



# In situ generated TiO<sub>2</sub> over zeolitic supports as reusable photocatalysts for the degradation of dichlorvos

Silvina Gomez<sup>a,c,\*</sup>, Candelaria Leal Marchena<sup>a,c</sup>, María S. Renzini<sup>a,c</sup>,  
Luis Pizzio<sup>b,c</sup>, Liliana Pierella<sup>a,c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> CITEQ (Centro de Investigación y Tecnología Química), Facultad Regional Córdoba, Universidad Tecnológica Nacional, Maestro López esq. Cruz Roja Argentina, Córdoba, Argentina

<sup>b</sup> Centro de Investigación y Desarrollo en Ciencias Aplicadas "Dr. J. J. Ronco" (CINDECA), Departamento de Química, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas, UNLP-CCT La Plata, 47 N° 257, 1900 La Plata, Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>c</sup> CONICET, Argentina

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 27 January 2014

Received in revised form 2 June 2014

Accepted 27 June 2014

Available online 5 July 2014

### Keywords:

Photodegradation  
Dichlorvos  
Zeolites  
Titanium dioxide  
Reusable catalyst

## ABSTRACT

Materials based on titania supported on zeolitic matrices (HBETA, HY and HZSM5) were synthesized by in situ generation of TiO<sub>2</sub>. The supported catalysts characterized by XRD indicate the presence of the anatase phase alone. The materials were also characterized by FTIR, S<sub>BET</sub>, and UV-VIS DRS. A high TiO<sub>2</sub> content produced lower degradation, due to the presence of TiO<sub>2</sub> particle aggregates of greater size on the zeolite matrix surface, as evidenced by the calculated crystal size. TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%) presented more activity than TiO<sub>2</sub> supported on the other matrices due to higher adsorption of dichlorvos on HBETA. It has more surface area and a lower band gap value too, which makes it more effective. The mineralization degree is lower than the degradation percentage due to the formation of organophosphorous intermediates that are less toxic than the starting material. The complete degradation and mineralization of the pollutant was obtained in 360 and 540 min of reaction with TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%), respectively. This catalyst resulted in degradation percentages close to that of commercial TiO<sub>2</sub> P25. The main advantage of supported catalysts is their easy separation and reuse, in this case resulting in a very low activity loss during eight cycles. These materials present suitable properties to be used as catalysts in the photocatalytic treatment of wastewater that contains pesticide dichlorvos in water.

© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

The increasing demand and shortage of clean water sources due to the rapid development of industrialization, population growth and long-term droughts have become an issue worldwide. With this growing demand, various practical strategies and solutions have been adopted to yield more viable water resources [1].

In recent years, an alternative to conventional methods for the decontamination of water has been provided, which is known as "Advanced Oxidation Processes" (AOPs) and is based on the generation of very reactive species such as hydroxyl radicals that quickly and nonselectively oxidize a broad range of organic pollutants [2].

One of these AOPs that has attracted special attention is heterogeneous photocatalysis, employing UV-Vis light as energy source and a solid catalyst as active site for water detoxification. Indeed, the subject has become an area of intensive research. The main advantage of photocatalysis over conventional water treatment methods is that a wide range of organic compounds can be completely mineralized, leading to the formation of carbon dioxide, water, and inorganic mineral salts [3]. The generated OH• radicals interact with organic pollutants, leading to progressive degradation that is followed by complete mineralization. Among these heterogeneous photocatalysts, TiO<sub>2</sub> has been considered as a promising one for the remediation of wastewater treatment [4–7]. TiO<sub>2</sub> is presented as one of the most appropriate semiconductor materials to be employed as a photocatalyst due to its high activity in the photodegradation of organic compounds, low cost, low toxicity, and chemical stability [8].

The main drawbacks of TiO<sub>2</sub> catalysts are the need for complex filtration procedures and the high turbidity that decreases the radiation flux. The practical applications of TiO<sub>2</sub> are limited because

\* Corresponding author at: CITEQ (Centro de Investigación y Tecnología Química), Facultad Regional Córdoba, Universidad Tecnológica Nacional, Maestro López esq. Cruz Roja Argentina, Córdoba, Argentina. Tel.: +54 351 469 0585; fax: +54 351 469 0585.

E-mail address: [sgomez@scdt.frc.utn.edu.ar](mailto:sgomez@scdt.frc.utn.edu.ar) (S. Gomez).

of the problems of low recovery efficiency of  $\text{TiO}_2$  fine particles, fast recombination rate of the photogenerated electron–hole pair, and a low quantum yield in the photocatalytic reactions in aqueous solutions [9].

Such problems have motivated the development of supported photocatalysts in which  $\text{TiO}_2$  is immobilized on different adsorbent materials. Immobilizing  $\text{TiO}_2$  on substrates such as a glass matrix, optical fiber and stainless steel plate eliminates the problem of agglomeration, although the photocatalytic efficiency of immobilized  $\text{TiO}_2$  is less than that of the suspended  $\text{TiO}_2$  particles [10]. Besides, the specific surface area also decreases due to the fixing of  $\text{TiO}_2$  on nonporous supports, which reduces the adsorption capacity. For photocatalytic decomposition of a target compound, its adsorption on the  $\text{TiO}_2$  surface is essential prior to the surface reaction. Furthermore, organic pollutants generally occur in low concentrations (ppm level or below) and pre-concentration of the substrates on the surface where photons are absorbed is a desirable feature for effective photodegradation [11].

The supports should withstand reactive oxidative radical attack during illumination, have long-term stability, prevent  $\text{TiO}_2$  leaching during light irradiation, and have the ability to delocalize electrons. Many reported studies deal with the immobilization of  $\text{TiO}_2$  over different inert porous supports [10,12–23]. In this context, zeolites have attracted greater attention due to their adsorption capacity, which helps in pooling the pollutants to the vicinity of the  $\text{TiO}_2$  surface and also leads to faster degradation [7,23,24].

