ChemComm

COMMUNICATION

RSCPublishing

View Article Online View Journal | View Issue

Cite this: Chem. Commun., 2013, 49, 10269

Received 12th July 2013, Accepted 5th September 2013

DOI: 10.1039/c3cc45252b

www.rsc.org/chemcomm

A new microporous carbon material synthesized *via* thermolysis of a porous aromatic framework embedded with an extra carbon source for low-pressure CO₂ uptake[†]

Yiming Zhang, # Baiyan Li, # Kia Williams, Wen-Yang Gao and Shengqian Ma*

Pre-introducing an extra carbon source into the porous aromatic framework of PAF-1 followed by thermolysis affords a new microporous carbon material, which demonstrates a CO_2 uptake capacity of 93 cm³ g⁻¹ (equivalent to 4.1 mmol g⁻¹ or 18.2 wt%) at 295 K and 1 bar.

The steady increase of CO_2 levels in the atmosphere over the past several decades has urged the development of viable carbon dioxide capture and sequestration (CCS) technologies to reduce the greenhouse emissions.¹ Current technologies are dominated by amine-based web-scrubbing systems, which are energy-costly, corrosive and inefficient.² This thus prompts the exploration of alternative approaches for CCS, and physisorption of CO_2 using porous materials holds great promise due to the facile regeneration process.³

Advanced porous materials such as porous organic polymers (POPs) (including conjugated microporous polymers (CMPs),⁴ porous aromatic frameworks (PAFs),⁵ and porous polymer networks (PPNs)⁶) and metal-organic frameworks (MOFs)^{3,7} have recently been intensively investigated for CO2 capture application. However, POPs usually exhibit very low CO₂ uptake capacities at ambient temperatures and pressures due to the low CO2 adsorption enthalpies as a result of the lack of strong CO₂ binding sites,^{6d} whereas MOFs typically possess poor water/chemical stabilities.^{3e} Porous carbon materials, which feature high thermal/water/chemical stabilities, diverse availability and facile regeneration, have also been explored for CO2 capture application.8 Nonetheless, the large pore sizes together with broad pore size distributions lead to low CO2 adsorption capacities, typically 2–3 mmol g⁻¹ at 25 °C under 1 bar, for most porous carbon materials.^{8c,d} Various studies on CO₂ capture in MOFs have suggested that pore size plays an important role in

 CO_2 capture performances, and narrow pores of ~4 Å to ~8 Å could facilitate CO₂ adsorption due to the fact that the potential fields of the opposite pore walls can overlap thus strengthening the interaction with CO₂ molecules.^{3e,9} Direct thermolysis of MOFs or MOFs embedded with additional carbon sources to prepare ordered porous carbon materials with reduced pore sizes has recently been demonstrated,¹⁰ but the pore size distributions are usually not very uniform thus unfavorable for CO2 uptake at low pressure. Direct carbonization of highly porous PAFs to reduce the pore size in order to enhance CO₂ uptake capacity has also been recently reported,¹¹ but the enhancement was not very dramatic due to the remaining pore size being over 1.0 nm. To further narrow down the pore size with uniform distribution, herein, we report a new strategy of pre-introducing an extra carbon source into a PAF followed by carbonization, which afforded a new microporous carbon material with a small pore size of 5.4 Å thus facilitating a high CO_2 uptake capacity of 4.1 mmol g⁻¹ at 295 K and 1 bar.

We selected PAF-1¹² for "proof-of-concept" studies considering its relatively large pore size and framework robustness as well as readiness for post-synthetic modification. To introduce an extra carbon source into PAF-1 (Scheme 1), we first postgrafted it with sulfonic acid, which can serve as the catalytic site for the polymerization of furfuryl alcohol (FA).^{10b,13} The resulting PAF-1-SO₃H was then stirred in FA for two days, during which the adsorbed FA was catalyzed by the grafted sulfonic acid to polymerize within the pores of PAF-1. After careful filtration and washing with ethanol to remove FA physically adsorbed on the exterior surface, the obtained FA-PAF-1-SO₃H composite was heated at 900 °C under an inert gas atmosphere for 8 h to afford the carbonized material, which is designated as PAF-1/C-900.

Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) patterns of PAF-1/C-900 (Fig. S1, ESI[†]) display two broad peaks at around 23° and 43° , corresponding to carbon (002) and (101) diffractions respectively. These results indicate the amorphous feature of PAF-1/C-900. Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) studies suggest that PAF-1/C-900 exhibits wormhole-like micropores (Fig. 1), and it is essentially amorphous, which is consistent with PXRD analysis.

Department of Chemistry, University of South Florida, 4202 E. Fowler Avenue, Tampa, FL 33620, USA. E-mail: sqma@usf.edu; Fax: +1-813-974-3203; Tel: +1-813-974-5217

[†] Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Detailed procedures for preparation of materials, gas sorption measurements, PXRD patterns, and plots of gas sorption isotherms. See DOI: 10.1039/c3cc45252b

 $[\]ddagger$ These authors contributed equally to this work.





Fig. 1 TEM images of PAF-1/C-900 at different magnifications

The N_2 adsorption isotherm collected at 77 K (Fig. 2a) reveals that PAF-1/C-900 exhibits typical type-I adsorption behavior, a characteristic of microporous materials. Its uptake capacity at the saturation pressure ($P/P_0 = 0.95$) is 316 cm³ g⁻¹, which is much lower than that of PAF-1 (1546 $\text{cm}^3 \text{ g}^{-1}$). This means a dramatic drop in the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) surface area from 4246 m² g⁻¹ for PAF-1 to 1174 m² g⁻¹ for PAF-1/ C-900 (Table S1, ESI[†]). Direct carbonization of PAF-1 at 900 °C also led to a remarkable decrease in surface area of the resulting material, PAF-1-900, which exhibits an even lower BET surface area of 923 m² g⁻¹ as derived from the N_2 adsorption isotherm at 77 K. Pore size distribution analysis based on the Horvath-Kawazoe (HK) model (Fig. 2b), which is widely employed for micropore size analysis,¹⁴ indicates that the pore size of PAF-1/ C-900 is predominantly distributed around 5.4 Å in comparison with 14.5 Å for PAF-1 and 9.4 Å for PAF-1-900 (Table S1, ESI⁺). These results thus highlight the effectiveness of our strategy in further narrowing down the pore size by pre-introducing an extra carbon source compared with the direct carbonization method.

Given that the pore size of PAF-1/C-900 falls in the range of 4 Å to 8 Å, we decided to assess its low pressure CO_2 adsorption performances. CO_2 adsorption isotherms collected at 295 K show that PAF-1/C-900 can adsorb a large amount of CO_2 with an uptake capacity of 93 cm³ g⁻¹ (equivalent to 4.1 mmol g⁻¹ or 18.2 wt%) under 1 atm of pressure, meaning an enhancement



Fig. 2 (a) N_2 adsorption isotherms at 77 K and (b) pore size distributions (H–K model) for PAF-1, PAF-1/C-900, and PAF-1-900.



Fig. 3 CO₂ adsorption isotherms of PAF-1/C-900 and PAF-1 at 295 K.

