Production of Hydrogen by Photogalvanic Cell. Part roduction of Hydrogen by Photogalvanic Cell, Part 2. pH Dependence of Alkylammonium Molybdate
System

TOSHIHIRO YAMASE* and TSUNEO IKAWA

tute of Technology, 42.59 Nagatsuta, Midori-ku, Yokohama tute of Technology, 4259 Nagatsuta, Midori-ku, Yokohama
227, Japan Received March 17,198O

Introduction

We have reported the photogalvanic behavior (at we have reported the photogalyamic behavior (at $\frac{1}{2}$ pH 5.2–5.4) for the aqueous alkylammonium molybdate based on the photoreduction of Mo^{VI} to Mo^V which is coupled with a water oxidation to hydroxyl radical [1]. The splitting of water $(H_2O \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}H_2 +$ •OH) has been considered to be given in terms of the half-reactions:

$$
\text{Photoanode: } \text{Mo}^{\text{VI}} = \text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{\text{h}\nu} \text{Mo}^{\text{V}} - \text{OH} + \cdot \text{OH} \tag{1}
$$

$$
MoV-OH \rightarrow MoVI = O + H+ + e
$$
 (2)

Cathode : $H^+ + e \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}H_2$ (3)

This is the first example producing hydrogen from inis is the first example producing hydrogen from water using photogalvanic effect of molybdenum compounds, although the photoreactivity is limited to ultraviolet wavelength $(\lambda < 400 \text{ nm})$. When
hexakis(isopropylammonium) heptamolybdate, exakis(isopropylammonium) heptamolybdate,
NH D¹¹ LMo 0 1 is used as the molybdate, it has $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}$ been postulated that the electrochemical that the electrochemical state $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}$ been postulated that the electrochemically active intermediate, exhibiting the photogalvanic effect, is produced by the decondensation of the one-electron photoreduced 7-molybdate to 1-molybdate $[2]$. To understand some of the basic aspects of photoelectrolysis, we describe here the operation of a photogalvanic cell

Pt154.4 mM-[NH3Pri16[Mo,0za] II5N-HzS04 IPt

on the values for the values for the anodic solution of \mathcal{A} on the variation of p_H values for the anodic solution containing 54.4 mM $\text{[NH}_3\text{Pr}^1]_6 \text{[Mo}_7\text{O}_{24}\text{]}$ and discuss the reason for an observable optimum pH (7–8).

 $F(X) = F(X)$ is a function of the experiment cell: (1) 18 $F(X) = F(X)$ $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{A}}$ because the anomaly contribution properties (and $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{A}}$) is $mm²$ bright Pt circular plate (anode); (2) molybdate solution at given pH; (3) glass frit; (4) KCI-agar salt bridge; (5) 50 mm long and 1 mm in diameter Pt wire (cathode); (6) $5N$ H₂SO₄ solution; (7) buret.

Experimental

Hexakis(isopropylammonium) heptamolybdate riexakis(isopropylammonium) neptamolyouate trihydrate was prepared and recrystallized following our procedure [2] and its structure was determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction. 2-methyl-2-nitrosopropane was added in the spin trapping experiments. A solution of pH 6 to 8 was adjusted by $Na₂$. MoO₄ to avoid a drastic decrease in Mo₇O $_{24}^{6}$ concentration due to the equilibrium reaction $(Mo₇O₂₄⁶$ + $4H_2O \neq 7MoO_4^{2-} + 8H^+$ between $Mo_7O_{24}^{6-}$ and MoO_4^{2-} [3]. Measurements of the absorbance (ϵ = 90 M^{-1} cm⁻¹) at 320 nm revealed that the concentration of M₀₇O₂₄ was almost constant (54.4 mM) at these pH range. Other pH levels were adjusted by HClO₄ or NaOH. Continuous irradiation experiments were performed using a 500 W superhigh pressure mercury lamp in conjunction with filters. The light intensity was determined by ferrioxalate actinometry. Measurements of electrode potential and photocurrent were done by Takeda Riken Co. electrometer TR-8651. The flash photolysis experiment was carried out using a conventional flash-photolysis apparatus Xenon Corp. Model 720. X-band e.s.r. spectra were recorded on a Varian E12 spectrometer. Unless otherwise specified, all measurements were done at room temperature. e done at foom temperature.

I'm a photogalvanic cell for H_2 generation is shown in Fig. 1: The anode compartment was made of two test chambers (for the KCl-agar salt bridge-immersed and irradiated solutions) connected by glass tubing 10 mm in inside diameter with a very fine glass frit. Anodic solutions were flushed with argon and irradiated at 313 nm with an intensity of 1.76×10^{-8}

^{*}Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

Fig. 2. Photostationary potential $(E₁)$ and short-circuit photocurrent (i_p) as a function of anode solution pH. Photocurrent measurements were after 1 hr irradiation with 313 nm light.

