single-site model, a comparison was made with a dual-site model. The developed single-site model was capable of yielding appropriate apparent orders for the reactions w.r.t. the reactant concentrations because it was better at properly predicting the experimental data with variations in molar feed ratios and total pressure as compared to the dual-site model. These results underline the importance of competitive adsorption effects on the reaction kinetics for this catalyst. Apparent activation energies of 90 and 110 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) respectively for CO\(_2\) hydrogenation to methanol and the RWGS reactions were obtained over the In\(_2\)O\(_3\) catalyst derived from experimental reaction rates. The parity plots showed good agreement between the experimental yields of each species and those calculated from the model. Significantly w.r.t. the CO\(_2\) partial pressure, the reaction rates initially were found to increase and then slightly decrease indicating a varying order of the reaction. The single-site model is consistent with all the experimental data obtained from the In\(_2\)O\(_3\) catalyst under different reaction conditions that confirm the robustness of the model. Further, this kinetic modeling study over In\(_2\)O\(_3\) catalyst for CO\(_2\) hydrogenation reaction should continue by investigating the influence of product components such as CO, methanol and water on the kinetics. These detailed investigations of the kinetic model for methanol synthesis over the In\(_2\)O\(_3\) catalyst can be used for further reactor and process design.
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