Low pressure conversion of CO$_2$ to methanol over Cu/Zn/Al catalysts. The effect of Mg, Ca and Sr as basic promoters

Previtali D.$^a$, Longhi M.$^b$, Galli F.$^c$$^*$, Di Michele A.$^d$, Manenti F.$^a$, Signoretto M.$^e$, Menegazzo F.$^e$, Pirola C.$^b$

$^a$Dipartimento di Chimica, Materiali e Ingegneria Chimica “Giulio Natta”, Politecnico di Milano, piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32, 20133 Milano, Italy
$^b$Dipartimento di Chimica, Università degli Studi di Milano, via Golgi 19, 20133, Milano, Italy
$^c$Department of Chemical Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal, C.P. 6079, Succ. CV Montréal, H3C 3A7, Québec, Canada
$^d$Dipartimento di Fisica e Geologia, Università degli Studi di Perugia, via Pascoli 1, 06123 Perugia, Italy
$^e$Dipartimento di Scienze Molecolari e Nanosistemi, Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia, via Torino 155, 30170 Venezia Mestre, Italy

Abstract

Carbon dioxide concentration level is reaching a non-returning point. Carbon capture technologies are immature and short-term actions are necessary. The conversion of CO$_2$ into methanol is a technical challenge. Commercial copper-zinc-alumina catalysts convert maximum 7% carbon dioxide in syngas at high pressures (5 MPa to 10 MPa) and moderate temperatures (473 K to 573 K) into methanol. However, there are not records on the synthesis of methanol at low pressure ($P < 2.5$ MPa) and without a large excess of hydrogen in the feed. Here, we tested three new catalysts prepared by co-precipitation of copper, zinc and aluminum nitrates (CZA), with strontium, magnesium or calcium as basic promoters to enhance CO$_2$ conversion to methanol. We discussed the microstructure of the catalysts according to the supersaturation of the relative carbonates formed during the co-precipitation synthesis. Compared to the benchmark, the sample doped with Ca showed higher carbon conversion with all the feed compositions tested (syngas, synthetic biosyngas and CO$_2$ with H$_2$). CZA doped with Sr is inactive in this reaction.
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1. Introduction

In December 2015, at the Paris United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), 195 nations agreed to take action to stop global warming. The goal is to decrease the average temperature 2 K above the value at the pre-industrial level. This target is ambitious, yet feasible [1]. There is 66% chance to reach the objective if CO$_2$ quantity in atmosphere reduces by 1000 Gt compared to 2011. Thanks to the exponential increase in wind and solar energy deployment [2] green electricity will be available at a competitive cost, as it is not linked to oil prices [3], but actions are necessary to block emissions now, as a short-term strategy.
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The EPA estimates that most of the emissions of carbon dioxide derive from combustion to produce energy (fuel, electricity, etc.); 21% of the total global greenhouse emissions account for the industrial sector. Green energy sources (even though intermittent) are available (solar, wind, marine) while alternative feedstock to produce chemicals lack.

In the period 2017-2020, 9839 scientific documents have been published regarding carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) (research made the 27/03/2020 in the Topic field of Web of Science Core Collection with the keywords “(carbon dioxide capture) OR (Carbon capture and storage)”). CCS technologies rely on the absorption and mineralization of carbon dioxide over solids or liquids. However, high process costs and technical issues, such as corrosion, limit the expansion of CCS at larger scale. Hansan et al. estimated that the sequestration of CO\(_2\) whose concentration in a gas stream is higher than 10% costs from 30 $/t to 70 $/t of CO\(_2\), depending on the flow rate and the composition of the exhausted. Moreover, a survey conducted in Germany in 2016 revealed that population rejects the CSS (sub-sea) compared to alternative remedies such as afforestation because of a general skepticism.

According to the IEA, CCS, CCSU, reduction of upstream oil consumption, nuclear energy and energy switching could decrease the CO\(_2\) emissions up to 28%. The impact on the total emissions of the production of fuels or chemicals from CO\(_2\) could represent a reduction between 5% to 20% of them.