by a factor of 2.4 compared to parent PAF-1 (27 $\text{cm}^3 \text{ g}^{-1}$ or 1.2 mmol g^{-1} or 5.3 wt%) under the same conditions (Fig. 3). A higher uptake capacity of 135 cm³ g⁻¹ (or 6.0 mmol g⁻¹ or 26.5 wt%) is observed for PAF-1/C-900 at 273 K and 1 bar. In comparison, at 295 K and 1 bar, PAF-1-900 exhibits a lower CO₂ uptake capacity of 79 cm³ g⁻¹ (or 3.5 mmol g⁻¹ or 15.5 wt%) and a much lower CO_2 adsorption capacity of 26 cm³ g⁻¹ (or 1.2 mmol g^{-1} or 5.1 wt%) is observed for carbonized poly(FA) (Fig. S4, ESI[†]). These results thus validate our strategy of preintroducing an extra carbon source into a PAF followed by carbonization for enhancing the CO₂ uptake capacity. It is worth noting that the CO₂ uptake capacity of PAF-1/C-900 at 295 K and 1 bar is among the highest for porous carbon materials reported thus far.¹⁵ PAF-1/C-900 outperforms P-C450¹⁰ (4.5 mmol g^{-1} at 273 K and 1 bar) which is resulted from directly carbonizing PAF-1 at 450 °C without introducing an extra carbon source, and it also surpasses the sulfonic acid grafted porous organic polymers, PPN-6-SO₃H (3.6 mmol g⁻¹ at 295 K and 1 bar) and PPN-6-SO₃Li (3.7 mmol g^{-1} at 295 K and 1 bar);^{6b} yet it is comparable to the aliphatic amine-tethered porous organic polymer, PPN-6-CH₂DETA (4.3 mmol g^{-1} at 295 K and 1 bar).^{6a} The CO₂ uptake capacity of PAF-1/C-900 at 295 K and 1 bar also exceeds that of ZIFs (e.g. 9.1 wt% for the best ZIF of ZIF-78^{7d} at 298 K and 1 bar),^{3c,e} most MOFs (e.g. 15.4 wt% for mmen-Cu-BTTri7c and 15.2 wt% for bio-MOF-11^{7e} at 298 K and 1 bar)^{3c,e} and most zeolite materials (e.g. 3.1 mmol g^{-1} for Na-A^{16b} at 298 K and 1 bar)¹⁶ under similar conditions.



It has been well-documented that narrow pores can strengthen the interaction between pore walls and CO₂ molecules due to the overlap of potential fields of the opposite pore walls.^{3e,9,17} We calculated the heats of adsorption (Q_{st}) of CO₂ for PAF-1/C-900 and PAF-1 based on the CO₂ adsorption isotherms at 273 K and 295 K using the virial method.¹⁸ As shown in Fig. 4, PAF-1/C-900 exhibits a Q_{st} of ~ 27.0 kJ mol⁻¹ at zero-loading, which is 11.6 kJ mol⁻¹ higher than that of PAF-1 (Q_{st} of 15.4 kJ mol⁻¹). These results further validate the contribution of narrow pores to the remarkable enhancement of CO₂ uptake in PAF-1/C-900.

In summary, pre-introducing an extra carbon source into PAF-1 followed by carbonization at 900 °C afforded a microporous carbon material, PAF-1/C-900, with a small pore size of ~5.4 Å. As a result of the substantially reduced pore size, PAF-1/C-900 demonstrates remarkable enhancement of CO₂ uptake capacity at 295 K and 1 bar by a factor of ~2.4 and a dramatic increase in $Q_{\rm st}$ of CO₂ by 11.6 kJ mol⁻¹ at zero-loading compared to the parent PAF-1. The strategy of pre-introducing extra carbon sources into the POP materials followed by thermolysis represents a promising approach to create microporous carbon materials with very narrow pores (<8 Å), which could hold promise for CO₂ capture applications. Ongoing work in our laboratory includes the design and synthesis of other types of functional porous materials for application in CO₂ capture, sensors and catalysis.

The authors acknowledge the University of South Florida for financial support of this work.

