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## GAS-SENSITIVE PROPERTIES OF OXIDE SYSTEMS BASED ON $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ AND $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ OBTAINED BY SOL-GEL TECHNOLOGY

## INTRODUCTION

The results of investigations of gas-sensitive behavior and structural peculiarities of ultra-dispersed semiconducting metal oxides, performed by the group of Thin Film Laboratory in the latest years have been summarized in the paper. The distinctive feature of this kind of investigations as compared to other institutions is that gas-sensitive oxide layers in form of ceramics, thin- and thick films were prepared by using colloid solutions of metal hydroxides stabilized by different additives like organic and inorganic acids, binding and surface active agents. Paper overview devoted to the methods of oxide system synthesis and the regularities of their formation is given in [1].

## 1. EXPERIMENTAL

Oxides and oxide nanocomposites have been obtained by co-precipitation of metal hydroxides followed by their conversion into colloid solutions and thermal treatment at different temperatures. Thin film and ceramic sensors were fabricated by using colloid solutions. Powders were used for performing certain structural studies and for the fabrication of thick film sensors.

Structural features of powder and film samples were studied by XRD, ESR, Mossbauer spectroscopy, TEM, SEM, XPS, IR and Optical spectroscopies.

Gas-sensitive properties of ceramic and thin film sensors were investigated. Construction of the indicated sensors is presented in the Fig. 1. Forming procedures of ceramic and thin film sensors have been described elsewhere [2-4]. Response ( $\Delta U$ ) of ceramic sensors was determined as $\Delta U=U_{\text {air }}-U_{\text {gas }}$, where $U_{\text {air }}, U_{\text {gas }}$ represent sensor voltages at constant current in air and gas ambient, correspondingly. Sensitivity $(S)$ of thin film sensors at the detection of reducing and oxidizing gases was determined as $S=R_{\text {air }} / R_{\text {gas }}$ and $S=R_{\text {gas }} / R_{\text {air }}$, correspondingly, where $R_{\text {air }}, R_{\text {gas }}$ are sensitive layer resistances in air and gas ambient.

## 2. STRUCTURAL PECULIARITIES OF OXIDE SYSTEMS OBTAINED BY SOL-GEL TECHNOLOGY

Oxide systems prepared by sol-gel technology demonstrate certain structural peculiarities. They are characterized by high dispersity and defectiveness, formation of metastable phases, stabilization of ions in unusual oxidation state.

Particle average size for simple oxides does not exceed 10 nm after annealing at $300{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. In the case of thin films, high dispersity preserves up to $800{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Table 1).

Thin film sensor


Table 1
Average grain size of simple oxides annealed at different temperatures

| Sample Characteristics | Grain Size, nm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $300{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $400{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $500{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $800{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $1100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (film, $\mathrm{HNO}_{3}$ ) |  | 4 | 6 |  | 12 | 25 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ (film, oleic acid) | 2 | 2 |  | 5 |  | 10 | 35 |  |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ (powder, oleic acid,) | 2 | 4 | 10 | 30 |  | 150 | 150 |  |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ (powder, w/o stabilizer) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 |  | 50 | 120 |  |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ (powder, $\mathrm{HNO}_{3}$ ) | 2 |  |  | 6 | 7 | 40 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{TiO}_{2}$ (powder, $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{COOH}$ ) | 4 | 6 |  | 30 | 35 | 200 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{TiO}_{2}$ (film, w/o stabilizer) | 7 | 7 |  | 10 | 12 | 75 |  |  |
| $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (powder, $\mathrm{HNO}_{3}$ ) | 2 | 2 | 5 | 15 |  | 75 |  |  |
| $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (powder, $\mathrm{HNO}_{3}$ ) |  | $6(\gamma)$ |  | $10(\gamma)$ <br> $35(\alpha)$ |  | $45(\alpha)$ |  |  |

Table 2
The most characteristic defects of oxide structures obtained by thermal treatment of xerogels

| Oxide | Structural Defects | Methods of Investigation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2-\mathrm{x}}$ | $V_{\mathrm{O}^{-}}, \mathrm{Sn}^{(4-\delta)+}-V_{\mathrm{O}^{\delta-}}, \mathrm{Sn}^{2+}, \mathrm{Sn}^{3+}, F$-centers | ESR; Mössbauer spectroscopy |
| $\mathrm{In} 2 \mathrm{O}_{3-\mathrm{x}}$ | $\mathrm{In}^{2+}, F$-centers | ESR, XPS |
| $\mathrm{TiO}_{2-\mathrm{x}}$ | $\mathrm{Ti}^{3+}$ (regular and interstitial), $\mathrm{Ti}_{2}{ }^{7+}, F$-centers | ESR, XPS |
| $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ | 5 - and 6 -fold coordinated $\mathrm{Mo}^{5+}, \mathrm{O}^{-}, F$-centers | ESR, XPS, Optical spectroscopy |

Thus, the formation of significant amounts of single charged oxygen vacancies in slightly different coordination neighborhood is found in sol-gel obtained $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ by ESR [5]. According to the results of Mössbauer spectroscopy, partial reduction of $\mathrm{Sn}^{4+}$ ions, liading to the formation of $\mathrm{Sn}^{3+}$ and $\mathrm{Sn}^{2+}$ intermediate oxidation states, takes place in $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Pd}$ films [6]. Probably, this process is caused by charge transfer from oxygen vacancies to tin ions. For ${ }^{119} \mathrm{Sn}$ nuclei correlation between chemical shift value and tin oxidation state occurs. Under the growth of s-electron density at tin nucleus chemical shift is positive, as we observed for sol-gel synthesized and annealed $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$. $F$-centers and $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ ions in two types of coordination neighborhood are found in $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ after annealing in air [7, 8]. Interstitial and regular $\mathrm{Ti}^{3+}$ ions and $\mathrm{Ti}_{2}{ }^{7+}$ dimers, which are characteristic of partially reduced $\mathrm{Ti}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{O}_{2 \mathrm{n}-1}$ oxide phases, are formed [9]. $\mathrm{Mo}^{5+}$ centers in different coordination are stabilized in $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ under annealing in air [10].

