



Cite this: *Energy Environ. Sci.*,  
2019, 12, 3609

## Correction: Understanding cation effects in electrochemical CO<sub>2</sub> reduction

Stefan Ringe,<sup>†\*ab</sup> Ezra L. Clark,<sup>†cd</sup> Joaquin Resasco,<sup>e</sup> Amber Walton,<sup>c</sup> Brian Seger,<sup>d</sup> Alexis T. Bell<sup>c</sup> and Karen Chan<sup>\*f</sup>

DOI: 10.1039/c9ee90056j

Correction for 'Understanding cation effects in electrochemical CO<sub>2</sub> reduction' by Stefan Ringe et al., *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2019, 12, 3001–3014.

rsc.li/ees

In the original version of the manuscript, the fit function presented in the caption of Fig. 7 for the hydrated ions was wrong. The correct function was  $-2.2x + 7.2$  (change highlighted in bold). Therefore the  $x$ -axis positions of the different cations in Fig. S17 which were obtained from this correlation function were also wrong. The correct Figure is as follows:




Fig. S17 Predicted cation effects for electrocatalytic CO<sub>2</sub> reduction at Ag(111) surfaces. The Figure depicts the predicted CO partial current density for A<sub>x</sub>B electrolytes having a cation : anion charge ratio of z<sub>x</sub> : z<sub>x</sub> as a function of the hydrated cation size relative to that of TBA<sup>+</sup> obtained from the linear fit in Fig. 7.

In addition, Fig. 6a used the wrong cation sizes for the organic cation data points. The updated Figure is given below:

Previous studies electrodeposited a Ag monolayer on Pt or Au and found the PZC to be up to 0.25 V more positive compared to Ag(111).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>a</sup> SUNCAT Center for Interface Science and Catalysis, Department of Chemical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, USA. E-mail: sringe@stanford.edu

<sup>b</sup> SUNCAT Center for Interface Science and Catalysis, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Menlo Park, California, 94025, USA

<sup>c</sup> Joint Center for Artificial Photosynthesis, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>d</sup> Surface Physics & Catalysis (SurfCat), Department of Physics Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

<sup>e</sup> Department of Chemical Engineering, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93117, USA

<sup>f</sup> CatTheory Center, Department of Physics, Technical University of Denmark, Kongens Lyngby 2800, Denmark. E-mail: kchan@fysik.dtu.dk

<sup>†</sup> These authors contributed equally.






Fig. 6 (a) Double layer capacitance at the Au(111) single-crystal electrode using a 0.05 M KHCO<sub>3</sub> or NaHCO<sub>3</sub> electrolyte. (a) Potential-dependence of the double layer capacitance obtained from fitting a RC circuit to the impedance data. Filled circles denote the data points, the solid gray line the difference in surface charge density between both experiments under the assumption of the same PZC of 0.97 V vs. RHE.<sup>1</sup>

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.

## References

- 1 S. Trasatti and E. Lust in *Modern Aspects of Electrochemistry*, ed. J. O'M. Bockris, B. E. Conway and R. E. White, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, 1999, vol. 33.
- 2 K. A. Soliman and L. A. Kibler, Variation of the potential of zero charge for a silver monolayer deposited onto various noble metal single crystal surfaces, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2007, 52(18), 5654–5658.