Notes and references

- 1 R. K. Pachauri, A. Reisinger, IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007.
- 2 (a) J. Johnson, Chem. Eng. News, 2004, 82, 36; (b) C. Wang, H. Luo,
 D. Jiang, H. Li and S. Dai, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2010, 49, 5978.
- 3 (a) Z. Yong, V. Mata and A. E. Rodrigues, Sep. Purif. Technol., 2002, 26, 195; (b) S. Ma and H.-C. Zhou, Chem. Commun., 2010, 46, 44; (c) J.-R. Li, Y. Ma, M. C. McCarthy, J. Sculley, J. Yu, H.-K. Jeong, P. B. Balbuena and H.-C. Zhou, Coord. Chem. Rev., 2011, 255, 1791; (d) Y.-S. Bae and R. Q. Snurr, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2011, 50, 11586; (e) K. Sumida, D. L. Rogow, J. A. Mason, T. M. McDonald, E. D. Bloch, Z. R. Herm, T.-H. Bae and J. R. Long, Chem. Rev., 2012, 112, 724; (f) J. Liu, P. K. Thallapally, B. P. McGrail, D. R. Brown and J. Liu, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2012, 41, 2308; (g) Z. Zhang, Y. Zhao, Q. Gong, Z. Li and J. Li, Chem. Commun., 2013, 49, 653.
- 4 (a) A. I. Cooper, Adv. Mater., 2009, 21, 1291; (b) M. G. Rabbani,
 A. K. Sekizkardes, O. M. El-Kadri, B. R. Kaafarani and H. M. El-Kaderi, J. Mater. Chem., 2012, 22, 25409; (c) X. Zhu, C. C. Tian,

S. M. Mahurin, S. H. Chai, C. M. Wang, S. Brown, G. M. Veith, H. M. Luo, H. L. Liu and S. Dai, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **134**, 10478; (*d*) Y. Zhu, H. Long and W. Zhang, *Chem. Mater.*, 2013, **25**, 1630; (*e*) Y. Xu, S. Jin, H. Xu, A. Nagai and D. Jiang, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2013, DOI: 10.1039/c3cs60160a.