Zeolites are microporous crystalline aluminosilicates with structural features, such as the ability to trigger photoinduced electron donor and acceptor reactions, which make them attractive hosts for photochemical applications [25,26]. Furthermore, zeolites delocalize band-gap excited electrons of  $\text{TiO}_2$  and minimize electron–hole recombination. Due to these interesting properties, zeolites are attractive catalyst supports in the treatment of pesticide-contaminated water.  $\text{TiO}_2$  supported on zeolites, which have large surface area and light transparent nature, increases the adsorption capacity, and the uniform diffusion of pesticide pollutants leads to efficient degradation [27].

Increasing pesticide application and improper wastewater disposal methods contaminate water resources and severely affect the ecology as well as the environment [24]. Insecticides are considered accumulative and toxic compounds. Their presence as contaminants in aquatic environments may cause serious problems to human beings and other organisms [28]. The migration of pesticides to groundwater and surface water has become an issue of great concern, and numerous incidents of contamination have been documented in developed countries [29]. Organophosphorous pesticides such as methyl parathion and dichlorvos are commonly used in Third-World countries like India where there are poor environmental controls for increasing agricultural productivity and they are detected in various environmental matrices such as soil, water and air because of their widespread use [30,31].

In the present work, we attempted to combine the well-known photocatalytic properties of  $\text{TiO}_2$  and the properties of zeolites as  $\text{TiO}_2$  supports to synthesize heterogeneous photocatalytic materials. They were prepared by impregnation of titanium (IV) isopropoxide onto three different zeolites (HBETA, HY and HZSM5) and characterized by a series of complementary techniques: X-ray diffraction (XRD), transmittance–Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR), and UV–visible diffuse reflectance spectroscopy (DRS). The materials were evaluated in the photodecomposition of organophosphate pesticide dichlorvos. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that these materials have been successfully synthesized and tested in the photodegradation of this pollutant.

## 2. Experimental

### 2.1. Preparation of photocatalysts

The supports employed were BETA, ZSM5 and Y zeolites. Zeolite HY was provided by Aldrich; the other zeolites were synthesized by means of the hydrothermal crystallization method using tetrapropylammonium hydroxide (TPAOH, Fluka) for the ZSM5 structure [32] and tetraethylammonium hydroxide (TEAOH, Merck) for the BETA structure [33] as directing agents. The ammonium forms of zeolite were prepared by ion exchange of the as-prepared Na-zeolite form with 1 M ammonium chloride solution at 80 °C for 40 h. The HBETA and HZSM5 were obtained by means of a thermal treatment under nitrogen flow for 8 h at 500 °C and then calcinations in air at the same temperature for 10 h. The catalysts supported on zeolitic matrices (HBETA, HY and HZSM5) were prepared by using an appropriate amount of titanium (IV) isopropoxide (Aldrich chemistry, 97%) and zeolite matrix in ethanol (Cicarelli), which was mechanically stirred for 4 h at ambient temperature. Then the solvent was removed by rotary evaporation. In the HBETA matrix, the amount of titanium (IV) isopropoxide was varied with the purpose of generating in situ  $\text{TiO}_2$  concentrations of 5, 10, 20, and 30 wt% in the final solid. The mixture was then dried at 110 °C and calcined in air at 450 °C. They were denominated  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}(5\%)$ ,  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}(10\%)$ ,  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}(20\%)$  and  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}(30\%)$ . In order to compare the activity,  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HY}(20\%)$  and  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HZSM5}(20\%)$  were prepared with 20 wt% of  $\text{TiO}_2$  in the final solid in HY and HZSM5, respectively. P25 standard  $\text{TiO}_2$ , which was included for comparison with the supported catalyst, was kindly supplied by Degussa.

### 2.2. Characterization

The powder XRD diffraction patterns of the materials were collected on a PANalytical X'pert PRO diffractometer equipped with  $\text{Cu K}\alpha$  (1.54 Å) in the range of  $2\theta$  from 5 to 50° (for HBETA and HY) and 5–60° (for HZSM5) in steps of 0.05° with a count time of 2 s at each point. The crystallite size (Dc) of the new crystalline phase was estimated by XRD using the Scherrer equation. BET surface area determinations were carried out with Micromeritics ASAP 2000 equipment. Infrared (IR) studies were performed on a JASCO 5300 FTIR spectrometer. The spectra in the lattice vibration region were performed using KBr 0.05% wafer technique and they were carried out from 1800 to 400  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  in 16 consecutive registers of 4  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  resolution each. UV–visible diffuse reflectance spectroscopy (DRS) in absorbance mode was recorded using an Optronics OL 750-427 spectrometer in the wavelength range of 200–900 nm.

The Si/Al relation of HBETA and HZSM5 zeolites was determined by atomic absorption in a Perkin Elmer Analyst 800 spectrometer after the digestion of the samples by microwave in a Milestone ETHOS 900 digester. In order to determine the Bronsted/Lewis acid site relation and concentration of acidic sites of the zeolitic matrices, pyridine (Py) adsorption experiments were carried out on self-supporting wafers (8–10  $\text{mg}/\text{cm}^2$ ) using a thermostated cell with  $\text{CaF}_2$  windows connected to a vacuum line. Pyridine (3 Torr) was adsorbed at room temperature and desorbed at 400 °C and  $10^{-4}$  Torr for 1 h. The Bronsted/Lewis relation was calculated from the maximum intensity of the adsorption bands at 1545  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  and 1450–1460  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ , for Bronsted and Lewis sites, respectively, and quantified using the literature data of the integrated molar extinction coefficients [34], which are independent of the catalysts or strength of the sites.

