ADVANCES IN CATALYST MODELING AND SIMULATION

A technical investigation
commissioned by the members of the
Catalytic Advances Program

Client Private
August 2018

TCGR THE CATALYST GROUP RESOURCES™

Gwynedd Office Park ● P.O. Box 680 ● Spring House, PA 19477 – USA – ● Phone: +1-215-628-4447 ● Fax: +1-215-628-2267
E-mail: tcgr@catalystgrp.com ● Web Site: www.catalystgrp.com

The Catalytic Advances Program (CAP)

The Catalytic Advances Program (CAP) is an information resource for research and development organizations in the petroleum, chemical, and polymer industries. By the direction of the member companies (through balloting and other interactive means), the program delivers a range of timely and insightful information and analyses which are accessible exclusively to members and protected by confidentiality agreements. The objective is to provide a technical update on commercially viable advances in catalysis as well as benchmark commercial advances in catalysis and process technology.

Members receive three in-depth **CAP Technical Reports** which are written and peer reviewed by leading scientists and experienced industry professionals in areas selected by the membership (via ballot); weekly *CAP Communications* (delivered via e-mail) which provide the latest updates on technical breakthroughs, commercial events and exclusive development opportunities; and attendance at the **CAP Annual Meeting**.

The **Catalytic Advances Program (CAP)** is available on a membership basis from The Catalyst Group Resources (TCGR). For further details, please contact Matthew A. Colquitt at Matthew.A.Colquitt@catalystgrp.com or +1.215.628.4447 (x1130).

P.O. Box 680
Spring House, PA 19477 U.S.A
ph: +1.215.628.4447
fax: +1.215.628.2267
website: www.catalystgrp.com

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... **xiii**

1. INTRODUCTION **1**

2. ADVANCES IN CATALYST MODELLING **5**

2.1 INTRODUCTION 5

2.1.1 Experimental Data Required to Generate a Kinetic Model for a New Catalyst 5

2.1.2 Reaction Mechanism Generation 8

2.1.3 Kinetic Parameter Estimation and Model Discrimination 8

2.1.4 Model Targeted Experimentation 9

2.1.5 Model Based Innovations to Evaluate and Compare New Catalysts with Examples 10

2.2 DESCRIPTION OF CATALYSTS BASED ON CLASSICAL PHYSICS 10

2.2.1 Advances in Molecular Mechanics and Molecular Dynamics to Describe Catalysts 11

2.2.2 Advances in the Use of Algorithms in View of Potential Applications in the Description of Catalysts 13

2.2.3 Enhanced Sampling of Collective Variables with Large Time Steps 14

2.2.4 Development of Force Fields (with Emphasis on Reactive Force Field) 14

2.3 DESCRIPTION OF CATALYSTS BASED ON QUANTUM CHEMISTRY 15

2.3.1 Application of Quantum-based Methods of Modelling Catalysts, with Particular Stress on Advances in Density Functional Theory (DFT) Calculations 16

2.3.2 Models Used to Describe Various Catalysts (Heterogeneous, Homogeneous, Enzymatic) 18

2.3.3 Development of Functionals and Discussion on the Correct Choice of Functional 19

2.3.4 Advances in Description of Specific Interactions Relevant for Catalytic Processes (incl. non-bonding, pi-interactions, long-range) 22

