Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect



Journal of Molecular Catalysis A: Chemical



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/molcata

A new magnetically recoverable nanocatalyst for epoxidation of olefins

M. Masteri-Farahani*, N. Tayyebi

Faculty of Chemistry, University of Tarbiat Moallem, Tehran, Iran

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 23 April 2011 Received in revised form 25 June 2011 Accepted 15 August 2011 Available online 22 August 2011

Keywords: Magnetite Nanoparticle Molybdenum Immobilization Epoxidation

1. Introduction

In recent years, nanosized materials have attracted great academic interests because of their special properties, such as relatively large surface area and surface to volume ratio [1-7]. Among them magnetic nanoparticles are widely used in the various fields such as metal ion separations, enzyme immobilization, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), drug delivery and catalysis [8–15]. The magnetite Fe₃O₄ nanoparticles have superparamagnetic property which enables them to attract to an external magnetic field, but retain no residual magnetism after removing the magnetic field. Thus, suspended magnetic nanoparticles can be adhered and then removed very quickly from the sample solutions with utilization of a magnetic field and do not agglomerate after removing the external field. As the surface of Fe₃O₄ nanoparticles are relatively inert to chemical reactions, functionalization with reactive species should be made to facilitate incorporation of other molecules on the surface of the Fe_3O_4 nanoparticles [16–18].

On the other hand, it has been found that dioxomolybdenum (VI) complexes of multidentate Schiff base ligands are selective homogeneous catalysts for the epoxidation of olefins. Many attempts have been done for heterogenization of molybdenum catalysts within different supports such as silicates, zeolites and other molecular sieves [19–26] to facilitate the recovery and reuse of the catalysts. But, the resulted catalysts suffer from decreased catalytic

ABSTRACT

In this work, a new magnetically recoverable nanocatalyst was developed by covalent binding of a Schiff base ligand, N,N'-bis(3-salicylidenaminopropyl)amine (salpr), on the surface of silica coated magnetite nanoparticles (SCMNPs) and followed complexation with MoO₂(acac)₂. Characterization of the prepared nanocatalyst was performed with different physicochemical methods such as FT-IR and atomic absorption spectroscopies, X-ray diffraction (XRD), scanning electron microscopy (SEM), transmission electron microscopy (TEM) and vibrating sample magnetometry (VSM). Finally, catalytic activity of the prepared MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs was examined in the epoxidation of olefins with tert-butyl hydroperoxide (TBHP) and cumene hydroperoxide (CHP).

© 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

activity due to limited diffusion of substrates through the narrow pores of the support.

Due to the high surface to volume ratio of the nanoparticles surface modification of nanoparticles is an alternative rout for preparation of highly active catalysts. Moreover, diffusion limitations can be avoided, as all of the surface area of the nanoparticles is external. However, the recovery of these modified nanoparticles with filtration methods is very difficult. In this respect, immobilization of homogeneous catalysts on modified magnetic nanoparticles such as iron oxides gives heterogenized catalysts that can be quickly and easily recovered in the presence of external magnetic fields [11,27–33].

In this work, our objective is to functionalize magnetite nanoparticles with chloropropyl groups and then incorporate a molybdenum Schiff base complex with anchoring method to obtain a heterogeneous molybdenum catalyst for the epoxidation of olefins. To the best of our knowledge there is no any report about preparation of such magnetically recoverable nanocatalyst for the epoxidation of olefins. The advantage of this system is facile and fast recovery of the solid catalyst at the end of reaction as well as good activity and selectivity for epoxidation of olefins.

2. Experimental

2.1. Materials and instrumentation

Ferrous chloride tetrahydrate (FeCl₂·4H₂O), ferric chloride (FeCl₃·6H₂O), chloropropyl trimethoxysilane, tetraethyl orthosilicate (TEOS), ammonia (25 wt.%) were purchased from Merck chemical company. The salpr ligand was prepared according to

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +98 261 4551023; fax: +98 261 4551023. *E-mail address*: mfarahany@yahoo.com (M. Masteri-Farahani).