Converting CO\(_2\) into chemicals or fuel is another profitable strategy that enables the reuse of carbon instead landfilling it. Methanol is a bulk chemical and a reagent for the production of various added value chemicals, like formaldehyde, olefins, biodiesel, aromatics. Methanol is an energy vector as well. The annual world methanol production is increasing, in 2016 it was 80 Mt and it is expected to reach 100 Mt in 2020. The main reactions during the methanol synthesis are:

\[
\text{CO}(g) + 2 \text{H}_2(g) \rightleftharpoons \text{CH}_3\text{OH}(g) \quad (\Delta H^0_{533K} = -136.9 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}) \quad (1)
\]

\[
\text{CO}_2(g) + 3 \text{H}_2(g) \rightleftharpoons \text{CH}_3\text{OH}(g) + \text{H}_2\text{O}(g) \quad (\Delta H^0_{533K} = -97.36 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}) \quad (2)
\]

\[
\text{CO}_2(g) + \text{H}_2(g) \rightleftharpoons \text{CO}(g) + \text{H}_2\text{O}(g) \quad (\Delta H^0_{533K} = 46.4 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}) \quad (3)
\]

Methanol is produced by reaction 1 and 2 while reverse Water Gas Reaction (rWGS, reaction 3) consumes part of the hydrogen producing H\(_2\)O and CO. Methanol synthesis reactions are exothermic and catalyzed by copper and zinc (CZA catalyst), while rWGS is an endothermic reaction. The atomic molar ratio of a CZA (Cu/ZnO/Al\(_2\)O\(_3\)) commercial catalyst is 60/30/10 with 1% to 3% by weight of MgO. Cu and Zn oxide, with alumina as structural promoter, catalyze the hydrogenation of CO. The catalyst activity depends on the copper exposed area. Assuming a regular distribution of copper, zinc and dopants, the higher the surface area, the greater the activity of the catalyst is. MgO increases the catalyst lifetime, stabilizing the CZA structure and avoiding decreasing of the exposed copper area due to thermal sintering. However, MgO inhibits methanol formation. In methanol synthesis reactions, the moles of products are lower than the moles of reactants (Eq.1 and 2), therefore high pressures thermodynamically favor methanol formation. Industrial reactors typically operate at a pressure from 5 MPa to 10 MPa with average CO conversion per pass of 25% and a selectivity towards methanol over 99%. Moderate temperatures (473 K to 573 K) avoid thermodynamic limitations due to the reaction exothermicity. CO\(_2\) is co-fed in low percentages (from 0.5% to 5%) to increase
methanol productivity [33]. Data are available on carbon dioxide conversion at medium pressure (over 5 MPa) while literature is lacking of data under 2.5 MPa. Working at lower pressures allows energy and cost savings, which leads to a greener and more remunerative processes. For example, a plant that produces methanol from water electrolysis and biomass gasification consumes about 10% of the energy in gas compression [34]. Another limitation is the large excess of hydrogen employed in the feed: Meshkini et al. employed a mixture of CO$_2$ and syngas with 87.8% of hydrogen [35]. This decreases the economic competitiveness of the process proposed and limits its scale up. They reported that Mn and Zr improve the methanol space time yield after 60 h of operation (500 g kg$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ and 520 g kg$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$, respectively compared to 490 g kg$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ for the undoped catalyst). As far as we know, no one tested the effect of calcium oxide on the catalyst activity of CZA at low pressure. The ideal feed has the lowest pressure and percentage of hydrogen possible (the stoichiometric amount). Here we test four different CZA catalysts in the conversion of syngas, a simulated biosyngas and a stream of CO$_2$ and H$_2$ into methanol. We study a commercial CZA by Alfa Aesar (CZA-C) and three catalysts prepared i) without the addition of Mg (CZA-S) and two doped with either ii) Ca (CZA-Ca) or iii) Sr (CZA-Sr). This paper is original because: we study the methanol synthesis with different gas composition but without an excess of hydrogen, aiming at developing a more economical process performing the reaction at low pressure and we test the activity of CZA-Ca and CZA-Sr, which was never reported in literature before. We also characterized a sample prepared with the same co-precipitation method employing Mg as promoter.