**Table 1**

Specific surface area, crystallite size and optical band gap of TiO<sub>2</sub>, HBETA, HY, HZSM5 and TiO<sub>2</sub>/zeolite samples.

Samples	$S_{\text{BET}}$ (m <sup>2</sup> /g)	$D_c$ (nm) <sup>a</sup>	$E_g$ (eV) <sup>b</sup>
HBETA	585		5.40
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HBETA(5%)	522	14.1	3.52
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HBETA(10%)	516	15.2	3.20
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HBETA(20%)	510	12.9	2.98
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HBETA(30%)	466	16.1	2.98
HY	485		5.10
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HY(20%)	346	17.5	3.58
HZSM5	355		5.70
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HZSM5(20%)	342	16.4	3.47

<sup>a</sup>  $D_c$  values of TiO<sub>2</sub>/zeolite samples were calculated using  $2\theta = 25.4^\circ$  assigned to the (1 0 1) crystal plane.

<sup>b</sup>  $\pm 0.05$  eV.

### 2.3. Photocatalytic degradation of dichlorvos


The catalytic activity of the materials was evaluated in the photodegradation of dichlorvos (DDVP Pestanal, Fluka) in water, at 25 °C. The tests were carried out employing a 125 W high-pressure mercury lamp (the maximum emission is 365 nm and the light intensity is about 20 mW/cm<sup>2</sup>) placed inside a Pyrex-glass jacket, thermostated by water circulation, and immersed in the DDVP solution contained in a 400 mL cylindrical Pyrex-glass reactor. For comparison purposes, solar light was utilized for the best supported catalyst. The catalyst was maintained in suspension by stirring and air was continuously bubbled. Previously, the DDVP solution (400 mL,  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  mol L<sup>-1</sup>, 22.1 ppm) containing 100 mg of catalyst was magnetically stirred in the absence of light for 30 min to ensure that the adsorption–desorption equilibrium of DDVP on the surface of the materials was attained. During the course of the experiments, samples were periodically extracted, filtered using a Millipore syringe adapter (porosity, 0.22  $\mu$ m) and then analyzed. The variation of the pesticide concentration as a function of irradiation time was determined using a Shimadzu double-beam UV-Visible spectrophotometer, measuring the absorbance at 210 nm [35]. The extent of DDVP mineralization was determined using the Total Organic Carbon, Shimadzu 5050. In order to evaluate the possibility of TiO<sub>2</sub> leaching, a reaction was conducted under similar conditions to that of the degradation, only that after 30 min of reaction the catalyst was removed and then, the reaction continued as before up to 240 min.

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1. Catalyst characterization

The surface area ( $S_{\text{BET}}$ ) of HBETA, HY, HZSM5 and TiO<sub>2</sub>/zeolite samples, determined from N<sub>2</sub> adsorption–desorption isotherms using Brunauer–Emmett–Teller (BET) method, is listed in Table 1. In all the cases, the  $S_{\text{BET}}$  decreases with the increment of TiO<sub>2</sub> content in the sample. This could be due to deposition of TiO<sub>2</sub> particles on the zeolite matrix surface and pore blocking. The greatest decrease was observed for TiO<sub>2</sub>/HY zeolite, which has the largest pore size with respect to the other matrices [36], favoring the formation of larger crystals of TiO<sub>2</sub> in the pores, blocking them. This behavior can be checked with the results of XRD (Fig. 1).

In order to confirm the structure and crystallinity of TiO<sub>2</sub>/zeolite catalysts, an XRD study was carried out. Fig. 1 shows the XRD patterns of HBETA (a) and different titania-supported catalysts (b–e). The figure shows the characteristic signals of the parent HBETA catalyst at  $2\theta$  angles of 7–8° and 21–22° [37,38]. These data were confirmed with JC-PDF file for BETA zeolite. However, its intensity decreases in parallel with the increment of TiO<sub>2</sub> content. TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA prepared in this study showed a diffraction peak




**Fig. 1.** XRD pattern of (a) HBETA zeolite, (b) TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(5%), (c) TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(10%), (d) TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%), and (e) TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(30%).

at 25.4°, which was assigned to the characteristic reflection from the (1 0 1) plane of anatase [39]. The peak intensity at  $2\theta = 25.4^\circ$  increased with an increasing amount of TiO<sub>2</sub> loaded on zeolite [23,40–43]. The peak at 48.5° is barely observed since the amount of TiO<sub>2</sub> would not be enough to give clear diffraction peaks. On the other hand, no peak assigned to the rutile phase ( $2\theta = 27.4^\circ$ ) was observed in the XRD patterns of all TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA catalysts used in the present study. For most photocatalytic reaction systems, it is generally accepted that the anatase phase has higher activity than rutile, and this enhancement in photoactivity has been ascribed to the higher Fermi level of anatase than that of rutile by about 0.1 eV [39].

The XRD patterns of HY and HZSM5 matrices (see supplementary data, Figure S1) show the characteristic peaks,  $2\theta$  angles of 6.3° and 15.92°, and  $2\theta$  angles of 7–8° and 21–22°, respectively. TiO<sub>2</sub>/HY(20%) and TiO<sub>2</sub>/HZSM5(20%) materials, as well as other supported catalysts, show the anatase phase but not the rutile phase. Therefore, it can be suggested that the anatase particles are favorably stabilized on the surface of the zeolite matrix [23]. However, the absence of characteristic peaks assigned to the rutile phase could also be due to its presence in a lower proportion than the anatase phase or in a high dispersion degree (very small crystals undetected by XRD). In TiO<sub>2</sub>/HY(20%), some peaks of the starting matrix disappeared and the baseline was modified, resulting in a less crystalline catalyst compared with the other supported catalysts. Zeolite Y is more sensible than other zeolites during the incorporation of other substances in the matrix. This is partly due to the instability of zeolites Y at low Si/Al ratios (see supplementary data T1) [44,45].