^{1381-1169/\$ -} see front matter © 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. doi:10.1016/j.molcata.2011.08.007

the reported method [34]. $MoO_2(acac)_2$ was prepared according to literature method [35].

Fourier transform infrared spectra were recorded using Perkin-Elmer Spectrum RXI FT-IR spectrometer, using pellets of the materials diluted with KBr. The transmission electron micrographs (TEM) of the nanoparticles were recorded using a Philips EM 208 S instrument with an accelerating voltage of 100 kV. Samples were prepared for TEM by placing droplets of a suspension of the sample in acetone on a polymer microgrid supported on a Cu grid. Scanning electron micrographs (SEM) of the samples were taken with ZEISS-DSM 960A microscope with attached camera. Magnetic susceptibility measurements were carried out using a vibrating sample magnetometer (VSM) (BHV-55, Riken, Japan) in the magnetic field range of -8000 Oe to 8000 Oe at room temperature. The crystalline phase of the nanoparticles were identified by means of X-ray diffraction measurements using Cu k α radiation (λ = 1.54 Å) on a SIEFERT XRD 3003 PTS diffractometer in the 2θ range of 10–80°. Chemical analyses of samples were carried out with VARIAN VISTA-MPX ICP-AES atomic absorption spectrometer.

2.1.1. Preparation of silica coated magnetite nanoparticles (SCMNPs) and chloropropyl modified SCMNPs (ClpSCMNPs)

Magnetite nanoparticles (MNPs) were prepared according to reported method [36]. Modification of the prepared MNPs was performed as followed: The magnetite nanoparticles (1g) were dispersed in deionized water in a 250 ml round-bottom flask with sonication and then an aqueous solution of TEOS (10% (v/v), 80 ml) was added, followed by glycerol (60 ml). The pH of the suspension was adjusted to 4.6 using glacial acetic acid, and the mixture was then stirred and heated at 90°C for 2h under a nitrogen atmosphere. After cooling to room temperature, the silica coated magnetite nanoparticles was separated from the reaction mixture using a permanent magnet and washed several times with distilled water and methanol. The obtained SCMNPs (2g) were suspended in ethanol (100 ml) and then chloropropyl trimethoxysilane (2 ml, Merck) was added under dry nitrogen atmosphere. The mixture was refluxed for 12 h and the resulted solid was magnetically separated, washed with ethanol to remove the unreacted residue of silvlating reagent and then vacuum dried at 353 K.

2.1.2. Preparation of salpr/SCMNPs

ClpSCMNPs (2g) was suspended in 100 ml of acetonitrile with sonication. To this mixture was added excess of salpr ligand (1g, 3.2 mmol) and triethylamine (0.5 ml) and the resulted mixture was refluxed for 12 h. The resultant solid was separated magnetically and then washed with ethanol several times to remove the unreacted residue of the salpr ligand and dried under vacuum at 353 K.

2.1.3. Preparation of MoO₂salpr modified SCMNPs (MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs)

For preparation of MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs, excess of MoO₂(acac)₂ (500 mg, 1.5 mmol) was dissolved in ethanol (50 ml). Salpr /SCM-NPs (1 g, dried in vacuum oven at 353 K) was then added to this solution and after sonication the mixture was refluxed for 12 h. After separation with an external magnet, the product was washed with methanol to remove unreacted MoO₂(acac)₂. The resulted MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs material was then dried under vacuum at 353 K and characterized with FT-IR spectroscopy, X-ray diffraction, scanning and transmission electron microscopies and vibrating sample magnetometry.

2.2. Catalytic epoxidation of olefins in the presence of MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs

Epoxidation of olefins (purchased from Merck) was carried out in a 25 ml round bottomed flask equipped with a condenser and a



Fig. 1. FT-IR spectra of (a) salpr/SCMNPs and (b) MoO₂ salpr/SCMNPs materials.