As it follows from ESR study, capturing of unpaired electrons by several nuclei simultaneously that results in the formation of complex defect is characteristic of most of non-stoichiometric oxides. Local charge compensation as well as bulk one accompanying by the formation of paramagnetic defects is possible. The data available indicate that there are common regularities in distribution of electronic density within crystal lattice, that depends on cation nature. For most of cations the possibility of electron capture (a) can be expressed as $a=z / r^{2}$, where $z$ - actual cation charge, $r$ - cation radius. Ionic cation radiuses and ionization po-
tentials of the studied metals are listed in the Tables 3, 4. From the data reported it follows that the efficiency of electron capture by cation rises within the row: $\mathrm{In}^{3+}<\mathrm{Zr}^{4+}<\mathrm{Sn}^{4+}<\mathrm{Fe}^{3+}<\mathrm{Ti}^{4+}<\mathrm{Mo}^{6+}$.

Table 3
Ionic radiuses of some metal cations

| Cation | $\mathrm{In}^{3+}$ | $\mathrm{Zr}^{4+}$ | $\mathrm{Sn}^{4+}$ | $\mathrm{Fe}^{3+}$ | $\mathrm{Ti}^{4+}$ | $\mathrm{Mo}^{6+}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $r, \AA(\mathrm{cn} 4)$ | 0.76 | 0.73 | 0.69 | 0.63 | 0.56 | 0.55 |
| $r, \AA(\mathrm{cn} 6)$ | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 0.79 | 0.75 | 0.75 |

Table 4
Ionization potential of some metal cations

| Transition | Ionization Potential, eV |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{In}^{2+} \rightarrow \mathrm{In}^{3+}$ | 28.035 |
| $\mathrm{Al}^{2+} \rightarrow \mathrm{Al}^{3+}$ | 28.447 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}^{2+} \rightarrow \mathrm{Fe}^{3+}$ | 30.650 |
| $\mathrm{Zr}^{3+} \rightarrow \mathrm{Zr}^{4+}$ | 34.336 |
| $\mathrm{Ni}^{2+} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ni}^{3+}$ | 35.165 |
| $\mathrm{Sn}^{3+} \rightarrow \mathrm{Sn}^{4+}$ | 40.734 |
| $\mathrm{Ti}^{3+} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ti}^{4+}$ | 43.265 |
| $\mathrm{Mo}^{5+} \rightarrow \mathrm{Mo}^{6+}$ | 68.402 |

The formation of metastable at r.t. oxide phases $\left(H-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, M-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, H-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}\right.$, $\mathrm{SnO}, \gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, \beta-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ) and the decrease of phase transformation temperatures are the consequences of oxide crystal growth peculiarities in the presence of stabilizers and the products of their thermolysis [7, 11, 12]. Usually, the formation of such phases takes place under thermoreduction of the corresponding oxides. For instance, the formation of low-temperature rutile phase is found in $\mathrm{TiO}_{2}$ obtained by annealing of titanium hydroxide sols stabilized with acetic acid at $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in air [13].

Moreover, an increased component mutual solubility and the formation of highly dispersive crystal structures with a dopant content exceeding its equilibrium concentration is inherent of complex oxide systems.

The structural features pointed above may be also caused by the presence of additives at different stages of oxide synthesis. Modifying the crystal growth is possible during crystallization of oxide structures from the stabilized sols. The role of the modifiers may be played by the stabilizing additives. They are incorporated into the sol micelle structure, and further into the structure of crystalline phases. In the case of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, modified growth takes place both during ageing of indium hydroxide sol and under annealing of xerogels. Self-organization of nanoparticles with the formation of definite-shaped blocks takes place in colloidal solution of indium hydroxide stabilized with nitric acid. The particle dispersity may be preserved in the block structures; however, recrystallization is also possible. In the case of $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$, anisotropic crystal growth with the formation of nee-dle-like and plate crystals under elevated temperatures is observed.

Thus, the addition of active components results in the alteration of i) composites dispersion, ii) system Fermi level, iii) bonding energy of metal-oxygen on the oxide surface, iv) nature and amount of adsorption centers.

It is important to note that the conditions of synthesis and, consequently, states of ions undoubtedly influence the gas-sensitive properties of simple oxides and doped oxide systems. The specific elements of structure (e.g. ions in unusual oxidation state, associates, clusters) may work as activation centers for adsorbed oxygen molecules and molecules of detected gases.

It has been shown, that red/ox-transformations of the ions in unusual oxidation state proceeding under annealing in reducing and oxidizing ambient are completely reversible [14, 15]:

$$
\mathrm{M}^{(\mathrm{n}-1)+}-V_{\mathrm{o}} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{n}+}-V_{\mathrm{o}}^{-}
$$

It results in saving the initial high gas-sensitive activity of an oxide for long period of time. Thus, the mentioned centers may either directly participate in the detection of gases or alter the activity of oxide matrix.

Advantages of sol-gel synthesis of gas-sensitive layers are most prominent not for single oxides, but for binary oxide systems or systems «oxide-metal» (noble metals, d-metals, etc.). Their structural features provide the variety of properties of such materials.

## 3. GAS-SENSITIVE PROPERTIES OF OXIDES AND OXIDE COMPOSITES

### 3.1. Ceramic and thick film sensors

Most of metal oxide based sensors $\left(\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{SnO}_{2}\right)$ are characterized by low selectivity to different gases in gas mixtures; the sensitivity of these sensors is also unsuitable.

As it was established in the literature, most efficient ways to improve both selectivity and sensitivity of such sensors are: i) variation of chemical and phase composition and fine adjusting sensing layer structure, ii) control of sensor operating temperature.

