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Abstract

With an ever increasing need for a more energy-efficient and environmentally benign procedure for gas separation, adsorbents with tailored structures and tunable surface properties are in high demand. Metal–organic frameworks (MOFs), constructed from metal-containing nodes connected by organic bridges, are such a new type of porous materials. They are promising candidates as adsorbents for gas separations due to their large surface areas, adjustable pore sizes and controllable properties, as well as acceptable thermal stability. However, the bottleneck in this context is that MOFs are expensive to be fabricated and majority of them are not stable in harsh environments, which are often required by industrial processes. In this thesis, we introduce three families of metal-organic frameworks with exceptional gas separation performance for a variety of different gas mixtures separation. Their unique separation performances are well supported by isotherm measurement, X-ray crystallography, DFT calculations, and breakthrough test. These MOFs are all readily synthesizable by inexpensive precursor and highly stable at extreme conditions.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BET</td>
<td>Brunauer-Emmett-Teller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>compressed natural gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>direct air capture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFT</td>
<td>density functional theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>N,N-diethylformamide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMF</td>
<td>N,N-dimethylformamide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSLF</td>
<td>Dual-Site Langmuir Freundlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCMC</td>
<td>Grand Canonical Monte Carlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPU</td>
<td>gas permeation unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKUST</td>
<td>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOF</td>
<td>hydrogen-bonded organic framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAST</td>
<td>Ideal Adsorption Selectivity Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRMOF</td>
<td>isoreticular metal-organic framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPAC</td>
<td>International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCD</td>
<td>largest cavity diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF</td>
<td>linear driving force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNG</td>
<td>liquefied natural gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>metal azolate framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>microporous coordination polymer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFM</td>
<td>Manchester framework materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL</td>
<td>Matériel Institut Lavoisier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF</td>
<td>metal-organic framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF</td>
<td>Massey University framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMR</td>
<td>nuclear magnetic resonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN</td>
<td>porous coordination network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>porous coordination polymer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLD</td>
<td>pore limiting diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>pressure swing adsorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>postsynthetic modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PXRD</td>
<td>powder X-ray diffraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>relative humidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBU</td>
<td>secondary building unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCXRD</td>
<td>single crystal x-ray diffraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>scanning electron microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>standard temperature and pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMOF</td>
<td>Stockholm University metal-organic framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGA</td>
<td>Thermogravimetric analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA</td>
<td>temperature swing adsorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSA</td>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiO</td>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VASP</td>
<td>Vienna Ab initio Simulation Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSA</td>
<td>vacuum swing adsorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIF</td>
<td>zeolitic imidazolate framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZJU</td>
<td>Zhejiang University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 General introduction to metal-organic frameworks

1.1.1 Definition, terminology and nomenclature

Metal-organic frameworks (MOFs) are a new class of hybrid materials, constructed from metal ions or metal-containing clusters and divergent organic linkers to form one-, two- or three dimensional network-like structures. These materials are composed of metal centres, which are represented by metal ions, or metal clusters and one or several organic ligands, which serve as linkers between these metal centres. The interest in MOFs was sparked in the 1990s, with hundreds of these materials now discovered. Such interest in MOFs is related to their unique properties. MOFs are crystalline (i.e. the atoms are arranged in a regular, ordered and periodic manner) and porous materials with high accessible pore volume. With a great variety of metal clusters and organic linkers, there seems to be infinite number of possible combinations to make MOFs. The tuneable nature of MOFs have allowed the rational structural design of numerous MOFs and the incorporation of various functionalities via constituent building blocks.

These materials have emerged from an interdisciplinary field with an origin in inorganic and coordination chemistry, so there is a variety of terminological usages for these materials in the literature. Additionally, different individual research groups have used, or formerly used, various names for MOFs, such as porous coordination networks (PCNs, by Zhou’s group), porous coordination polymers (PCPs, by Kitagawa’s group), and microporous coordination polymers (MCPs, by Matzger’s group), which causes more confusion and unnecessary misunderstanding. In 2013, the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) published its recommendations to give some clarity to the definitions and terminologies used in the field of MOFs. According to IUPAC, a metal-organic framework, abbreviated to MOF, is a coordination network with organic ligands containing potential voids. Here, a coordination network refers to a coordination compound extending, through repeating coordination entities, in one dimension, but with cross-links between two or more individual chains, loops, or spiro-links, or a coordination compound extending through repeating coordination entities in two or three dimensions. IUPAC also defines a
coordination polymer as a *coordination compound with repeating coordination entities extending in one, two, or three dimensions*. As can be seen from these definitions, MOFs are a subset of coordination networks which they are again a subset of coordination polymers (Figure 1.1).

A task group from IUPAC has worked to revise the nomenclature of coordination and inorganic polymers.\(^2\) In general, IUPAC agrees that the nickname of the MOFs (e.g. MOF-5\(^3\)) or abbreviated formula [e.g. \(\text{Mg}_2\text{(dobdc)}\), \(^4-6\) dobdc \(= 2,5\)-dioxido-1,4-benzenedicarboxylate], can be commonly used, when referring to a MOF. Another way of naming MOFs recognized by IUPAC is naming materials based on their place of origin followed by a number, such as MUF-15 (MUF = Massey University Frameworks),\(^7\) MIL-101 (Matérial Institut Lavoisier),\(^8\) and UiO-66 (UiO = University of Oslo).\(^9\) In this thesis, the term MOF will be used based on IUPAC recommendations and all materials initially reported with alternative terms will be classified as MOFs.

### 1.1.2 A brief overview of the history of MOFs

As a subclass of coordination networks, the historical development of MOFs is closely related to that of coordination networks. Prussian blue, \(\text{Fe}_4[\text{Fe(CN)}_6]\cdot\text{xH}_2\text{O}\), might be the first coordination network which was first deliberately synthesized in 1706 as a pigment and its crystal structure was solved not earlier than 1977.\(^{10}\) In spite of some different opinions, it is mostly agreed that the work of Hoskins and Robson proposed in 1989-1990 lead to a new

---

**Figure 1.1** A diagram showing that MOFs are a subset of coordination networks, and that coordination networks are further subset of coordination polymers.
chapter in the study of MOFs. They presented a “design” flavour to the assembly of 3D frameworks by the combinations of organic building blocks (ligands) and metal ions.\textsuperscript{11-12} Ten years after Hoskins and Robson’s work, two outstanding MOFs, MOF-5 (Zn\textsubscript{4}O(bdc)\textsubscript{3}, \(\text{bdc} = 1,4\)-benzenedicarboxylate)\textsuperscript{13} and HKUST-1 (Cu\textsubscript{3}(btc)\textsubscript{2}, \(\text{btc} = 1,3,5\)-benzenetricarboxylate)\textsuperscript{14} were introduced, and greatly helped to advance this field, mainly because of their permanent porosity towards incoming gases which was verified experimentally (Figure 1.2). MIL-101 (Cr\textsubscript{3}OF(bdc)\textsubscript{3}), another milestone representative of MOFs, was introduced shortly thereafter showing not only permanent porosity but also high stability.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Figure 1.2} Crystal structure of (a) MOF-5, (b) HKUST-1 and (c) MIL-101 constructed from linking metal clusters and organic linkers. Colour code: orange: chromium; green: copper; blue: zinc; grey: carbon; red: oxygen.