The crystallite size ( $D_c$ ) of the new crystalline phase, estimated by XRD using the Scherrer equation, seems to be independent of the TiO<sub>2</sub> content in the prepared materials in the majority of the cases. In general, an increase in the TiO<sub>2</sub> content causes an increase in the crystal size, but in the case of TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%) the crystallite size is smaller, which maybe because this amount of TiO<sub>2</sub> is appropriate to generate smaller crystals of TiO<sub>2</sub> and achieve good dispersion (Table 1). Also, the available surface area is large enough to accommodate new crystals instead of generating larger crystals.

The FTIR spectrum of HBETA (Fig. 2a) shows the bending mode of water at 1640 cm<sup>-1</sup>. The framework asymmetric vibrations of Si–O–Si and Si–O–Al give an intense broad band between 1300 and 850 cm<sup>-1</sup>, and the symmetric vibration at 800 cm<sup>-1</sup>. The spectra b–e shown in the same figure correspond to 5, 10, 20 and 30 wt% TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA catalysts. Though the spectra appear similar, there are still some variations in the region of the bending modes of HBETA framework. The symmetric vibration of Si–O–Si



**Fig. 2.** FTIR of (a) HBETA zeolite, (b)  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}(5\%)$ , (c)  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}(10\%)$ , (d)  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}(20\%)$ , and (e)  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}(30\%)$ .

( $800\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) is clearly resolved in the spectrum of HBETA (spectrum a) but its intensity decreases with the increase in  $\text{TiO}_2$  loading. This is attributed to intense Ti–O stretching overlapped with Si–O–Si vibration, due to calcination of the samples at  $450^\circ\text{C}$  [42,46]. The other bands also show a decrease in intensity, which can be due to a dilution effect by the increase in  $\text{TiO}_2$  loading and a decrease in the zeolite matrix loading.


The intensity of the O–H<sub>2</sub> bending mode at  $1640\text{ cm}^{-1}$  increases up to 10 wt%, but decreases for 20 and 30 wt%  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}$ . There may be a transfer of outer surface Bronsted acid sites of HBETA to  $\text{TiO}_2$  particles up to 10 wt%  $\text{TiO}_2$  loading. Hence, both negatively charged Si–O–Al bridge and protonated  $\text{TiO}_2$  particles could adsorb water. But the excess  $\text{TiO}_2$  particles block the acid sites in 20 and 30 wt%  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}$  [42]. Hence, the intensity of the OH<sub>2</sub> bending mode decreases for higher loading of  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}$ .

For the other matrices, the FTIR spectra in the range  $1800\text{--}400\text{ cm}^{-1}$  (see supplementary data, Figure S2) present vibrations assigned to the internal bonds of a  $\text{TO}_4$  tetrahedral structure (T=Si or Al) that are insensitive to changes in the zeolite structure, asymmetrical stretching ( $1300\text{--}900$ ), symmetrical stretching ( $850\text{--}750\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) and to (O–T–O) deformation ( $600\text{--}400\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ).

In all the cases, no band in the region near  $960\text{ cm}^{-1}$  was detected, which could be assigned to the antisymmetric stretching vibration of the Ti–O–Si bonds [43,46,47]. Therefore, the tetrahedral Si sites were not replaced with Ti during preparation. So, we can conclude that  $\text{TiO}_2$  was deposited on the zeolite surface [23].

The diffuse reflectance spectrum of zeolitic matrices (see supplementary data, Figure S3) presents two bands at 216 and  $300\text{ nm}$  assigned to the first one that arose from the Al–O charge-transfer transition of four-coordinated framework aluminum, the second one being attributed to structures with highly ordered octahedral symmetry [48,49]. The UV–vis diffused reflectance spectra of  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HBETA}$ ,  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HY}(20\%)$  and  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HZSM5}(20\%)$  samples are shown in Fig. 3. In the supported catalyst, the absorption band at  $200\text{--}250\text{ nm}$  is due to electron transfer from the ligand oxygen to an unoccupied orbital of the  $\text{Ti}^{4+}$  framework [50]. The spectra are also characterized by an intense band centered at  $320\text{ nm}$ , corresponding to charge transfer from the valence band (O 2p) to the conduction band (Ti 3d) [51]. According to the literature, a band around  $320\text{ nm}$  might be due to the presence of anatase in the extra framework [52]. The UV–vis DRS results may confirm the absence of a Ti–O–Si linkage in these systems [25].

The band gap energy values ( $E_g$ ), estimated from UV–Vis–DRS spectra using Kubelka–Munk remission function [53], are listed in Table 1. The  $E_g$  values of zeolitic matrices (HBETA, HY and HZSM5) without  $\text{TiO}_2$  and  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{zeolites}$  are similar to those reported in the



**Fig. 3.** DRS of the catalyst supported on the different zeolitic matrices with  $\text{TiO}_2$ .

literature [54,55]. The  $E_g$  values decrease slightly with the increment of the  $\text{TiO}_2$  content for the HBETA zeolite up to 20%  $\text{TiO}_2$  loading, and then the  $E_g$  values remain practically unchanged no matter the  $\text{TiO}_2$  content in the samples. For the different zeolitic matrices with the same loading, the values indicate that there are differences in the band gap for the  $\text{TiO}_2/\text{HY}(20\%)$  sample, whose value was relatively high (3.58 eV). This result may be due to the low crystallinity in this sample compared with other matrices. The higher number of imperfections and defects in the  $\text{TiO}_2$  structure may act as recombination centers for the electron/hole pairs, which in turn will result in poor efficiency in photocatalysis [43].