Undoped $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ possesses satisfactory sensitivity to the majority of reducing gases - hydrocarbons, CO, $\mathrm{H}_{2}$, alcohol vapors, etc. (Fig. 2). The lack of selectivity to separate gases in gas mixtures and unsatisfactory stability at long-term operation may be pointed as deficiencies of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-sensors. To remove these disadvantages active dopants are added into $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$. The addition of $\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}$ ions (1-5 wt \% NiO ) decreases $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensitivity to reducing gases ( $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{4}, \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{CO}\right)$, but in different degree (Fig. 3) [16]. $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}$ sensors remain satisfactory sensitive to CO at comparatively low working temperatures ( $200-300{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), but become insensitive to other gases, first of all, to $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$.
$\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Au}$ sensors are characterized by high sensitivity to CO and independence of sensitivity on humidity. They are selective to CO in the presence of hydrocarbons at definite operating conditions.

Doping of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ with Pt increases $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensitivity to low concentrations of $\mathrm{NH}_{3} . \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Pt}$ sensors allow to detect $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ at $1 / 2$ threshold level (Fig. 4) [17].


Fig. 2. Responses ( $\Delta U$ ) of ceramic $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensors vs. operating current (I)


Fig. 3. Responses ( $\Delta U$ ) of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}$ ceramic sensors to $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and CO vs. operating current (I)


Fig. 4. Responses $(\Delta U)$ of ceramic $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Pt}$ sensors vs. $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ concentration ( $C$ )


Fig. 5. Responses $(\Delta U)$ of $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ ceramic sensors to $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and CO vs. operating current (I)


Fig. 6. Comparison of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and ZnO ceramic sensor behavior in $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ ambient


Fig. 7. Temperature dependent responses (S) to $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}(0.025 \%$ ) of thick film sensors:
$\mathrm{a}-\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}(\mathrm{Fe}: \mathrm{Sn}=9: 1)$,
$\mathrm{b}-\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}(\mathrm{Fe}: \mathrm{Sn}=1: 1), \mathrm{c}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}, \mathrm{~d}-\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, $\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}(\mathrm{Fe}: \mathrm{Sn}=1: 9)$

Undoped $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ is characterized by unsatisfactory sensitivity to reducing gases. Therefore, gas-sensitive layers usually consist of doped tin oxide. It was found that $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Sb}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Pd}$ sensors [18] are the most suitable for practical use. Such sensors possess gas-sensitive characteristics comparable with ones of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-sensors. $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Sb}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Pd}$ sensors are the most useful for detection of high concentrations of $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$. In addition, these sensors are sensitive to formaldehyde.

The most favorable properties - threshold sensitivity levels, response values, response times - are inherent to $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensors $\left(\mathrm{SnO}_{2}: \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}=65: 35\right)$ [19].

Ceramic $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ sensors possess the properties, which are very similar to the properties of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}$ sensors. At low temperatures, $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ sensors are sensitive to CO and insensitive to hydrocarbons (Fig. 5) [20].

ZnO ceramic sensors appear to be selective when analysis of $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ is mentioned. They are insensitive to $\mathrm{CH}_{4}, \mathrm{CO}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$ at temperatures optimal for $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ detection (Fig. 6) [21].
$\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ thick film sensors demonstrate considerable activity with regards to alcohols. Thus, the highest response to ethanol shows $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ (9:1) nanocomposite (Fig. 7). Sensitivity of simple oxides are rather low. And the $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ (1:9) sample we failed to measure because of its extremely high resistance.

### 3.2. Thin film sensors

Thin film sensors based on simple oxides are characterized by rather low sensitivity to $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{CH}_{4}$. However, they are sensitive to $\mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$ [22-25].

With regard to the maximum response towards $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$, the oxide films can be placed in the following consequence:

$$
\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\mathrm{SnO}_{2}>\mathrm{MoO}_{3}
$$

The film sensitivity depends essentially on the oxide synthesis condition and the presence of various additives $\left(\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}, \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}, \mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right)$. Addition of a second component to the base oxide influences essentially its electrical parameters and gas sensitivity. The response of sensors of various chemical compositions to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ has compared in the Table 5.
$\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ thin films are almost insensitive to reducing gases [22]; meanwhile, they are highly sensitive to oxidizing gases, such as $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$. Addition of metal of variable valency ( $\mathrm{Ni}, \mathrm{Mo}, \mathrm{Fe}$ ) to $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ leads to the considerable increase of its sensitivity to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ (Fig. 8). Maximum response values to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ show $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-containing composites.

Depending on structural features of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ composite, the latter demonstrates prevalent sensitivity either to $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ or $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$. Thus, $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1) / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensor shows high response in the $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ ambient at $135{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, while its sensitivity to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ at the same temperature is negligible (Figs. 9 a , b). In contrast, $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1) / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sample shows good response to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ in the temperature range $50-100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ together with rather low one to $\mathrm{O}_{3}$. These distinctions, observed in the behavior of both composites, can be used for selective analysis of $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ in gas mixture.

Generally, the sensitivity of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ films to $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ is lower in comparison with their sensitivity to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}[4,21]$ In contrast, $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ layers are characterized by higher sensitivity to $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ than to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$. Moreover, the indicated compositions show better $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ detection performance than the previously investigated thin film sensors based on $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}$ [23] and $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ [22]. Thus, $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (9:1) and $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1)$ composites prepared via $\mathrm{Fe}^{2+}$ precursor and supplied with preliminary deposited $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sub-layer are characterized by high sensitivity to $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ over a low temperature range ( $70-135^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) [26], as it is reported in the Figs. $9 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$.