Rapid development of MOF field can be clearly related to the observations of a variety of exciting properties and the great potential of these materials in the near future. Moreover, flexible behaviour of dynamic MOFs as well as other alluring properties of MOFs has added to the attraction of this field, and has discriminated them from traditional porous materials.\textsuperscript{16} It should also be highlighted that among porous materials, MOFs exhibit the highest surface areas per gram by far reported to date.\textsuperscript{17} Such high surface areas of MOFs has led to their enormous use in gas storage systems, where only 1 g of MOF can accommodate a football field in its pores.\textsuperscript{18} As a developing field, the complication in properties and structures of MOFs is constantly increasing, and novel applications are being discovered.\textsuperscript{19}

\subsection*{1.1.3 From traditional porous solid materials to MOFs}

There were only two types of porous materials, inorganic and carbon-based materials that were being applied in industry by the mid-1990s.\textsuperscript{20} Nowadays, porous materials are a broad family, ranging from organic to inorganic, from synthetic to natural, and from
crystalline to amorphous. A classic example of inorganic porous materials is zeolites, which are crystalline aluminosilicates with pores with a diameter of 3-13 Å interconnected to each other. A big portion of industrial processes, particularly separation processes, are performed using zeolites, which reflects the importance of these materials in our daily life. Compared to zeolites, activated carbons are amorphous materials and does not have uniform structures, but they possess higher specific surface area and porosity and hold a great share of the market.

Figure 1.3 Schematic of porous solid classification emphasizing MOFs as hybrid porous materials. Three types of porous solids with polymers, zeolites and MOFs as an example porous organic solids, porous inorganic solids, and porous organic-inorganic hybrid solids, respectively, as well as a general construction procedure for a MOF.

The classification of porous materials is shown in Figure 1.3 presenting MOFs as a type of new hybrid materials, consisting of organic and inorganic compounds, as well as a typical procedure for the construction of MOFs. MOFs are regarded as one of the most advanced porous materials because of their crystallinity, regular pore size, diversity, flexibility, and designability in both structure and properties, which enable them to reach or outperform current adsorption technologies. In comparison to traditional inorganic porous solids and
activated carbons, the number of newly synthesized MOFs are drastically increasing due the vast library of inorganic and organic compounds. It can indeed be seen from the growing number of papers published on these materials in the last 20 years. In addition to adsorptive characteristic, because of the hybrid nature of MOFs takes advantage of the properties of both inorganic and organic moieties, and hence they can also be utilized in a number of other exciting applications including magnetism and luminescence. Because of their crystalline nature, the structure of MOFs can be determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction. MOFs also possess uniform pore structure which aims in the easy exploration of them and properties-structure relationships understanding. It leads to further design and synthesis of new and improved MOFs. Actually, this regular pore size distribution has helped to determine a number of adsorption phenomena in MOFs directly. Such a uniform pore space can be used as a molecular reactor for stabilizing reactants and conduct reactions more systematically. Compared to other porous solid materials such as zeolites and activated carbons, MOFs possess a higher degree of designability and their functionality can be tuned by introducing different functional groups. The tunable nature of MOFs can be attributed to at least one of these concepts, (a) MOF are generally synthesized in mild conditions which allows for controlling the reactions easily; (b) by the virtue of organic chemistry, ligands can be readily designed or functionalized; (c) organic ligands and metal clusters have fixed coordination numbers which means a specific framework can be generated by combining rigid organic and inorganic building units; (d) MOFs sometimes obey isoreticular approach, i.e., their structure and functionality can be tuned while the topology and connectivity between nodes remains unchanged; and (e) metal nodes or the organic linker in the framework can be post-synthetically modified. As an example of one of these characteristics, isoreticular approach has led to the synthesis of the most fascinating families of MOFs whose physical structure and chemical affinity can be fine-tuned, whilst keeping the basic topology of the framework unchanged. For instance, isoreticular chemistry enables design of MOFs with tailored porosity and high surface areas that can lead to the development of highly efficient MOFs for storage applications. As an example, Schröder and co-workers developed a series of isoreticular MOFs through elongation of some octacarboxylate ligands where they have significantly improved the surface areas and deliverable CH$_4$ capacity. As can be seen from Figure 1.4, substitution of extended octacarboxylate ligands in the MFM-180 (MFM: Manchester Framework Materials) structure has led to the development of MOFs with larger cages with improved surface areas, while the topology and structure of these MOFs remain intact. The surface area of the MOF with the most elongated ligand (MFM-185) has nearly doubled and the CH$_4$ deliverable capacity increased to 0.24 g g$^{-1}$ and 163 vol/vol (298 K, 5–65 bar).
Additionally, isoreticular approach allows for the design of MOFs with precise pore dimensions and favourable affinities by the right selection of organic linkers and metal ions so that they selectively adsorb specific guest molecules, while excluding other gases. This unique ability also has led to significant improvements in design and development of MOFs with high thermal and physical stability compared to that of their parent MOF.

By exposure to some certain stimuli, the structure of some MOFs can change. These frameworks that are referred to as flexible/dynamic MOFs are a unique subclass of these materials while other solid porous materials such as zeolites have a rigid frameworks. Mostly,
MOFs also have rigid frameworks and a similar properties to that of traditional inorganic porous solids, such as activated carbons and zeolites. Nonetheless, flexible/dynamic structures are specific to MOFs and they show interesting behaviour, especially during adsorption and adsorptive separations. These structural transformations in flexible MOFs are generally seen during adsorption or desorption of guest molecules.

1.1.4 Design, synthesis, and potential applications of MOFs

The “design” of MOFs is somehow controversial, and it is hard to say a MOF has been rationally designed. Conceptually speaking, MOFs are formed based on the direct connection of organic linker and inorganic nodes with specific coordination states and shapes. This concept was applied in the early stages of this research area by Robson and others where they presented the “node and spacer” theory to form coordination polymers. Based on this approach, metal ions with a fixed coordination number and ligands with a certain coordination bond and connectivity, can enable synthesis of a coordination polymer with fixed shapes and linkage geometries. This approach seems to be applicable for construction of a simple MOF to a certain extent (e.g., reaction of a tetrahedral node and a linear bridging linker offers a diamondoid shape coordination polymer), but when it comes to reality, it is more difficult to obtain the on-paper designed material, particularly when designing more complicated cases (for example, MOFs containing multiple ligands). The discussion of whether it is possible to rationally design a porous material is an ongoing question, and it even becomes more complicated when it comes to MOFs. For example to synthesize a MOF under solvothermal conditions (the most common method of MOF synthesis), it may not be easy to control the formation of expected metal clusters or retain the single metal ion. Even in a simpler case where a single metal ion acts as node, it is quite possible that the metal forms various coordination geometries or different connectivities, which makes the prediction of the final product very difficult. The effects of solvent molecules and reaction temperature are other factors that need to be considered as they participate in the process of forming crystals. Currently, MOFs are defined as materials that can be constructed by strong covalent bonds between metal-containing clusters (while assuming their formation can be controlled during MOF synthesis) which act as secondary building units (SBUs), and rigid organic moieties. Design seems to be absolutely practical in this sense. Based on this approach, a MOF can be reproduced using an SBU with known coordination geometry and similar but new linkers. This “design” based on reticular approach, has assisted the evolution of the MOF field and led to a systematic design of the frameworks with the same topology and structure, and have enabled scientists to systematically explore the effects of various structural modification on a variety of MOFs.
properties. In another sense, “Design” can also be regarded as the ability of scientist to design an experiment to target a MOF that its topologies and pore characteristics are already anticipated, or by designing organic linkers with the same linkage geometry to obtain a predetermined MOF.