2. Experimental

2.1. Catalyst synthesis

CZA catalysts were synthesized with a co-precipitation method [36]. Distilled water dissolved metal nitrates precursors (Cu(NO$_3$)$_2$, Zn(NO$_3$)$_2$, Al$_2$(NO$_3$)$_3$, Mg(NO$_3$)$_2$, Sr(NO$_3$)$_2$, and Ca(NO$_3$)$_2$, purity 95%, Sigma Aldrich) with a total concentration of 1.0 mol L$^{-1}$ and a metal molar ratio of 60-30-10-1, respectively for Cu, Zn, Al and X, where X is Ca, Mg or Sr. We selected this percentage to avoid excessive covering of the basic promoter and to have a comparable concentration comparable to the one employed in literature [29, 35, 37]. We added the metal solution to 200 mL of distilled water in a jacket reactor. A syringe pump controlled the metal solution flow, set to 5 mL min$^{-1}$. A thermocouple and a pHmeter monitored the operating condition. The simultaneous addition of a Na$_2$CO$_3$ solution (1.0 mol L$^{-1}$) maintained the pH to a value of (7.0 ± 0.2) A thermostatic bath set the temperature of the reactor to 343 K. After the metal solution addition, the mixture aged for 1 h at 343 K and pH = 7. A Buchner filtered the blue precipitate. It was washed with 150 mL of deionized water and dried at 353 K for 15 h in an oven. A furnace calcined the powder at 573 K under static air for 3 h (ramp of 15 K min$^{-1}$). A sieve meshed the resulting catalyst in the range 106 µm to 136 µm to avoid mass transfer limitations in the reaction.

2.2. Characterization

We characterized all synthesized samples before testing them. A Micromeritics Tristar II apparatus (Tristar II 3020) measured the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) specific surface area from N$_2$ adsorption/desorption isotherms at 77 K [38]. Barret-Joyner-Halenda (BJH) method applied to the N$_2$ adsorption data evaluated porosity distribution [39]. We pre-treated the samples at 423 K for 4 h under a N$_2$ flow to remove adsorbed water and contaminants. A LEO1525 Field emission scanning electron microscope (SEM) imaged all the samples. A Bruker Quantax EDX instrument equipped on the SEM mapped elements’ distribution on catalysts’ surface. X-ray photoelectron
spectra (XPS) were taken in an M-probe apparatus (Surface Science Instruments). The source was monochromatic Al Kα radiation (1486.6 eV). A Philips PW3020 diffractometer (XRD) collected samples' diffractograms from 10° to 65° with a step of 0.04° (step time of 10s). Temperature programmed reduction (TPR) analyses measured the reduction temperature of Cu to metal \[40\]. 50 mg of samples reacted with 40 mL min\(^{-1}\) of 5 % of H\(_2\) (in Ar) ramping the temperature from 298 K to 1173 K at 10 K min\(^{-1}\). A thermoconductivity detector (TCD) measured H\(_2\) uptake. A Mettler Toledo TGA/DSC 3+ characterized CZA-S before and after the synthesis and estimated the amount of carbon coke remained on the catalyst after the reaction. TGA measured weight variation of the sample under an air flux, ramping the temperature from 313 K to 973 K at 5 K min\(^{-1}\).

### 2.3. Bench scale plant

We charged (1.00 ± 0.01) g of catalyst in a 6.35 mm diameter reactor (teactor length = 560 mm). A blank test assured that its internal surface is inactive. Two pieces of quartz wool held the catalyst in place, in a fixed bed configuration. Prior to the test, 20 NmL min\(^{-1}\) of H\(_2\) reduced the catalyst in situ at 573 K for 3h. Then, four mass flow controllers flowed nitrogen (internal standard for chromatographic analyses), carbon monoxide, hydrogen and carbon dioxide into the reactor. A pressure controller back-regulated the pressure to a value of 2 MPa. An electrical furnace heated the reactor to the desired temperature. A k-type thermocouple measured the reaction temperature right above the catalytic bed. We profiled the isothermal zone of the reactor (Supporting Information, Fig. S1). Reactants flow from the top to the bottom of the reactor with a GHSV of 4030 h\(^{-1}\). Before the pressure controller, a cold trap (T = (265 ± 1) K) condenses the reaction products (methanol and water). A micro-GC (Agilent 3000A, carrier: He), equipped with a PlotQ and a MOLSIEVE columns, samples the exiting gases every 1 h. It calculates the flow of CO that exits the reactor \(F_{CO, out}\) using the flow and peak area of the internal standard (N\(_2\), eq 4) and, therefore, CO conversion \(X_{CO}\) (5)[41]. The micro-GC also detects methanol that is not condensed.