### 3.2. Photocatalytic activities

Prior to photocatalytic experiments, the DDVP solution ( $400\text{ mL}$ ,  $1 \times 10^{-4}\text{ mol L}^{-1}$ , 22.1 ppm) with 100 mg of catalyst was magnetically stirred in the absence of light to study the adsorption on the surface of the materials. The pesticide adsorption over the zeolitic matrices follow a Langmuir isotherm behavior. From the linealized Langmuir isotherm the maximum adsorbed amounts were obtained. These values were 0.02, 0.01 and  $0.006\text{ mg}$  of DDVP for mg catalyst for HBETA, HY and HZSM5, respectively. These behaviors of the zeolitic matrices agree with the structural properties and stability of each material. The results revealed the greater adsorption of DDVP on HBETA and hence, it was chosen as the suitable support for further studies. The lower adsorption property of HY and HZSM5 compared to HBETA is attributed to the higher hydrophilic nature of HY and lower surface area of HZSM5. Apart from these facts, the larger number of acid sites in HBETA (see supplementary data, Table S1) could also be yet another reason for the better adsorption of DDVP [56]. The DDVP molecule can be efficiently adsorbed on the acid sites of HBETA due to its small size. The maximum adsorption was reached within 30 min, that is, at least 30 min was necessary to ensure that the adsorption–desorption equilibrium of DDVP on the surface of the materials was attained.

The results of the photolysis experiments carried out without any catalyst showed that only 2–5% degradation occurred. In the presence of H-zeolites as catalyst, no significant mineralization was observed, confirming that zeolitic matrices are not in themselves active in the degradation of DDVP.


The effect of  $\text{TiO}_2$  percentage in the zeolitic matrices on the photocatalytic activity of DDVP is shown in Table 2. The studies were done using 100 mg of catalyst in  $400\text{ mL}$  of DDVP aqueous solution. The degradation percentage was calculated as  $X = (C_0 - C/C_0) \times 100$ , where  $C_0$  is the original DDVP concentration and  $C$  the remaining DDVP concentration in solution at specific time intervals. It is



**Table 2**

Degradation percentages for DDVP at 240 min, reaction rate ( $k_r$ ), adsorption equilibrium constant ( $K_{ads}$ ) and TOC values. The experimental conditions were air; pH 5; [DDVP] =  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  mol L<sup>-1</sup>; [catalyst] = 250 mg/L; UV lamp.

Catalyst	Degradation percentage (%)	$k_r$ (mol L <sup>-1</sup> min <sup>-1</sup> )	$K_{ads}$ (mol <sup>-1</sup> L)	TOC (ppm)
TiO <sub>2</sub>	90.04 (±0.02)	$2.52 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.28 \times 10^3$	3.47
HBETA	30.02 (±0.03)	$3.33 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.88 \times 10^3$	4.82
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HBETA(5%)	67.28 (±0.05)	$1.10 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.67 \times 10^3$	3.45
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HBETA(10%)	77.35 (±0.06)	$2.32 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.91 \times 10^3$	2.96
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HBETA(20%)	89.96 (±0.05)	$2.94 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.27 \times 10^3$	2.75
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HBETA(30%)	75.34 (±0.04)	$1.89 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.03 \times 10^3$	2.98
HY	22.82 (±0.04)	$3.33 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.42 \times 10^3$	4.84
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HY(20%)	47.54 (±0.03)	$5 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.04 \times 10^3$	4.13
HZSM5	18.66 (±0.07)	$3.33 \times 10^{-7}$	$3.03 \times 10^3$	4.82
TiO <sub>2</sub> /HZSM5(20%)	71.40 (±0.05)	$5 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.89 \times 10^3$	3.32



**Fig. 4.** DDVP photocatalytic degradation at different initial concentration with TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA (20%).

known that the photocatalytic reaction rate of most organic compounds is described by pseudo-first-order kinetics that is rationalized in terms of the Langmuir–Hinshelwood model, modified to accommodate reactions occurring at a solid–liquid interface [57]:

$$r_0 = -\frac{dc}{dt} = \frac{k_r K C_0}{1 + K C_0} \quad (1)$$

where  $r_0$  is the initial rate of DDVP degradation,  $C_0$  its initial concentration,  $K$  the equilibrium constant and  $k_r$  the degradation rate at maximum coverage for the experimental conditions [58]. Equation (1) is linearized by its reciprocal expression (2):

$$\frac{1}{r_0} = \frac{1}{k_r} + \frac{1}{k_r K C_0} \quad (2)$$


For this purpose, experiments at five different initial concentrations of DDVP (Fig. 4) with TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%) were carried out. The conditions were the same as those for photocatalytic reactions, 400 mL of DDVP solution with 100 mg of catalyst. The  $r_0$  values were independently obtained from these curves by the linear fit, using only the experimental points during the first minutes of illumination.

With our experimental data, Fig. 5 was plotted with Equation (2). From the intersection of this straight line with the ordinate  $1/k_r$  results and hence, the value of the reaction rate is  $k_r = 2.94 \times 10^{-6}$  mol L<sup>-1</sup> min<sup>-1</sup>. From the slope of this line, the equilibrium constant,  $K = 3.27 \times 10^3$  mol<sup>-1</sup> L, was calculated.

The same procedure was performed for each of the catalysts. The results are listed in Table 2.

The extent of DDVP mineralization was measured at the end of reaction by TOC and the results are listed in Table 2. The initial TOC of DDVP was 4.86 ppm.

For the catalysts supported on the zeolitic matrix HBETA, the increment of TiO<sub>2</sub> content in TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA samples from 5 to 20 wt%



**Fig. 5.** Linearization of Langmuir–Hinshelwood equation.

produces a continuous increment of the photocatalytic activity at 240 min. The decline in the degradation of samples with loadings higher than TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%) could be due to the presence of TiO<sub>2</sub> particle aggregates of greater size on the zeolite matrix surface. As shown in Table 1 and by XRD, the crystallite size is larger in TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(30%) than in TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%). Moreover, at higher percentage loading, the excited particles may not be close to the zeolite surface and hence, its conduction band electron is not delocalized over zeolite. As a result, there could be much electron–hole recombination giving a low degradation rate. Additionally, the increment of the catalytic activity can also be due to the lower band gap values of the samples with higher TiO<sub>2</sub> contents, which would increase the absorption capacity of higher wavelength radiation.