MOFs are commonly synthesized through self-assembly reaction of metal salts and organic ligands in a solution of one or more solvents at a temperature from room temperature to 300 °C in one pot. The desired products are crystalline solids precipitated (preferably large crystals for better X-ray diffraction) at the end of reactions. At near room temperatures, due to the slow diffusion of reactants in the solution and gradual evaporation of solvents, crystals can grow slowly and larger crystals might be obtained. At elevated temperatures and pressures, which is generally referred to as solvothermal synthesis, reaction times are normally less than room temperature reactions, but single crystals are still formed. Compared to reactions in room temperatures, the resultant products might be more complex and diverse at high temperatures. Another important factor that can control the reaction rate and purity of crystalline product is the pH value of the reaction solution. Also efforts have been made to drive the formation of the products kinetically rather than thermodynamically, even though this area has not studied largely. As a quick way of synthesizing a MOF, microwave-assisted techniques have been developed and has certainly offered several advantages in comparison to other MOF synthesis methods. Other than using solvents, ionic liquids also have been used for the synthesis of MOFs. This method is termed as ionothermal synthesis and the ionic liquid serves both as a solvent and template during the formation of crystals. Moreover, solvent-free synthesis has been developed and used for the synthesis of MOFs. These methods are more convenient than former methods and largely cut down the environmental contamination. Apart from one-pot reactions, methods with a high degree of control but synthetically more complicated has been exploited through a stepwise method and using metal organic polyhedra acting as supramolecular building blocks. MOFs also have been synthesized in nanoscale which have exhibited some outstanding characteristics. Another notable concern in the synthesis of MOFs is formation of pure phase, as existence of other phases limits the determination of structure and full characterization. This might not be very simple in some cases; for instance, frameworks with various levels of interpenetration are usually difficult to be separated from each other. Moreover, to achieve the entire potential of MOFs full activation of samples are required to obtain empty and uniform pores which might sometimes be quite challenging, particularly for unstable or highly porous MOFs with strong guest-framework interactions. MOFs are generally activated by solvent exchange (washing with volatile solvents) followed by removing solvents and other guest molecules from pores by evacuation at elevated
temperatures. Besides this general methods, some advanced methods such as “density separation” for the purification and “supercritical CO$_2$ flowing” for activation of MOFs have been presented and performed.$^{63}$

The scope of applications of MOFs is very broad. Due to their permanent porosity, diversity and tunable nature they have been exploited in a variety of different applications, such as catalysis,$^{64-66}$ magnetic materials,$^{67-68}$ luminescence,$^{69-70}$ wastewater treatments,$^{71-73}$ sensing,$^{74-75}$ biological systems,$^{76}$ non-linear optics,$^{77}$ electron$^{78-82}$ and proton$^{83-85}$ conduction, battery cathode materials,$^{86}$ photovoltaics,$^{87}$ semiconductors,$^{79}$ guest inclusion,$^{8, 88-89}$ biomedical imaging,$^{62}$ drug delivery,$^{90-91}$ cancer therapy,$^{92}$ just to name a few areas. Gas separation is only a small portion of current research on MOFs. As the content of this thesis is about the ability of MOFs for gas separation, we further review this application in detail and readers are encouraged to go through the several reviews and monographs in the literatures for further information.

### 1.1.5 Method of characterizations

The direct determination of MOF structure is often performed by single-crystal X-ray diffraction, or in some cases by powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD). The latter also is employed to investigate the phase purity of the final product. Furthermore, gas adsorption experiments are used to establish the pore characteristics and guest-framework interactions of MOFs. Other tools such as nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) of either acid-digested materials or in-tact solids, thermogravimetric analyses (TGA), infrared spectroscopy, and elemental analysis, also are frequently employed to characterize the structure of MOFs. Here, two methods of crystallography and gas adsorption are discussed in more detail.

#### 1.1.5.1 Crystallography

Crystallographic structural data is perhaps the most utilized and powerful tool for characterizing MOFs. X-ray crystallography is the most common technique exploited for determination of the position of atoms and molecular structure of a crystal, where a beam of X-rays is diffracted to different specific direction after exposure to the crystalline structure. A 3D picture of the density of electrons within the crystal can be then obtained by measuring the angles and intensities of these diffracted beams. From this electron density, the mean positions of the atoms in the crystal can be determined, as well as their chemical bonds, their crystallographic disorder, and various other information. Another technique that has been used is neutron diffraction or elastic neutron scattering which is the application
of neutron scattering to the determination of the atomic and/or magnetic structure of a material.

A sample to be examined is placed in a beam of thermal or cold neutrons to obtain a diffraction pattern that provides information of the structure of the material. The technique is similar to X-ray diffraction but due to their different scattering properties, neutrons and X-rays provide complementary information: X-Rays are suited for superficial analysis, strong X-rays from synchrotron radiation are suited for shallow depths or thin specimens, while neutrons having high penetration depth are suited for bulk samples. From structural data, many properties, such as surface functionality, density, and surface area can be determined. Without these results, drawing conclusions about the origin of material behaviour towards guest molecules is challenging. Due to the modular nature of metal-organic frameworks, often powder diffraction patterns are sufficient to confirm that a new material is isostructural to a previously documented structure. Figure 1.5 indicates the structure of some well-known MOFs determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction.

![Crystallographic structure of various MOFs](image)

**Figure 1.5** Crystallographic structure, molecular formula, common name, BET surface area, and centroid-centroid pore diameters for some well-known MOFs determined from single-crystal X-ray diffraction technique. Color code: Green, red, gray, yellow, purple, orange, dark red, and blue correspond to Zn, O, C, Cr, V, Fe, Cu, and N, respectively.
1.1.5.2 Gas adsorption

Gas sorption measurement has been employed to characterize MOFs in two senses: calculation of the surface area and pore volume, and the adsorption capacity and adsorption strength of different guest molecules. Usually, a N$_2$ adsorption isotherm at 77 K is used to measure surface area and pore volume using different methods such as Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) and Langmuir method.$^{93-94}$ For example, the BET theory applies to systems of multilayer adsorption and usually utilizes probing gases that do not chemically react with material surfaces as adsorbates to quantify specific surface area. Based on this theory, adsorption occurs in a flat surface, while there is no interaction between adsorbate molecules in adjacent sites and they only interact with adjacent layers. These monolayers are covered by gas molecules until there is no space for incoming gas molecules.$^{93}$ A schematic of adsorption based on BET model is presented in Figure 1.6. A functional description of this method is presented in the BET section of this chapter.