Table 5
Overview of gas-sensitive ( $\mathrm{NO}_{2}, 1 \mathrm{ppm}$ )
and structural characteristics of the different oxides

| Sensor | S, r.u. | T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Phase Composition |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 30 | 150 | $C-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ |
| $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}(99: 1)$ | 40 | 150 | $C-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ |
| $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}(95: 5)$ | 0,5 | 200 | $C-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ |
| $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{MoO} 3(9: 1)$ | 35 | 250 | $C-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ |
| $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 350 | 100 | $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ |
| $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(1: 1)$ | 1150 | 70 | $C-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, \gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ | 15 | 100 | $T-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ | 5 | 200 | $R-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(99: 1)$ | 5 | 150 | $T-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(3: 1)$ | 1 | 250 | $T-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(1: 1)$ | -2 | 100 | $T-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ |

Investigating the gas-sensitive behavior of $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Mo}$ thin films one can observe the opposite influence of Mo additive on the sensitivity of the sensors to the different gases (Table 6). By controlling $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ concentration in $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ thin films, we achieved a selective detection of both $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{O}_{3}$. Thus, $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ $(\mathrm{Sn}: \mathrm{Mo}=3: 1)$ thin films are insensitive towards gaseous species like $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{CH}_{4}$, $\mathrm{NO}_{2}, \mathrm{O}_{3}$; however, they are extremely sensitive to ethanol. $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(\mathrm{Sn}: \mathrm{Mo}=$ $=99: 1)$ composite is selective to ozone at $400^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


Fig. 8. Comparison of sensitivity of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ based sensors doped with oxides of different metals to 1 ppm NO


T, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \square-\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1) / \operatorname{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \\
& \triangle-\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1) / \operatorname{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \\
& \square-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

Fig. 9. Temperature-dependent responses (S) of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-based sensors to oxidizing gases: $a-200 \mathrm{ppb} \mathrm{O}, b-5 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{NO} 2$

In contrast, the sensitivity to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and CO is suppressed in the presence of molybdenum. As is in the case of ethyl alcohol, the effect correlates with the content of molybdenum in the sample - the higher the content of Mo, the lower the sensor responses to CO and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$. Note, that in the case of CO , slight shift of the maximum sensitivity to lower temperatures was also observed.

Table 6
Gas-sensitive properties of $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ thin film sensors to different gases

| Detected gas | S, r.u. |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{O}_{3}, 175 \mathrm{ppb}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}, 500 \mathrm{ppm}$ | $\mathrm{NO}_{2}, 1 \mathrm{ppm}$ |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\text {oper. }}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 400 | 300 | 100 |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ | 1 | 10 | 20 |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(99: 1)$ | 40 | 50 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}(3: 1)$ | 1 | 85 | 1 |

$\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Pd}$ thin film sensors [3] allow selective detection of single components ( $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{NO}, \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ ) in complex gas mixtures at different operating temperatures: NO at $185^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CO}$ at $260-330^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ at $480-560{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Figs 10, 11). Note, that selective properties are exclusively characteristic of sol-gel obtained $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Pd}$ sensors.

Fig. 12 clearly demonstrates the fact that the sensors based on single $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ layers have practically the same response values to ethanol, but they slightly differ regarding the optimal operating temperature. The sensors based on $\gamma$ - $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ heterostructure (bi-layer sensors) are characterized by significantly higher sensitivity to ethanol, than the single-layer ( $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ) ones. In this case, $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sub-layer not only provides the sufficient $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ film conductivity, but it has a clear influence on the sensor sensitivity.


Fig. 10. $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Pd}$ sensor responses $(S)$ to $\mathrm{CO}(10 \mathrm{ppm})$,
$\mathrm{CH}_{4}(10000 \mathrm{ppm})$, $\mathrm{NO}(6 \mathrm{ppm}), \mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{CH}_{4}$
and $\mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{NO}$ mixtures vs. operating temperature ( $T$ )


Fig. 11. $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ sensor responses ( S ) to $\mathrm{CO}(10 \mathrm{ppm}$ ),
NO ( 6 ppm ) and CO + NO mixture vs. operating temperature ( $T$ )


Fig. 12. Temperature-dependent responses (S) of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ thin film sensors to $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$ ( 100 ppm )

The addition of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ( $10 \% \mathrm{~mol}$.) to $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ layer leads to decrease of the $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensor response to ethanol (Fig. 13). According to the XRD data, $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (9:1) composite has the structure of $\mathrm{In}^{3+}$ in $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ lattice solid solution; certain amount of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ phase also presents. On the contrary, further increasing $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ content within $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ layer of $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ structure up to $50 \%$ mol. causes abrupt rising of its sensitivity, which even overwhelms the sensitivity of $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sample.


Fig. 13. Temperature-dependent responses (S) of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ bi-layer thin film sensors to $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}(100 \mathrm{ppm})$

In comparison with $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (9:1) sample, $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (1:1) one probably consists of two highly dispersive phases with great phase interface. From the XRD data of the sample it is difficult to determine exactly phase composition of the sample because of the similarity of $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ crystal lattices. The growth of $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (1:1) dense layer is due to the formation of numerous bonds between the oxide particles within this composite.

Moreover, $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensor sensitivity strongly depends on the crystal structure of the active layers, in particular, $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ phase. There are two possible $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ phases suitable under operating temperatures used $-\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$. In the case of the pure $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, the response achieves its maximum value at lower temperatures $\left(250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, than in the case of $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\left(300{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. When methanol detection is considered, one can observe the same regularities inherited to ethanol, excepting the lower response. $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(1: 1) / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ thin film sensors are essentially more sensitive than $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ ones which are known to be extremely selective regarding ethanol (Table 7).

Table 7
Maximum response values of thin film sensors of various composition to ethanol ( 500 ppm )

| Sensor | $\mathrm{S}_{\text {max }}$, r.u. | $\mathrm{T},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 15 | 350 |
| $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 165 | 300 |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ | 30 | 400 |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ | 80 | 300 |

It is important to note that all double-layer sensors are much more sensitive towards alcohol $\left(\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$ vapors than single-layer $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ samples; the maximum response is showed by $\gamma$ - $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ composite. $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-containing films are insensitive to $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ over the temperature range of the most efficient ethanol detection ( $250-400^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). At the same time, their sensitivity regarding ethanol is negligible at $50-150{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ when $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ interaction with oxide surface has the maximum value. An increase of the $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ content within $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ composite up to $50 \%$ (mol.) leads to the growth of the sensor responses both to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and ethanol.

