CO₂ Reduction to CO with 19% Efficiency in a Solar-Driven Gas Diffusion Electrode Flow Cell under Outdoor Solar Illumination
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ABSTRACT: Solar-driven reduction of carbon dioxide represents a carbon-neutral pathway for the synthesis of fuels and chemicals. We report here results for solar-driven CO₂ reduction using a gas diffusion electrode (GDE) directly powered by a photovoltaic cell. A GaInP/GaInAs/Ge triple-junction photovoltaic cell was used to power a reverse-assembled gas diffusion electrode employing a Ag nanoparticle catalyst layer. The device had a solar-to-CO energy conversion efficiency of 19.1% under simulated AM 1.5G illumination at 1 Sun. The use of a reverse-assembled GDE prevented transition from a flooded catalyst bed and allowed the device to operate stably for >150 h with no loss in efficiency. Outdoor measurements were performed under ambient solar illumination in Pasadena, California, resulting in a peak solar-to-CO efficiency of 18.7% with a CO production rate of 47 mg cm⁻² per day and a diurnal-averaged solar-to-fuel conversion efficiency of 5.8%.

Solar photovoltaic and wind energy conversion are rapidly growing sources of low-carbon electric power. However, the intermittency of solar and wind resources over wide time scales ranging from minutes to months means solar electricity is not a dispatchable power source. Thus, efficient and inexpensive approaches for energy storage are needed for wide penetration of renewable energy into the power grid. While electrical energy storage in batteries may be important for short-term storage and grid power management, seasonal energy storage is unlikely to rely on batteries. Transformation of solar energy into chemical bonds provides a long-term energy storage strategy that opens a path for the synthesis of fuels and chemicals. One approach to chemical energy storage is via solar-driven hydrogen generation, where (i) photovoltaics supply carbon-free electricity to the grid that is used to generate H₂ by water electrolysis at high current densities; (ii) photovoltaics are used to directly drive electrolysis at low current densities, or (iii) an integrated photoelectrochemical device performs unassisted direct water splitting to form H₂. Parallel to solar hydrogen generation approaches, pathways for solar-driven reduction of carbon dioxide to fuels have used (i) direct electrolysis, (ii) photovoltaic directly driven electrolysis, and (iii) integrated photoelectrochemical conversion. Of particular interest is solar-driven reduction of carbon dioxide using a high-efficiency photovoltaic (PV) device directly coupled to an electrochemical cell tailored for reduction of CO₂ to CO. Mixtures of solar-generated CO and H₂ could be used as syngas precursors in a future Fischer–Tropsch chemical synthesis process to produce high molecular weight hydrocarbon fuels or chemicals as products. Carbon dioxide reduction to CO is generally more energy efficient and kinetically easier than direct reduction of CO₂ to multicarbon products.

Among the most efficient heterogeneous solid-state catalysts for CO₂ reduction to CO are gold, silver, WSe₂, and MoS₂. The use of high surface area morphology structures such as nanoparticles can improve catalytic activity. Other factors that impact catalytic performance include catalyst morphology, cations present in the electrolyte solution, electrolyte concentration, and local pH. The state-of-the-art CO₂-to-CO conversion using a Au needle catalyst showed an operating current of 15 mA cm⁻² and 95% Faradaic efficiency at −0.35 V vs RHE. However, the current record efficiency device for solar conversion of CO₂ to CO using a solution-based electrochemical cell suffered from low current density (0.33 mA cm⁻² at −0.6 V vs RHE) due to limited...
catalyst activity. This required the use of large-area electrodes to match the photovoltaic device area.\textsuperscript{10} Table S1 shows overpotential and Faradaic efficiency data at current densities close to 15 mA cm\textsuperscript{-2} along with the electrolyte conditions and catalyst loading for various Ag and Au electrodes. The catalytic activities shown in Table S1 indicate that in many cases nanoparticles of Ag have an activity similar to that of Au while costing significantly less.

Bulk aqueous electrolyte cells can exhibit high catalyst overpotentials due to the limited solubility of CO\textsubscript{2} (33.4 mM) in the electrolyte, a limited pH operating range of \textasciitilde{6–10}, and slow ionic transport in the solution. In contrast, gas diffusion electrode (GDE) assemblies do not suffer these same restrictions.\textsuperscript{29–35} In a GDE using 1 atm CO\textsubscript{2} vapor, CO\textsubscript{2} is transported in the vapor phase and reacts at a thin (<100 nm) solid–liquid–gas phase interface. In this configuration, liquid-state concentration and diffusion do not limit the conversion rate, resulting in lower overpotentials and higher current densities for CO\textsubscript{2} reduction.\textsuperscript{30} Simulations have also shown that a cell using a thin (10 nm) layer of electrolyte on the catalysts (wetted catalyst) outperforms cells with either a completely dry or a completely flooded catalyst configuration.\textsuperscript{36} These insights have led to the development of gas diffusion electrodes\textsuperscript{37} and membrane electrode assemblies (MEA)\textsuperscript{38} with a humidified gas supply to facilitate ion conduction and water balance.