![Figure 1.6 BET model of multilayer adsorption, that is, a random distribution of sites covered by one, two, three, etc., adsorbate molecules.](image)

In the case of a MOF with smaller pore diameter than kinetic diameter of N$_2$, an argon isotherm at 87 K or CO$_2$ isotherm at 195 K can be alternatively used. In particular, surface area measurements are quite useful to establish the phase purity of a MOF. PXRD only can confirm the presence of an anticipated phase, and the existence of amorphous dense phases or other unwanted phases which are formed during MOF synthesis is not confirmed or denied. Elemental analyses and thermogravimetry are other methods that can be used to check the phase purity of a MOF, but they are also usually difficult to be interpreted in MOFs because of the existence of solvent molecules within the pores. Phase purity of a MOF can often be confirmed by matching the value of measured surface area and the surface area predicted from the crystallographic structural data (or the same samples that their surface area is previously determined). Storage and gas separation is one of the most promising applications of MOFs.$^{95}$ Hydrogen$^{93}$ and methane$^{96}$ storage by MOFs has direct impact on to emissions of less CO$_2$ to the environment, while separation of CO$_2$ from N$_2$ by MOFs
lead to the development of materials that can simply be placed to the exhaust streams of power plants to reduce the emissions of CO₂ into the environment. Adsorption of these gases can be measured volumetrically, resulting in a further evaluation of MOFs for any gas separation application. Besides, adsorption isotherms at different temperatures can be used to determine the adsorption strength by fitting them to the Clausius-Clapeyron equation.

1.2 Adsorptive gas separations

1.2.1 Essentials of adsorption phenomena

Generally, the surface of any solid is not smooth, and the forces acting in the surface are not saturated. Thus, upon exposure to a gas, a bond between surface and gas molecules are formed. This phenomenon is called adsorption. Based on the nature of interaction between the adsorbate molecules and solid surface, adsorption can be classified as physical adsorption or chemical adsorption (also called as chemisorption). Chemical adsorption involves electron transfer between the atoms of adsorbate and adsorbent, and is basically a two-dimensional chemical reaction (referred as covalent bonds). Chemical adsorption is not reversible, thus it is not often encountered largely in gas separation processes. Therefore, this type of adsorption is not focused here.

In contrast to chemical adsorption, the bonds in physical adsorptions are held by electrostatic interactions including dipolar and Coulombic forces, and these forces are much weaker compared to chemical adsorptions (30-50 kJ/mol). Coulombic forces are repulsive or attractive interactions between two ions (partial charges) because of their electric charges. In the context of MOF-guest system, this interaction only exists between highly polar molecules and highly polar surfaces, such as MOFs with open metal sites. These are the strongest intermolecular forces defined based on Coulomb’s law. Polar covalent atoms/molecules are sometimes described as "dipoles", meaning that the molecule has two "poles". One end (pole) of the molecule has a partial positive charge while the other end has a partial negative charge. These molecules can orientate themselves so that they interact with the polar surface of the adsorbent favourably and create attractive force called dipolar interactions. These interactions can be categorized into dipole-dipole, induce dipole-dipole, and dispersive (London) interactions. The latter largely exist in MOF adsorption systems and arise from the rapid fluctuation of electron density in each atom of adsorbate molecules, which induce an electrical moment in neighbouring atoms on the surface of adsorbent, and thus generate an attractive or repulsive force between them. A schematic of dispersive interactions between hydrogen atoms of ethane molecules and the rhombic cavity of aromatic rings in MOF Cu(Qc)₂ are presented in Figure 1.7.
For a given solid-gas system, the amount of gas adsorbed at equilibrium is described as a function of pressure at a constant temperature, which is called an *adsorption isotherm*. The great majority of the isotherms observed to date, can be classified into six types, as demonstrated in Figure 1.8.\textsuperscript{99,101} Types I and II are the most frequently observed isotherms in separation processes. In the context of MOFs, Type IV is also encountered frequently in flexible MOFs.
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\caption{The five types of adsorption isotherms according to the BDDT classification.\textsuperscript{101} \(q_A\) and \(p_A\) are the concentration of adsorbate in solid phase (adsorption uptake) and partial pressure of adsorbate in gas phase, respectively.}
\end{figure}
Numerous theories have been developed to interpret these different types of isotherms, of which three of them have been widely employed in adsorption systems: The Langmuir approach, the Gibbs approach and the potential theory. These approaches have presented various models to define these isotherms, such as Langmuir, Freundlich, combination of Langmuir and Freundlich, BET, Temkin and so on.\textsuperscript{99}

1.2.2 Adsorptive gas separation technology

Gas separation techniques include a broad area ranging from membrane-based, absorption-based and adsorption-based technologies to cryogenic distillation.\textsuperscript{20,102-103} Shortly after the evolution of synthetically-prepared zeolites in the 1940s followed by the emergence of a number of different adsorbents and the progress in adsorption-based separation technologies, adsorptive separation has become one of the leading technologies for separating gases.\textsuperscript{21,99,104} With the development of a significant number of new adsorbents with various functionalities, tailored porosity and exceptional properties and the increasing demand for environmental-friendly separation processes, adsorption-based separation has gained great attention in the gas separation industry. Hence, adsorption-based separation will likely play an important role in the future of energy and green technologies.\textsuperscript{20,99,105} Among numerous gas separation applications performed by adsorption-based processes, noticeable examples are purification of H\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4}, CO\textsubscript{2} capture, natural gas and biofuel upgrading, sulfur removal from transportation fuels, CO removal in fuel cell industry and other technologies that can greatly help to having a clean and energy efficient environment. Numerous monographs and reviews on adsorptive separation for these gas systems have been published.\textsuperscript{99,104-110}

In concept, adsorption-based gas separations can be classified into two types: purification and bulk separation. Purification implies the adsorption of a small quantity of impurities from a gas stream (generally less than 2 wt%), while the latter involves the adsorption of a notable amount of gas stream (usually 10 wt%).\textsuperscript{20} In a typical adsorptive gas separation process, a gas mixture passes through a column filled with sorbents to produce a stream which is rich in weakly-adsorbed compound. As an example, a MOF with a highly polar pore surface can be packed into an adsorption column to produce pure N\textsubscript{2} from a mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} by adsorbing highly polar CO\textsubscript{2} molecules (Figure 1.9).
In adsorptive gas separation systems, the separation is usually achieved based on the ability of the adsorbent to recognize different species in the gas mixture. The performance of any adsorption-based separation is directly governed by the characteristics of both adsorbate and adsorbent. Based on these characteristics, separation can be achieved based on three mechanisms. Separation due to the difference in equilibrium capacity of species, difference in kinetics of adsorption, and difference in size of adsorbates (molecular sieving).\textsuperscript{111-113} To better understand these mechanisms, schematic of the journey of a single CO\textsubscript{2} molecule from bulk gas to adsorption site in a MOF (Mg-MOF-74) is illustrated in Figure 1.10.