According to the responses to various gases, the sensing layers can be placed as follows:
$\mathrm{O}_{3}: \quad \gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$
$\mathrm{NO}_{2}: \quad \alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$
CO: $\quad \gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \geq \alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$
Alcohol: $\quad \gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}>\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$
Referring to the results of functional and structural investigations, one can recommend a series of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ samples with different structure and phase composition to be used as advanced materials for $\mathrm{O}_{3}, \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$ detection. The particular compositions, dispersion and structural and phase features are listed in the Table 8.

The most promising gas-sensitive materials recommended for fabrication of highly selective sensors and their structural peculiarities.

Temperature of annealing $300{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

| Sensor | $\mathrm{T},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Detected <br> Gas | Gas conc., <br> ppm | Phase <br> Composition | Grain Size, <br> nm |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1) / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ <br> via $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{OH})_{2}$, mixing | 135 | $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 0.06 | $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ <br> $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 25 |
| $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1) / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ <br> via $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})$, co-precipitation | $70-100$ | $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ | 0.5 | $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (anisotropic) | $8 \times 15$ |
| $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ via Fe(OH) 25 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 4. REGULARITIES OF $\mathrm{NO}_{2}, \mathrm{O}_{3}$ AND $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$ DETECTION

On the basis of the obtained results we made an attempt to find the correlations between structural features of different oxide systems and their gas-sensitive behavior.

### 4.1. Nitrogen dioxide

Two models of conductivity changes should be considered at the interaction of metal oxides with oxidizing gas molecules. The first model deals with adsorption in molecular form and corresponding surface band bending, whereas the second model takes into account chemical interactions leading to changes of oxide stoichiometry and charge carrier concentration. In the case of sol-gel obtained highly defective metal oxide systems, the second model looks preferable.

The model of $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ detection by thin film $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-sensors has been described elsewhere [27]. The model explains change of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ films conductivity in terms of surface band bending due to molecular adsorption of $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$. It is supposed that $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ film conductivity is determined by the presence of adsorbed oxygen, which plays the role of electron acceptor and is in equilibrium with $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ surface defects. Molecular adsorption of $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ upsets this equilibrium and creates additional acceptor levels. The centers of $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ adsorption on indium oxide are electron defects of structure, namely $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ and $F$-centers. The increase of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensitivity to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ at doping with $\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}$ can be explained by an increase of $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ and oxygen vacancy concentration in $\mathrm{In}_{2-\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{Ni}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ solid solution structure. The generation of $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ ions is due to the following process:

$$
\mathrm{In}^{3+}+\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}>\mathrm{In}^{2+}+\mathrm{Ni}^{3+} .
$$

It is known that band mechanism of charge transfer occurs in $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ at comparatively low temperatures ( $\mathrm{T}<550^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) [8]. At low temperature electrons caused by the presence of $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{In}^{+}$ions in indium oxide are delocalized and transfer to conductivity band formed by overlapping of In 5s-orbitals. Broadening of $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ ESR signals and absence of hyper-fine structure lines in ESR spectra of nonstoichiomertic $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ indicate the delocalization of electrons [7]. High mobility of electrons in $\operatorname{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ at low temperature is provided by easy electron exchange process between $\operatorname{In}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{In}^{+}$ ions: $2 \mathrm{In}^{2+} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{In}^{3+}+\mathrm{In}^{+}$. Lower conductivity of $\mathrm{In}_{2-\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{Ni}_{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ solid solution as compared to undoped $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ may be caused by decreasing of free carrier mobility and change of conductivity mechanism.

The deviation from the band charge transfer mechanism is very possible for $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-based solid solutions [8, 16, 23]. The charge transfer in $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}$ system is probably occurs not only through In-O-In but also through $\mathrm{In}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{Ni}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{In}$ chains. The participation of $\mathrm{Ni}^{2+} / \mathrm{Ni}^{3+}$ ions in charge transfer decreases the rate of electron exchange in $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}$ as compared to $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$. It is known that d-orbitals of nickel are localized at separate ions and overlap insignificantly.

When $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ is detected by $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-sensors, not only $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ adsorption and related $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ conductivity changes, but also the possibility of chemical interaction between indium oxide and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and stipulated change of defect concentration should be taken into account [22,27]. $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ is the strong oxidizing agent. It is known that $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ dissotiatively chemisorbed at semiconductor oxide surface oxidizes structure defects - partially reduced ions (i.e. $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ ) and oxygen vacancies, and causes the formation of atomic oxygen at $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ surface. The appearance of additional oxygen at $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ films after treatment with $\mathrm{NO}_{2}+\mathrm{O}_{2}$ mixture has been found by means of XPS [22]. At comparatively low temperatures $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ chemisorption occurs mainly at partially reduced centers $\left(\mathrm{In}^{2+}\right)$ with the formation of surface complexes: $\mathrm{In}^{2+}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}=\mathrm{O}$. The oxidation process $\mathrm{In}^{2+} \rightarrow \mathrm{In}^{3+}$ is accompanied by tearing oxygen atom off from chemisorbed $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ molecule in surface complex. Under these conditions $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}$ bond breaking energy must be compensated by In-O bonding energy. Such process is energetically profitable in the case of either $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ or $\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}$ [27]. Note, that $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ bonding energy ( $480 \mathrm{~kJ} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}, \mathrm{O}_{2}$ ) is higher than $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}$ one ( $292 \mathrm{~kJ} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}, \mathrm{NO}_{2}$ ). Thus, the oxidation of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}$ surface in $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ ambient requires higher temperature than in $\mathrm{NO}_{2}+\mathrm{O}_{2}$ ambient. It may provide the detection of low $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ concentration in $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ presence at low operating temperatures. The possibility of chemical reaction between indium oxide and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ is indicated by slow recovery of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-based thin film sensors at detection of $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$.