 \mathbf{F} conventional conventional conventional \mathbf{F} s. cm. Trydrogen was analy with a Carbosieve S column.

The photocurrent-applied potential curves at given pH were measured potentiostatically according to the previous method with a light pulse of 6 ms duration and each data point on curves was for the photocurrent value just before the light is turned off under
the chopped white light irradiation [1].

Results and Discussion

The photopotential of the electrode of the photo-I ne photopotential of the electrode of the photogalvanic cell (Fig. 1) reached the photostationary value within several minutes of the irradiation time. The short-circuit photocurrent rose steeply within several seconds and then decreased with fast decay $(\tau \approx 15 \text{ min})$ and succeeding long term decay ($\tau \approx$ 14 hrs) during the duration of the irradiation. The photostationary potential (E_1) and the short-circuit photocurrent (i_p) at 1 hr irradiation are plotted as a function of the anodic solution pH in Fig. 2, where the most negative E_1 and the highest i_p are observed around pH 7.4. The evolution of H_2 bubbles at the cathode was readily observed at pH 5-8, where E_1 was more negative than the redox potential (-0.22) V vs. SCE at $pH = -0.4$) [4] of $H⁺/H₂$. The quantum yield of the cell at optimum pH 7.4 in terms of current produced per photon added to the system was calculated to be 0.08 using $i_p = 135 \mu A/cm^2$ ⁺. On the basis of the fact that a stoichiometric ratio for moles of electrons to moles of H_2 was close to 2:1 [1], then, quantum yield for H_2 production was

Intrinsic value of the quantum yield may be higher since

 u culated to be 0.04. In this case, pH gradient across the KCl-agar salt bridge supplies a voltage of approximately 8×59 mV = 0.472 V: 0.472 eV of a total of 1.77 eV $[4]$ for water splitting is derived from pH gradient as an external potential source, if we assume that the nett reaction of water splitting is $2H₂O$ \rightarrow H₂ + H₂O₂. 1.3 eV which was actually gained at the quantum yield of 0.08 for electron flow from 4 eV photons ($\lambda = 313$ nm) is therefore produced at an optical energy conversion efficiency $\lceil 5 \rceil$ of 2.6%. This value is comparable to the largest value (about 2%) for the photoelectrolysis with a use of $TiO₂$ photoanode $[6]$.

calculated to be 0.04. In this case, pH gradient across the 0.04. In this case, pH gradient across the 0.04. In

Quantities of ΔE_{1d} (E₁ relative to the dark equilibrium potential of $+0.18$ V vs. SCE at pH 7.4) was logarithmically dependent on light intensity with a slope of 85 mV. i_p was linearly proportional to the light intensity. During the prolonged irradiation, the anodic solution at $pH 7.4$ changed to a brown color. Resulting solution was e.s.r. inactive at room temperature and admission of oxygen into the solution brought about a color change to colorless, suggesting that the brown solution contained a dimer of the reduced 1-molybdate probably with an octahedral di- μ -oxo structure [7]. Irradiation of the solution in the presence of 2-methyl-2-nitrosopropane in the cavity of an e.s.r. instrument immediately produced a signal of the spin adduct $(g = 2.004, a =$ 16.0 G, $a_H = 3.1 - 3.5$ G at pH 7.4) of \cdot OH (or \cdot OOH) which resulted from the water oxidation (eqn. 1). Back reaction between the reduced molybdates and \cdot OH (or H₂O₂) was likely to be depressed, since most of \cdot OH (or H₂O₂) reacted with Mo₇O₂₄ to yield peroxymolybdate (for example $Mo₇O₂₆⁶$) under the high concentration (54.4 mM) of $[NH_3Pr^1]_6[N\sigma_7$ O_{24}] [8]. A consumption of Mo₇ O_{24}^{6-} due to the reaction with \cdot OH (or H₂O₂) may be a factor which decreased the short-circuit photocurrent during the duration of the irradiation.

