Effect of RuO₂ deposition on the activity of TiO₂: Photocatalytic oxidation of trichloroethylene in aqueous phase

P. B. AMAMA, K. ITOH, M. MURABAYASHI

Graduate School of Environment and Information Sciences, Yokohama National University, 79-7 Tokiwadai, Hodogaya-ku, Yokohama 240-8501, Japan E-mail: placidus.amama@yale.edu

The deposition of transition metal/metal oxide on $TiO₂$ to modify the surface of $TiO₂$, in order to improve its photocatalytic activity, is an area of great concern. Such surface modification has most often resulted in increased photocatalytic activity of $TiO₂$, especially in aqueous phase reactions [1–4]. This has been rationalized to be due to the ability of these transition metal deposits to inhibit the electron–hole recombination process of semiconductors during photocatalysis [1–4]. It is well documented that this recombination process is an impediment to enhanced reaction rates and also a major energy-wasting step [1, 2, 4]. The metallization of $TiO₂$ using transition metal deposits remains as one of the most promising approaches that can be employed to reduce the electron–hole recombination process. Pd and most especially Pt are the best candidates as metal deposits because they have shown striking improvement of the photocatalytic activity of $TiO₂$ [1, 4]. The use of precious metals (Pt or Pd) for $TiO₂$ metallization may prove uneconomical because of the difficulty associated with the recyclability of powdered catalysts used in wastewater treatment. Therefore, there is a need to explore other effective ways of metallizing $TiO₂$ with other non-precious metals such as $RuO₂$.

 $RuO₂$ is an efficient hole and electron transfer catalyst on $TiO₂$ and seems to improve the efficiency of charge separation at the metal oxide/semiconductor interface, when deposited in small amounts, because an excess amount is capable of acting as a recombination center [1]. An important beneficial effect of $RuO₂$ loading on $TiO₂$ is the increase in conductivity, which ultimately allows more efficient charge transfer within the photocatalyst and makes it kinetically faster when it is involved in redox processes [5]. Most studies carried out so far on photocatalytic oxidation reactions with TiO_2/RuO_2 involve either H_2O cleavage reactions or reactions in which hydrogen is evolved. To the best of our knowledge the use of $TiO₂/RuO₂$ as catalyst in aqueous phase photocatalytic oxidation reactions involving chloro-hydrocarbons has not been reported. In this work, materials belonging to $TiO₂$ -RuO₂ system have been prepared by impregnation and slurry precipitation using Degussa P-25 $TiO₂$ (P-25) and $TiO₂$ glass fiber cloth (TiO₂-GFC) as supports. An evaluation of their photocatalytic activities during trichloroethylene (TCE) oxidation in aqueous phase has been carried out. A correlation between their photocatalytic activities and the method employed for $RuO₂$ deposition has been established. The activity of $TiO₂-GFC/RuO₂$

has also been compared with those of $TiO₂$ -GFC/Pt and $TiO₂$ -GFC/Pt/RuO₂.

P-25 (non porous, mainly anatase, 50 m²g⁻¹) was provided by Nippon Aerosil, Japan, while $TiO₂-GFC$ (dimension = $5.5 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm}$; amount of TiO₂ loaded $= 4.8$ mg/cm²) was supplied by Nippon Muki Co. Ltd., Japan. $TiO₂-GFC$ has been characterized in detail by Murabayashi et al. [6]. P-25/RuO₂ was prepared by impregnation [7] and slurry precipitation [2] using $RuCl₃·3H₂O$ (Aldrich) as $RuO₂$ precursor. The sequential deposition of Pt and $RuO₂$ on TiO₂-GFC in the bifunctional photocatalyst was performed by photoplatinization [8] using $H_2PtCl_6·6H_2O$ (Wako Chemicals) as the Pt precursor and impregnation (mentioned above, [7]) respectively.

Photocatalytic oxidation reaction of TCE (reagent grade; purchased from Junsei Chemical Co., Ltd., Japan) was executed in a batch reactor, consisting of a 'test-tube' Pyrex vessel of 400 ml with a three-necked teflon-lid with gas-in, gas-out and sample port at 298 K. The gas-in and gas-out openings were closed throughout the reaction. 300 ml aqueous solution containing 5 mg/l of TCE was prepared by stirring the neat compound with deionized water for more than 6 h. The experiment was performed under continuous magnetic agitation by placing the glass fiber cloth sample vertically in the solution or mixing 0.05 g of the powdered sample with the solution. The batch reactor was completely sealed to minimize the escape of TCE due to volatilization. Illumination in the near UV (300–440 nm) was carried out by eight black light lamps (8×20) W, Toshiba FL20S.BLB, intensity $= 3.2$ mW/cm²) positioned at a distance of 7 cm from the batch reactor. Before and during illumination, 2 ml of the sample was withdrawn from the batch reactor at regular intervals and TCE present was extracted with 3 ml of *n*-hexane and analyzed with a Hitachi G5000 gas chromatograph equipped with an electron capture detector.

The deposition of $RuO₂$ on P-25 by impregnation slightly improved the photocatalytic activity of P-25 as presented in Fig. 1. The photocatalytic activity is expressed in terms of the rate of TCE oxidation. This slight improvement in activity was observed between 0.1 and 0.3 wt%. The initial increase in activity after the deposition of 0.1 wt% of $RuO₂$ was higher than subsequent increases in activity on addition of more $RuO₂$. This result also reveals that the deposition of $RuO₂$ by slurry precipitation deactivated P-25. P-25 (0 wt% $RuO₂$) subjected to the process of slurry precipitation

Figure 1 Comparison of the photocatalytic activities of P-25/RuO₂ prepared by slurry precipitation and impregnation methods. TCE = 5 mg/L , UV light = 3.2 mW/cm^2 , P- $25 = 0.05 \text{ g}$.