The proceeding of oxidation process when interacting of $\mathrm{TiO}_{2-\mathrm{x}}$ with $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ has been proved by Iuengar et al. [28] They found the sample weight changes, disappearance of $\mathrm{Ti}^{3+}$ ESR signal and appearance of NO and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ species in gas phase after $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ adsorption-desorption cycle at $\mathrm{TiO}_{2-\mathrm{x}}$ sample. Capehart and Chang [29] proved that $\mathrm{SnO}_{2-\mathrm{x}}$ conductance changes under NO treatment is not due to surface band bending but due to $\mathrm{SnO}_{2-\mathrm{x}}$ oxidation accompanying by decrease of oxygen vacancy bulk concentration.

In the case of Mo-containing oxide systems, $\mathrm{Mo}^{(5+\delta)+}-\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{n}}{ }^{\delta-}$ complexes appear to be active centers of gas adsorption. The formation of the mentioned complexes is confirmed by XPS study of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ composites exposit to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ vapors (Fig. 14).


Fig. 14. Mo 3d X-ray core level in XPS spectra of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ films annealed: $a-$ in air ( $400{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}$ ), $b-$ in $\mathrm{NO}_{2}\left(200{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.$; 0.5 h ), $c-$ in vacuo ( $200{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; 0.5 h ),

$$
d-\text { in air }\left(700^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 1 \mathrm{~h}\right)
$$

Composites prepared by using sol-gel technology are characterized by increased solubility of the additives and the formation of crystal structures with dopant content exceeding its equilibrium concentration. The presence of the second oxide component retards the crystallization and the particle growth of base oxide $\left(\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}, \mathrm{ZnO}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}\right)$, and it favors the stabilization of amorphous ( $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$, $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ) and metastable phases. $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sample doped with $\mathrm{Ni}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{Mo}^{\mathrm{VI}}$ ions results in an increase of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ nonstoichiometry degree and stabilization of $\mathrm{In}^{2+}$ and $F$-centers, which are activation points of $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ gaseous species.

The indicated structural peculiarities of oxide systems explain clearly the observed difference in $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ detection of oxide nanocomposites like $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{NiO}$, $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}, \mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$.

As it was noted above, $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(1: 1)$ sample demonstrates the highest sensitivity to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ as compared to other systems (see Fig. 8, Table 5). The special composite structure, whose important parameters are represented by phase composition, dispersion, morphology of particles and manner of their coalescence with the formation of numerous bonds provides the optimum set of adsorption and catalytic properties. According to the XRD data, $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (1:1) composite is a heterogeneous system; it consists of $\mathrm{Fe}^{3+}$ in $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ lattice solid solution and $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ phases. It is important to take into consideration that $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ oxides have a similar crystal structure. The solubility of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ in $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ lattice essentially exceeds the equilibrium value; it provides a very close contact between the particles of two phases and thereby facilitates the charge transfer. Sufficient film electroconductivity is also due to the lacy framework of the phase based on $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$.

In order to elucidate the origin of very high sensitivity of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ nanocomposites prepared by both co-precipitation and mixing of Fe (II) and In(III) hydroxides the careful structural examination of the studied samples was carried out.

As it was found from the XRD studies, all the samples appear to be nanosized. The composites annealed at $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ differ by phase composition that depends on synt-
hesis conditions. Thus, $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ species obtained by $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})$ and $\mathrm{In}(\mathrm{III})$ hydroxide mixing contain $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, which is metastable at room temperature. Structural peculiarities of the mentioned modification of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ such as readiness of $\mathrm{Fe}^{3+} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Fe}^{2+}$ charge transfer and high conductivity as well as differentiation between the functions of receptor and transducer between different phases $\left(\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right)$ provides high performance of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ sensors. Co-precipitation of Fe (II) and In (III) hydroxides leads to the crystallization of highly dispersive $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ which is the most thermodynamically stable $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ phase. ESR data give evidence that the mentioned composites contain $\mathrm{Fe}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{Fe}$ associates, $(\mathrm{FeO})_{\mathrm{x}}$ clusters or micro-inclusions of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ amorphous phase. Fe(III) ions are characterized by cubic symmetry of coordination environment. The very areas of poorly crystallized (or amorphous) phase are active in gas adsorption that follows from the increasing of the corresponding ESR signal intensity under exposure of the $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ layers in $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ ambient (Fig. 15). Isolated Fe (III) ions are not participating in this process.

In the case when the species is only consisted of amorphous phase, suitable value of sensing layer conductivity is not reaching. The presence of amorphous phase is essential in quantity, sufficient to provide a chemisorption of detected gas, but not making difficult the charge transfer. The later should be provided by other highly conductive phases ( $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ).

Mossbauer spectroscopy analysis of the $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ composite of different structure and simple $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ oxides allowed to conclude that local crystal environment of Fe (III) ions within the co-precipitated sample prepared via Fe (II) precursor and having the structure of $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ is closer to the environment, which is typical of cubic $\gamma$ - $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ rather than to trigonal $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (Fig. 16, Table 9). The indicated phase consisting of three types of $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$-centers is extremely active in gas adsorption.