- 5 (a) T. Ben and S. Qiu, CrystEngComm, 2013, 15, 17; (b) T. Ben, C. Pei,
 D. Zhang, J. Xu, F. Deng, X. Jing and S. Qiu, Energy Environ. Sci.,
 2011, 4, 3991; (c) H. Ma, H. Ren, X. Zou, F. Sun, Z. Yan, K. Cai,
 D. Wang and G. Zhu, J. Mater. Chem. A, 2013, 1, 752; (d) X. Zou,
 H. Ren and G. Zhu, Chem. Commun., 2013, 49, 3925.
- 6 (a) W. Lu, J. P. Sculley, D. Yuan, R. Krishna, Z. Wei and H.-C. Zhou, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2012, 51, 7480; (b) W. Lu, D. Yuan, J. Sculley, D. Zhao, R. Krishna and H.-C. Zhou, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2011, 133, 18126; (c) D. Yuan, W. Lu, D. Zhao and H.-C. Zhou, Adv. Mater., 2011, 23, 3723; (d) J. P. Sculley, J.-R. Li, J. Park, W. Lu and H.-C. Zhou, Sustainable Technologies, Systems & Policies, DOI: 10.5339/stsp.2012.ccs.16.
- 7 (a) A. R. Millward and O. M. Yaghi, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2005, 127, 17998; (b) S. R. Caskey, A. G. Wong-Foy and A. J. Matzger, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2008, 130, 10870; (c) A. Demessence, D. M. D'Alessandro, M. L. Foo and J. R. Long, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2009, 131, 8784; (d) R. Banerjee, H. Furukawa, D. Britt, C. Knobler, M. O'Keeffe and O. M. Yaghi, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2009, 131, 3875; (e) J. An, S. J. Geib and N. L. Rosi, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2010, 132, 38; (f) R. Vaidhyanathan, S. S. Iremonger, G. K. H. Shimizu, P. G. Boyd, S. Alavi and T. K. Woo, Science, 2010, 330, 650; (g) B. Li, Z. Zhang, Y. Li, K. Yao, Y. Zhu, Z. Deng, F. Yang, X. Zhou, G. Li, H. Wu, N. Nijem, Y. J. Chabal, Z. Lai, Y. Han, Z. Shi, S. Feng and J. Li, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2012, 51, 1412; (h) S. D. Burd, S. Ma, J. A. Perman, B. J. Sikora, R. Q. Snurr, P. K. Thallapally, J. Tian, L. Wojtas and M. J. Zaworotko, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2012, 134, 3363; (i) S. Xiang, Y. He, Z. Zhang, H. Wu, W. Zhou, R. Krishna and B. Chen, Nat. Commun., 2012, 3, 954; (j) W.-Y. Gao, W. Yan, R. Cai, K. Williams, A. Salas, L. Wojtas, X. Shi and S. Ma, Chem. Commun., 2012, 48, 8898; (k) J.-R. Li, J. Yu, W. Lu, J. Sculley, P. B. Balbuena and H.-C. Zhou, Nat. Commun., 2013, 4, 1538.
- A. Wahby, J. M. Ramos-Fernández, M. Martínez-Escandell, A. Sepúlveda-Escribano, J. Silvestre-Albero and F. Rodríguez-Reinoso, *ChemSusChem*, 2010, 3, 974; (b) V. Presser, J. McDonough, S.-H. Yeon and Y. Gogotsi, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2011, 4, 3059; (c) S. Himeno, T. Komatsu and S. Fujita, *J. Chem. Eng. Data*, 2005, 50, 369; (d) Y. Zhao, L. Zhao, K. X. Yao, Y. Yang, Q. Zhang and Y. Han, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2012, 22, 19726.
- 9 P. Nugent, Y. Belmabkhout, S. D. Burd, A. J. Cairns, R. Luebke, K. Forrest, T. Pham, S. Ma, B. Space, L. Wojtas, M. Eddaoudi and M. J. Zaworotko, *Nature*, 2013, 495, 80.
- (a) B. Liu, H. Shioyama, T. Akita and Q. Xu, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2008, 130, 5390; (b) H. L. Jiang, B. Liu, Y. Q. Lan, K. Kuratani, T. Akita, H. Shioyama, F. Zong and Q. Xu, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2011, 133, 11854; (c) M. Hu, J. Reboul, S. Furukawa, N. L. Torad, Q. Ji, P. Srinivasu, K. Ariga, S. Kitagawa and Y. Yamauchi, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2012, 134, 2864; (d) S. Lim, K. Suh, Y. Kim, M. Yoon, H. Park, D. N. Dybtsev and K. Kim, Chem. Commun., 2012, 48, 7447.
- 11 T. Ben, Y. Li, L. Zhu, D. Zhang, D. Cao, Z. Xiang, X. Yao and S. Qiu, Energy Environ. Sci., 2012, 5, 8370.
- 12 T. Ben, H. Ren, S. Ma, D. Cao, J. Lan, X. Jing, W. Wang, J. Xu, F. Deng, J. M. Simmons, S. Qiu and G. Zhu, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2009, 48, 9457.
- 13 (a) S. Che, A. E. Garcia-Bennett, X. Liu, R. P. Hodgkins, P. A. Wright, D. Zhao, O. Terasaki and T. Tatsumi, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2003, 42, 3930; (b) Q.-H. Yang, W. Xu, A. Tomita and T. Kyotani, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2005, 127, 8956.
- 14 R. T. Yang, Adsorbents: Fundamentals and Applications, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, 2003.
- (a) M. Sevilla and A. B. Fuertes, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2011, 4, 1765;
 (b) M. Sevilla, P. Valle-Vigon and A. B. Fuertes, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2011, 21, 2781;
 (c) Y. Zhao, X. Liu, K. X. Yao, L. Zhao and Y. Han, *Chem. Mater.*, 2012, 24, 4725.
- (a) R. Krishna and J. A. vanBaten, *Langmuir*, 2010, 26, 3981;
 (b) T.-H. Bae, M. R. Hudson, J. A. Mason, W. L. Queen, J. J. Dutton, K. Sumida, K. J. Micklash, S. S. Kaye, C. M. Brown and J. R. Long, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2013, 6, 128.
- 17 S. Ma, Pure Appl. Chem., 2009, 81, 2235.
- 18 L. Czepirsky and J. Jagiello, Chem. Eng. Sci., 1989, 44, 797.