\[
F_{CO, out} = F_{N_2, in} \times \frac{\text{Area}_{CO}}{\text{Area}_{N_2}} \tag{4}
\]

\[
X_{CO} = \frac{F_{CO, in} - F_{CO, out}}{F_{CO, in}} \times 100 \tag{5}
\]

\[
S = \frac{F_{H_2, in} - F_{CO_2, in}}{F_{CO_2, in} + F_{CO, in}} \tag{6}
\]

At the end of each test, a GC-FID Fision 8000, equipped with a Porapak column QS, determined the methanol concentration in the cold trap, using acetone (Sigma Aldrich, 99 % purity) as internal standard. The oven temperature was 573 K, the carrier was He at a inlet pressure of 100 kPa. The attenuation and the cold trap were 1 and 2 respectively. We tested CZA-C, -S, -Ca and -Sr catalysts with: a) syngas, with a H\(_2\)/CO molar ratio of 2, to simulate a stoichiometric amount of reactants produced by methane steam reforming \[22\] \[43\], which is also the typical feed composition for Fischer-Tropsch reactors \[43\] \[44\] \[45\], b) syngas containing 5.6 % of CO\(_2\), which is similar to the composition obtained by steam-gasification of biomass-derived oil (carrier gas: N\(_2\) and T = 1073 K) \[47\] and a H\(_2\) concentration of 72 %. In this feed, H\(_2\) concentration was set to have a \(S\) value of 2.4 (eq 6). \(S\) considers the extra amount of H\(_2\) that CO\(_2\) consumes in the rWGS \[48\]. A value \(S = 2\) corresponds to the stoichiometric H\(_2\) quantity. Nevertheless, in commercial processes a value higher that 2 is employed (2.2-2.4). Finally, catalysts were tested with a c) stoichiometric
mixture of CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2} (1:3), to study the direct conversion of carbon dioxide into methanol (Table
1). The reactor operated between 513 K to 533 K as most of CZAs have a maximum conversion of
CO\textsubscript{2} [29]. We set the pressure to 2 MPa because Saeidi et al. [49] reported from many catalysts for
CO\textsubscript{2} conversion this operating pressure.

Table 1: Summary of the experiments for CZA-C, CZA-S, CZA-Ca and CZA-Sr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Temperature, K</th>
<th>Flow rate set, NmL min\textsuperscript{-1}</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>H\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>N\textsubscript{2}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Results and discussion

During TGA analysis, CZA-S loses weight in the ranges 373 K to 473 K (Figure 1 A), 523 K to
673 K (Figure 1 B) and, 723 K to 873 K (Figure 1 C), in accordance with the data reported by Gines
et al. [50, 51]. Firstly, crystallized water contained in hydroxycarbonates evaporates. The complete
dehydroxylation occurs as the second peak and the decarbonation with the loss of strongly bonded
CO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{–} constitutes the third peak [51]. During sample preparation, at 573 K, hydroxycarbonates
partially dehydroxylate and decompose [52, 53], therefore oxides may form in this second step.
XRD analyses confirm this observation. For CZA-S, CZA-Ca and CZA-Mg, indeed, typical peaks
of copper and zinc oxide are observed (Figure 2). Moreover, in CZA-Ca peaks of crystalline CaCO\textsubscript{3}
are also evidenced (Circular of the Bureau of Standards n. 539: standard X-ray diffraction powder
patterns). CZA-Sr has a similar behavior, with the presence of SrCO\textsubscript{3}. In CZA-Mg, MgCO\textsubscript{3} peaks
are absent (Figure 2), as also observed in [51], even though also its degradation temperature is
higher than 573 K.

