Ab initio molecular dynamics study of D₂ dissociation on CO-precovered Ru(0001)

M. Wijzenbroek and G. J. Kroes

*Leiden Institute of Chemistry, Gorlaeus Laboratories, Leiden University,
P.O. Box 9502, 2300 RA, Leiden, The Netherlands*

In dynamics calculations of H₂ dissociating on metal surfaces often clean, high-symmetry surfaces are used. Few such dynamics studies have been performed on surfaces with pre-adsorbed molecules, especially when also the motion of the surface and the adsorbate are considered. In this study, the dissociation of H₂ on a carbon monoxide-covered Ru(0001) surface is considered. Ab initio molecular dynamics (AIMD) calculations are performed on this system using the PBE-vdW-DF2 functional, which accurately describes the reaction probability for H₂ on Ru(0001). Using this functional, the reaction probability of H₂ on the CO-covered Ru(0001) surface is found to be too low compared to experiments. This suggests that exchange–correlation functionals that can describe reaction of H₂ on a bare metal surface are not in general able to describe the reaction of H₂ on a CO-precovered surface of the same metal, with the same accuracy. It can however not be ruled out that the discrepancy between theory and experiment is partly due to an inhomogeneous coverage of the surface by CO in the experiments. The incorporation of the motion of the surface has only a small effect on the reaction probability. It is found that when including surface motion for this system, the size of simulation cell can be important. Upon collision, a considerable amount of energy is transferred to the surface, causing the adsorbed CO molecules to move apart, which opens the surface for reaction. In order to obtain converged reaction probabilities with respect to the size of the simulation cell, at least a 3×3 simulation cell is needed, because in the smaller $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell the CO molecules cannot be pushed apart as only a single independent CO molecule is present, also leading to less energy exchange with the surface.

I. INTRODUCTION

In detailed dynamics simulations of hydrogen molecules reacting on metal surfaces often clean, high-symmetry surfaces are used.¹ Only few dynamics studies have been performed on surfaces which have been pre-covered with, for example, H atoms or CO molecules, in particular when surface atoms and the pre-adsorbed atoms or molecules are allowed to move. Such studies have been performed for H₂ dissociation on various palladium surfaces decorated with H, S or Cl atoms.²⁻⁷ No studies with a non-rigid surface have however been performed yet for the dissociation of H₂ or D₂ on a CO-covered surface, which are of interest because CO acts as a common poison for catalysts.

An example of such a system, for which sticking probabilities have been experimentally measured, is D₂ dissociation on a CO-covered Ru(0001) surface.⁸ This system has already been studied with extensive density functional theory (DFT) calculations⁹ and with dynamics calculations,¹⁰ but in the dynamics calculations the CO and the surface atoms were fixed at their ideal lattice positions. Although no large surface temperature effects would be expected at the rather low experimental surface temperature ($T_s = 180$ K⁸), it has not yet been tested whether or not allowing the surface atoms and CO molecules to move may improve the description of the process. In particular, a relevant question is whether or not the D₂ can exchange energy with the CO molecules. The masses of the D₂ and CO molecules match better than those of D₂ and Ru, suggesting energy exchange may play a large role in the dynamics, as the simple Baule model suggests that energy exchange may play an important role when the masses of the projectile and the surface atoms match.^{11,12} Finally, Zhao *et al.*¹³ have studied co-adsorption of H₂ and CO on Ru(0001) with DFT, considering precoverages of Ru(0001) by CO other than the 1/3 ML precoverage considered here. With the RPBE functional used, they obtained reasonable agreement with ultrahigh vacuum experiments for their computed CO and H₂ desorption temperatures and patterns.

The underlying surface system (CO on Ru(0001)) has been the subject of many different studies in which, *e.g.*, CO adsorption and desorption, surface structures and vibrations have been studied, both from an experimental¹⁴⁻³⁹ and a theoretical^{13,38-52} point of view. At different CO coverages, different surface structures are observed. For low coverages of up to 1/3 monolayer (ML), CO molecules tend to adsorb on top sites.^{15,16,43-45} For CO on Ru(0001), the CO molecules adsorb with an orientation perpendicular to the surface, with

the C atom bonded to the surface.^{14–18} One particularly well-studied system is 1/3 ML CO on Ru(0001) (for a comparison of experimental and theoretical data, see reference 9), which exhibits a $(\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3})R30^\circ$ geometry, which seems to be the best defined CO-covered Ru(0001) surface,^{9,45} with the CO molecules occupying one in every three top sites. For this reason, and because previous theoretical studies^{9,10} of D₂ dissociation on CO-covered Ru(0001) have also considered this particular coverage, the 1/3 ML case is considered in this study.

For H₂ and D₂ dissociation on a bare Ru(0001) surface, recently two DFT exchange–correlation (XC) functionals were found that could describe the reaction probability well over the range of incidence energies for which experiments⁵³ are available.⁵⁴ Previous calculations⁵⁵ showed that the reaction could not be well described by the PW91⁵⁶ (or the similar PBE⁵⁷) and RPBE⁵⁸ XC functionals, which are commonly used for studies of molecules dissociating on metal surfaces. A mixture of these functionals allowed several experiments on H₂ dissociation on Cu(111) to be reproduced with chemical accuracy.⁵⁹ For H₂ dissociation on Ru(0001) however, these functionals yielded reaction probabilities that increased too quickly with increasing incidence energy. It was, for this system, found that using functionals with either vdW-DF⁶⁰ or vdW-DF2⁶¹ correlation results in an improved agreement of the reaction probability with experiments.

The description of CO-covered surfaces with DFT has received a lot of attention. For example, the popular PW91, PBE and RPBE functionals fail to predict the correct adsorption site of the CO molecule on the Pt(111) surface.⁶² Also for other surfaces (Cu(111) and Rh(111)) the wrong adsorption site preference is found,⁴² giving rise to the ‘CO adsorption puzzle’.⁴⁶ Using higher level electronic structure calculations, *e.g.*, hybrid functionals (B3LYP⁴⁶ and PBE0 and HSE03⁶³), the random phase approximation (RPA),⁶⁴ the revTPSS meta-generalized gradient approximation (meta-GGA) functional⁴⁹ or vdW-DF functionals⁶⁵ helps or fully resolves this problem. For 1/3 ML CO-covered Ru(0001) the correct adsorption site (top) is already predicted on the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) level.⁹

In this study, *ab initio* molecular dynamics (AIMD) calculations are performed to describe D₂ dissociation on a 1/3 ML CO-covered Ru(0001) surface, to understand if allowing the CO molecules and the surface atoms to move has effects on the dynamics. A second aspect, however, is the use of the XC functional. Dynamics calculations have previously been performed for H₂ dissociation on CO-covered Ru(0001) with the RPBE⁵⁸ functional.¹⁰

This functional however yielded reaction probabilities that were too low compared to experiments that have been performed for this system.⁸ Recently, two functionals have been identified using a specific reaction parameter (SRP)⁵⁹ approach that can describe the dissociation of H_2 on a bare $\text{Ru}(0001)$ surface, which is not possible with the RPBE functional.⁵⁴ These functionals use either vdW-DF⁶⁰ or vdW-DF2⁶¹ correlation. An interesting question is whether these functionals can also properly describe H_2 dissociation on a CO-covered $\text{Ru}(0001)$ surface.⁶⁶ For the present study one of the two candidate SRP functionals for H_2 dissociation on $\text{Ru}(0001)$, the PBE-vdW-DF2 functional, is taken.