Although membrane electrode assembly systems are more scalable, they often suffer from short-term stability due to salt precipitation or membrane dehydration at high current densities.\textsuperscript{39} Hence, we chose to work with an aqueous GDE cell configuration. In this work, we employ a triple-junction photovoltaic (PV) device directly coupled with a gas diffusion electrode (GDE) as the first extension of an electrolyte flow type PV-GDE reactor that provides both high selectivity and long-term stability. For a directly driven PV-GDE system, the power generated by the PV is directly supplied to the GDE. In our device, the areas of the PV photosensor (A\textsubscript{PV}) and GDE (A\textsubscript{GDE}) were both 0.31 cm\textsuperscript{2}. To match the lower current density of the PV cell with the operating conditions of the anode, a relatively low catalyst loading of GDE was chosen. A Ag nanoparticle catalyst was used because of its relatively high activity and relatively low cost (Table S1).

Figure 1a is an illustration of the compression flow cell employed for the evaluation of gas diffusion electrode catalytic performance. Dilute silver nanoparticles (Ag-NPs) with diameters of \textless{}50 nm were drop cast onto the microporous side of the GDE substrate (Sigracet 29BC). The loading of Ag-NPs in this work was measured to be 0.12 mg cm\textsuperscript{-2}. A detailed description can be found in Methods in the Supporting Information. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) images of the microporous layer with and without Ag-NPs are shown in Figure 1b. Gas was delivered to the GDE through an interdigitated electrode flow field (Figures 1a and S1) against which the GDE is compressed to maximize the interaction of CO\textsubscript{2} with the catalyst and gas utilization.\textsuperscript{40} Current to the GDE was supplied through the interdigitated electrode to Ag-NP/carbon paper substrate. Gaseous products were collected at the outlet of the flow field, which was directly connected to a gas chromatograph (for more information see Methods in the Supporting Information).

An issue for aqueous GDEs is flooding or saturation of the porous catalyst layer with electrolyte or water during operation. This results in a thick (>1 \textmu{}m) electrolyte layer and a diffusion-limited supply of CO\textsubscript{2} to the electrode.\textsuperscript{41} To maintain the catalyst in a wetted but not flooded condition that minimizes losses of CO\textsubscript{2} to the electrolyte and extends the operational lifetime, we assembled our aqueous GDE in a nontraditional manner with the catalyst coating of Ag-NPs facing away from the electrolyte and toward the CO\textsubscript{2} gas supply. We denote this configuration as a reverse-assembled GDE. The microporous layer of the GDE was treated with polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), which helped to prevent flooding. Needle valves in the gas and liquid output streams allowed separation of the liquid and gas phases as well as control of the pressure difference between the aqueous electrolyte and the CO\textsubscript{2} stream. Contact angle analysis indicated that the Ag-NP coated surface was significantly less hydrophobic than the surface without Ag-NPs. Contact angle and optical microscope images of the GDE are shown in Figure S2.

With both the gas inlet and outlet on the same side of the GDE, the device operates in a “flow-by” GDE configuration. The Ag-NP catalyst side of the electrode was facing the CO\textsubscript{2} gas channel as illustrated in Figure 1c. This orientation of the Ag-NPs maintained a thin electrolyte layer on the catalyst and enhanced the rate of CO\textsubscript{2} reduction.\textsuperscript{42} The turnover frequency of the Ag-NP catalyst for the reverse-assembled GDE at \textasciitilde{}0.6 V vs RHE was calculated as \textasciitilde{}9 \times 10\textsuperscript{3} h\textsuperscript{-1} (see the Supporting Information).
were found for the standard-assembled GDE (Figure 2b). To compare the activity of the Ag-NPs in different orientations and pH, overpotential analysis for CO2 reduction to CO was performed (Figure 2c). The comparable Tafel slopes (right half of graph) of (a) the reserve-assembled Ag-NP GDE and (b) a standard-assembled Ag-NP GDE. (c) Overpotential versus CO partial current of Ag-NPs GDE for CO2 reduction to CO. Overpotential = U_{GDE,RHE} + 0.11 V, J_{CO} \equiv J_{GDE} \times f_{FE,CO} - 0.6 V vs RHE in 1 M KOH.