Mg\textsuperscript{2+} has a radius close to copper and the same charge [54] and therefore it substitutes copper in
the lattice, without forming MgCO\textsubscript{3}, which is not detected in XRD spectra. CZA-S and CZA-C have
a similar structural morphology, i.e. agglomerated spherical particles randomly organized (Figure 3a
[51]). Doping the catalyst with Ca and Sr induces the formation of well-organized rod-like structures
constituted by smaller nanoparticles. Sr makes the rods cover the main structure (Figure 3g and
3h). Baltes et al. obtained a similar conformation applying the same synthesis conditions [36].
These structures are similar to polycrystalline calcite needle-fiber, formed by random precipitation
around nuclei in the presence of highly supersaturated solution [55]. These columnar structures are
absent in CZA-Mg (Figure 3i-3j), whose morphology is similar to CZA-S. These differences are due
to carbonates water solubility (MgCO\textsubscript{3}, 1.4 × 10\textsuperscript{-1} g L\textsuperscript{-1}, CaCO\textsubscript{3}, 1.4 × 10\textsuperscript{-2} g L\textsuperscript{-1}, and SrCO\textsubscript{3},
3.4 × 10\textsuperscript{-3} g L\textsuperscript{-1} [56, 57]), that induces a different relative supersaturation (RS) of these salts in
solution during the synthesis (RS = 0, 11 and 73 for MgCO\textsubscript{3}, CaCO\textsubscript{3}, SrCO\textsubscript{3}, respectively). Indeed,
during the precipitation step, alongside the formation and growth of hydroxycarbonates (the core
of CZA), alkaline earth metal carbonates form and are stable at the synthesis conditions [58, 50].
In our synthesis, the concentration of MgCO\textsubscript{3} was not in supersaturated conditions.
Hydroxycarbonates have a pH\textsubscript{p.z.c.} above 7 \cite{59}. The pH during the synthesis is about 7, and hydroxycarbonates, positively charged, attract negative species as carbonates that interact preferably with the formed solid rather than dissolved cations in solution \cite{60}. These particles attract the solute clusters (embryos) by Van der Waals forces \cite{61}. The concentration of embryos in the proximity of the forming crystals depends on the supersaturation of the solution, the larger the $RS$ the higher their concentration \cite{61}. When $RS$ is large a rapid coagulation happens, leading to the formation of nuclei greater than a critical size, above which there is the nucleation \cite{61}. These superstructures based on chaotically assembled nanoparticles precipitate on the hydroxycarbonates.

This phenomenon is defined as secondary nucleation and is responsible of the structures observed when doping with Ca and Sr. The difference between these two alkaline earth metals is related to the different $RS$ value, being in the case of Sr higher than Ca. In the case of doping with Mg, the solution is not supersaturated and these structures do not grow.

These structures affect the porosity distribution (Figure 4) in the range of pores between 2 nm to 10 nm. In fact, doping with Ca and Sr, the amount of pores in this range is higher than in the
Figure 2: XRD analyses

Case of both CZA-S and CZA-C. This difference is due to the porosity created between the building-blocks of the rod-like structures. The growth of these structures may also explain the lower specific surface area and pore volumes of these materials (Table 2) compared to commercial and undoped samples. In fact, the secondary nucleation, responsible of these structures, may take place both onto the surface and in bigger pores, partially occluding them and provoking a decrease of both specific surface area and pore volume. Indeed, samples without rod-like structures possess similar specific surface area. Moreover, CZA-C does not present micropores, while all the other samples do. The majority of pores diameters’ fall in the range 2 nm to 10 nm (above 40%), especially in the case of commercial sample (90% of the total). However, in CZA-Ca and CZA-Sr these pores are in a lower amount than in the other samples, and this might be justified considering the formation of rod-like structures as stated above.