magnetic stirrer. Tert-butylhydroperoxide (TBHP) (obtained from Merck as 80% in di-tertiary butyl peroxide) or cumene hydroperoxide (80% in cumene, Merck) were used as oxidants. In a typical procedure, to a mixture of catalyst (100 mg) and olefin (8 mmol) in chloroform (20 ml) was added oxidant (14.4 mmol) under nitrogen atmosphere and the mixture was refluxed for appropriate time. Samples were withdrawn periodically and after dilution with chloroform and cooling were analyzed using a gas chromatograph (HP, Agilent 6890N) equipped with a capillary column (HP-5) and a FID detector. Products were quantified using isooctane (1 g, 8.75 mmol, Merck) as internal standard. GC–MS of products were recorded using a Shimadzu-14A fitted with a capillary column (CBP5-M25). The molybdenum content of recycled catalyst was measured with above mentioned atomic absorption spectrometer after dissolution of the solid in hydrogen fluoride solution.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Preparation of MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs

Scheme 1 shows the sequence of events in the functionalization of MNPs with molybdenum Schiff base complex. In the first step, the external surface of MNPs was coated with a silica shell to obtain SCMNPs. Then, treatment of silanol groups of SCMNPs with chloropropyl trimethoxysilane affords chloropropylated magnetite nanoparticles (ClpSCMNPs). The second step involves substitution reaction of ClpSCMNPs). The second step involves substitution reaction of ClpSCMNPs chloro groups with secondary amine group of salpr Schiff base to yield the salpr/SCMNPs, a tetradentate Schiff base ligand supported on SCMNPs. Addition of triethylamine in this step facilitates the substitution reaction. Based on the literature method [20], complexation of the salpr/SCMNPs was performed with excess of MoO₂(acac)₂ to afford MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs in the third step. Soxhlet extraction of the product was carried out subsequently in order to remove the unreacted MoO₂(acac)₂ from the resulted material.

3.2. Characterization of the prepared nanomaterial

In order to confirm the modification of the magnetite surface the FT-IR spectra of the prepared salpr/SCMNPs and MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs materials were obtained and have been shown in Fig. 1. The observation of two broad bands at around 430–584 cm⁻¹ indicates the presence of magnetite core in the prepared nanoparticles. The silica coating of magnetite nanoparticles was confirmed by observation of a broad band about 1000–1100 cm⁻¹ assigned to Si–O–Si and Si–OH stretching



Scheme 1. The sequence of events in the preparation of MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs.

vibrations. The presence of anchored propyl groups were confirmed by stretching vibrations appeared at about 2923 cm⁻¹ in the FT-IR spectrum of ClpSCMNPs (not shown here). In the FT-IR spectrum of salpr /SCMNPs (Fig. 1a) a band at 1631 cm⁻¹, assigned to C=N stretching vibration of salpr ligand [20,35], and some weak bands at 1400–1500 cm⁻¹ assigned to stretching vibrations of aromatic rings of salpr ligand were observed that were not present in parent SCMNPs. The band at 1631 cm⁻¹ upon reaction of slapr ligand with MoO₂(acac)₂ shifted to lower frequency (1617 cm⁻¹) (Fig. 1b) indicating complexation of C=N group of supported ligand with molybdenum. Also, appearance of two adjacent bands at 911 and 938 cm⁻¹ in the FT-IR spectrum of complexed material is characteristic of presence of cis-MoO₂ group [37] and formation of MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs nanomaterial.

Molybdenum content of the prepared nanomaterial was found to be 0.71 wt.% on the basis of ICP-AES chemical analysis.

Fig. 2 depicts the XRD pattern of prepared nanomaterial. The diffraction peaks can be assigned to the planes of inverse cubic spinel structured Fe_3O_4 (JCPDS no. 19-0629). The broad peaks indicate the nanocrystalline nature of the prepared MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs.

To study the magnetic properties of magnetite nanoparticles before and after silica coating we investigated the hysteresis loops of magnetite and functionalized magnetite nanoparticles at room temperature using vibrating sample magnetometry (VSM).

Magnetization curves of prepared materials were shown in Fig. 3. The magnetization curve of MNPs exhibited no remanence effect (superparamagnetic property) with saturation magnetization of about 60 emu/g. Also, the silica coated magnetite nanoparticles showed superparamagnetic behavior with decreased saturation magnetization about 42 emu/g. The MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs nanomaterial exhibited superparamagnetic properties with saturation magnetization about 37 emu/g. The superparamagnetic properties of the prepared MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs are critical for their application, which prevents aggregation and enables them to redisperse rapidly when the magnetic field is removed.