In section II the methods used are described, starting with the dynamical model in section II A. Initial and analysis conditions are described in section II B and the computational details in section II C. In section III the results are shown and discussed, starting with properties of the surface in section III A. The molecule–surface interaction is explored in section III B. The reaction probability, its comparison to experiments as well as differences between the results obtained with different unit cell sizes are discussed in section III C. Finally, in section IV the conclusions are given.

II. METHODS

A. Dynamical model

In all calculations the Born–Oppenheimer⁶⁷ approximation is used. Two types of calculations are performed: calculations in which the surface atoms are allowed to move at the experimental surface temperature ($T_s = 180$ K), and calculations in which the surface atoms are frozen at their ideal lattice positions. The forces and energies needed for the dynamics were determined ‘on the fly’ from DFT^{68,69} calculations. For the DFT calculations the PBE-vdW-DF2^{54,57,61} functional was used, which was found to be able to describe the dissociation of H_2 and D_2 on $\text{Ru}(0001)$ rather accurately.⁵⁴

In the dynamics calculations for $T_s = 180$ K, the motion of all atoms of the D_2 molecule and the CO-covered $\text{Ru}(0001)$ slab is taken into account, except for the bottom layer of the $\text{Ru}(0001)$ slab, which remains fixed during the dynamics. For the ideal lattice calculations, the whole slab, including the layer of CO molecules, remains fixed during the dynamics and only the D_2 molecule is allowed to move. Calculations were done both using a $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ and

FIG. 1. (a) The center of mass coordinate system used to describe the coordinates of the H_2 molecule. (b) The surface unit cell considered for the $\text{H}_2/\text{Ru}(0001)$ system. (c) The $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ surface unit cell considered for the $\text{H}_2/\text{CO}+\text{Ru}(0001)$ system. The diagonal of the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ unit cell coincides with one of the lattice vectors of the 3×3 cell. In (b) and (c), several sites which are commonly considered are indicated. The subscript “ads” in (c) is used to indicate which site is nearest the adsorbed CO, for sites that are, due to addition of CO, no longer symmetry equivalent.

a 3×3 cell, but for the ideal lattice calculations only a $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell was used. In figure 1 the coordinate system that is used to describe the location of the H_2 molecule, the surface unit cell for bare $\text{Ru}(0001)$, and the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ surface unit cell of $1/3$ ML CO-covered $\text{Ru}(0001)$ are shown. It is noted that if the surface atoms are allowed to move, the molecule–surface distance Z is generally ill defined. Throughout this paper the convention is used that the highest atom part of the slab (including the adsorbate; for the CO-covered surface this is therefore generally an oxygen atom of a CO molecule on the surface) determines the location for $Z = 0$ Å. Negative Z values thus correspond to the H_2 molecule being in the CO layer

FIG. 2. (a) The six triangles spanned by the CO molecules for the 3×3 cell. Each triangle has three CO molecules that can move independently. (b) The bins used to compute site-specific properties. The sites giving names to the bins have been indicated (see also figure 1(c)).

of the slab.

In figure 2 two schemes used for analysis are shown. In figure 2(a), the six triangles that are spanned by the CO molecules in a 3×3 cell are shown. These triangles are used to analyse the amount of freedom a molecule has to dissociate on different parts of a slab at a finite surface temperature. Each triangle has three CO molecules at the corners of the triangle that are, to a large extent, free to move relative to the surface. This is in contrast to the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell, in which only one single independent CO is present. In figure 2(b), the bins used to obtain site-specific properties are shown. The names of the bins are derived from the site that is located at the center of the bins in the ideal, static surface.

In the dynamics, the equations of motion are integrated using the leapfrog propagator with a time step of 1 fs for the slab equilibrations, and a time step of 0.5 fs, 0.25 fs or 0.125 fs for $(v = 0)$, $(v = 1)$ and $(v \geq 2)$ D₂, respectively.

B. Initial and analysis conditions

Quasi-classical dynamics calculations are performed, in which zero point energy is imparted to the D_2 initially. The initial rovibrational energy that is put into the D_2 molecule is determined by the Fourier grid Hamiltonian method.⁷⁰ An ensemble of D_2 molecules in various rovibrational states and with various translational energies corresponding to the experimental distribution in the molecular beam is considered. This procedure, including the parameters used for these distributions, is the same as used for the H_2 dissociation on Ru(0001) calculations of reference 54.

The H_2 molecule is initially placed at $Z = 6.5 \text{ \AA}$. The molecule is considered to have scattered if $Z > 4.0 \text{ \AA}$ with a momentum vector away from the surface. The molecule is considered to have dissociated if $r > 2.0 \text{ \AA}$. Molecules that have neither reacted nor dissociated after 1 ps (2 ps for the highest energy point), are considered to have scattered.

To generate the initial conditions of the slab and CO molecules, several steps are performed. First, the bulk lattice constants a and c for Ru are determined by relaxing a HCP unit cell with two atoms. No thermal expansion is taken into account, as Ru at $T_s = 180 \text{ K}$ is very similar to Ru at $T_s = 0 \text{ K}$ (from 0 K to 180 K, the a and c lattice constants grow by 0.05% and 0.08%, respectively).⁷¹ The ideal slab geometry is then determined by allowing all atoms of a CO-covered slab, except the bottom layer, to relax in the z direction. Vibrational frequencies are then determined for each of the atoms that are allowed to move in the slab, while keeping the other atoms fixed. These vibrational frequencies are then used to initialize random displacements for the atoms of the slab. Initial velocities for the surface atoms are taken from a Maxwell–Boltzmann distribution. For the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell, 50 randomly determined configurations are taken. Each of these 50 snapshots is propagated for in total 4.0 ps with a time step of 1.0 fs. During the first 1.0 ps velocities are rescaled every 5 (first 0.5 ps) and 50 (second 0.5 ps) time steps. After the velocity rescaling, the calculation proceeds in the NVE ensemble, of which the first 0.5 ps is discarded. Initial conditions for the slab and CO molecules are then randomly selected from the remaining 2.5 ps, giving in total $125 \cdot 10^3$ possible sets of initial conditions spread over the different slabs. For the 3×3 cell, the same procedure is used, except that only 20 slabs are propagated due to the increased size of the simulation cell.

C. Computational details

The electronic structure calculations were done with version 5.2.12 of the VASP^{72–75} software package. The standard⁷⁵ projector augmented wave⁷⁶ potentials were used. The non-local vdW-DF2 correlation functional in VASP is evaluated within the scheme of Román-Pérez and Soler⁷⁷.

To speed up convergence, first order Methfessel–Paxton⁷⁸ smearing was used with a smearing width of 0.1 eV. For the bulk calculation, a $20 \times 20 \times 20$ Γ -centered k -point grid was used with a plane wave cutoff of 500 eV. For all other calculations, a $9 \times 9 \times 1$ Γ -centered (shifted Monkhorst–Pack⁷⁹) k -point mesh was used for calculations with the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ unit cell, while a $5 \times 5 \times 1$ Γ -centered k -point mesh was used for the 3×3 cell. A plane wave cutoff of 400 eV was used. For both cells a vacuum of 13 Å was chosen to separate different images of the slab. In all cases a five layered ruthenium slab was considered, with either one or three CO molecules adsorbed on one side, for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ and 3×3 cells, respectively. Convergence tests for the potential energy suggest that the error introduced due to the basis set size, k -point integration and the number of Ru layers is less than 30 meV. Tests with CO molecules adsorbed on both sides of the slab suggest barrier heights may be decreased by at most about 20 meV.