**Figure 1.9** Schematic of an adsorption bed packed with MOF for separating CO\textsubscript{2} from N\textsubscript{2}.

**Figure 1.10** Typical steps of adsorption in a MOF (Mg-MOF-74): 1, diffusing through bulk gas to the external surface of MOF; 2, diffusing through the internal pores of the MOF to the adsorption site; 3, adsorption to the MOF.
Firstly, an adsorbate molecule in the bulk fluid phase diffuses through the bulk gas mixture to the external surfaces of the MOF (1), then it diffuses through the internal pores of the MOF, to the adsorption site (2), being adsorbed to the adsorption site (3). Now, in adsorptive gas separation based on the difference in equilibrium adsorption capacity, step 3 is the governing step. Both gases are given enough time to reach the adsorption site, but only one of them adsorbed strongly. In kinetic separation, step 1 and 2 controls the separation. Adsorption takes place as one of the species reach the adsorption site faster than the other one. And finally in size-based separation, step 2 dictate the efficiency of adsorption. Generally the pores are small enough that the larger molecule cannot get into the pores.

Because of the reversible nature of physical adsorption, adsorption processes can be designed in continuous cycles, in which the adsorbents are regenerated by desorbing the strongly-adsorbed component and reusing for the next cycle. A number of different cyclic adsorption processes are developed based on the way of regenerating the adsorbent, such as pressure swing adsorption (PSA) processes, thermal swing adsorption (TSA) processes, vacuum swing adsorption (VSA) processes, inert purge cycles, and so on. Among these methods, PSA and TSA have been widely used in adsorptive gas separation processes. In a conventional PSA, desorption is performed by reducing the partial pressures of the strongly-adsorbed compound in the gas phase. It is usually carried out by either decreasing the total pressure of adsorption column or by recycling a portion of the product stream to the adsorption column around room temperatures, while in a TSA cycle, desorption is achieved by heating the adsorption column with either a portion of the feed stream or gas product at around atmospheric pressure. TSA cycles are often employed for gas purification purposes, whereas bulk separation is achieved by PSA. Figure 1.11 shows a simplified and idealized schematic of PSA, TSA and VSA processes for CO$_2$ removal from natural gas (CH$_4$).

Figure 1.11 Schematic illustrations of simplified and idealized (a) TSA, (b) PSA, and (c) VSA cycles employed for the removal of CO$_2$ from natural gas.
In the first two stages of all of these three processes, a mixture of CH$_4$ and CO$_2$ passes through an adsorption column and CO$_2$ is captured by the bed, producing pure methane in the effluent. The captured CO$_2$ is then removed from the bed by heating and purging (usually with CH$_4$), pressure reduction and leaving the bed under vacuum in a TSA, PSA and VSA process, respectively. The bed will be cooled in TSA or pressurized in PSA/VSA processes to get ready for the next adsorption cycle.

Together with an acceptable mechanical strength and high adsorption capacity and selectivity, a promising adsorbent must be regenerable at reasonably mild operational conditions and have a favourable adsorption kinetics. To satisfy these requirements, firstly an adsorbent should possesses a relatively high surface area as well as a favourable pore characteristics to recognize different gases in the mixtures. As a good examples of these adsorbents, zeolites with their stable structures and uniform and somewhat tunable pores, have played important roles in the progress of adsorption-based processes and have been vastly exploited in industrial separation.$^{114-115}$ Notably, in practical adsorption-based separation, adsorbents are often pelletized into different shapes using a binder (usually a polymer) which not only improve the mechanical strength of adsorbents, but also reduce the pressure drop in adsorption columns. These polymeric diluents also facilitate the transfer of guest molecules from the gas stream to the adsorption sites by generating mesoporous or macroporous structures.$^{116}$

1.2.3 Metrics for MOF evaluation

Different metrics are defined to evaluate separation performance of adsorbent (here MOFs), including adsorption isotherm, working capacity, recovery, adsorption kinetics, recovery, productivity, purity and breakthrough curves, which are discussed briefly here.

1.2.3.1 Adsorption isotherm

Adsorption isotherm is probably the most basic metric that provides information about the separation performance of a MOF. These information are mainly adsorption capacity, shape of isotherm, and steepness of isotherm. Adsorption capacity is the amount of gas, an adsorbent can take up before it become saturated. MOFs with high capacity are favourable in adsorption-based separations, as less amount of MOFs are required to produce a certain amount of a purified gas. Shape of isotherm also provides useful information about the mechanism of adsorption and thus the separation medium of any MOFs. For example flexible MOFs can be recognized based on the shape of their isotherms and they have been
vastly served for gas separation applications. Long and co-workers reported a series of MOFs with “phase changing” behaviour.\textsuperscript{117} This behaviour was first recognized based on the unusual shape of their CO\textsubscript{2} isotherms (Figure 1.12)

These MOFs were then exploited for TSA processes, as they possess high working capacity and the temperature gap for adsorption and desorption are small so that the energy penalty for sorbent regeneration is low. The other precious information that can be obtained from isotherms is the adsorption strength of a particular adsorbate-MOF system. The steepness of an adsorption isotherm (Langmuir shape) is direct evidence of how strongly an adsorbate is adsorbed on the surface of a MOF. Isotherms with a steep shape at low pressure imply a strong interaction between adsorbate and MOF, while Henry (linear) isotherms typically indicate weak interactions.

![Figure 1.12 Adsorption isotherm of CO\textsubscript{2} on mmen-MOF-74 at different temperatures, showing a phase change at low pressures. The adsorbent shows negligible amount of adsorption at low pressure, followed by a steep jump showing the adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2} molecules by adsorbent. Data are extracted using a digitizer software from\textsuperscript{117}.](image)

### 1.2.3.2 Selectivity

Selectivity is another crucial metric for determining the separation performance of a MOF. It is defined as the ability of a MOF to selectively adsorb one component over other components in a gas mixture. Different methods have been developed to obtain the selectivity of an adsorbent for different components in a gas mixture, but they mainly use single gas adsorption isotherms to predict the mixture adsorption isotherms, i.e., the adsorption uptake of one component in the presence of other components in the mixture.
There are two commonly used methods for determining selectivity in MOFs field. Selectivity defined as the ratio of Henry constants: In this method, Henry constants for different components can be simply obtained from the slope of their single adsorption isotherms at low pressure region and selectivity is calculated by dividing the Henry constant of strongly adsorbed component to weakly adsorbed one. Selectivity based on Ideal Adsorbed Solution Theory (IAST) proposed by Myers and Prausnitz.$^{99,118}$

The equation used to determine selectivity of component 1 over component 2 is:

$$S_{1,2} = \frac{q_1/p_1}{q_2/p_2}$$

Where, $q$ is the adsorption uptake in the mixture and $p$ is the partial pressure. $q_1$ and $q_2$ are obtained from IAST theory (see the last section of this chapter for further details of this method). A functional description of this method along with an example are presented in IAST section of this chapter.