All catalysts start to reduce in the range 473 K to 493 K, with a sharp peak from 539 K to 557 K, which corresponds to the transformation of CuO into Cu⁰ (Figure 2), in accordance with literature
Therefore, the activation temperature chosen permitted to reduce copper. All samples present a minor and broad reduction peak between 873 K to 1043 K. It corresponds to the partial reduction of ZnO [64]. TPR confirms the presence of a sole copper species for CZA-S at 573 K, ascribable to the reduction of highly dispersed CuO [65]. The peak position of CZA-Mg is similar to that of CZA-S, with a broad peak between 593 K to 653 K. Ca and Sr doping shifts and broadens the reduction peak of CZA (inset of Figure 5) because of the stronger interaction between the two lattice of CuO and ZnO [66].

SEM-EDX analysis shows a good distribution of each metals for all catalyst samples (see Supporting Information, Figure S2-S4) and no traces of carbon (coke) were present on the spent catalysts. TGA diagrams report an increase of weight for CZA-S. This phenomenon is probably caused by copper oxidation. When CZA is discharged, the reactor is cold (T = 303 K) and not all the metallic copper is oxidized by atmospheric oxygen. The remaining Cuₐ reacts during the TGA analysis and CuO formation determines an increase in weight. This theory is confirmed also by the fact that the weight gain usually is 1.3 mg which corresponds to the quantity of oxygen necessary to oxidizes about 10% of the all metallic copper (see Supporting Information, Figure S5). XPS reports a surface enrichment of aluminum, as also reported in [67]. Its concentration reaches the maximum in the first layers of the particles (XPS measures from 38% to 40% atomic percentage of Al) and decreases after few micrometers depth (SEM-EDX measures from 7% to 8% atomic percentage of Al). This enrichment is due to the hydrolysis of the nitrate system [68].

All the catalytic tests have a mass balance for carbon and oxygen over 90%. With syngas (CO/H₂) as feed, the carbon conversion is higher at 533 K (Figure 6b) due to kinetic reasons. We did not observe the typical volcano-shape curve for CO conversion because we operated the reactor at only two temperatures, near to the average maximum value (523 K, [29]) to have a comparison of the catalysts at similar thermodynamic and kinetic conditions. The activity of CZA-Ca is significantly higher (12% CO conversion (Tab 3) respect to 9% for CZA-S) already at 513 K and increases at 533 K producing more than the double amount of products respect to CZA-C and maintaining a similar methanol content in the condensed fraction (Figure 7). CZA-S has an overall productivity similar to CZA-Ca at 513 K but with a methanol concentration lower than 20% (Figure 7) by weight. The presence of Ca and Mg (the latter contained in CZA-C) limits the rWGS, the main source of water, at 513 K and 533 K where its endothermicity favors water formation. At 513 K, CZA-Ca has a stationary CO conversion value of about 5.6% while CZA-S the one with the lower conversion (3.9%). At 533 K the same trend was observed (11.5% versus 9.1%, Tab 3). This is confirmed by the productivities of both methanol and water (Figure 7). With syngas, Ca improves methanol formation by 3 times while the water content remains low (about 30% by weight). CZA-S has the worst performances as methanol productivity and as water content. The pore size dimension and distribution does not have an effect on CO or CO₂ conversion and methanol productivity.

With CO₂/H₂ as feeding mixture, temperature has a negligible influence on CO₂ conversion with CZA-C. The same trend is obtained observing the productivities (Figure 7). Due to the large presence of CO₂ and H₂, high temperature favors the reverse Water Gas Shift reaction (rWGS) increasing the water and CO productivity while methanol concentration in the liquid product decreases. For this reason, with this feed are obtained the highest values of water concentration. CZA-C is the more stable varying the temperature while both CZA-Ca and CZA-S show an increase in CO₂ conversion of 2 or 3 times. Also in this case an increase of temperature cause a decreasing of methanol concentration. CZA-Sr resulted the least active.