To obtain accurate statistics, 500 trajectories are computed for two energy points of interest on the reaction probability curve. Only for the highest energy point with the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell for $T_s = 180$ K, 1000 trajectories are computed. Throughout this paper, observables are often denoted by $O \pm \sigma$, where σ is an approximation of the statistical errors due to the limited number of trajectories, and is approximated by $\sigma = s/\sqrt{nN}$, where s is the sample standard deviation, N the number of trajectories and n the number of samples per trajectory. For reaction probabilities, $\sigma = \sqrt{P_r \cdot (1 - P_r)}/\sqrt{N}$, where P_r is the computed reaction probability.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Properties and dynamics of the CO-covered surface

The adsorption energies (defined as $E_{\text{ads}} = E_{\text{CO}} + E_{\text{Ru}} - E_{\text{CO/Ru}}$) for CO above a five layer Ru slab on the top and hcp sites are found to be 1.91 eV and 1.65 eV, respectively.

Property	Relaxed	$\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ (+ D ₂)	3×3 (+ D ₂)	Experiment
$\langle \sigma_O \rangle$ (Å)	0	0.337	0.425 0.341	0.567 —
$\langle \sigma_C \rangle$ (Å)	0	0.216	0.270 0.214	0.347 —
$\langle \sigma_{CO} \rangle$ (Å)	0	0.278	0.351 0.280	0.468 —
$\langle \sigma_O^{\parallel} \rangle$ (Å)	0	0.330	0.414 0.335	0.559 0.5 ± 0.1^{16}
$\langle \sigma_C^{\parallel} \rangle$ (Å)	0	0.207	0.257 0.206	0.339 0.3 ± 0.1^{16}
$\langle \sigma_O^{\perp} \rangle$ (Å)	0	0.061	0.093 0.058	0.096 0.1^{16}
$\langle \sigma_C^{\perp} \rangle$ (Å)	0	0.056	0.077 0.055	0.071 0.1^{16}
$\langle \vartheta_{C-O} \rangle$ (°)	0	7.7	9.4 7.9	11.1 —
$\langle \vartheta_{Ru-O} \rangle$ (°)	0	5.6	7.0 5.7	9.2 —
$\langle d_{1-2} \rangle$ (Å)	2.137	2.139	2.134 2.139	2.137 2.094^{80}
$\langle d_{\text{prot}} \rangle$ (Å)	0.184	0.165	0.147 0.169	0.164 0.07 ± 0.03^{27}
$\langle r_{Ru-C} \rangle$ (Å)	1.915	1.920	1.918 1.920	1.923 1.93 ± 0.04^{27}
$\langle r_{C-O} \rangle$ (Å)	1.165	1.166	1.167 1.166	1.167 1.10 ± 0.05^{27}

TABLE I. Several geometrical parameters of the dynamics of the CO-covered Ru(0001) surface. The meaning of the symbols is explained in the text. The values for D₂ dissociation correspond to averages over the (whole) computed trajectories for $E_{\text{trans}} = 0.466$ eV.

These numbers match quite well to the adsorption energies computed by Groot *et al.*⁹ and the top site adsorption energy is in good agreement with the measured adsorption energy of Pfnür and Menzel²³ for 1/3 ML (1.81 eV), but less so with the adsorption energy from an earlier study (1.66 eV) by the same authors²⁴ and the experimental value reported by Abild-Pedersen and Andersson⁴⁸ (1.49 ± 0.22 eV). It is noted that it is not clear how this value was determined (multiple experiments were cited) and at which coverage, which should be important: Pfnür and Menzel²³ found the adsorption energy to depend on the CO coverage of the surface.

In table I several geometrical parameters of the 1/3 ML CO-covered Ru(0001) surface are shown, comparing the small and large simulation cells with and without the D₂ molecule impinging on the surface. All properties are ensemble averages, which in the context of the present calculations means that averages are taken over, if applicable, one or more occurrences in the unit cell and the different trajectories that were performed. Several

FIG. 3. Schematic side view (left) of the $1/3$ ML CO-covered Ru(0001) surface. The shown view is along the Y -axis for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell of figure 1(c), starting at the bottom (the u or X -axis). The frontmost two CO molecules have been displaced from their ideal positions (open circles). The geometrical parameters of table I are indicated and are explained in more detail in the text. Atoms that are further away are indicated by faded circles (see right figure).

types of properties are considered: average root mean square displacements (σ_x) of atoms ($x = C, O$) or the CO center of mass ($x = \text{CO}$) with respect to its position in the case of the ideal lattice, the parallel ($\sigma_x^{\parallel}$) or perpendicular ($\sigma_x^{\perp}$) components of the average root mean square displacements, the angle of a vector from atom a to b with respect to the surface normal (ϑ_{a-b}), the first interlayer spacing (d_{1-2} , average distance between the two topmost Ru layers of the surface), the protrusion of the Ru atom directly below the CO molecule with respect to the other Ru atoms in that layer (d_{prot}), and bond lengths (r_{a-b}) between atoms a and b . Many of these parameters are also shown in figure 3. In table I, with a subscript Ru the Ru atom immediately below a C or O atom of a CO molecule is meant. The results for the cases with the D_2 molecule impinging on the surface are discussed in section III C; for the case without the D_2 molecule the results are discussed below.

The distance between the topmost ruthenium atom and the C atom, as well as the distance between the C and O atoms, has been measured by Over *et al.*²⁷ and Michalk *et al.*¹⁵ The values found here for all cases (1.92 Å for the $r_{\text{Ru-C}}$ distance and 1.17 Å for $r_{\text{C-O}}$) match quite well to the experimental values by Over *et al.* (1.93 ± 0.04 Å and 1.10 ± 0.05 Å, respectively) and Michalk *et al.* (2.00 ± 0.10 Å and 1.10 ± 0.10 Å, respectively), although the computed C–O distance is a bit on the long side. The root mean square displacement of the C and O atoms has been measured by Gierer *et al.*¹⁶ and Over *et al.*^{27,28} The computed

displacements are in fair agreement with the results of the latest experiment¹⁶ (0.5 ± 0.1 Å for $\sigma_{\text{O}}^{\parallel}$ at $T_s = 150$ K and 0.3 ± 0.1 Å for $\sigma_{\text{C}}^{\parallel}$). The protrusion of the Ru atom to which the CO is attached with respect to the other atoms in the layer is somewhat larger than the experimental value (0.07 ± 0.03 Å) by Over *et al.*²⁷ The contraction of the distance between the first and second layer is about 1.5% compared to the computed bulk interlayer spacing (2.169 Å), which is a bit smaller than the value for the bare Ru(0001) surface with the DFT functional used (3.3%). At $T_s = 300$ K, Baddorf *et al.*⁸⁰ measured the contraction of the distance between the first and second layer to be $2.2 \pm 0.4\%$, corresponding to a first interlayer spacing of about 2.094 Å. Finally, the results are overall in good agreement with DFT studies^{9,45} in which the RPBE functional was used.

Another interesting property concerns the motion of CO with respect to the surface. From the C and O displacements given above, it is clear that although the molecule has some freedom to move, it does not readily move to the next top site (about 2.7 Å away). The fact that the displacement of the CO center of mass (σ_{CO}) closely matches the weighted average of the displacements of the individual C and O displacements, as well as that the Ru–C and C–O distances remain similar during the dynamics as in the static surface case, suggests that the molecules behave in a way similar to that proposed by Gierer *et al.*¹⁶: the CO molecule tilts with respect to the topmost Ru atom, keeping the topmost Ru to which the CO is adsorbed, and the C and O atoms approximately on a line. Tilt angles of the line connecting the two atoms with respect to the surface normal ($\vartheta_{\text{C-O}}$ and $\vartheta_{\text{Ru-O}}$) have been computed. $\vartheta_{\text{Ru-O}}$ is slightly smaller (by about 2°) than $\vartheta_{\text{C-O}}$, suggesting that the C atom is on average not displaced far enough for the Ru, C and O atoms to be on a line. Although the tilt angles are not large, the tilting of the CO molecules may nonetheless have an effect on the H₂ dissociation dynamics. A small decrease in reactivity might be expected, because more of the surface is ‘screened’ by the CO for the impinging D₂ molecules.

