# Assessing Transfer in Electrocatalytic Active-Site Design: Transparent Baselines and Failure Analysis


## Abstract

Two distinct lines of inquiry—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—converge on a practical question for electrocatalytic active-site design: what evidence is needed before a reported advantage becomes a defensible basis for explanation, comparison, or deployment? The analysis combines two focal publications with 12 previously verified sources and organizes the evidence around coordination structure, adsorption energetics, selectivity, operando evidence, and durability. Rather than pooling incompatible outcomes, it compares research questions, representations, controls, and validation envelopes. The combined literature indicates that methodological gains become actionable only when coordination structure and adsorption energetics are evaluated together and when limits associated with durability are explicit. This shifts the emphasis from isolated scores toward traceable chains of evidence and decision relevance. The article concludes with a research agenda built around transparent comparators, targeted stress tests, and evidence records that can be reused without overstating causal or practical reach.



## Keywords

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


## 1. Introduction

Research on electrocatalytic active-site design links scientific ambition and practical constraint. The scientific task demands not only stronger nominal performance but also explanations of the conditions and mechanisms behind success. The boundary is clearest when considering 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 transparent baselines and failure analysis. Evidence that appears persuasive within a particular material, corpus, cohort, geography, or load profile may fail once its operating context shifts. For this reason, analysis must preserve the unit of analysis and the decision context. Equally important is distinguishing a mechanism from a correlation, a benchmark advantage from a deployment advantage, and an interpretable diagnostic from a causal explanation.

This review uses five analytical lenses: coordination structure, adsorption energetics, selectivity, operando evidence, durability. These dimensions matter because they jointly cover the designed object, its measurement, and the invariants required for transfer. The comparison begins from structure-property relationships. Under that principle, technical creativity remains only one part of credibility; the comparison also checks comparator alignment, uncertainty disclosure, and representation of resource or safety limits. This contribution is a literature synthesis and introduces no new experiment, cohort, measurement campaign, or benchmark score.

## 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, the chain is commonly fragmented even though errors propagate across them. An expressive model can magnify noise or bias already present in its evidence; an apparently accurate output can still be poorly calibrated for the final decision. For that reason, mechanistic evidence should accompany aggregate performance. A useful evaluation makes explicit its controlled factors and permitted variation, then selects metrics that correspond to the intended use rather than to convenience alone.

A second premise concerns transfer boundaries. Coordination structure defines the local design problem, while durability determines whether the design can survive outside that boundary. Bridging the two are adsorption energetics and selectivity connect those ends by exposing trade-offs that a single score conceals. At this point, null findings and sensitivity analysis has diagnostic value because it locates the credible range of an explanation. 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 transparent baselines and failure analysis, the paper serves as a design case with explicit limits: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis retains the boundary while comparing its premises with adjacent studies.

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 transparent baselines and failure analysis, the paper serves as a design case with explicit limits: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis retains the boundary while comparing its premises with adjacent studies.

Across the focal studies, coordination structure should be interpreted jointly with adsorption energetics. A design can improve one yet displace burden or uncertainty to its counterpart. 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. The matrix is designed to prevent an attractive mechanism from being detached from the circumstances that support it. It also clarifies which ablations are informative: a component ablation should probe a declared mechanism instead of adding an isolated metric.

Selectivity links technical design with operational choice. A defensible assessment must distinguish nominal behavior from stress response and show dispersion alongside averages, 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 preserve methodological differences; they make the reasons for their differences auditable.

## 4. Material and Interface Design

The neighboring evidence base brings together 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.

A complementary strand is visible in 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.

For triangulation, the literature includes (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.

The design space is broadened by 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

Implementation can follow a staged workflow. 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 transparent baselines and failure analysis connected to observable requirements.

Across applications, responsible progress in electrocatalytic active-site design depends on interfaces as much as components. Interfaces determine how uncertainty moves between measurement and inference, between algorithm and operator, or between microscopic design and system behavior. Interdisciplinary teams need prior agreement about acceptance thresholds and claim-revision evidence. When those agreements are explicit, efficiency can be improved without concealing losses in validity, safety, or interpretability.

## 6. Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations qualify the synthesis, including differences in vocabulary, protocol, and level of reporting. Bibliographic verification confirms the record, not the reproducibility or universal truth of its findings. Venue and version information may evolve. Accordingly, focal Scholar strings remain intact and anomalous records receive separate comparison notes.

Research can advance by seeking to preregister comparison protocols where feasible, publish machine-readable settings and test transfer under a substantively important shift in manufacturing tolerance. Research should also classify failures by causal mechanism as well as prevalence. For electrocatalytic active-site design, a valuable shared benchmark would combine baseline utility, resource cost, calibration, and post-perturbation recovery. Such a benchmark would reward designs that remain useful when evidence is incomplete or conditions change.

## 7. Conclusion

The evidence concerning 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 transparent baselines and failure analysis; the additional literature reveals the assumptions required to interpret those contributions. Across coordination structure, adsorption energetics, selectivity, operando evidence, and durability, a durable conclusion is the need for alignment: the representation or mechanism must match the problem, assessment must correspond to the decision and deployment claims to the evaluated envelope. Such alignment improves reproducibility, transfer safety, and diagnostic value under failure.

## 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