The differences in the behaviors of the zeolitic matrices in the photocatalytic activity of DDVP can be associated with the structural properties and stability of each material. The lower activity for zeolite ZSM5 could be associated with its microporous structure (pores defined by ten member rings) that hinders the access of large molecules to the internal acid sites. In addition and in comparison with the other matrices, it has lower surface area and a fewer number of acid sites. The lower adsorption property and photocatalytic activity of HY compared to HBETA is attributed to the higher hydrophilic nature of HY, which allows water to pass through its channels but it does not allow the passage of organic molecules such as those of DDVP. Also, as aforementioned, zeolite Y is more sensible and unstable than other zeolites due to low Si/Al ratios. The loss of crystallinity because of the incorporation of TiO<sub>2</sub> and the thermal treatment reduce the activity of the catalytic material. In these studies BETA zeolite presents better results due to its three-dimensional pore system with straight channels of 0.73 nm × 0.65 nm and tortuous channels of 0.55 nm × 0.55 nm with 1.0 nm channel intersections, with higher accessibility to its

active sites (pores defined by twelve member rings), which makes it more active.

The rate of degradation is related to the formation of  $\text{OH}^\bullet$  radical, which is the critical species in the degradation process [59]. The equilibrium adsorption of reactants on the catalyst surface and the reaction rate of  $\text{OH}^\bullet$  radicals with other chemicals are also significant in the rate of degradation [60]. The hydroxyl radicals are formed through the reaction of holes with adsorbed  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  on the  $\text{TiO}_2$  surface. The oxidizing power of the  $\text{OH}^\bullet$  radicals is strong enough to oxidize adsorbed DDVP on the surface of  $\text{TiO}_2$ /zeolites.

After 240 min of irradiation, the amount of degraded DDVP was close to 90% with  $\text{TiO}_2$ /HBETA(20%), but the mineralization degree was close to 44%. The TOC values decreased with the increase in the degradation percentage, but were slightly lower than the amount of degraded DDVP as a result of the formation of organic intermediates. These results are in agreement with previous reports that indicate the formation of phosphate-containing intermediates [23,58]. The *O,O,O*-trimethyl phosphoric ester and *O,O*-dimethyl phosphonic ester have been reported as the main intermediates during the photodegradation of DDVP [61]. These by-products appear to be less toxic than the parent compound, so a less contaminant solution than the starting solution is obtained. The complete degradation and mineralization of the pollutant was obtained under these conditions in 360 and 540 min of reaction with  $\text{TiO}_2$ /HBETA(20%), respectively. We assume that once all the DDVP have been degraded, the phosphate intermediates start to be degraded. Additionally, comparative studies were performed to understand the role of the support during the photocatalytic degradation between  $\text{TiO}_2$ /HBETA(20%) and bulk  $\text{TiO}_2$  (Degussa P25). The reaction was carried out with 20 mg of  $\text{TiO}_2$  P25 and 400 mL of DDVP solution  $1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol L}^{-1}$ , which is equivalent to 20% in the matrix. In Table 2, at 240 min of reaction, it can be seen that the  $\text{TiO}_2$ -supported system shows similar degradation to that of bulk  $\text{TiO}_2$ , both materials reaching almost the same degradation. This may suggest that the zeolite matrix does not affect the degradation capacity and the photocatalytic properties of  $\text{TiO}_2$ . But supported  $\text{TiO}_2$  is easier to separate than the commercial one, so it can be easily reused. Also, the dispersion of  $\text{TiO}_2$  over zeolite material avoids particle–particle aggregation and light scattering by  $\text{TiO}_2$  [23]. TOC results revealed that pure  $\text{TiO}_2$  required more time for the complete mineralization of DDVP.

The experiment with solar light was performed with  $\text{TiO}_2$ /HBETA(20%), the degradation percentage achieved was 58% at 240 min of reaction. Kinetic and adsorption equilibrium constants were calculated as:  $k_r$ :  $2.31 \times 10^{-6} \text{ mol L}^{-1} \text{ min}^{-1}$  and  $K$ :  $2.86 \times 10^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ L}$ , respectively. This result is mainly due to the different initial photon flow of both light sources [57]. With an improvement in the photocatalytic system, making solar rays focus on the photoreactor, the system applied may be better.

### 3.3. Reusability of the catalysts

To evaluate the reusability of the catalysts we chose  $\text{TiO}_2$ /HBETA(20%) because it was the catalyst with better performance in this study. At the end of the first photocatalytic cycle, the catalyst was separated from the resulting suspension by filtering, washed, oven dried at  $70^\circ\text{C}$ , and then reused without any calcination treatment. The same procedure was employed after the second and all the cycles of use. The percentage of degraded DDVP after each cycle of use, together with the mineralization degree, is shown in Fig. 6.

The comparison of the DDVP degradation degree reached at the end of the first cycle showed that the degradation rate decreased slightly and then kept constant. The decrease in the degradation percentage was probably due to the accumulation of organic




Fig. 6. DDVP degradation and mineralization degree as a function of the number of cycles of use for  $\text{TiO}_2$ /HBETA(20%).




Fig. 7. Evolution of DDVP after photocatalysis with  $\text{TiO}_2$ /HBETA(20%) (♦) and leaching test (■) with the same catalyst filtrate at the 30 min.

intermediates in the cavities and on the surface of the catalyst affecting the adsorption of DDVP, and reducing the activity of the catalytic material. Finally, these results show that these materials can be reused without noticeable activity loss during at least eight cycles, and the synthesized materials can be considered as suitable photocatalysts to degrade organophosphorous pesticides.