B. The molecule–surface interaction

In figure 4 contour plots of the potential energy surface (PES) for H₂ dissociation on an ideal 1/3 ML CO-covered Ru(0001) surface ($\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell) are shown for dissociation above various sites and orientations with $\vartheta = 90^\circ$. It is clear that near a CO-covered Ru atom it is rather unfavourable for the H₂ molecule to dissociate, although for dissociation above hcp

FIG. 4. The (r, Z) dependence of the potential energy surface for H_2 dissociating on 1/3 ML CO-covered Ru(0001) above several different sites and orientations ($\vartheta = 90^\circ$). (a) top_{ads} ($\varphi = 0^\circ$), (b) $\text{bridge}_{\text{ads}}$ ($\varphi = 120^\circ$), (c) hcp ($\varphi = 90^\circ$), (d) top ($\varphi = 0^\circ$), (e) bridge ($\varphi = 0^\circ$), (f) bridge ($\varphi = 90^\circ$), (g) t2h ($\varphi = 150^\circ$), (h) t2f ($\varphi = 90^\circ$).

or $\text{bridge}_{\text{ads}}$ nonetheless a barrier and an exit channel is found. In contrast, for the cases where the H_2 molecule is near a Ru atom without an adsorbed CO molecule, dissociation is much more favourable. For all cases in figure 4 where a full elbow is shown, late barriers are found. For dissociation directly above the Ru atom without an adsorbed CO molecule, additionally an early barrier and well is found. This is in general agreement with previous results for the RPBE functional.⁹ For bridge-to-hollow dissociation (figure 4(e)) however, Groot *et al.* found an early barrier, while here a later barrier is obtained with the use of the PBE-vdW-DF2 functional. For t2f ($\varphi = 90^\circ$) (figure 4(h)), only a late barrier is found, whereas previously also an early barrier was found for a geometry, t2f ($\varphi = 88^\circ$), which is close to the one considered here.

In table II barrier heights and positions for dissociation of H_2 on an ideal 1/3 ML CO-covered Ru(0001) surface ($\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell) are compared to those for dissociation of H_2 on an ideal, bare Ru(0001) surface. In the case where one geometry for the bare Ru(0001) has multiple symmetry inequivalent geometries for the CO-covered surface due to the addition of

Site	Surface	r_b (Å)	Z_b (Å)	E_b (eV)	E_b^{RPBE} (eV)
top-to-bridge	bare Ru(0001)	0.751	2.605	0.004	
— on top _{ads} (a)	CO/Ru(0001)	—	—	—	
— on top (d)	CO/Ru(0001)	0.754	-0.971	0.095	0.30
bridge-to-hollow	bare Ru(0001)	0.796	1.858	0.276	
— on bridge _{ads} (b)	CO/Ru(0001)	0.773	-0.350	4.347	
— on bridge (e)	CO/Ru(0001)	1.059	-2.050	0.799	0.85
t2h-to-fcc	bare Ru(0001)	0.771	2.139	0.115	
— on t2h _{ads}	CO/Ru(0001)	—	—	—	
— on t2h (g)	CO/Ru(0001)	1.225	-1.887	0.739	
t2f-to-t2f	bare Ru(0001)	1.292	1.552	0.312	
— t2f($\varphi = 90^\circ$) (h)	CO/Ru(0001)	1.312	-1.737	0.923	0.84
— t2f($\varphi = 150^\circ$)	CO/Ru(0001)	0.747	-1.032	0.684	
hcp-to-t2f	bare Ru(0001)	0.850	1.678	0.430	
— hcp($\varphi = 30^\circ$)	CO/Ru(0001)	0.721	-0.538	2.807	
— hcp($\varphi = 90^\circ$) (c)	CO/Ru(0001)	0.741	-0.470	2.389	

TABLE II. Barrier heights and positions for several dissociation geometries for H₂ dissociation on bare and 1/3 ML CO-covered Ru(0001). For all dissociation geometries $\vartheta = 90^\circ$. The notation *a*-to-*b* corresponds to dissociation above the *a* site with the H atoms moving towards the next nearest *b* site. If this notation is ambiguous, the geometry according to figure 1(c) is given. The dissociation geometries also considered in figure 4 are indicated with the letter of the panel they are shown in. Values for the bare Ru(0001) surface from the PBE-vdW-DF2 PES described in reference 54. RPBE barrier heights from reference 9.

CO, both are given. The subscript ‘ads’ refers to the site which is closest to the adsorbed CO molecule (see also figure 1). Note that Groot *et al.*⁹ only considered the sites furthest away from the CO in their analysis (*i.e.*, the ones here denoted without subscript ‘ads’). Similar barrier heights are obtained for the fcc and t2f site as for the hcp and t2h site, respectively, and as such, values for a particular orientation are only given for either hcp (t2h) or fcc (t2f). It is clear that for all configurations that are considered the barrier height is increased relative to the bare Ru(0001), and in some cases a particular dissociation geometry even becomes

FIG. 5. Reaction probabilities as a function of average collision energy computed with several methods compared to experiment.⁸ Results obtained with the RPBE⁵⁸ functional by Groot *et al.*¹⁰ are also shown.

non-dissociative (*i.e.*, no transition state could be found). This is in general agreement with findings obtained using the RPBE functional.⁹ The computed barrier heights are in good agreement with previously obtained values⁹ with the RPBE functional, except for the top-to-bridge barrier. For this geometry, the PBE-vdW-DF2 functional predicts a barrier height that is 0.20 eV lower than the RPBE barrier height. Note that the barrier referred to is for passage to a local molecular chemisorption minimum, see figure 4(d). Sites close to the CO molecule show either a very high barrier (> 2 eV) or no barrier at all.

The results obtained with the PBE-vdW-DF2 functional are at least in qualitative agreement with the results obtained with the RPBE functional.⁹ As the dissociation barriers near top_{ads} are very high, it is clear that the H_2 molecule is repelled by the adsorbed CO molecule and dissociation can therefore only occur in the center of the triangles shown in figure 2(a), *i.e.*, close to the bare top site. As Z_b near the top site is ≈ -2 Å, it is clear that the H_2 molecule needs to move into the layer of CO molecules, and if needed push the CO molecules aside, in order to be able to dissociate.

C. Reaction probability and energy exchange

In figure 5 the reaction probability is shown as a function of average collision energy as computed using a rigid, ideal $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell, and using $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ and 3×3 simulation cells at

$T_s = 180$ K. For comparison, the experimental data by Ueta *et al.*⁸ and the previous results using the RPBE⁵⁸ functional by Groot *et al.*⁹, which were obtained with the use of a rigid, ideal $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell in the DFT calculations, are also shown.

It is clear that the PBE-vdW-DF2 reaction probabilities are too low compared to experiment, which was also the case for the previously computed RPBE reaction probabilities.⁹ The PBE-vdW-DF2 reaction probabilities are even lower than the RPBE reaction probabilities. The reaction probability computed with a frozen ideal surface matches closely to, or is even slightly larger than, the reaction probability computed with the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell for $T_s = 180$ K. The reaction probabilities computed for $T_s = 180$ K are greater if the 3×3 simulation cell is used, this result being statistically significant for $E_{\text{trans}} = 0.466$ eV. At this incidence energy, the reaction probability for the 3×3 cell is higher by about 0.05 compared to the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell.