Transmission electron micrographs of the magnetic nanomaterial are shown in Fig. 4a. As can be seen, most of the nanoparticles



Fig. 2. XRD pattern of prepared MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs.



Fig. 3. Magnetization curves of (a) MNPs, (b) SCMNPs, (c) MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs.



SEM HV: 30.00 kV WD: 13 SEM MAG: 75.00 kX Det: SE 500 nm

VEGA\\ TE



Fig. 4. (a) SEM and (b) TEM images of prepared MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs.

are almost spherical in shape. The particle size is about 10 nm and relatively monodispersed.

Fig. 4b shows the SEM image of the prepared nanomaterial. The SEM image indicates that the obtained product is composed of spherical nanoparticles. Aggregation gives rise to increasing the size of observed nanoparticles as seen in the SEM image.

3.3. Catalytic epoxidation of olefins in the presence of MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs

Catalytic activity of the prepared nanomaterial was examined in the epoxidation of some olefins with TBHP and CHP. The oxidation results as well as turnover frequencies (TOF's), i.e. mmol of product formed per mmol of molybdenum in the catalyst are given in Tables 1–3. We have included the results of epoxidation of cyclooctene in the presence of parent SCMNPs and blank (no catalyst) in Table 1 in order to clear up the catalytic effect of the prepared MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs.

Table 1

Results of catalytic epoxidation of some olefins with TBHP in presence of MoO_2 salpr/SCMNPs.

Olefin	Time (h)	Conversion (%)	Selectivity (%) ^a	TOF $(h^{-1})^b$
Cyclooctene	6	99.9	99	180
Cyclooctenec	6	80	99	59
Cyclohexene	6	61	98	110
Cyclohexenec	6	72	99	53
1-hexene	6	56	99	101
1-hexene ^c	6	22	99	16
Cyclooctene ^d	3	85	99	-
	20	89	95	-
Cyclooctene (1st) ^e	6	99	98	178
Cyclooctene (2nd) ^e	6	98	99	177
Cyclooctene	12	14	41	-
Cyclooctene ^g	12	9	45	-

Reaction conditions: catalyst (100 mg), olefin (8 mmol), TBHP (1.6 ml, 14.4 mmol), refluxing chloroform (20 ml).

^a Selectivity toward the corresponding epoxide.

^b Calculated as mmol of product formed per mmol of molybdenum in the catalyst per hour.

^c Values from Ref. [20].

^d Catalytic test after filtration of the catalyst.

^e Catalytic test with first and second recovered catalyst.

^f Reaction was carried out without catalyst.

^g Reaction was carried out in the presence of SCMNPs.

Table 2

Results of catalytic epoxidation of olefins with CHP in presence of MoO_2 salpr/SCMNPs.

Olefin	Time (h)	Conversion (%)	Selectivity (%)	$TOF(h^{-1})$
Cyclooctene	6	95	99	171
Cyclohexene	6	62	99	112
1-Hexene	6	45	98	81

Reaction conditions: catalyst (100 mg), olefin (8 mmol), CHP (14.4 mmol), refluxing chloroform (20 ml).

As seen in Tables 1 and 2, catalytic activities and TOFs increase in the order of cyclooctene > cyclohexene > 1-hexene as internal double bond olefins with higher electron density show higher reactivities than terminal olefins.

Comparison of the obtained results with our earlier work on the similar catalyst derived from mesoporous material (MCM-41), i.e. MoO_2 salpr@MCM-41 [20], is interesting and instructive. Compared to MoO_2 salpr@MCM-41 with 1.75 wt% molybdenum, the MoO_2 salpr/SCMNPs with 0.71 wt% molybdenum shows more catalytic activity, e.g. TOF = 180 for the last vs. TOF = 59 in the former in cyclooctene epoxidation or TOF = 110 vs. TOF = 53 in cyclohexene epoxidation in the same reaction conditions (results showed in Table 1). This can be interpreted by considering the fact that compared to the MoO_2 salpr@MCM-41 catalyst with higher surface area but narrow pore size, the MoO_2 salpr/SCMNPs has not diffusion limitations, as all of the surface area of the nanoparticles is external. On the other hand, the MoO_2 salpr/SCMNPs nanocatalyst can be recovered easily with application of a permanent magnet

Table 3

Results of catalytic epoxidation of allyl alcohols with CHP in presence of MoO_2 salpr/SCMNPs.