Using as feed the mixture of CO and CO₂ at 513 K, the more active catalyst is CZA-S followed
Table 2: BET area, pore volume and surface composition results (EDX and XPS) for all catalysts synthesized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Chemical composition</th>
<th>BET area m² g⁻¹</th>
<th>Pore volume m³ g⁻¹</th>
<th>Al / atomic %, XPS / EDX (±0.5)</th>
<th>Cu / atomic %, XPS / EDX (±0.5)</th>
<th>Zn / atomic %, XPS / EDX (±0.5)</th>
<th>O / atomic %, XPS / EDX (±0.5)</th>
<th>Mg / atomic %, XPS / EDX (±0.5)</th>
<th>Ca / atomic %, XPS / EDX (±0.5)</th>
<th>Sr / atomic %, XPS / EDX (±0.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CZA-C</td>
<td>100 ± 1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>40.2 / 7.8</td>
<td>12.8 / 21.2</td>
<td>8.8 / 9.6</td>
<td>38.2 / 60.4</td>
<td>- / 1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA-S</td>
<td>94.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>34.6 / 8.1</td>
<td>13.0 / 15.5</td>
<td>10.0 / 10.1</td>
<td>42.4 / 66.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA-Ca</td>
<td>81.8 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>38.6 / 8.3</td>
<td>11.6 / 17.7</td>
<td>7.0 / 13.8</td>
<td>42.8 / 60.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0 / 0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA-Sr</td>
<td>71.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>44.0 / 6.8</td>
<td>12.2 / 33.3</td>
<td>6.1 / 15.0</td>
<td>37.7 / 44.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0 / 0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA-Mg</td>
<td>97.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>32.8 / 1.1</td>
<td>3.8 / 29.4</td>
<td>5.1 / 8.5</td>
<td>33.3 / 61.0</td>
<td>25.0 / 0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by CZA-C (about 20% less, Tab 3) and CZA-Ca with the lowest productivity. For CZA-C at 533 K, the productivity increases despite the CO conversion decreases. This could be explained by an increase of selectivity of CO\(_2\) to methanol instead of CO and water (rWGS). This effect is emphasized with CZA-S where no promoters are present. Liu et al. obtained the same result with a Cu based catalyst supported on titania and modified with 1% of MgO [69]. They explained this behavior considering kinetics and thermodynamics. The presence of MgCO\(_3\) results in a stronger CO\(_2\) adsorption that improves its activity in terms of conversion. CaCO\(_3\) is a stronger base than MgCO\(_3\), and indeed the CO\(_2\) conversion increases (Figure 6). CZA-C and CZA-Ca maintain similar productivity in terms of liquid quantity and composition at the two temperature tested. However, for CZA-S, increasing the temperature, the methanol formation is halved. CZA-Ca has the lowest productivities at both temperatures among the active catalysts, while CZA-Sr resulted inactive with this feed (CO conversion lower than 3% for both the temperatures tested). Phongamwong et al. [70] derived an equation to calculate methanol selectivity and to assess the quantity of CO\(_2\) converted to methanol (Table 4). Except for CZA-Sr, which resulted inactive for the negligible amount of methanol condensed in the cold trap, all the catalysts increases CO\(_2\) conversion into CH\(_3\)OH at 533 K. Therefore, higher temperature activates carbon dioxide for this reaction. CZA-S and CZA-Ca resulted superior, probably because of the larger pore volume available compared to CZA-C (Table 2). The stationary state conversion of carbon at 513 K and 533 K demonstrated that the best promoter is not the most basic (Figure 6), indeed Ca resulted the most active sample for all the feedstock tested. A deeper investigation on the diverse carbonate stability at different temperature and CO\(_2\) partial pressures and on the dimension of the crystallites may correlate these findings.

Our materials are better than commercial one, and among home-made catalysts CZA-Ca shows with CO/H\(_2\) and CO\(_2\)/H\(_2\) the best performance in terms of methanol yield. These results may be justified considering porosity results. Despite many factors influence methanol yield, as stated by Li et al. [71], specific surface area has a great effect in this process, but pore volume and mesoporosity centered between 2 nm to 10 nm are both more pivotal. CZA-C possesses the highest specific surface area but also the lowest pore volume (Table 2), even if pores are centered in the optimal range, whilst CZA-Ca is characterized by a lower specific surface area and amount of pores centered in small mesopores but a larger pore volume (Table 2). For the other samples the results can be justified considering the combination between pore volume and mesoporosity. These data show that porosity and its distribution are important for catalytic activity in this process.

Table 3: Carbon conversion and sample standard deviation (in parenthesis) for all the tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature, K</th>
<th>Feed</th>
<th>H(_2)/CO</th>
<th>H(_2)/CO/CO(_2)</th>
<th>H(_2)/CO(_2)</th>
<th>H(_2)/CO</th>
<th>H(_2)/CO/CO(_2)</th>
<th>H(_2)/CO(_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>CZA-S</td>
<td>4.0(0.2)</td>
<td>31.9(0.4)</td>
<td>16.0(0.5)</td>
<td>9.0(0.1)</td>
<td>23.4(0.2)</td>
<td>19.4(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CZA-C</td>
<td>5.4(0.1)</td>
<td>27.5(0.2)</td>
<td>19.0(1.0)</td>
<td>10.3(0.1)</td>
<td>20.3(0.3)</td>
<td>20.8(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CZA-Ca</td>
<td>5.7(0.1)</td>
<td>29.6(0.4)</td>
<td>20.3(0.8)</td>
<td>11.5(0.1)</td>
<td>21.8(0.4)</td>
<td>22.5(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CZA-Sr</td>
<td>2.7(0.1)</td>
<td>3.2(0.1)</td>
<td>9.2(0.3)</td>
<td>5.5(0.1)</td>
<td>3.0(0.1)</td>
<td>14.2(0.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Methanol selectivities and fraction of CO\textsubscript{2} converted into CH\textsubscript{3}OH for the tests with CO\textsubscript{2} and syngas co-fed \[70\]. Uncertainties are reported in parenthesis with a confidence interval of 95%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temperature, K</th>
<th>CH\textsubscript{3}OH selectivity, %</th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2} to CH\textsubscript{3}OH, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA-C</td>
<td>0.2(0.0)</td>
<td>0.1(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA-S</td>
<td>0.4(0.0)</td>
<td>0.5(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA-Ca</td>
<td>0.2(0.0)</td>
<td>0.3(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZA-Sr</td>
<td>0.0(-)</td>
<td>0.0(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: SEM images of commercial and synthesized CZA
Figure 4: Pore diameter distribution obtained from BJH model (adsorption branch of the isotherm)
Figure 5: Temperature programmed reduction of the synthesized catalysts
Figure 6: Conversion of CO$_2$ or CO for all catalysts with different feed compositions: CO$_2$ and H$_2$ (a), CO and H$_2$ (b) and CO$_2$, CO and H$_2$, (c). CZA-Sr resulted inactive with this latter stream.
Figure 7: Methanol and water productivity (divided by the total test time) at 513 K (a) and 533 K (b)

Figure 8: Catalysts maximum carbon conversion at 513 K (a) and 533 K (b) versus basic promoter
4. Conclusions

Methanol can be produced from biosyngas and streams of CO$_2$. However, at present, the industrialisation of this process is limited by economic constraints. We doped a typical copper-zinc-alumina catalyst with 1% alkali earth metals to confer the final material basicity. These catalysts synthesize methanol at 2.0 MPa, with co-production of water. Sr resulted inactive towards CO$_2$ conversion into methanol. With syngas and CO$_2$/H$_2$ as feed, CZA-Ca resulted the best catalyst, with a CO conversion of 20% and 6% at 513 K and 24% and 12% at 533 K, respectively. The undoped catalyst possesses the highest CH$_3$OH selectivity and conversion of CO$_2$ into methanol, but literature reports low lifetime for these kind of materials. Metal doping tailor catalysts’ morphology. Ca and Sr induce the formation of columnar structures. The catalysts were tested for 48 h at constant temperature, therefore little information is available on their stability over time, i.e. sintering, poisoning, etc. The synthesis of mixed oxide doped CZA and the effect of different dopants concentration will be the object of future works.
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