There is frequently a trade-off between selectivity and adsorption capacity in adsorbent materials. Usually, high adsorption capacities arise from large pores which cannot discriminate between molecules of similar sizes, thus leading to a substantial decrease of selectivity. On the other hand, to boost the selectivity, pores are designed to only allow the passage of small guest molecules and block the larger ones, which in turn lead to low pore volumes and thus low uptake capacities. So design of adsorbent, which can accommodate large amount of guest molecules, while at the same time exhibiting good selectivity is one of the greatest challenge in the development of adsorbents.

1.2.3.3 Working capacity

Working capacity is another metric that can determine the performance of a MOF for adsorption-based separations. It mainly plays a key role in the design of cyclic adsorption processes. In PSA processes it is defined as the difference between the adsorption uptake of an adsorbent at adsorption stage pressure (high pressures) and adsorption uptakes at desorption stage (low pressures). On the other hand, in TSA processes, it is defined as the adsorption uptake of an adsorbent at adsorption stage temperature (low temperatures) and adsorption uptakes at desorption stage (high temperatures). The higher working capacity guarantees the efficiency of a cyclic adsorption processes, as the temperature/pressure swing are quite small so the required energy for regeneration is low for a certain amount of purified product.
1.2.3.4 Productivity

Productivity is a criterion for estimating the total amount of purified product by certain amount of adsorbent during a certain duration. For example, for a PSA unit, which produces component \( i \) and a portion of product \( i \) is used for purging, it can be defined as the sum of the amount of produced product during adsorption and blowdown stage minus the amount of product used for purging, per amount of adsorbent and duration of processes.

\[
\text{Productivity}_i = \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_{AD}} F_{i,\text{out}} \, dt + \int_{t_0}^{t_{BD}} F_{i,\text{out}} \, dt - \int_{t_0}^{t_{PU}} F_{i,\text{in}} \, dt}{\text{Mass of adsorbent} \times t_{AD+BD+PU}}
\] (2)

Where, AD, BD and PU are indicator of adsorption, blowdown and purging stage in PSA processes and \( F_i \) is the flowrate of component \( i \). Productivity is an important criterion especially for the design of adsorption units, as it gives information about how fast a product can be produced and how much adsorbent is required.

In the context of MOF, another simplified definition has been used for the productivity based on a single adsorption stage as below:\(^{37,119-120}\)

\[
\text{Productivity} = \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} F_{\text{product,\,out}} \, dt}{m_{\text{MOF}}}
\] (3)

Here, productivity is simply the amount of produced product per amount of adsorbent during adsorption stage. It should be noted that the time required for producing a certain amount of product is not considered in this definition.

1.2.3.5 Heat of adsorption

The heat of adsorption is an indicator of the strength of the interaction between an adsorbate and a solid adsorbent. This parameter can be determined from the heat released in calorimetric experiments or from the analysis of adsorption isotherms at different temperatures. The latter, called isosteric heats of adsorption, are commonly used in the characterization of materials for gas-phase adsorption.\(^{121}\)

The isosteric heats of adsorption of the components of a gas mixture are key thermodynamic variables for design of practical gas separation processes such as pressure
swing and thermal swing adsorption. They determine the extents of adsorbent temperature changes within the adsorber during the adsorption (exothermic) and desorption (endothermic) steps of the processes. The adsorbent temperature is a key variable in determining the local adsorption equilibria and kinetics on the adsorbent, which ultimately govern the separation performance of the processes.\textsuperscript{99}

To calculate isosteric heat of adsorption, isotherm data are collected at very low pressure to follow the adsorption mechanism. Analyses are performed at different temperatures, thus, different adsorption isotherms are obtained, from which adsorption isobars are plotted. Then the Clausius-Clapeyron equation is applied to obtain the Isosteric heat of adsorption as a function of the degree of coverage.\textsuperscript{122} These equations and a brief instruction for calculation of heat of adsorption is presented in Section 1.4.

\textbf{1.2.3.6 Breakthrough curves}

Adsorption is a transient process. The amount of material adsorbed within a bed depends both on position and time. Considering time dependence, as fluid enters the bed, it comes in contact with the first few layers of absorbent. Adsorbates are adsorbed, filling up some of the available sites. Soon, the adsorbent near the entrance is saturated and the fluid penetrates farther into the bed before all adsorbates are adsorbed. Thus the active region shifts down through the bed as time goes on until bed is fully saturated and the concentration of the adsorbed gas starts to breakthrough into the effluent. This concentration variation versus time in the effluent is called a breakthrough curve and is one of the most important results of a dynamic experiment under forced flow conditions on a fixed bed. For a gas mixture passing through an adsorption column, this curve indicates the period in which adsorption column can efficiently produce the desired product with acceptable purity (mainly the weakly adsorbed component) and often is the main metric for the design of adsorption columns. A schematic of a breakthrough curves are presented in Figure 1.13.
Integration of the area above the entire breakthrough curve gives the maximum capacity of the adsorptive material which is equal to equilibrium capacity. Additionally, the duration of the breakthrough experiment until a certain threshold of the adsorptive concentration at the outlet can be measured (breakthrough point), which enables the calculation of a technically usable sorption capacity (often called dynamic capacity). Up to this time, the quality of the product stream can be maintained. Considering the position dependence, in any particular time during the breakthrough test, three zones in the adsorption bed can be observed: Saturated zone, mass transfer zone and unused length of the bed. A schematic of an adsorption column with three distinct zones is presented in Figure 1.14.

Figure 1.13 Schematic representation of breakthrough curve.

Figure 1.14 Schematic of an adsorption column with three zones.
The saturated zone is the area that is already has been saturated with adsorbates and no more adsorption takes place. Mass transfer zone is the active area in the adsorption column where adsorbates are being adsorbed. The wave front may change shape as it moves through the bed, and the mass transfer zone may broaden or diminish. Unfavourable and linear isotherms tend to broaden while favourable Langmuir and Freundlich isotherms may broaden at first, but quickly achieve a constant pattern front. This means that the mass transfer zone is constant with respect to both position and time. The shape of the mass transfer zone depends on the adsorption isotherm (equilibrium expression), flow rate, and the diffusion characteristics. Usually, the shape must be determined experimentally. The last zone in the adsorption column is the unused part of the bed, where it does not go under adsorption. Before the wave front reaches this zone, the adsorption process is switched to the next stage. This parameter is often calculated and added to the effective length of the bed during adsorption bed design calculations.

Since almost all adsorptive separation processes are dynamic, i.e., they are running under flow, testing porous materials for those applications for their separation performance has to be tested under flow as well. Hence, the most realistic metric to evaluate the separation performance of an adsorbent is breakthrough test. Apart from its dynamic nature, a breakthrough curve is an interplay of different kinetic and thermodynamic effects. The sorption capacity, selectivity, release and transfer of heat as well as the sorption rate, inlet concentration and gas velocity play a key role during the dynamic sorption process and influence the position and shape of the breakthrough curve considerably.