### 3.4. Titanium dioxide leaching

It is worth noting that no leaching of titanium dioxide from  $\text{TiO}_2$ /zeolite samples occurs during the reaction.  $\text{TiO}_2$  could not be detected in the liquid filtrate after each cycle of use. Additionally, no significant conversion of DDVP was observed when we evaluated the possibility of  $\text{TiO}_2$  leaching. This reaction was carried out under similar conditions to that of the degradation, except that after 30 min of reaction the catalyst was removed. As can be seen in Fig. 7, the reaction stopped. These observations strongly suggest that the reaction proceeds heterogeneously over the catalyst.

## 4. Conclusions

Materials based on  $\text{TiO}_2$  supported on zeolitic matrices (HBETA, HY and HZSM5) were synthesized by the in situ generation of  $\text{TiO}_2$  using titanium (IV) isopropoxide and ethanol. XRD patterns indicate that all materials presented crystalline phases and only showed the presence of the anatase phase. In FTIR no band in the region near  $960 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  was detected, so it can be concluded that  $\text{TiO}_2$

was deposited on the surface of zeolites. In the TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA samples,  $S_{\text{BET}}$  decreased with the increase of the TiO<sub>2</sub> content as a result of zeolite pore blocking, attributed to clogging of zeolite pores by TiO<sub>2</sub> species. Comparing the different matrices with the same TiO<sub>2</sub> content, TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%) shows the highest surface area.

The results of the present investigation indicate that the most convenient catalyst for photocatalytic degradation is TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%). At higher TiO<sub>2</sub> content the degradation percentage is lower, which could be due to the presence of TiO<sub>2</sub> particle aggregates of greater size on the zeolite matrix surface. This is evidenced by the crystal size calculated by XRD.

TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%) presented more activity than TiO<sub>2</sub>/HY(20%) and TiO<sub>2</sub>/HZSM5(20%) due to higher adsorption of DDVP on it. It has more surface area and a lower band gap value too, which makes it more effective. The complete degradation and mineralization of the pollutant was obtained in 360 and 540 min of reaction, respectively. These materials can be reused without noticeable activity loss during at least eight cycles. The mineralization degree is lower than the degradation percentage due to the formation of organophosphorous intermediates that are less toxic than the starting material.

According to the results presented in this work, the materials obtained by in situ generation of TiO<sub>2</sub> onto zeolitic matrices, HBETA, HY and HZSM5, present suitable properties to be used as catalysts in the photocatalytic treatment of wastewater that contains DDVP insecticide. The TiO<sub>2</sub>/HBETA(20%) catalysts prepared in this study yielded degradation percentages closer to commercial TiO<sub>2</sub> P25. The advantage of supported catalysts, in comparison with the commercial ones, is mainly their easy separation and reuse.

## Acknowledgements

This project was partially supported by: Mincyt-Córdoba PID 000121 and PID UTN 25/E172. We thank CONICET: L.B.Pierella, L.R. Pizzio, M. S. Renzini, C. Leal Marchena and S. Gomez.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2014.06.047>.

## References

- [1] M.N. Chong, B. Jin, C.W.K. Chow, C. Saint, *Water Res.* 44 (2010) 2997–3027.
- [2] N. Daneshvar, D. Salari, A.R. Khataee, *J. Photoch. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 157 (2003) 111–116.
- [3] M.L. Satuf, R.J. Brandi, A.E. Cassano, O.M. Alfano, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 44 (2005) 6643–6649.
- [4] J.-M. Herrmann, *Catal. Today* 53 (1999) 115–129.
- [5] P.R. Gogate, A.B. Pandit, *Adv. Environ. Res.* 8 (2004) 501–551.
- [6] M. Pratap Reddy, A. Venugopal, M. Subrahmanyam, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 69 (2006) 164–170.
- [7] V. Durga Kumari, M. Subrahmanyam, K.V. Subba Rao, A. Ratnamala, M. Noorjahan, K. Tanaka, *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* 234 (2002) 155–165.
- [8] V. Fuchs, L. Méndez, M. Blanco, L. Pizzio, *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* 358 (2009) 73–78.
- [9] C. Wang, H. Shi, Y. Li, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 257 (2011) 6873–6877.
- [10] Y. Xu, C.H. Langford, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 101 (1997) 3115–3121.
- [11] A. Bhattacharyya, S. Kawi, M.B. Ray, *Catal. Today* 98 (2004) 431–439.
- [12] M.V. Phanikrishna Sharma, V. Durga Kumari, M. Subrahmanyam, *Chemosphere* 73 (2008) 1562–1569.
- [13] C. Anderson, A.J. Bard, *J. Phys. Chem.* 99 (1995) 9882–9885.
- [14] G.P. Lepore, L. Persaud, C.H. Langford, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 98 (1996) 103–111.
- [15] Y. Xu, W. Zheng, W. Liu, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 122 (1999) 57–60.
- [16] C. Minero, F. Catozzo, E. Pelizzetti, *Langmuir* 8 (1992) 481–486.
- [17] C. Anderson, A.J. Bard, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 101 (1997) 2611–2616.
- [18] T. Torimoto, Y. Okawa, N. Takeda, H. Yoneyama, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 103 (1997) 153–157.
- [19] J. Hermann, J. Matos, J. Disdier, C. Guillard, J. Laine, S. Malato, J. Blanco, *Catal. Today* 54 (1999) 255–265.
- [20] H. Yoneyama, T. Torimoto, *Catal. Today* 58 (2000) 133–140.
- [21] Y. Xu, C.H. Langford, *J. Phys. Chem.* 99 (1995) 11501–11507.
- [22] N. Takeda, M. Ohtani, T. Torimoto, S. Kuwabata, H. Yoneyama, *J. Phys. Chem.* 101 (1997) 2644–2649.
- [23] S. Gomez, C. Leal Marchena, L. Pizzio, L. Pierella, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 258–259 (2013) 19–26.
- [24] M.V. Shankar, S. Anandan, N. Venkatachalam, B. Arabindoo, V. Murugesan, *Chemosphere* 63 (2006) 1014–1021.
- [25] M.V. Phanikrishna Sharma, V. Durgakumari, M. Subrahmanyam, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 160 (2008) 568–575.
- [26] P.K. Dutta, Y. Kim, *Curr. Opin. Solid State Mater. Sci.* 7 (2003) 483–490.
- [27] M.V. Phanikrishna Sharma, K. Lalitha, V. Durgakumari, M. Subrahmanyam, *Sol. Ener. Mat. Sol. C* 92 (2008) 332–342.
- [28] S.A. Naman, Z.A.-A. Khammas, F.M. Hussein, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 153 (2002) 229–236.
- [29] J. Senthilnathan, Ligy Philip, *Chem. Eng. J.* 172 (2011) 678–688.
- [30] S.K. Golfinopoulos, A.D. Nikolaou, M.N. Kostopoulou, N.K. Xilourgidis, M.C. Vagi, D.T. Lekkas, *Chemosphere* 50 (2003) 507–516.
- [31] J. Senthilnathan, L. Philip, *J. Environ. Sci. Health B* 44 (2009) 262–270.
- [32] P. Chu, Crystalline zeolite ZSM-11, US Patent No. 3,709,979 (1972).
- [33] S. Valencia, M.A. Cambor Fernandez, A. Corma, J. Perez Pariente, *Síntesis de zeolita Beta*, U.S. Patent 2,124,142 (1999).
- [34] C.A. Emeis, *J. Catal.* 141 (1993) 347–354.
- [35] M. Atiqur Rahman, M. Muneer, *Desalination* 181 (2005) 161–172.
- [36] J. Jae, G.A. Tompsett, A.J. Foster, K.D. Hammond, S.M. Auerbach, R.F. Lobo, G.W. Huber, *J. Catal.* 279 (2011) 257–268.
- [37] M.S. Renzini, U. Sedrán, L.B. Pierella, *J. Anal. Appl. Pyrolysis* 86 (2009) 215–220.
- [38] K.K. Cheralathan, I. Sudarsan Kumar, M. Palanichamy, V. Murugesan, *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* 241 (2003) 247–260.
- [39] K. Porkodi, S. Daisy Arokiamary, *Mater. Charact.* 58 (2007) 495–503.
- [40] S. Yamaguchi, T. Fukura, Y. Imai, H. Yamaura, H. Yahiro, *Electrochim. Acta* 55 (2009) 7745–7750.
- [41] H. Chen, A. Matsumoto, N. Nishimiya, K. Tsutsumi, *Colloid. Surf. A* 157 (1999) 295–305.
- [42] M. Mahalakshmi, S. Vishnu Priya, B. Arabindoo, M. Palanichamy, V. Murugesan, *J. Hazard. Mater.* 161 (2009) 336–343.
- [43] D.I. Petkowicz, R. Brambilla, C. Radtke, C. Silva da Silva, Z.N. da Rocha, S.B.C. Pergher, J.H.Z. dos Santos, *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* 357 (2009) 125–134.
- [44] S. Koichi, N. Yoichi, M. Nobuyuki, I. Motoyasu, S. Hiromichi, *Microporous Mater.* 59 (2003) 133–146.
- [45] F. Azzolina Jury, I. Polaert, L. Estel, L.B. Pierella, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* 453 (2013) 92–101.
- [46] C. Wang, C. Lee, M. Lyu, *L. Dyes Pigment.* 76 (2008) 817–824.
- [47] Y. Kim, M. Yoon, *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem.* 168 (2001) 257–263.
- [48] E.D. Garbowski, C. Mirodatos, *J. Phys. Chem.* 86 (1982) 97–102.
- [49] M.A. Zanjanchi, A. Razavi, *Spectrochim. Acta A* 57 (2001) 119.
- [50] D.I. Petkowicz, S.B.C. Pergher, C.D. Silva da Silva, Z.N. da Rocha, J.H.Z. dos Santos, *Chem. Eng. J.* 158 (2010) 505–512.
- [51] J. Liqiang, S. Xiaojun, C. Weimin, X. Zili, D. Yaoguo, F. Honggang, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* 64 (2003) 615–623.
- [52] F. Geobaldo, S. Bordiga, A. Zecchina, E. Giamello, G. Leofanti, G. Petrini, *Catal. Lett.* 16 (1992) 109–115.
- [53] S.P. Tandon, J.P. Gupta, *Phys. Stat. Solidi* 38 (1970) 363–367.
- [54] E. Joselevich, I. Willner, *J. Phys. Chem.* 98 (1994) 7628–7635.
- [55] G. Yan, J. Long, X. Wang, Z. Li, X. Fu, *CR Chim.* 11 (2008) 114–119.
- [56] K.V. Subba Rao, M. Subrahmanyam, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.* 1 (2002) 597–599.
- [57] P. Oancea, T. Oncescu, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.* 199 (2008) 8–13.
- [58] E. Evgenidou, K. Fytianos, I. Poullos, *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* 59 (2005) 81–89.
- [59] M.V. Shankar, B. Neppolian, S. Sakthivel, M. Banumathi Arabindoo, V. Palanichamy, Murugesan, *Ind. J. Eng. Mater. Sci.* 8 (2001) 104–109.
- [60] C. Kormann, D.W. Bahnemann, M.R. Hoffmann, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 25 (1991) 494–500.
- [61] E. Evgenidou, I. Konstantinou, K. Fytianos, T. Albanis, *J. Hazard. Mater.* B137 (2006) 1056–1064.