It is not fully understood why a disagreement between theory and experiment remains. As surface temperature is taken into account here, it seems likely that the disagreement of the PBE-vdW-DF2 reaction probabilities for $T_s = 180$ K with experiment is due to the XC functional not being good enough, even though this functional works well for H_2 dissociation on bare Ru(0001).⁵⁴ Another possible cause for the discrepancy between theory and experiments concerns the coverage of Ru(0001) by CO in the experiment. To obtain the 1/3 ML CO-covered Ru(0001) system, which should correspond to the simple $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ system studied here,^{15,19,21,22} the experiments worked with a system exhibiting half the measured saturation coverage.⁸ The assumption has been that this should correspond to the 1/3 ML covered surface, because the saturation coverage is experimentally known to be 2/3 ML.³⁵ If the saturation coverage achieved by Ueta *et al.* however was somehow less than 2/3 ML, this could explain the observed discrepancy with experiment at least in part. Specifically, on average the coverage should then be less than 1/3 ML in the molecular beam experiment, and that should make the measured reactivity higher than the one calculated here. This could be aggravated by inhomogeneity effects, as this could give rise to the formation of islands²¹ with the 1/3 ML $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ coverage considered here and areas with a much lower coverage, which should exhibit a much greater reactivity. It would therefore be useful if the experiments could be repeated with the accompanying use of low-energy electron diffraction (LEED) to ascertain the surface coverage pattern used in the experiments indeed corresponds to the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ pattern considered here, to rule out this source of error.

The remainder of this section will focus on the effects motion of the surface has on the reaction probability. Possible reasons for why the reaction probability of D_2 on a thermal slab might be slightly smaller than the reaction probability of D_2 on a frozen ideal slab, as found with the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell, are that the CO molecules and the Ru(0001) surface act as an energy sink, causing the D_2 to lose energy it could otherwise have used to overcome the barrier to dissociation, and that slightly less of the surface might be available because the CO molecule is, on average, slightly tilted in the dynamics. From the present results, it is not clear how important these effects are.

With respect to the difference between the smaller and larger simulation cell, it is not immediately apparent what could be the cause. Possible causes could be extra dynamical effects due to the presence of multiple independent CO molecules, such as extra possibilities for energy exchange, but also small differences in DFT parameters (a smaller k -grid was used for the 3×3 calculations) might play a role. These two effects are discussed below. As is shown below, the larger reactivity obtained with the 3×3 cell is probably due to the D_2 exchanging energy with three independent CO molecules, which allows the nearby CO molecules to move apart, so that the reactive Ru(0001) surface becomes exposed.

Convergence tests have been carried out on the k -point grid used for the DFT calculations. From these convergence tests, it is clear that the $\text{H}_2/\text{CO}+\text{Ru}(0001)$ interaction is described accurately, the largest observed difference between the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell and the 3×3 cell being about 34 meV. Although this number is not small on the scale of the differences (the relative displacement on the energy scale of the two $T_s = 180$ K reaction probability curves is estimated to be in the range of 50–100 meV, it cannot explain the whole difference. Also, the maximum observed energy difference was in the opposite direction to that which would be expected to explain the difference in reactivity (the potential near the surface was higher for the 3×3 cell rather than lower, which decreases reactivity instead of increasing it). It therefore seems unlikely that small differences in the DFT parameters can explain the observed differences for the two simulation cells.

In table III the average initial translational energy of the molecules that go on to react is shown for all AIMD calculations, together with the reaction probability for each calculation. It is clear that for the different simulation cell models the average initial translational energy of the dissociating molecules is the same, at least insofar as the error due to sampling is concerned. This suggests that the ‘effective’ barriers to dissociation are the same for all

Energy	Cell model	$\langle E_{\text{trans}} \rangle_r$ (eV)	P_r
0.363 eV	$(\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3})$ 180 K	0.415 ± 0.015	0.034 ± 0.008
	(3×3) 180 K	0.452 ± 0.028	0.042 ± 0.009
0.466 eV	$(\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3})$ ideal	0.607 ± 0.020	0.088 ± 0.013
	$(\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3})$ 180 K	0.585 ± 0.016	0.073 ± 0.008
	(3×3) 180 K	0.576 ± 0.020	0.124 ± 0.015

TABLE III. For all AIMD calculations, the average initial translational energy of the molecules that go on to react, along with the reaction probability for that calculation.

different simulation cell sizes and thus that differences between the models are not due to static effects (*i.e.*, due to the barrier to dissociation being different for different sizes of the simulation cell).

In table I several geometrical properties are given of the surface, with D_2 (the dynamics done to determine the reaction probability) and without D_2 (the dynamics of the slab used to generate initial conditions). In section III A the results without D_2 were discussed. The results with D_2 , and the comparison to the results without D_2 , are discussed here. The numbers in table I correspond to averages from the trajectories beginning with the D_2 molecule in the gas phase, for the case that D_2 is present. As such, these parameters do not straightforwardly correspond to a physically measurable situation, and these parameters are only used to compare to the (in principle measurable) parameters for the case without D_2 . For both the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ and the 3×3 cell, the mean square displacement of the C and O atoms is increased markedly compared to the case without D_2 , and even more so for the 3×3 cell than for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell. This occurs for both the parallel and perpendicular components of the displacements, but mostly for the parallel component. Intriguingly, for the perpendicular component, little or no difference is found between the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ and the 3×3 cells, whereas the parallel component does show a difference. Furthermore, the average tilt angles of the CO with respect to the surface are also increased. This means that the geometry of the CO-covered Ru(0001) surface is altered by the impinging D_2 molecules, and more so for the 3×3 cell than for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell. As energy in D_2 can be exchanged with the surface to alter the geometry of the CO-covered surface, this in turn suggests that more energy is exchanged with the surface for the 3×3 cell than for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell.

Energy	$\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell (eV)	3×3 cell (eV)
0.363 eV	0.080 ± 0.003	0.191 ± 0.005
— direct only	0.077 ± 0.003	0.187 ± 0.005
— indirect only	0.106 ± 0.013	0.225 ± 0.018
0.466 eV	0.105 ± 0.002	0.263 ± 0.007
— direct only	0.104 ± 0.002	0.258 ± 0.008
— indirect only	0.119 ± 0.010	0.278 ± 0.014

TABLE IV. Amount of energy exchanged with the surface in collisions of D_2 with the CO-covered Ru(0001) surface, for cases which result in scattering. Direct trajectories make only a single rebound.

In particular, the O atom moves most, with the C atom moving less, as also indicated by the increased tilt angles. The other parameters, *i.e.*, the interlayer spacing, the protrusion of the topmost Ru atom, the Ru–C and C–O bond lengths are all not much influenced by the impinging D_2 molecule. These results therefore indicate that energy can be exchanged between D_2 and the CO molecules, and not so much with the Ru(0001) surface.

In table IV the amount of energy exchange of the molecule with the surface is shown for scattered trajectories, which is defined as the total energy lost to the surface by the D_2 molecule at $t = t_{\text{final}}$ compared to $t = 0$. The results have also been split into direct (single rebound) and indirect (multiple rebounds) scattering. It is clear that the amount of energy exchanged in the larger simulation cell is significantly larger than that for the smaller simulation cell, by about a factor 2.5 for the higher incidence energy and slightly less for the lower incidence energy. The number of atoms has increased by a factor 3 on going from the smaller to the larger cell, which suggests that, for the atoms with which energy is exchanged, also energy is exchanged with molecules that would correspond to mirror images in the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell, but are independent in the 3×3 cell. For indirect scattering, slightly more energy is exchanged than is the case for direct scattering.

Intriguingly, a considerable amount of energy is transferred to the surface for both simulation cell sizes. It is rather remarkable that in the case of the 3×3 cell the amount of energy that is exchanged is over half the amount of initial translational energy, in particular if this is compared to the amount for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell. A likely explanation for this discrepancy

FIG. 6. Time evolution of the kinetic energy of the ruthenium slab, the CO molecules and H_2 molecule, averaged over all trajectories with $t_{\text{final}} > 300$ fs, for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ and 3×3 cells. The energies for the CO and Ru atoms have been normalized to the amount present in the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell.

seems to be that the D_2 molecule deposits energy into the CO molecule(s). It is interesting to see that in spite of the large energy transfer to the CO molecule(s) the reaction probability of the ideal and the $T_s = 180$ K surface do not differ much. This suggests that the energy transfer is at least partly compensated by new reaction pathways becoming available.

To better understand to what part of the surface the energy is lost, in figure 6 the time evolution of the kinetic energy of the ruthenium slab, the CO molecules and the H_2 molecule, averaged over all trajectories with $t_{\text{final}} > 300$ fs, is shown. The kinetic energies of the CO molecules and Ru atoms for the 3×3 cell have been divided by three to account for the increase in the number of atoms in the 3×3 cell compared to the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell. It is clear that the amount of kinetic energy that is transferred to the Ru atoms is rather small, while the amount of kinetic energy that is transferred to the CO molecules is larger. No large differences are observed between the smaller and larger cell. These results therefore show that energy is indeed exchanged with the, in the 3×3 cell, independent images, and, in particular, with the CO molecules.

Further information about the differences between the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ and 3×3 cell can be found by binning the energy that is exchanged with the surface with respect to the impact site of the molecule. The results of such an analysis are given in table V and the bins that have been used are indicated in figure 2(b). For all sites that are considered, except the

Energy	Site	$\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell (eV)	3×3 cell (eV)
0.363 eV	top _{ads}	0.102 ± 0.008	0.104 ± 0.009
	top	0.056 ± 0.007	0.203 ± 0.013
	bridge _{ads}	0.100 ± 0.005	0.173 ± 0.009
	bridge	0.057 ± 0.004	0.255 ± 0.013
	hcp/fcc	0.080 ± 0.005	0.215 ± 0.010
0.466 eV	top _{ads}	0.167 ± 0.009	0.178 ± 0.012
	top	0.066 ± 0.005	0.269 ± 0.017
	bridge _{ads}	0.111 ± 0.003	0.222 ± 0.011
	bridge	0.095 ± 0.007	0.329 ± 0.014
	hcp/fcc	0.099 ± 0.004	0.295 ± 0.013

TABLE V. Amount of energy exchanged with the surface in collisions of D₂ with the CO-covered Ru(0001) surface, binned with respect to the impact site.

top_{ads} site, and both incidence energies, the amount of energy exchange is larger for the 3×3 cell than for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell. For the top_{ads} site however, the amount of energy exchange is, to within the statistical errors indicated, the same for both simulation cells. As the top_{ads} site corresponds to the D₂ molecule colliding directly on top of the CO molecule, this difference is not surprising, because the next CO molecule is $\sqrt{3}$ times the Ru–Ru distance away, which for the present case is 4.77 Å. The molecule thus exchanges energy with only a single CO molecule, and predominantly energy in motion in the z direction, as it is a head-on collision and the molecule initially only has momentum in z . For all other sites, the interpretation is that the molecule will go in between the CO molecules, which means that the D₂ molecule may be able to exchange energy with up to three nearest CO molecules. In this case, energy exchange will mostly involve motion in the u and v directions, as the D₂ molecule collides with the CO molecule(s) more from the side. As in the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell only a single CO molecule is present the D₂ molecule pushes against its mirror images in such a way that the forces parallel to the surface partially cancel each other. As in the 3×3 cell three independent CO molecules are present for similarly small D₂–CO distances projected on the surface (see figure 2(a)), such a cancellation of forces does not occur and energy can be exchanged with all of the three independent CO molecules without forces between CO

Energy	Δ_C ($\text{\AA}^2$)		Δ_O ($\text{\AA}^2$)	
	$t = 0$	$t = t_{\text{final}}$	$t = 0$	$t = t_{\text{final}}$
0.363 eV	9.92 ± 0.03	11.29 ± 0.08	10.04 ± 0.05	12.32 ± 0.13
— scattering	9.91 ± 0.03	11.26 ± 0.08	10.03 ± 0.05	12.29 ± 0.14
— dissociation	9.97 ± 0.13	11.92 ± 0.18	10.22 ± 0.27	12.75 ± 0.30
0.466 eV	9.85 ± 0.03	11.56 ± 0.08	9.94 ± 0.05	12.67 ± 0.14
— scattering	9.83 ± 0.03	11.45 ± 0.09	9.90 ± 0.05	12.61 ± 0.16
— dissociation	10.03 ± 0.09	12.26 ± 0.17	10.21 ± 0.15	13.05 ± 0.30
ideal	9.85	—	9.85	—

TABLE VI. Size of the surface triangle (see figure 2(a)) in which the D_2 is initially located for D_2 scattering or dissociation on the CO-covered Ru(0001) surface. t_{final} is taken to be the first time step for which the analysis conditions are met.

and D_2 being partly cancelled through the imposed periodicity, explaining the larger energy exchange.

If energy is exchanged between the D_2 and CO in the u and v directions, the CO will move along the surface, but in case of the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell the entire layer moves, as only a single independent CO molecule is present. In case of the 3×3 cell however, the three independent CO molecules may move apart. This can be analysed by tracking the size of the 2D triangles that are spanned by the CO molecules (six for the 3×3 cell, see also figure 2(a)). In table VI the size of the surface triangle in which the D_2 is initially located ($t = 0$) is shown for the first and final time step of both reactive and non-reactive trajectories, with the corners of the triangle attached to either the C or the O atoms. For both non-reactive and reactive trajectories, and for both the C and O triangles, the size of the surface triangle in which the D_2 is initially located grows during the dynamics, from a value essentially equal to that of an ideal triangle size to a value which is in the range of about 15% to 30% larger, *i.e.*, the CO layer locally ‘opens’ due to the impinging D_2 molecule pushing the CO molecules aside. The O triangles are larger than the C triangles, suggesting that the molecules, apart from being pushed away, are also tilted away to make room for D_2 . As the initial triangle size is slightly larger for dissociative trajectories than for scattered trajectories, an additional effect appears to be that in the 3×3 CO-covered surface the D_2 molecule can find spots where

the CO molecules have already moved apart a bit, which opens the surface to reaction. It should, however, be stressed that such an effect is small and not fully established at present due to the limited statistics of the dynamics calculations. The main established mechanism therefore is the CO layer opening effect due to the impinging D₂ molecule pushing the CO molecules away.

The difference between the reaction probability of the 3×3 and the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cells can thus be explained mainly from the amount of energy exchanged between the D₂ molecule and the surface, and in particular energy transferred to motion of CO molecules parallel to the surface. Significantly more energy is exchanged between the molecule and the CO overlayer for the 3×3 cell than for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell. As a result of this, the CO molecules can move away from one another in the 3×3 cell. Only in the 3×3 cell (three) independent CO molecules are present. These independent CO molecules can move apart, leaving more space, and therefore more favourable pathways to reaction, for the molecule.

An interesting open question is whether or not further increasing the size of the simulation cell could result in further changes in the reaction probability. As the spacing between different CO molecules is rather large (the diagonal of the HCP(0001) unit cell which, for this system, is 4.77 Å), it seems likely that the D₂ molecule cannot influence the motion of the next nearest neighbour CO molecule, meaning CO molecules further away than the three making up the triangle in which it lands (see figure 2). It is therefore not expected that increasing the size of the simulation cell further will dramatically change the reaction probability.

Even though the PBE-vdW-DF2 functional used here describes the reaction of H₂ and D₂ on bare Ru(0001) rather well,⁵⁴ it severely underestimates the reactivity of D₂ on CO-covered Ru(0001). The PBE-vdW-DF2 functional may be described as a candidate SRP XC functional for H₂/Ru(0001) (it described the dissociation of H₂ and D₂ quite well, but its validity for other (diffraction) experiments was not established⁵⁴). The present study suggests that a XC functional that gives a good description of H₂ reacting on a bare metal surface may not necessarily work for the same metal, but with the surface poisoned by CO. Additional studies on other H₂-metal surface and H₂-CO pre-covered metal surface systems are needed to establish whether this finding is general to these systems and what causes the problem noted.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The dissociation of D_2 on $1/3$ ML CO-covered Ru(0001) has been studied with quasi-classical AIMD calculations using the PBE-vdW-DF2 functional. The PBE-vdW-DF2 functional gives a reasonable description of the structure of the CO-covered surface, both when compared to experimental data and when compared to previous theoretical studies. The molecule-surface interaction of D_2 with the CO-covered Ru(0001) surface is mostly in agreement with a previous study⁹ where the RPBE functional was used, but some qualitative as well as quantitative differences are found.

The reaction probabilities computed with the AIMD method are not in agreement with experimental data, as the computed reaction probabilities are too low. The reaction probabilities are however in reasonable agreement with the previous RPBE results using a frozen ideal surface model, although the values reported here are still slightly lower. The discrepancy with experimental data is assigned to the functional which is used here not working well enough for this system, in spite of the fact that it works well for H_2 dissociation on bare Ru(0001). For the higher investigated incidence energy ($E_{\text{trans}} = 0.466$ eV), the reaction probability for the 3×3 cell is somewhat higher (by about 0.05) than for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell.

The reaction probability for D_2 on a $T_s = 180$ K slab is overall similar to the reaction probability for D_2 on an ideal slab. This arises due to a balance between opposing factors. The D_2 molecule loses a rather large amount of energy to the surface. In this way the impinging D_2 molecules can push aside the CO molecule(s). Although the resulting energy loss leads to a decrease in reaction, as this energy cannot be used to overcome the barrier to reaction, the displacement of CO molecules leads to new reactive pathways opening up. The CO molecules in a $T_s = 180$ K slab are additionally slightly tilted, whereas they are upright in the ideal slab, which may lead to a decrease of reactivity, although the size of this effect is not clear from the present results.

The difference between the reaction probabilities obtained for the higher incidence energy for the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ and the 3×3 cells can be explained by the number of independently moving CO molecules present in the cell. For the 3×3 cell, the D_2 molecule can exchange energy with up to three independent CO molecules, allowing the CO layer of the surface to open up locally. For the $\sqrt{3} \times \sqrt{3}$ cell only a single independent CO molecule is present, which leads to some of the forces working on the C and O atoms to be cancelled out due to the

D₂ molecule pushing different mirror images of these atoms in opposing directions. As a result, the D₂ molecule exchanges less energy with the surface and cannot displace the CO molecules far enough for dissociation to become more effective.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank I. M. N. Groot for useful discussions related to their DFT calculations. This work was supported financially by the division Chemische Wetenschappen of the Nederlandse organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk onderzoek (NWO-CW) and by the European Research Council through an ERC-2013 advanced grant (no. 338580), and with computer time granted by the Physical Sciences division of NWO (NWO-EW).

REFERENCES

- ¹G. J. Kroes and C. Díaz, *Chemical Society Reviews*, 2016, DOI: 10.1039/C5CS00336A.
- ²A. Groß and A. Dianat, *Physical Review Letters*, 2007, **98**, 206107.
- ³A. Lozano, A. Groß and H. F. Busnengo, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2009, **11**, 5814–5822.
- ⁴A. Groß, *ChemPhysChem*, 2010, **11**, 1374–1381.
- ⁵A. Lozano, A. Groß and H. F. Busnengo, *Physical Review B*, 2010, **81**, 121402.
- ⁶A. Groß, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2011, **135**, 174707.
- ⁷A. Groß, *Surface Science*, 2013, **608**, 249–254.
- ⁸H. Ueta, I. M. N. Groot, M. A. Gleeson, S. Stolte, G. C. McBane, L. B. F. Juurlink and A. W. Kleyn, *ChemPhysChem*, 2008, **9**, 2372–2378.
- ⁹I. M. N. Groot, J. C. Juanes-Marcos, R. A. Olsen and G. J. Kroes, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2010, **132**, 144704.
- ¹⁰I. M. N. Groot, J. C. Juanes-Marcos, C. Díaz, M. F. Somers, R. A. Olsen and G. J. Kroes, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2010, **12**, 1331–1340.
- ¹¹B. Baule, *Annalen der Physik*, 1914, **349**, 145–176.
- ¹²A. Groß, *Theoretical Surface Science*, Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- ¹³P. Zhao, Y. He, D. B. Cao, X. Wen, H. Xiang, Y. W. Li, J. Wang and H. Jiao, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2015, **17**, 19446–19456.

- ¹⁴J. C. Fuggle, T. E. Madey, M. Steinkilberg and D. Menzel, *Surface Science*, 1975, **52**, 521–541.
- ¹⁵G. Michalk, W. Moritz, H. Pfnür and D. Menzel, *Surface Science*, 1983, **129**, 92–106.
- ¹⁶M. Gierer, H. Bludau, H. Over and G. Ertl, *Surface Science*, 1996, **346**, 64–72.
- ¹⁷J. C. Fuggle, M. Steinkilberg and D. Menzel, *Chemical Physics*, 1975, **11**, 307–317.
- ¹⁸T. E. Madey, *Surface Science*, 1979, **79**, 575–588.
- ¹⁹E. D. Williams and W. H. Weinberg, *Surface Science*, 1979, **82**, 93–101.
- ²⁰H. Pfnür, D. Menzel, F. M. Hoffmann, A. Ortega and A. M. Bradshaw, *Surface Science*, 1980, **93**, 431–452.
- ²¹H. Pfnür and D. Menzel, *Surface Science*, 1984, **148**, 411–438.
- ²²H. Pfnür and H. J. Heier, *Berichte der Bunsengesellschaft für physikalische Chemie*, 1986, **90**, 272–277.
- ²³H. Pfnür and D. Menzel, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 1983, **79**, 2400–2410.
- ²⁴H. Pfnür, P. Feulner, H. A. Engelhardt and D. Menzel, *Chemical Physics Letters*, 1978, **59**, 481–486.
- ²⁵H. Pfnür, P. Feulner and D. Menzel, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 1983, **79**, 4613–4623.
- ²⁶J. Braun, K. L. Kostov, G. Witte and C. Woll, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 1997, **106**, 8262–8273.
- ²⁷H. Over, W. Moritz and G. Ertl, *Physical Review Letters*, 1993, **70**, 315–318.
- ²⁸H. Over, M. Gierer, H. Bludau and G. Ertl, *Physical Review B*, 1995, **52**, 16812–16829.
- ²⁹M. Bonn, S. Funk, C. Hess, D. N. Denzler, C. Stampfl, M. Scheffler, M. Wolf and G. Ertl, *Science*, 1999, **285**, 1042–1045.
- ³⁰L. Diekhöner, H. Mortensen, A. Baurichter and A. C. Luntz, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2001, **115**, 3356–3373.
- ³¹J. Gladh, T. Hansson and H. Öström, *Surface Science*, 2013, **615**, 65–71.
- ³²C. Hess, S. Funk, M. Bonn, D. N. Denzler, M. Wolf and G. Ertl, *Applied Physics A*, 2000, **71**, 477–483.
- ³³P. Jakob, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 1998, **108**, 5035–5043.
- ³⁴K. L. Kostov, H. Rauscher and D. Menzel, *Surface Science*, 1992, **278**, 62–86.
- ³⁵D. E. Starr and H. Bluhm, *Surface Science*, 2013, **608**, 241–248.
- ³⁶S. Wagner, H. Öström, A. Kaebe, M. Krenz, M. Wolf, A. C. Luntz and C. Frischkorn, *New Journal of Physics*, 2008, **10**, 125031.