In order to find the reason for the optimum pH 7.4 of anodic solution, the photocurrent-applied potential (vs. SCE) behavior at given pH was measured. Typical results are shown in Fig. 3. The relaxation time of about 20 ms $[1]$ for the photocurrent signal was almost independent on solution pH, suggesting that the lifetime of the electrochemically active species was scarcely influenced by pH. Anodic photocurrent onset from the photocurrent-applied potential curves, which corresponds to the value of the standard redox potential $(E_{M\text{o}}^{o}VI_{M\text{o}}v)$ for the electrochemically active species, represents the approximately linear pH dependence with a slope of about -59 mV/pH as shown in the insert of Fig. 3. At pH \geq 9 the electrochemically active species was scarcely formed, since Raman spectra of the solutions at $pH \geqslant$ 9.0 exhibited only three bands at 898, 833, and 310 cm^{-1} due do nonphotoactive MoO₄⁻⁻. This explains why there was no significant operation of the photo-

Fig. 3. Influence of applied potential on photocurrents for different pH-value (= parameter). The resulting potential onset (E') for the photocurrent in dependence on the pH is shown in the insert.

galvanic cell at anodic solution $pH \ge 9$. Therefore, the observation of the most negative E_1 at pH 7.4 (Fig. 2) can be explained by pH dependences of the redox reaction (eqn. 2) for the electrochemically active species and the equilibrium reaction between 7- and 1-molybdates in the dark. As shown in Fig. 3 the maximum photocurrent in photocurrent-applied potential curves occurs near the redox potential $(E_{O_2/H_2O}^{\circ} = 0.985 - 0.06$ (pH) volt vs. SCE) [4] for the water oxidation to oxygen, because of the oxygen-quenching of the electrochemically active species at anodic polarization higher than $E_{O, fH, O}$ $[1]$. This suggests that the value of the reorganization energy for the electrochemically active species is more than 1 eV corresponding to the difference between E_{O_2/H_2O}° and $E_{Mo}^{\circ}VI_{Mo}V$ [9]. In flash photolysis experiments the first intermediate with broad absorbance at the near ultraviolet-visible wavelength range was converted into the second species ℓ_{max} = 500 nm) with a first order reaction of $\tau \approx$ \overline{t} intermediative of pH (≤ 8). Qualitative observations indicated that the yield of the intermediate

formation was maximized at pH 5.4. Based on the assumption that an electron transfer can only occur between both donor and acceptor electronic energy states having equal energy $[9]$, therefore, a steep increase of i_p with increasing pH ≤ 7.4 (Fig. 2) was considered to result from increasing overlaps of distribution functions between H^+ (acceptor) and electrochemically active species (donor) due to the shift of E_{Mo}° v I_{Mo} v to the negative side.

We extend the photogalvanic photoelectrolysis to other polyanions such as tungstate and vanadate [10]. In investigating H_2 evolution by isopropylammonium salts of these polyanions we found that $H₂$ was formed as expected and we noticed that the pH range favoring H_2 formation was at pH 7-10.

References

- H 1 T V ₉m T. Yamase and T. Ikawa, in Proc. *3rd Int. Conf. Chem.*
- *L259* (1979).
2 T. Yamase and T. Ikawa, in *Proc. 3rd Int. Conf. Chem.* Uses Molybdenum, edt. by P. C. H. Mitchell, Climax *Molybdenum Co., Ltd (1979); T. Yamase and T. Ikawa,* Bull. Chem. Soc. Japan, 50, 746 (1977).
- 3 J.-P. Collin, P. Lagrange and J.-P. Schwing, J. Less-Boston, *ibid., 36,95* (1974). D_n definition D_n and D_n . Electron D_n and D_n . Electron D_n and D_n Boston, ibid., 36, 95 (1974).
4 D. Dobos, 'Electrochemical Data', Elsevier, Amsterdam-
- Oxford-New York (1975).
- M. S. Wrighton, A. B. Ellis, P. T. Wolczanski, D. L. Morse, 5 *98, 2774 binnes*
R Abrahamson A. Fuiishima and K. Honda, *Nature, 238. 37* (1972); 98, 2774 (1976).
A. Fujishima and K. Honda, Nature, 238, 37 (1972);
- M. S. Wrighton, D. S. Ginley, P. T. Wolczanski, A. B. *U.S. Mighton, 2. 2.* 2. Y. Sasaki and A. G. Sykes, *J. Less-Common Metals, 36, U.S.A.*, 72, 1518 (1975).
Y. Sasaki and A. G. Sykes, J. Less-Common Metals, 36,
- 125 (1974); D. H. Brown, P. G. Perkins and J. G. 1. Event, *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton*, 1105 (1972).
1. Stand., *Standard. Acta Chem. Scand.*, ²⁶, ²⁶,
- I. Larking and R. Stomberg, *Acta Chem. Scand.*, 26, 3708 (1972).
- 9 H. Gerischer and F. Willig, Topics in Current Chemistry, $\frac{3}{12}$ 10 K. F. Jahr and J. Fuchs, *Angew. Chem., 78, 725* (1966) 1976).
10 K. F. Jahr and J. Fuchs, Angew. Chem., 78, 725 (1966)
- and references therein.