The adsorption capacity has a big impact on the position of the breakthrough curve. By increasing the sorption capacity, the breakthrough curve will be shifted to longer breakthrough times (to the right), because more adsorbate molecules will be held back by the adsorbent. This is not the case if the sorption kinetics on the sample is too slow and a spontaneous breakthrough occurs. In contrast to the sorption capacity, the sorption kinetics affect the shape of the breakthrough curve. For faster kinetics the breakthrough curve becomes steeper (sharper) and the mass transfer zone will be smaller. A fast mass transfer from the gas phase to the adsorption sites leads to short local equilibrium times and therefore for a smaller enlargement of the concentration front. In some cases this relationship will be compensated by other phenomena, i.e. the release of heat by adsorption. An increasing sample temperature leads to a flatter, more asymmetric breakthrough curve. This effect can be a major factor in the expansion of the mass transfer zone.

A fourth parameter is the axial dispersion, which is responsible for the broadening of the mass transfer zone. This parameter is also responsible for an increasing asymmetric character of the breakthrough curves. Contrary to this effect, the curvature of the corresponding
isotherm can have effects on the shape of breakthrough curves as well. A type I isotherm leads to smaller mass transfer zones during adsorption. The desorption curve is broadened in such cases. The opposite can be observed for type III and type V isotherms.

It is clear that a simple distinction between the individual influences is hard to observe. Here simulations with mass and energy balances may help for a better understanding of the whole dynamic process. (see breakthrough curves simulation section in this chapter for further details).

To measure a breakthrough curve, a fixed bed of porous materials is pressurized and purged with a carrier gas. After becoming stationary, one or more adsorptives are added to the carrier gas, resulting in a step-wise change of the inlet concentration. The effluent concentration can be read over time by gas chromatography or mass spectrometry to obtain breakthrough curves. A schematic of breakthrough apparatus is provided in breakthrough section of this chapter. In the case of a gas mixture with two adsorptives, passing through an adsorption column, the area between the breakthrough point of the weakly adsorbed and highly adsorbed adsorptive is the amount of purified product (Figure 1.15).

![Figure 1.15](image)

**Figure 1.15** Schematic of a separation of a mixture of two gases shown by breakthrough curves. The area between the breakthrough point of the weakly adsorbed and highly adsorbed adsorptive is the amount of purified product

### 1.2.4 Metal-organic frameworks for adsorptive gas separations

Separation and purification processes account for almost half of energy consumption in industrial processes, which highlight the critical role of separation processes in modern
chemical industry for producing pure compounds from chemical mixtures.\textsuperscript{123} Industrial gas separations, including natural gas processing and hydrocarbon separations, are vastly demanding in the production of bulk chemical products for manufacturing fuels, plastics and polymers\textsuperscript{124-126}. Traditional gas separation techniques such as distillation or absorption are highly energy demanding and require huge capital cost. During distillation, gas mixture goes under repetitive evaporation-condensation cycle under harsh conditions, while the regeneration of liquid absorbent requires substantial amount of heat and energy.\textsuperscript{127} Conversely, non-thermal separation alternatives, including adsorption-based and membrane technologies, taking the advantage of different chemical affinity and molecular size of species in the gas mixture, have been developed and employed as more energy efficient technologies.\textsuperscript{99, 116, 128} For instance, energy consumption of membrane-based separation technologies is about 10\% of that of distillation processes.\textsuperscript{129} However, the efficiency of these developing technologies is highly dependent on the internal porosity and pore characteristic of porous solids because of their significant role in gas adsorption. In comparison to traditional porous solids like zeolites and carbon-based materials, MOFs are a new class of porous materials with customizable pore structure and functionality. MOFs can be synthesized straightforwardly through a self-assembly reaction between organic ligands and metal ions/clusters.\textsuperscript{130-133} In contrast to zeolite which are mainly formed by tetrahedra SiO\textsubscript{4} connecting to each other by O\textsubscript{2}/OH linkages, the countless combinations of numerous metal clusters and organic linkers for construction of MOFs have resulted in a vast library of these materials with different structures, porosity and functionalities. MOFs are unique in terms of their tunable pore size, uniform pore architecture, high porosity, high crystallinity, and customized/designable structures. More interestingly, the dimension and functionality of the pores within MOFs can be systematically tuned by proper selection and functionalization of organic ligands of different lengths and chemistry.\textsuperscript{134-137} A selection of some important gas separation applications of MOFs that are within the scope of this thesis will be briefly introduced here.

1.3 Selected gas separation applications using metal-organic frameworks

MOFs have been extensively exploited for a variety of different gas mixture separations. Readers are referred to different reviews and monographs in the literatures for further information. In this thesis, the application of MOFs for C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}/CO\textsubscript{2}, CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} and CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} separations will be discussed in details in the following chapters. Here as an example, the recent advances on the application of MOFs for carbon captures processes will be discussed briefly.
1.3.1 Carbon capture

Combustion of fossil fuels to generate electricity and power has undoubtedly emitted large amounts of CO$_2$ into the atmosphere which underlies the greenhouse effect and subsequent temperature increases.$^{138}$ Current technology for CO$_2$ capture involves absorption of CO$_2$ using wet amine chemisorptions such as primary and secondary alkyl because of their large capacity and high selectivity for acidic gas.$^{139-140}$ However, employments of these technologies is associated with several drawbacks including high energy consumption during the regeneration, solvent loss due to the degradation and evaporation, and corrosive nature of amines.$^{138,141}$ Amongst alternative techniques that have lower energy requirements and operating costs, the adsorption of carbon dioxide into porous materials is very attractive. MOFs are porous, crystalline materials built up using metal ions and organic ligands. They can be systematically designed with desired pore metrics, which in turn leads to tailored host–guest interactions. Carbon capture processes using MOFs are generally categorized into four types: post-combustion capture, pre-combustion capture, oxy-fuel combustion, and direct capture from air.