2.3.5 Advances in Ab-initio Thermodynamics 25

2.3.6 Novel Approaches to Partition Functions and Entropy 26

2.3.7 Approaches to Describe Environment (Solvation, Pressure), with Emphasis on the Importance for Electrocatalysis 27

2.3.8 Hybrid Quantum Mechanics/Molecular Mechanics (QM/MM) Approach 28

2.3.9 Advances in Path Integral Methods 29

2.4 STRUCTURE – ACTIVITY ANALYSIS 30

2.4.1 Directions in Choice of Descriptors 31

2.4.2 Big-data Analysis with Help of High-performance Computing, Inverse-design Approach, High throughput DFT/molecular Simulations for Large-scale Materials Screening/Assembly 32
2.4.3 QSAR/QSPR Models 34
2.5 NEW FEATURES IN POPULAR QUANTUM MECHANICS AND MOLECULAR MECHANICS/DYNAMICS SOFTWARE (GAUSSIAN, TURBOMOLE, AND SCIGRESS) 34
2.6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 36
2.7 REFERENCES 38
3. ADVANCES IN CATALYST SIMULATION 47
3.1 INTRODUCTION 47
3.2 ADVANCES IN METHODS FOR SIMULATION OF KINETICS OF CATALYTIC REACTIONS 49
3.2.1 Kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) 50
3.2.1.1 Most popular approaches 51
3.2.1.2 Advances in self-learning (adaptive) KMC 52
3.2.1.3 Description of lateral interactions 53
3.2.1.4 Sensitivity analysis with KMC 57
3.2.1.5 Capturing temporal evolution of the catalytic surface 60
3.2.1.6 Available codes 60
3.2.2 Microkinetic modelling 61
3.2.2.1 Most popular approaches, incl. coupling DFT with microkinetic modelling 62
3.2.2.2 Campbell's degree of rate control approach, rate-reactivity model, maximum rates of constituents steps, lump model, single-events first principles based semi-empirical methods 66
3.2.3 Comparison of Both Approaches 67
3.2.4 Advances in catalyst modelling: modelling based on reaction mechanism (homogeneous (metal complex) and heterogeneous catalysts) 68
3.3 ADVANCES IN UNDERSTANDING THE BEHAVIOUR OF CATALYSTS AND CATALYTIC REACTORS 69
3.3.1 Finite Element Methods (FEM) 69
3.3.1.1 Finite element methods used to describe catalysts 70
3.3.1.2 FEM coupled to other methods, e.g. reactive molecular dynamics, computational fluid dynamics 70
3.3.1.3 Challenges in application of FEM to study catalysts 71
3.3.2 Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) 71

3.3.2.1 Development of numerical algorithms for physics related to CFD, in view of potential application in description of catalysts 75
3.3.2.2 Problem of Navier-Stokes existence and smoothness 76
3.3.2.3 Advances in reactor simulations and optimisation 76
3.3.3 Catalyst Deactivation and Regeneration 77
3.3.3.1 Modelling for catalyst deactivation by coke formation, sintering, poisoning of active sites by chemisorption of foreign impurities 78
3.3.3.2 Catalyst regeneration modelling & simulation 79
3.3.3.3 Accelerated ageing method to estimate number of regeneration and final catalyst life 80
3.4 NEW FEATURES AVAILABLE IN SOFTWARE FOR CATALYST SIMULATIONS 81
3.4.1 Biovia, Materials Studio, Discovery Studio, COMSOL, CHEMKIN, CANTERA, ASPEN, gPROMS 81
3.5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 83
3.6 REFERENCES 85
4. INDEX 91

FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Schematic representation of QM/MM model (a) and ONIOM model (b). 28
Figure 2.2 Essential components of combinatorial catalysis. 33
Figure 3.1 Schematic illustration of the reaction path 48
Figure 3.2 Illustration of displacement algorithms used to initiate saddle point searches, adapted from (Xu and Henkelman 2008) 53
Figure 3.3 Systematic representation of hierarchical inclusion of adsorbate-adsorbate interactions (drawn for a hexagonal lattice), adapted from (Pineda and Stamatakis 2017) 55

TABLES

Table 1.1 Time and length scales of theoretical methods usually applied to study catalysis, adopted from (Reuter, Stampfl et al. 2005) 1
Table 1.2 Feasibility to capture the features of a catalyst as a function of its complexity (Sauer and Freund 2014) 3
Table 2.1 Classification of DFT functionals, showing their increased accuracy in prediction of atomisation energies computed for G3/99 test set (the reference value is 211.5 kcal/mol for Hartree-Fock method) (Perdew and Schmidt 2001). 17

Table 2.2 Best performing Density Functional Approximations for selected molecular properties (Goerigk, Hansen et al. 2017) 21

Table 2.3 Comparison of properties of various classes of dispersion-corrected DFT methods – adapted from (Grimme 2011) 24

Table 2.4 Conservative error estimates for the current E_{XC} functionals 37

Table 3.1 Dependence of KMC results on the inclusion/omission of lateral interactions taking as an example modelling of water-gas shift reaction catalysed by Cu(321) (Prats, Illas et al. 2018) 57

Table 3.2 List of elementary reactions considered in the study of Liwei Li and David S. Sholl (Li and Sholl 2015) (* denotes surface site) 63

Table 3.3 BEP relationship parameters developed by Michaelides et al. (Michaelides, Liu et al. 2003) for selected dissociation reactions 65

Table 3.4 Experimental selectivity in [%] to the main reaction products of syngas reaction over MoC_2 compared with the values predicted by microkinetic modelling using mean field (MF) and QCA approximations. Reaction conditions: $CO:H_2$ = 1:1, T = 573 K, p = 30 bar (Li and Sholl 2015) 66