Olefin	Time (h)	Conversion (%)	Selectivity (%)	$TOF(h^{-1})$
3-Methyl-2-butene-1-ol	6	83	99	150
1-Octene-3-ol	6	15	99	27
3-Butene-2-ol	6	73	98	132
Trans-2-hexene-1-ol	6	54	98	97

Reaction conditions: catalyst (100 mg), olefin (8 mmol), CHP (14.4 mmol), refluxing chloroform (20 ml).



Fig. 5. Magnetization curve of nanocatalyst after second recovery.

compared to MoO₂salpr@MCM-41 which needs a time consuming filtration of reaction mixture.

Table 3 exhibits the results of catalytic epoxidation of allylic alcohols with CHP in the presence of prepared MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs. As can be seen, the prepared nanocatalyst is active in the epoxidation of allylic alcohols with excellent selectivities.

Recovery test was performed on the prepared nanocatalyst to evaluate whether the catalysis was occurring via surface bound nanocatalyst. In a separate test epoxidation of cyclooctene was allowed to proceed 3 h (ca. 85% cyclooctene conversion, Table 1). The MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs was then recovered magnetically at the reaction temperature to avoid re-adsorption of the solubilized species and the solution was decanted into a clean 25 ml flask. The solution was refluxed for 20 h to elucidate whether conversion resulted from homogeneous catalyst leached from the support or surface bound molybdenum catalyst. The conversions and selectivities were determined after 3 and 20 h and it was found that the conversion only slightly increased to 89% and then remains constant (Table 1).

After using MoO₂salpr/SCMNPs as catalyst, no molybdenum was detected in the solution by ICP-AAS. On the other hand, the recovered nanocatalyst was reused for the epoxidation of cyclooctene and the reaction results are presented in Table 1. The results show that the activity and selectivity do not decrease significantly for at least two uses of the catalyst. So, from these results it can be concluded that molybdenum species is strongly bonded to the surface of SCMNPs and the prepared nanocatalyst is stable in the reaction conditions and that the epoxidation reaction is truly heterogeneous.

Also, the magnetic property of the recovered nanocatalyst was controlled after second recovery test with investigation of VSM analysis. As observed in Fig. 5, the saturation magnetization of the recovered nanocatalyst is about 35 emu/g with superparamagnetic behavior and so there is no considerable change in its magnetic property. Thus, the magnetite core is stable during the course of epoxidation reaction as a result of protective function of the silica shell against TBHP.

4. Conclusion

In this work, we have shown that functionalization of silica coated magnetite nanoparticles with a tetradentate salpr Schiff base ligand and subsequent complexation with molybdenum affords an easily recoverable truly heterogenized molybdenum nanocatalyst which is active and selective in catalytic epoxidation of olefins and allylic alcohols.