1.3.1.1 Post-combustion CO$_2$ capture

The flue gas exhausting from current power plants is mostly composed of N$_2$ (72–78%) and CO$_2$ (14–15%), at atmospheric total pressure. After removing SOx, the temperature of flue gas is increased to 40-60 °C because of exposure to CO$_2$ scrubber which is operated at these temperatures.$^{138}$ Hence, post-combustion carbon capture is performed at 40 °C or higher for separating CO$_2$ from a N$_2$-rich stream containing ~15% CO$_2$. In the context of adsorption-based separation using MOFs, Mg-MOF-74 is remarkable because of its high CO$_2$ uptakes due to the pores decorated with a high density of open metal sites (5.28 mmol/g at 40 °C and 0.15 bar).$^4,142$ However, it loses its CO$_2$ capacity in the presence of water molecules as water molecules largely occupy the open sites. As there is a considerable amount of water vapour (5–7%) in flue gas, it is essential to develop MOFs with appreciable CO$_2$ adsorption in the presence of water. Different attempts were made to overcome this issue, including introduction of alkylamines into MOFs structure to mimic CO$_2$ absorption behaviour in alkanoamine solvents.$^{143-145}$ Long and co-workers developed a functionalized Mg-MOF-74 by incorporating N,N'-dimethylene diamine (mmen) into the open metal sites.$^{144}$ Mmen molecules coordinate to open metal sites from one end and the other end interacts with CO$_2$ molecules (Figure 1.16a).
Mmen-Mg-MOF-74 shows a high selectivity for CO$_2$ even in the presence of water, which stems from high density of amine groups within the pores. Besides, this functionalized MOFs show a unique CO$_2$ adsorption behaviour by a near zero adsorption of CO$_2$ at low pressure regions followed by a steep step at elevated pressure. Diffraction and spectroscopic studies revealed that this abrupt jump in adsorption capacity of CO$_2$ is attributed to a cooperative CO$_2$ insertion mechanism that involves a chemical reaction of the adsorbed CO$_2$. More interestingly, this phase-change pressure can be tuned by varying temperature and type of metals in the cluster, resulting in an unprecedented CO$_2$ working capacity with a relatively slight temperature swing (Figure 1.16b).$^{117}$

Works on development of other alkylamines into structure of Mg-MOF-74 were also presented subsequently.$^{146-150}$ Besides MOFs with incorporated amine groups in open metal sites, different works have been done to functionalize MOFs with other functional groups. For instance, it was revealed that monodentate hydroxide can react strongly and reversibly with CO$_2$ molecules in a MOF called MAF-X27 ([$\text{Co}^{II}\text{Co}^{III}(\text{OH})\text{Cl}_2(\text{bbta})$, H$_2$bbta = 1H, 5H-benzo (1,2-d:4,5-d') bistriazole, MAF = metal azolate framework) through formation and decomposition of bicarbonate, enabling selective adsorption of CO$_2$ even in presence of water.$^{151}$ Another group of MOFs, SIFSIX-3-M (M = Cu, Zn, Ni), were also developed with optimal pore sizes and suitable decoration of inorganic anions to enhance the affinity of framework with CO$_2$. Although these MOFs adsorb CO$_2$ through physical interactions, still a good selectivity for CO$_2$ at humid conditions was achieved.$^{40, 152-153}$
1.3.1.2 Pre-combustion CO$_2$ capture

CO$_2$ can be alternatively removed before fuel combustion. In pre-combustion CO$_2$ capture processes, fuel is firstly decarbonized through gasification processes and then resultant clean fuel is combusted, which results in near zero carbon dioxide emission during the combustion. As a result of coal gasification, a gas mixture, containing H$_2$, CO, CO$_2$, and water vapour is produced at high pressures and temperatures. This gas mixture is then passed through the water–gas shift reaction to yield a stream of H$_2$ and CO$_2$ at a pressure of 5-40 bar and temperature of around 40 °C, depending on the plant. Thus, pre-combustion CO$_2$ capture is referred as a processes, in which CO$_2$ is removed from H$_2$. Produced H$_2$ can be subsequently burned in power plants to generate CO$_2$-free energy.

In the context of MOFs for pre-combustion capture processes, adsorption-based processes (particularly PSA processes) and membrane-based technology using MOFs has been intensively studied. Herein, we present one work for each systems in detail. H$_2$ and CO$_2$ has an evident difference in their molecular size (2.89 and 3.30 Å for H$_2$ and CO$_2$, respectively). So it is quite favourable to separate them based on sieving H$_2$ from CO$_2$ through membrane-based processes. In a breakthrough in development of MOF membranes, Yang and co-workers successfully prepared molecular sieve nanosheets from a layered MOF, Zn$_2$(bIm)$_4$ (bIm$^-$ = benzimidazolate). A single layer possess a aperture diameter of ~ 2.9 Å, which is perfectly suitable for the passage of H$_2$ molecules, while blocking the larger CO$_2$ molecules. As apertures were constructed from four flat bIm molecules, this membrane features uniform and straightforward pore windows, enabling easy and fast passage of H$_2$, which results in an unprecedented permeability for H$_2$. Later, the separation performance of this MOF membrane was improved by fine tuning the fabrication temperature, upon which Zn$_2$(bIm)$_4$ nanosheets were coated onto α-Al$_2$O$_3$ support. This optimal temperature significantly increased the permeability of H$_2$ molecules by minimizing the existing restacking between the nanosheets which could block the passage of H$_2$ molecules. As a result, this MOF membrane obtains a simultaneous high H$_2$/CO$_2$ selectivity (291) and H$_2$ permeability (2700 GPU), which successfully places the performance of this membrane above the Robeson's upper limit.

In another work, Vaidhyanathan and co-workers proposed a 4-pyridylcarboxylate–based ultra-microporous MOF [Ni-4PyC, Ni$_9$(m-H$_2$O)$_4$(H$_2$O)$_2$(C$_6$NH$_4$O$_2$)$_{18}$], with an extraordinarily high CO$_2$ saturation capacity of ~8 mmol/g and appreciable CO$_2$/H$_2$ selectivity at high pressures, making this MOF a suitable candidate for H$_2$ purification by PSA processes. A high pore space along with strong guest-guest interaction and multiple adsorption sites was found to be the main reason for high saturation capacity of this MOF.
The material also exhibits high water stability and favourable CO$_2$ diffusion coefficients as well as a relatively low heat of adsorption. Notably, [Ni-4PyC, Ni$_9$(m-H$_2$O)$_4$(H$_2$O)$_2$(C$_6$NH$_4$O$_2$)$_{18}$] can be scaled-up and synthesized straightforwardly from readily available ligand and metal salts in a one-pot synthesis mode.

### 1.3.1.3 Oxy-fuel combustion

Another way of reducing CO$_2$ emission into atmosphere is burning fossil fuels in a nearly pure O$_2$ environment, which is referred to as oxy-fuel combustion. In this way, the generated flue gas is only CO$_2$ and water. The coexisting water can be easily separated, isolating CO$_2$ for further sequestration. Here, the separation target is switched to producing pure O$_2$ from air. Classical cryogenic distillations are extremely energy-intensive, which makes them inviable solutions for CO$_2$ capture from oxy-fuel combustion. Hence, alternative technologies with less energy consumption are highly sought after. Membrane-based separation would not be a realistic solution here due to extremely close kinetic diameters of N$_2$ (3.64 Å) and O$_2$. As for adsorption-based separation, selective adsorption of one of these gases over the other one through physisorption mechanism does not seem to be feasible because of nearly identical physical properties of O$_2$ and N$_2$ (including boiling point, polarizability and quadrupole moment). Conversely, separation by chemisorption mechanism sounds to be an effective way of separating O$_2$ from N$_2$, as O$_2$ exhibits a high tendency to accept electrons from redox-active metal sites, whereas N$_2$ does not feature such behaviour. Numerous studies have been done in this area. