Integrating Coordination Structure and Adsorption Energetics in Electrocatalytic Active-Site Design: Design Trade-offs and Operational Evidence

Abstract

A central challenge in electrocatalytic active-site design is to compare studies whose mechanisms and validation settings do not share a single denominator. The present review uses chalcogenide-anion regulation of Ni2Mo6Te8 stability and nitrate-to-ammonia selectivity and cooperative atomically dispersed Fe-N4 and Sn-Nx coordination sites for oxygen reduction as focal cases for a boundary-aware synthesis. Two target papers are triangulated against 12 locally validated publications. The comparison follows coordination structure, adsorption energetics, selectivity, operando evidence, durability and deliberately separates mechanistic interpretation from performance ranking, because the latter can conceal incompatible experimental or operational conditions. Across the evidence base, the decisive issue is alignment: coordination structure shapes what is observed, adsorption energetics shapes how it is compared, and durability governs whether the conclusion can be transferred. Uncertainty is most informative when reported as part of the result rather than treated as a postscript. The contribution is a decision-oriented synthesis that connects method selection to failure cost and treats reproducibility, provenance, and bounded generalization as first-order design requirements.

Keywords

Electrocatalytic Active-Site Design; Coordination Structure; Adsorption Energetics; Selectivity; Operando Evidence; Durability

1. Introduction

Contemporary investigation of electrocatalytic active-site design connects scientific ambition and practical constraint. Progress requires not only stronger nominal performance but also explanations of the conditions and mechanisms behind success. That challenge is especially visible in comparing chalcogenide-anion regulation of Ni2Mo6Te8 stability and nitrate-to-ammonia selectivity with cooperative atomically dispersed Fe-N4 and Sn-Nx coordination sites for oxygen reduction through design trade-offs and operational evidence. A mechanism demonstrated for one specimen class, benchmark, patient group, region, or workload may be fragile outside its original boundary. For this reason, analysis must preserve the unit of analysis and the decision context. It should further distinguish a mechanism from a correlation, a benchmark advantage from a deployment advantage, and an interpretable diagnostic from a causal explanation.

Comparison proceeds across five linked dimensions: coordination structure, adsorption energetics, selectivity, operando evidence, durability. Their combination matters because they jointly cover the intervention, its evaluation, and the boundary conditions for reuse. The review is anchored in structure-property relationships. Under that principle, methodological novelty is necessary but insufficient; the comparison also asks whether baselines are aligned, whether uncertainty is visible, and whether resource or safety constraints are represented. The analysis is literature based and reports neither a new empirical study nor invented measurements or metrics.

2. Mechanistic Foundations

The analytical chain starts from the input evidence, the transformation applied to it, the output used for evaluation, and the decision that follows. In electrocatalytic active-site design, these elements are commonly tuned in isolation even though errors propagate across them. Bias in measurement can be carried forward and enlarged by the analytical method; an apparently accurate output can still be poorly calibrated for the final decision. A direct requirement is that, mechanistic evidence should accompany aggregate performance. An auditable study identifies the fixed conditions and experimental degrees of freedom, then selects metrics that correspond to the intended use rather than to convenience alone.

Boundary awareness provides the next principle. Coordination structure defines the local design problem, while durability determines whether the design can survive outside that boundary. Intermediate lenses such as adsorption energetics and selectivity connect those ends by exposing trade-offs that a single score conceals. Unexpected outcomes and sensitivity evidence maps the conditions under which the explanation remains viable. For applied work, documentation of manufacturing tolerance is therefore part of the scientific result, not an administrative afterthought.

3. Comparative Evidence

The target study X7-02, Critical Roles of Chalcogenide Anion on Strengthening Stability of Ni2Mo6Te8 for Almost Exclusive Electrocatalysts Nitrate to Ammonia Conversion [1], addresses a concrete part of electrocatalytic active-site design through chalcogenide-anion regulation of Ni2Mo6Te8 stability and nitrate-to-ammonia selectivity. It identifies a representation, mechanism, or evaluation boundary needed to compare claims. Against the focus on comparing chalcogenide-anion regulation of Ni2Mo6Te8 stability and nitrate-to-ammonia selectivity with cooperative atomically dispersed Fe-N4 and Sn-Nx coordination sites for oxygen reduction through design trade-offs and operational evidence, the paper serves as a design case with explicit limits: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis holds the paper to its own boundary and examines its premises elsewhere.

The target study X7-01, Cooperative Atomically Dispersed Fe–N4 and Sn–Nx Moieties for Durable and More Active Oxygen Electroreduction in Fuel Cells [2], addresses a concrete part of electrocatalytic active-site design through cooperative atomically dispersed Fe-N4 and Sn-Nx coordination sites for oxygen reduction. It identifies a representation, mechanism, or evaluation boundary needed to compare claims. Against the focus on comparing chalcogenide-anion regulation of Ni2Mo6Te8 stability and nitrate-to-ammonia selectivity with cooperative atomically dispersed Fe-N4 and Sn-Nx coordination sites for oxygen reduction through design trade-offs and operational evidence, the paper serves as a design case with explicit limits: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis holds the paper to its own boundary and examines its premises elsewhere.

Across the focal studies, coordination structure should be interpreted jointly with adsorption energetics. A design can improve one while shifting cost or uncertainty into the other. A structured comparison takes the form of a matrix whose rows are operating conditions and whose columns are evidence quality, computation or process cost, robustness, and consequence of failure. This organization helps prevent an attractive mechanism from being detached from the circumstances that support it. The matrix helps determine which ablations are informative: an ablation should challenge a mechanistic claim, not simply produce a score.

Selectivity joins methodological claims to their use. The evaluation protocol needs to disaggregate routine and adverse conditions while making variability visible, and test plausible alternative

explanations. Where operando characterization is central, calibration or sensitivity is as important as ranking. Where costs or hazards are asymmetric, utility-weighted assessment is more revealing than undifferentiated accuracy. These choices do not make studies identical; they make the reasons for their differences auditable.

4. Material and Interface Design

A complementary strand is visible in Boosting the selectivity and efficiency of nitrate reduction to ammonia with a single-atom Cu electrocat... [3]; Single-Atom Catalysts for Electrochemical Nitrate Reduction to Ammonia: Rational Design, Mechanistic Ins... [4]; Rational electrocatalyst design for selective nitrate reduction to ammonia [5]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of electrocatalytic active-site design. Together they illuminate coordination structure: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

For triangulation, the literature includes Transition metal single-atom electrocatalytic reduction catalyst for nitrate to ammonia [6]; Rational design of iron single-atom catalysts for electrochemical nitrate reduction to produce ammonia [7]; Theoretical Calculations on Hexagonal-Boron-Nitride-(h-BN)-Supported Single-Atom Cu for the Reduction of... [8]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of electrocatalytic active-site design. Together they illuminate adsorption energetics: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

The design space is broadened by (Invited) Fundamentals of Single Atom Alloy Catalysts for Electrochemical Nitrate Reduction to Ammonia [9]; Single-atom Fe-N-G as an efficient electrocatalyst for oxygen reduction reaction [10]; Single-atom catalysts for electrocatalytic nitrate reduction into ammonia [11]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of electrocatalytic active-site design. Together they illuminate selectivity: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

A first comparison set connects Electrocatalytic Reduction of Nitrate to Ammonia via a Au/Cu Single Atom Alloy Catalyst [12]; Different Bonding Defects on Dual-Metal Single-Atom Electrocatalyst CoZnN 6 (OH) for Oxygen Reduction Re... [13]; Revealing the pH-dependent mechanism of nitrate electrochemical reduction to ammonia on single-atom cata... [14]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of electrocatalytic active-site design. Together they illuminate operando evidence: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

5. Engineering Implications

For practice, five ordered decisions are useful. First, define the decision and its failure cost. Second, specify the evidence and operating envelope. Third, choose a method whose inductive assumptions match that evidence. Fourth, test operando evidence and durability under controlled perturbations. Finally, retain provenance so that an unexpected outcome can be traced to data, configuration, material batch, environmental condition, or user interaction. The workflow connects comparing chalcogenide-anion regulation of Ni2Mo6Te8 stability and nitrate-to-ammonia selectivity with cooperative atomically dispersed Fe-N4 and Sn-Nx coordination sites for oxygen reduction through design trade-offs and operational evidence connected to observable requirements.

At a wider level, responsible progress in electrocatalytic active-site design is determined by coupling as well as local design. Interfaces determine how uncertainty moves between measurement and inference, between algorithm and operator, or between microscopic design and system behavior. A shared protocol should state acceptance conditions and what would overturn a claim. When those agreements are explicit, efficiency can be improved without concealing losses in validity, safety, or interpretability.

6. Limitations and Future Directions

The analysis cannot eliminate uneven language, experimental structure, and reporting resolution. Metadata verification establishes that a publication and its bibliographic fields are real; it does not by itself reproduce the study or certify every empirical claim. Versioning is another source of uncertainty. Focal strings verified through Scholar were kept verbatim; uncertain fields were flagged in a parallel record.

Future work should preregister comparison protocols where feasible, make configurations computable and evaluate one meaningful change in context in manufacturing tolerance. Research should also organize error cases around mechanisms instead of counts alone. For electrocatalytic active-site design, a valuable shared benchmark would combine standard-condition utility, efficiency, confidence quality, and fault recovery. Such a benchmark would reward designs that remain useful when evidence is incomplete or conditions change.

7. Conclusion

The source base for electrocatalytic active-site design becomes clearer when treated as a linked evidence chain rather than a collection of isolated scores. The focal studies show how comparing chalcogenide-anion regulation of Ni2Mo6Te8 stability and nitrate-to-ammonia selectivity with cooperative atomically dispersed Fe-N4 and Sn-Nx coordination sites for oxygen reduction through design trade-offs and operational evidence; the additional literature reveals the assumptions required to interpret those contributions. Across coordination structure, adsorption energetics, selectivity, operando evidence, and durability, alignment is the most durable principle: the representation or mechanism must match the problem, assessment must correspond to the decision and deployment claims to the evaluated envelope. When these elements align, results are more reproducible and failures more revealing.

References

1. Xia, F., Li, B., Liu, Y., Tan, H., An, B., Gao, S., Marks, T. J., & Cheng, Y. (2024). Critical Roles of Chalcogenide Anion on Strengthening Stability of Ni2Mo6Te8 for Almost Exclusive Electrocatalysts Nitrate to Ammonia Conversion. Advanced Functional Materials, 34(14), 2312079.

2. Xia, F., Li, B., An, B., Zachman, M. J., Xie, X., Liu, Y., Xu, S., Saha, S., Wu, Q., Gao, S., Abdul Razak, I. B., Brown, D. E., Ramani, V., Wang, R., Marks, T. J., Shao, Y., & Cheng, Y. (2024). Cooperative Atomically

Dispersed Fe–N4 and Sn–Nx Moieties for Durable and More Active Oxygen Electroreduction in Fuel Cells. Journal of the American Chemical Society, 146(49), 33569-33578. https://doi.org/10.1021/jacs.4c11121

3. Zhao, X., Geng, Q., Dong, F., Zhao, K., Chen, S., Yu, H., et al. (2023). Boosting the selectivity and efficiency of nitrate reduction to ammonia with a single-atom Cu electrocatalyst. Chemical Engineering Journal, 466, 143314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2023.143314
4. Yin, S., & Wang, Y. (2025). Single-Atom Catalysts for Electrochemical Nitrate Reduction to Ammonia: Rational Design, Mechanistic Insights, and System Perspectives. Catalysts, 15(11), 1084. https://doi.org/10.3390/catal15111084
5. Niu, Z., & Wang, G. (2025). Rational electrocatalyst design for selective nitrate reduction to ammonia. Chemical Physics Reviews, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0230248
6. Mo, Z., Mu, J., & Liu, B. (2024). Transition metal single-atom electrocatalytic reduction catalyst for nitrate to ammonia. Journal of Electroanalytical Chemistry, 969, 118533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelechem.2024.118533
7. Chen, X., Ji, X., & Kou, J. (2023). Rational design of iron single-atom catalysts for electrochemical nitrate reduction to produce ammonia. Discover Chemical Engineering, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43938-023-00038-1
8. Liu, G., & Hao, C. (2025). Theoretical Calculations on Hexagonal-Boron-Nitride-(h-BN)-Supported Single-Atom Cu for the Reduction of Nitrate to Ammonia. Molecules, 30(24), 4700. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules30244700
9. Rivera, D., Gupta, S., & Muhich, C. L. (2024). (Invited) Fundamentals of Single Atom Alloy Catalysts for Electrochemical Nitrate Reduction to Ammonia. ECS Meeting Abstracts, MA2024-01(39), 2316-2316. https://doi.org/10.1149/ma2024-01392316mtgabs
10. Yang, D., Li, Y., & Han, G. (2021). Single-atom Fe-N-G as an efficient electrocatalyst for oxygen reduction reaction. Journal of Electroanalytical Chemistry, 892, 115271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelechem.2021.115271
11. Chao, G., Wang, J., Zong, W., Fan, W., Xue, T., Zhang, L., et al. (2024). Single-atom catalysts for electrocatalytic nitrate reduction into ammonia. Nanotechnology, 35(43), 432001. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6528/ad64d9
12. Yin, H., Peng, Y., & Li, J. (2023). Electrocatalytic Reduction of Nitrate to Ammonia via a Au/Cu Single Atom Alloy Catalyst. Environmental Science & Technology, 57(8), 3134-3144. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.2c07968
13. Zhao, M., Gan, G., & Zhang, Q. (2022). Different Bonding Defects on Dual-Metal Single-Atom Electrocatalyst CoZnN 6 (OH) for Oxygen Reduction Reaction. ChemPhysChem, 23(8). https://doi.org/10.1002/cphc.202100902
14. Yan, J., Xu, H., Chang, L., Lin, A., & Cheng, D. (2022). Revealing the pH-dependent mechanism of nitrate electrochemical reduction to ammonia on single-atom catalysts. Nanoscale, 14(41), 15422-15431. https://doi.org/10.1039/d2nr02545k