Fig. 15. ESR spectra of $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(1: 1)$ composite, annealed at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ : $a$ - initial, $b$ - treated in $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 0.5 \mathrm{~h}$


Fig. 16. Mossbauer spectra recorded from Fe-containing species at 298 K : $a-\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ standard, $b-\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (9:1), via $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})$, $c-\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1), d-\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (9:1), via $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})$

Table 9
Parameters of Mossbauer spectra recorded from Fe-containing samples at 298 K

| Sample | $\delta, \mathrm{mm} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$ |  | $\Delta, \mathrm{~mm} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ | $B, T$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1)\left(300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, via $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{II})$ | 0.38 | $78 \%$ | 0.08 | 50.7 |
|  | 0.53 | $15 \%$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.22 | $7 \%$ | 0.69 | 0 |
| $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1)\left(300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, via $\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{III})$ | 0.30 |  | 0.777 | 0 |
| $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1)\left(300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | 0.33 |  | 0.02 | 48.6 |
| $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\left(300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | 0.34 |  | -0.03 | 49.1 |
| $\gamma-{\mathrm{FeOOH}\left(300{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)}^{\left.\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \text { (amorphous) (300 }{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)} \quad 10.33$ |  | 0.78 | 0 |  |
| $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (standard sample) | 0.39 |  | 0.09 | 50.7 |
| $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (standard sample) | $0.34 \div 0.39$ |  | $-0.05 \div-0.1$ | $49.8 \div 50.6$ |

### 4.2. Ozone

$\mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ are interfering gases as they both demonstrate similar chemical properties. To separate sensor signals attributed to $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ transformation the following aspects should be mentioned: i) oxide materials possess unequal catalytic activity in $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ decomposition process, ii) inherent distinctions in $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ molecule adsorption and desorption of their decomposition products.

Thus, the sensors based on oxides which are active catalysts of $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ decomposition (like $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ) demonstrate maximum response at low temperature ( $70-100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). In the case of catalysts of low activity (like $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}, \mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ ), optimal temperature value shifts sidewise high temperatures ( $150-300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). Adsorption of $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ is going at external side of oxide surface; meanwhile $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ adsorbs at pores (at internal oxide surface).

Mechanisms of $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ detection at different temperatures can be presented by the following scheme:

At low temperature $\left(70-100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) \quad$ At high temperature $\left(150-300{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$
Adsorption of $\mathrm{O}_{3}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{O}_{3} \rightarrow \mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{O} \text { (at oxide surface) } & \mathrm{O}_{3} \rightarrow \mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{O} \text { (in vapor phase) } \\ 2 \mathrm{M}-\mathrm{O}+\mathrm{O}_{3} \rightarrow \mathrm{M}+\mathrm{O}_{2} & \mathrm{O}+\mathrm{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{M}-\mathrm{O} \\ & 2 \mathrm{M}-\mathrm{O} \rightarrow 2 \mathrm{M}+\mathrm{O}_{2} \\ & \text { Desorption of chemisorbed } \mathrm{O}_{2} \\ \mathrm{O}_{3}+\mathrm{MO} \rightarrow \mathrm{M}+2 \mathrm{O}_{2} & 2 \mathrm{MO} \rightarrow 2 \mathrm{M}+\mathrm{O}_{2}\end{array}$
The desorption of chemisorbed $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ is principally different for $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$. It can be realized for $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ at low temperature only through the attack of MO-intermediate by $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ molecule. The desorption of oxygen in the case of $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ goes only by the second route at high temperature. The distinctions in $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ optimal detecting temperature allow selective analysis of single gases in gas mixture.

### 4.3. Ethanol

Two ways of alcohol (for example, ethanol) molecule conversion are possible at the oxide surface - dehydrogenation and dehydration:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH} \rightarrow \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CHO}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \text { (dehydrogenation) }  \tag{1}\\
& \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{OH} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \text { (dehydration) } \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

According to the literature data, dehydrogenation (1) mainly occurs at the oxide surfaces with basic properties, and requires higher reaction temperatures in comparison with dehydration. Dehydration (2) is a typical example of acid basic reactions, and dominates at decreased temperatures and at acid surfaces. According to the results of Kohl [30] and Yamazoe et al. [31], the detection of ethanol at $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ proceeds through dehydrogenation route. Ethanol is adsorbed at surface tin atoms, and the process goes with the elimination of H from OH -groups forming acetaldehyde $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CHO} . \mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ is an example of typical acid catalyst [32]. However, the acidic properties of $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ become apparent only if the bulk molybdenum oxide phase forms. The process of the alcohol
dehydration on $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ proceeds by the classical acid-basic mechanism through the formation of carbonium ions. It is caused by the stabilization of hydrogen atoms and hydroxyl groups in the molybdenum oxide structures at the stage of their formation. These stabilized spices play the role of catalytic centers [33].

In the case of multi-component oxide systems, the complex dependencies in the alcohol conversion can be observed. The appropriateness of the change of catalytic properties in the acid-basic reactions is often opposite those in the red/ox reactions. In the certain cases, the addition of basic oxides (e.g. $\mathrm{La}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ) to $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ increases, and the addition of acid oxides $\left(\mathrm{MnO}_{2}\right)$ decreases the sensitivity to ethanol. However, as we observe in the case of $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Mo}$, the acid $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ increases the sensitivity to ethanol and decreases the detection temperature. The addition of acid catalyst (e.g. $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ) gives a similar effect [34]. High sensitivity of $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ to ethanol is due to bifunctional catalytic properties. $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ catalyses dehydration of ethanol with the formation of ethylene $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ adsorbed at the $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ surface. When added to $\mathrm{TiO}_{2}, \mathrm{WO}_{3}$, also known as acid catalyst, enforces dehydrogenation and suppresses dehydration of ethanol [35].

As it was found out by our group, the detection of alcohols using semi-conducting oxides goes by oxidizing dehydrogenation pathway:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}+1 / 2 \mathrm{O}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CHO}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \text { (oxidizing dehydrogenation) } \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The oxidizing dehydrogenation of alcohol (3) is heterolytic catalytic reaction. The process involves both reductive-oxidative and acid-base steps. In particular, alcohol molecule adsorption at metal cation, which plays a role of Lewis centre, is related to acid-base reaction.

The relative measure of oxide activity in the oxidation reactions can be oxy-gen-oxide surface bonding energy. In fact, the less the energy of oxygen atom isolation from an oxide surface, the higher the oxide oxidizing ability. The reactivity of oxides in acid-base reactions depends on the electronegativity of cations $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{n}+}$ : $\chi=\chi_{0}(2 n+1)$, where $\chi_{0}$ - Pauling's electronegativity, $n-$ ion charge. The electronegativity can be used as the measure of Lewis acid site activity. The adsorption of alcohol molecules at Lewis sites is going with great output. Complete oxidation of intermediate products is possible at the surface of the oxide, which is characterized by small values of M-O binding energy and electronegativity. According to the electronegativity ( $\chi$ ) increasing, the studied oxides can be placed as follows (Table 10):

$$
\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}<\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}<\mathrm{SnO}_{2}<\mathrm{MoO}_{3} .
$$

But in the general case, reductive-oxidative and acid-base properties of oxide surface may not correlate.

Thus, detection of ethanol using oxide materials, where metal is greatly electronegative $\left(\mathrm{MoO}_{3}\right)$ is not accompanying by complete oxidation of intermediates, but is characterized by striking selectivity.

In the range of considerable $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{O}$ bonding energy values, donor-acceptor interaction between alcohol molecules and $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{m}+} \mathrm{O}^{2-}$ species become clearly apparent. Oxides containing Mo (VI) cations, which are strong Lewis acids, are very active. In fact, low bonding energy and strong basic properties of an oxide promote further oxidation of intermediates of alcohol molecule transformation (Fig. 17), thereby increasing the corresponding sensor response values.

Table 10
The metal-oxygen binding energy for some oxides

| Metal Oxide | $E_{\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{O}}, \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{g}$ per atom | Electronegativity, r.u. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ | 91 | 30.55 |
| $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ | 70 | 17.64 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 56 | 13.72 |
| $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ | - | 12.46 |



Fig. 17. The scheme of alcohol oxidation process at oxide phase interface by the example of methanol $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$ oxidation

The oxides, which are characterized by the possibility of metal ion reduction without oxide phase state modification, have the greatest ability to promote oxidizing dehydrogenation processes. For instance, such oxides as $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}, \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ are inclined to facile the changing of metal ion oxidation state: $\mathrm{Mo}(\mathrm{VI}) \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Mo}(\mathrm{V}), \mathrm{In}$ (III) $\leftrightarrow \mathrm{In}$ (II), Fe (III) $\leftrightarrow \mathrm{Fe}$ (II), while oxide phase remains original.

The sensors based on heterojunction oxide structure show considerable response to alcohol (ethanol, methanol) vapors. The heterojunction between an oxide and solid solution phases appears to be very active in both adsorption and oxidation of alcohol. The presence of two types of centers possessing different reductive-oxidative and acid-base properties, and participating in the processes of the alcohol molecule transformation is essential requirement to achieve high sensor response when alcohol detection is considered. The centers of one type can suitably participate in adsorpti-on-desorption processes of alcohol molecules, whereas complete oxidation of intermediates effectively proceeds at the centers of another type.

As it was appeared, the experimental data regarding both catalytic and gas-sensitive properties of most of semi-conducting oxides are not in accordance with prevailing conception, asserting that the alcohol detection is predominately realized as dehydration process (2), when oxide with acidic properties are used, and as dehydrogenation (1) at base oxide surface. Thus, $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ possesses strong acidic behavior. At the same time, it is one of the most efficient catalysts of methanol conversion into formaldehyde (reaction of dehydrogenation). By reason of $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ high catalytic activity, it being added to $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ species evokes the increasing
the corresponding sensor sensitivity towards alcohols. However, in this case, af-ter-oxidation of formaldehyde, generated during dehydrogenation step, to form $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ is impossible because of great $\mathrm{Mo}-\mathrm{O}$ bond strength within $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$. Using this fact one can explain lesser response of $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{MoO}_{3}$ sensors to ethanol in comparison with $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ ones.

From the evidence reported one can conclude that the main process determining the efficiency of alcohol detection using semi-conducting oxides is oxidizing dehydrogenation process including both oxidation-redaction and acid-base steps. Hence, sensors based on heterojunction oxide systems and containing two types of centers show better performance.

## 5. CONCLUSION

As it follows from the reported data, by means of $\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ oxide doping and varying of their synthesis and annealing conditions it is possible to control gas-sensitive properties of the corresponding sensors. Gas-sensitivity can be varied within wide range by changing the structure of sensitive layers. Advanced materials suitable for selective detection of important gaseous species have been proposed. The material compositions, threshold gas concentration and operating temperature are listed in the Table 11.

Table 11
Sensor types, compositions and optimal conditions for selective detection of commonly determined gases

| Detected Gas | Threshold concentration, ppm | T oper., ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Gas-Sensitive Layer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{NO}_{2}$ | 0.5 | 70-100 | $\alpha-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, thin film |
|  | 0.2 | 250 | $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(1: 9)$, thin film |
| $\mathrm{O}_{3}$ | 0.06 | 400 | $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ (1:99), thin film |
|  | 0.045 | 100 | $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(9: 1)$, thin film |
|  | 0.045 | 100 | $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ (1:9), thin film |
| CO | 200 | 200-250 | $\mathrm{NiO}-\mathrm{In} 2 \mathrm{O} 3$ (1:9), ceramic |
|  | 200 |  | $\mathrm{MoO}_{3}-\mathrm{SnO}_{2}$ (1:3), ceramic |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | 1000 | 500-550 | $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Pd}$, thin film / ceramic |
|  | 20 |  | $\mathrm{SnO}_{2}-\mathrm{Sb}-\mathrm{Pd}$, ceramic |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$ | 50 | 300 | $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}-\mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(1: 1) / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, thin film |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{OH}$ | 50 | 300 | $\gamma-\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} / \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$, thin film |
| $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ | 15 | 300 | ZnO , ceramic |
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