Figure 2 Average reaction rate of TCE photocatalytic degradation in aqueous-phase as a function of the amount of $RuO₂$ deposited on TiO₂-GFC. TCE = 5 mg/L, UV light = 3.2 mW/cm^2 , P-25 = 0.05 g .

without $RuCl₃·3H₂O$ showed activity lower than native P-25. However, the activity of P-25 (0 wt%) subjected to the process of impregnation without $RuCl₃·3H₂O$ was similar to native P-25. Crittenden *et al*. [9] have shown that the high photocatalytic activity of P-25 is not enhanced by platinization. The slight improvement in activity of $P-25/RuO₂$ observed between 0 and 0.3 wt% is therefore significant.

Due to the deactivating effect of the process of slurry precipitation observed with $P-25/RuO₂$ samples (Fig. 1), $RuO₂$ was deposited on TiO₂-GFC using the impregnation method. An increase in photocatalytic activity was observed between 0 and 0.4 wt% of $RuO₂$ on $TiO₂-GFC$ as presented in Fig. 2. The increase in photocatalytic activity observed for $TiO₂-GFC$ was over ten times higher than that of $P-25/RuO₂$. The decrease in activity of $TiO₂$ -GFC beyond 0.4 wt% suggests that the optimum amount of $RuO₂$ deposition on TiO₂-GFC is ∼0.4 wt%. According to Sakata *et al*. [1] when RuO2 particles are deposited very densely on the surface of TiO₂ (in our case > \sim 0.4 wt%), the RuO₂ particles can function as recombination centers because the distance between particles becomes shorter than the distance in which the image force to both electrons and holes is effective. Also, the presence of excess $RuO₂$ deposits on

Figure 3 Photocatalytic degradation of TCE in aqueous phase using TiO2-GFC, TiO2-GFC/RuO2, TiO2-GFC/Pt and TiO2-GFC/Pt/RuO2. TCE = 5 mg/L, UV light = 3.2 mW/cm^2 , P-25 = 0.05 g .

 $TiO₂-GFC$ may shield the surface of $TiO₂-GFC$ from UV light illumination and this prevents the activation of TiO₂.

Comparisons of the photocatalytic activities of $TiO₂$ -GFC, TiO_2 -GFC/Ru O_2 , TiO_2 -GFC/Pt and a bifunctional photocatalyst (TiO₂-GFC/Pt/RuO₂) have been carried out as presented in Fig. 3. The photocatalytic activity is based on the consumption of TCE expressed in normalized concentrations with time. The photocatalytic activities of $TiO₂/Pt$ and $TiO₂/RuO₂$ with 0.4 wt% of Pt and $RuO₂$ deposits within 60 min of the reaction were almost indistinguishable. The calculated halflife values were approximately the same. Platinized $TiO₂-GFC$, however, showed a slightly higher activity than $TiO₂-GFC/RuO₂$ after 90 min. The activity shown by $TiO₂-GFC/RuO₂$ was greater than that of $TiO₂-GFC$.

The sequential deposition of both $RuO₂$ and Pt on TiO2-GFC in the bifunctional photocatalyst was performed with the aim of substituting half the amount of Pt in platinized $TiO₂$ while maintaining its high photocatalytic activity. The substitution of 0.2 wt% of Pt in $TiO₂-GFC/Pt$ with $RuO₂$ did not result in a significant decrease in photocatalytic activity as evidenced by the complete consumption of TCE after 90 min using either TiO_2 -GFC/Pt or TiO_2 -GFC/Pt/RuO₂ as presented in Fig. 3.

This work shows that a non-precious metal oxide catalyst $(RuO₂)$ can be used effectively to accomplish enhanced photocatalytic activity of $TiO₂$ in aqueous phase. From the above results, it is concluded that the photocatalytic activity of $TiO₂/RuO₂$ is dependent on the method employed for preparation. Slight improvement in the activity of P-25 has been accomplished through the deposition of $RuO₂$ on P-25 by impregnation. This method is therefore recommended for the preparation of efficient $TiO₂/RuO₂$.

Acknowledgment

The authors gratefully acknowledge Nippon Muki Co. Ltd., Japan for the generous supply of titanium dioxide coated on glass fiber cloth (TiO₂-GFC).

References

- 1. T. SAKATA, K. HASHIMOTO and T. KAWAI, *J. Phys. Chem.* **88** (1984) 5214.
- 2. E. BORGARELLO, J. KIWI, E. PELIZZETTI, M. VISCA and M. GRÄTZEL, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* **103** (1981) 6324.
- 3. M. MURABAYASHI, K. ITOH and K. TOGASHI, *Denki Kagaku* **6** (1998) 671.
- 4. J. CHIN, D. OLLIS, W. RULKENS and H. BRUNING, *Wat. Res.* **33** (1999) 661.
- 5. G. BLONDEEL, A. HARRIMAN, G. PORTER, D. URWIN and J. KIWI, *J. Phys. Chem.* **87** (1983) 2629.
- 6. M. MURABAYASHI, K. ITOH, K. KAWASHIMA, R. MASUDA and S. SUZUKI, in "Photocatalytic Purification and

Treatment of Water and Air," edited by D. F. Ollis and H. Al-Ekabi (Elsevier, London, 1993).

- 7. J. C. ESCUDERO, S. CERVERA-MARCH, J. GIMÉNEZ and R. SIMARRO, *J. Catal.* **123** (1989) 320.
- 8. B. KRAEUTLER and A. BARD, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* **100** (1978) 4317.
- 9. J. CRITTENDEN, J. LIU, D. HAND and PERRAM, *Wat. Res.* **31** (1997) 429.

Received 16 October and accepted 23 December 2003