References

- [1] G.A. Ozin, Science 271 (1996) 920–941.
- [2] A. Henglein, Chem. Rev. 89 (1989) 1861–1873.
- [3] C.N.R. Rao, A.K. Cheethan, J. Mater. Chem. 11 (2001) 2887-2894.
- [4] H. Gleiter, Acta Mater. 48 (2000) 1-29.
- [5] S.C. Tjang, H. Chen, Mater. Sci. Eng. 45 (2004) 1–88.
- [6] E.F. Hilinske, P.A. Lucas, Y. Weng, J. Chem. Phys. 89 (1998) 3435-3441.
- [7] S.E. Dapurkar, S.K. Badamali, P. Selvam, Catal. Today 68 (2001) 63-68.
- [8] T. Sen, A. Sebastianelli, I.J. Bruce, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 128 (2006) 7130–7131.
- [9] H. Lee, E. Lee, D.K. Kim, N.K. Jang, S.Y. Jon, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 128 (2006) 7383–7389.
 [10] S.H. Sun, C.B. Murray, D. Weller, L. Folks, A. Moser, Science 287 (2000)
- 1989–1992
- [11] A. Hu, G.T. Yee, W. Lin, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 127 (2005) 12485-12487.
- 12] S.C. Tsang, C.H. Yu, X. Gao, K. Tam, J. Phys. Chem. B 110 (2006) 16914–16922.
- [13] Y. Sun, L. Duan, Z. Guo, Y.D. Mu, M. Ma, L. Xu, Y. Zhang, N. Gu, J. Magn. Magn.
- Mater. 285 (2005) 65–70. [14] Y. Deng, C. Deng, D. Qi, C. Liu, X. Zhang, D. Zhao, Adv. Mater. 21 (2009) 1377–1382.
- [15] S.H. Huang, D.H. Chen, J. Hazard. Mater. 163 (2009) 174-179.
- [16] I.J. Bruce, J. Taylor, M. Todd, M.J. Davies, E. Borioni, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 284 (2004) 145-160.
- [17] Y.H. Deng, C.C. Wang, J.H. Hu, W.L. Yang, S.K. Fu, Colloid Surf. A: Physicochem. Eng. Aspects 262 (2005) 87–93.
- [18] Z. Ma, D. Dosev, M. Nichkova, R.K. Dumas, I.M. Kennedy, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 321 (2009) 1368–1371.
- [19] M. Masteri-Farahani, F. Farzaneh, M. Ghandi, J. Mol. Catal. A 248 (2006) 53-60.
- [20] M. Masteri-Farahani, F. Farzaneh, M. Ghandi, J. Mol. Catal. A 243 (2006) 170–175.
- [21] M. Masteri-Farahani, F. Farzaneh, M. Ghandi, Catal. Commun. 8 (2007) 6–10.
- [22] M. Masteri-Farahani, F. Farzaneh, M. Ghandi, J. Mol. Catal. A 192 (2003) 103–111.
- [23] M. Masteri-Farahani, J. Mol. Catal. A 316 (2010) 45-51.
- [24] C.D. Nones, M. Pillinger, A. Valente, I.S. Goncalves, Inorg. Chem. Commun. 6 (2003) 1228–1233.
- [25] M. Jia, W.R. Thiel, Chem. Commun. (2002) 2392.
- [26] M. Jia, A. Siefert, W.R. Thiel, Chem. Mater. 15 (2003) 2174–2185.
- [27] B. Baruwati, D. Guin, S.V. MAnorama, Org. Lett. 9 (2007) 5377-5380.
- [28] Z. Wang, P. Xiao, B. Shen, N. He, Colloid Surf. A: Physicochem. Eng. Aspects 276 (2006) 116-121.
- [29] E.M. Claesson, N.C. Mehendale, G. Van Koten, A.P. Philipse, J. Magn. Magn. Mater.
 - 311 (2007) 41–45.
 - [30] B. Panella, A. Vargas, A. Baiker, J. Catal. 261 (2009) 88-93.
 - [31] M.J. Jacinto, R. Landers, L.M. Rossi, Catal. Commun. 10 (2009) 1971-1979.
 - [32] L.M. Rossi, I.M. Nangoi, N.J.S. Costa, Inorg. Chem. 48 (2009) 4640-4642.
 - [33] V. Polshettiwar, R. Luque, A. Fihri, H. Zhu, M. Bouhrara, J.M. Basset, Chem. Rev. 111 (2011) 3036–3075.
 - [34] W.M. Coleman, L.T. Taylor, Inorg. Chem. 10 (1971) 2195-2199.
 - [35] G.J. Chen, J.W. Mc Donald, W.E. Newton, Inorg. Chem. 15 (1976) 2612–2615.
 - [36] X.Q. Liu, Z.Y. Ma, J.M. Xing, H.Z. Liu, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 270 (2004) 1-6.
 - [37] J. Topich, Inorg. Chem. 20 (1981) 3704-3707.