- ³⁷S. Wurm, P. Feulner and D. Menzel, *Physical Review Letters*, 1995, **74**, 2591–2594.
- ³⁸H. Öström, H. Öberg, H. Xin, J. LaRue, M. Beye, M. Dell’Angela, J. Gladh, M. L. Ng, J. A. Sellberg, S. Kaya, G. Mercurio, D. Nordlund, M. Hantschmann, F. Hieke, D. Kühn, W. F. Schlotter, G. L. Dakovski, J. J. Turner, M. P. Minitti, A. Mitra, S. P. Moeller, A. Föhlisch, M. Wolf, W. Wurth, M. Persson, J. K. Nørskov, F. Abild-Pedersen, H. Ogasawara, L. G. M. Pettersson and A. Nilsson, *Science*, 2015, **347**, 978–982.
- ³⁹M. Dell’Angela, T. Anniyev, M. Beye, R. Coffee, A. Föhlisch, J. Gladh, T. Katayama, S. Kaya, O. Krupin, J. LaRue, A. Møgelhøj, D. Nordlund, J. K. Nørskov, H. Öberg, H. Ogasawara, H. Öström, L. G. M. Pettersson, W. F. Schlotter, J. A. Sellberg, F. Sorgenfrei, J. J. Turner, M. Wolf, W. Wurth and A. Nilsson, *Science*, 2013, **339**, 1302–1305.
- ⁴⁰I. M. Ciobica and R. A. van Santen, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 2003, **107**, 3808–3812.
- ⁴¹I. M. Ciobica, A. W. Kleyn and R. A. van Santen, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 2003, **107**, 164–172.
- ⁴²M. Gajdos, A. Eichler and J. Hafner, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter*, 2004, **16**, 1141–1164.
- ⁴³J. J. Mortensen, Y. Morikawa, B. Hammer and J. K. Nørskov, *Zeitschrift für Physikalische Chemie*, 1997, **198**, 113–122.
- ⁴⁴C. Stampfl and M. Scheffler, *Physical Review B*, 2002, **65**, 155417.
- ⁴⁵J. S. McEwen and A. Eichler, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2007, **126**, 094701.
- ⁴⁶A. Stroppa and G. Kresse, *New Journal of Physics*, 2008, **10**, 063020.
- ⁴⁷B. Hammer, Y. Morikawa and J. K. Nørskov, *Physical Review Letters*, 1996, **76**, 2141–2144.
- ⁴⁸F. Abild-Pedersen and M. P. Andersson, *Surface Science*, 2007, **601**, 1747–1753.
- ⁴⁹J. Sun, M. Marsman, A. Ruzsinszky, G. Kresse and J. P. Perdew, *Physical Review B*, 2011, **83**, 121410(R).
- ⁵⁰C. Corriol, G. R. Darling, S. Holloway, I. Andrianov, T. Klamroth and P. Saalfrank, *Surface Science*, 2003, **528**, 27–34.
- ⁵¹C. Corriol, G. R. Darling, S. Holloway, W. Brenig, I. Andrianov, T. Klamroth and P. Saalfrank, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2002, **117**, 4489–4498.
- ⁵²G. Fuchs, J. C. Tremblay and P. Saalfrank, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2014, **141**, 094704.
- ⁵³I. M. N. Groot, H. Ueta, M. J. T. C. van der Niet, A. W. Kleyn and L. B. F. Juurlink,

- Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2007, **127**, 244701.
- ⁵⁴M. Wijzenbroek and G. J. Kroes, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 2014, **140**, 084702.
- ⁵⁵P. Nieto, D. Farías, R. Miranda, M. Luppi, E. J. Baerends, M. F. Somers, M. J. T. C. van der Niet, R. A. Olsen and G. J. Kroes, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2011, **13**, 8583–8597.
- ⁵⁶J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D. J. Singh and C. Fiolhais, *Physical Review B*, 1992, **46**, 6671–6687.
- ⁵⁷J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Physical Review Letters*, 1996, **77**, 3865–3868.
- ⁵⁸B. Hammer, L. B. Hansen and J. K. Nørskov, *Physical Review B*, 1999, **59**, 7413–7421.
- ⁵⁹C. Díaz, E. Pijper, R. A. Olsen, H. F. Busnengo, D. J. Auerbach and G. J. Kroes, *Science*, 2009, **326**, 832–834.
- ⁶⁰M. Dion, H. Rydberg, E. Schröder, D. C. Langreth and B. I. Lundqvist, *Physical Review Letters*, 2004, **92**, 246401.
- ⁶¹K. Lee, E. D. Murray, L. Kong, B. I. Lundqvist and D. C. Langreth, *Physical Review B*, 2010, **82**, 081101.
- ⁶²P. J. Feibelman, B. Hammer, J. K. Nørskov, F. Wagner, M. Scheffler, R. Stumpf, R. Watwe and J. Dumesic, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 2001, **105**, 4018–4025.
- ⁶³A. Stroppa, K. Termentzidis, J. Paier, G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Physical Review B*, 2007, **76**, 195440.
- ⁶⁴L. Schimka, J. Harl, A. Stroppa, A. Grüneis, M. Marsman, F. Mittendorfer and G. Kresse, *Nature Materials*, 2010, **9**, 741–744.
- ⁶⁵P. Lazić, M. Alaei, N. Atodiresei, V. Caciuc, R. Brako and S. Blügel, *Physical Review B*, 2010, **81**, 045401.
- ⁶⁶G. J. Kroes, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2012, **14**, 14966–14981.
- ⁶⁷M. Born and R. Oppenheimer, *Annalen der Physik*, 1927, **389**, 457–484.
- ⁶⁸W. Kohn and L. J. Sham, *Physical Review*, 1965, **140**, A1133–A1138.
- ⁶⁹P. Hohenberg and W. Kohn, *Physical Review*, 1964, **136**, B864–B871.
- ⁷⁰C. C. Marston and G. G. Balint-Kurti, *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 1989, **91**, 3571–3576.
- ⁷¹J. W. Arblaster, *Platinum Metals Review*, 2013, **56**, 181–189.
- ⁷²G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Physical Review B*, 1993, **47**, 558–561.
- ⁷³G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Computational Materials Science*, 1996, **6**, 15–50.
- ⁷⁴G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Physical Review B*, 1996, **54**, 11169–11186.

- ⁷⁵G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Physical Review B*, 1999, **59**, 1758–1775.
- ⁷⁶P. E. Blöchl, *Physical Review B*, 1994, **50**, 17953–17979.
- ⁷⁷G. Román-Pérez and J. M. Soler, *Physical Review Letters*, 2009, **103**, 096102.
- ⁷⁸M. Methfessel and A. T. Paxton, *Physical Review B*, 1989, **40**, 3616–3621.
- ⁷⁹H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, *Physical Review B*, 1976, **13**, 5188–5192.
- ⁸⁰A. P. Baddorf, V. Jahns, D. M. Zehner, H. Zajonz and D. Gibbs, *Surface Science*, 2002, **498**, 74–82.