Results from three-electrode measurements for reverse- and standard-assembled GDEs are shown in panels a and b of Figure 2, respectively, for 1 M KHCO3 (bulk pH of 8.5) and 1 M KOH (bulk pH of 14). Current densities are substantially lower than for earlier reported GDE devices because of the low catalyst loading used to match the current from the PV (current matching). For the reverse-assembled GDE, both the Faradaic efficiency (f_{FE,CO}) for CO and current density (J_{GDE}) increased with increasing potential with f_{FE,CO} close to 100% at −0.6 V vs RHE in 1 M KOH (Figure 2a). Similar trends of current density and Faradaic efficiency versus applied potential were found for the standard-assembled GDE (Figure 2b). To compare the activity of the Ag-NPs in different orientations and pH, overpotential analysis for CO2 reduction to CO was performed (Figure 2c). The comparable Tafel slopes (−0.23 V/dec) in KHCO3 and KOH for either orientation indicate a similar catalytic pathway regardless of the operating conditions. The Tafel behavior plotted with potentials vs NHE falls on a rough single line (Figure S3) and suggests that the rate-determining step for the reduction on our Ag-NP GDE is not proton-limited. The achievable current density and Faradaic efficiency (f_{FE,CO}) for CO are higher in 1 M KOH than in 1 M KHCO3 at the same overpotential (Figure 2c), likely because of a pH-independent rate-determining step. All subsequent measurements were, therefore, performed using 1 M KOH for the PV-GDE integrated device.

Figure 2d shows the Faradaic efficiency for CO versus time at −0.6 V vs RHE for the two GDE orientations in KOH. For the standard configuration, the f_{FE,CO} decreased to ~75% after 1 h and to 50% after 2 h, while for the reverse configuration, the f_{FE,CO} was ~97% for 3 h. Though similar in initial current density and f_{FE,CO}, the standard assembly, with the Ag-NP catalyst facing the electrolyte, became flooded during the first hour of operation resulting in a reduction of the Faradaic efficiency.

We performed two-electrode measurements for the GDE using an electrochemically activated nickel foam anode coupled to the GaInP/GaInAs/Ge triple-junction cell. For detailed information about the solar cell see Methods Figures S4 and S5, and Table S2 in the Supporting Information. A schematic of the cell is shown in Figure 3a with 1 M KOH as electrolyte using a Fumasep FAA-3-50 membrane. Both the cell potential (U_{cell}) and the cathode-to-reference electrode potential (U_{GDE}) were monitored during the operation. We calculated the solar-to-fuel efficiency (\eta_{STF}) for CO2 reduction using eq 1.

\[ \eta_{STF} = \frac{f_{out}}{P_{in}} = \frac{J_{GDE} \Delta U_{\text{rxn}} f_{FE,CO} A_{GDE}}{P_{light} A_{PV}} = \frac{J \Delta U_{\text{rxn}} f_{FE,CO}}{P_{light}} \]

where \Delta U_{\text{rxn}} is the thermodynamic potential difference between the oxygen evolution half reaction (OER) and the CO2 reduction half reaction of 1.34 V, A the area of the GDE or PV with A_{GDE} = A_{PV} = 0.31 cm2, J (= J_{GDE} = J_{PV}) the
The intersection between the red and yellow curves in Figure 3b shows the catalytic current of the Ag-NPs GDE. The red curve indicates the behavior of PV plus anode, the red curve activated Ni foam anode alone, while the yellow curve in the laboratory, as shown in Figure 3b parameters using simulated AM 1.5G sun illumination at 1 Sun.

To evaluate the efficiency and stability, we measured cell parameters using simulated AM 1.5G sun illumination at 1 Sun in the laboratory, as shown in Figure 3b—d. The blue curve in Figure 3b represents the performance of the electrochemically activated Ni foam anode alone, while the yellow curve indicates the behavior of PV plus anode. The red curve shows the catalytic current of the Ag-NPs GDE. The intersection between the red and yellow curves in Figure 3b defines the operation point, located at −0.6 V vs RHE and 14.4 mA·cm⁻² with a cell voltage of 2.23 V. Panels c and d of Figure 3 illustrate the cell performance over 20 h with an average Faradaic efficiency for CO of 99 ± 2% and an average CO production rate of 2.3 mg·h⁻¹. No degradation in performance was observed. From the experimental results, we calculated the average solar-to-CO efficiency for the 20 h operation as 19.1 ± 0.2%, with an average energy efficiency ηGDE of 59.4 ± 0.6%. The error bars were obtained as the variation within the 20 h of operation. All the experimental results are summarized in Table S3. The chemical composition of the Ag-NP catalyst layer was examined before and after the reaction by X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy as shown in Figure S6. No obvious changes were observed other than the absorption of potassium after operation with the Ag-NP catalyst maintaining its metallic phase.

The solar-to-CO efficiency of 19.1% represents a new record efficiency. A performance comparison with the current state-of-the-art PV-electrolyzer for CO₂ reduction to CO is shown in Table S4. The PV-GDE device had a CO production rate per projected cathode area 50 times higher than for the bulk electrolyte device (7.4 mg·h⁻¹·cm⁻² versus 0.145 mg·h⁻¹·cm⁻²) with greatly improved stability (20 h with no degradation versus 15% loss in 5 h). A similar PV-GDE device operated under 3.25 Suns illumination with A_GDE = 1 cm² and A_PV = 0.31 cm² (3.25 ≈ A_GDE/A_PV) showed over 150 h of stability, with an average Faradaic efficiency of 96 ± 2%, an average solar-to-CO efficiency of 18.9 ± 0.5%, and an average energy efficiency ηGDE of 53.7 ± 1.2% (Figure S7).

Full day outdoor tests were conducted with online gas product analysis in order to obtain the solar-to-fuel efficiency over the entire day. Results are shown in Figure 4. The triple-junction cell and a calibrated silicon photodiode were mounted on a solar tracker to maintain optimum orientation toward the Sun (see illustration in Figure S8). The dips in sun intensity at 7:00—9:00 a.m. and 4:00—6:00 p.m. in the data were the result of trees blocking the sunlight. The system operated at a cell voltage of 2.20 V and GDE potential U_GDE vs RHE, CO Faradaic efficiency J_{FE,CO}, and solar-to-fuel efficiency η_STF were recorded for a 24 h day cycle.

ACS Energy Lett. 2020, 5, 470–476
https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acsenergylett.9b02576
outdoor demonstration used a lens to concentrate the sunlight, producing an irradiance of 3.25 Suns (C = 3.25, \( A_{\text{GDE}} = 1 \text{ cm}^2 \), \( A_{\text{PV}} = 0.31 \text{ cm}^2 \) with data included in Figure S9 and Table S3) with a CO generation rate of 50 mg·day\(^{-1}\). Using this calculated rate, a system scale up to 1 m\(^2\) would result in a CO production rate of 0.5 kg·day\(^{-1}\).

The performance of our directly coupled PV-GDE device was compared to a DC–DC converter coupled PV and GDE with power-matching electronics. We simulate DC–DC converter output curves with the input of our solid-state PV curve as shown in Figure S10. Though the DC–DC converter can track the maximum power point (MPP) of the PV, a practical loss of 5–10% is expected.\(^{13}\) The operating point for the directly driven PV-GDE cell is \( U_{\text{cell}} = 2.23 \text{ V} \) and \( J = 14.4 \text{ mA·cm}^{-2} \) with a maximum efficiency of 19.3%. With a 95% efficient DC–DC converter, the operation point would be \( U_{\text{cell}} = 2.22 \text{ V} \) and \( J = 13.8 \text{ mA·cm}^{-2} \) with a maximum efficiency of 18.5%. For a 90% efficient DC–DC converter, the operation point would be \( U_{\text{cell}} = 2.20 \text{ V} \) and \( J = 13.2 \text{ mA·cm}^{-2} \) with a maximum efficiency of 17.7%. The maximum efficiencies are calculated assuming 100% Faradaic efficiency. All systems are summarized in Table S3. The slightly higher efficiency of our directly driven PV-GDE device, compared to the same setup with integrated DC–DC converter and power matching electronics, reveals the potential of developing a directly coupled PV-GDE device with its reduced complexity.

In summary, we have demonstrated a highly efficient solar-driven CO\(_2\) reduction device for CO generation using a flow-by reverse-assembled gas diffusion electrode cell directly coupled to a triple-junction solar cell. The reverse-assembled GDE is designed to minimize parasitic CO\(_2\) losses, utilizing a high CO\(_2\) concentration and low overpotential catalysts for the CO\(_2\) reduction reaction. The Ag-NPs-based catalyst exhibited near unity Faradaic efficiency toward CO generation at approximately −0.6 V vs RHE in 1 M KOH electrolyte. The PV-GDE system was evaluated under both laboratory AM 1.5G simulated solar irradiation and outdoor real sun conditions. Near-unity Faradaic efficiency was observed for CO\(_2\)-to-CO conversion, and an average solar-to-CO energy efficiency of 19.1% was achieved with AM 1.5G illumination at 1 Sun, leading to a CO production rate per catalyst area over 50 times higher than that of the current record photovoltaic-driven electrolysis device. The GDE was demonstrated to be stable for over 150 h without degradation, supporting our hypothesis that, by using a reverse-assembled GDE device configuration with the catalyst layer facing toward the CO\(_2\) gas supply, we could extend the system operation time without suffering a transition from a wetted to a flooded gas diffusion layer. Under outdoor sun conditions, the PV-GDE system exhibited a solar-to-CO conversion efficiency of 18.7% during noontime and yielded a CO production rate of 15 mg·cm\(^{-2}\)·day\(^{-1}\). This reverse-assembled PV-GDE establishes a new efficiency record for directly solar-driven CO\(_2\) reduction and offers an example of a very high-efficiency, stable device for solar CO\(_2\) conversion.
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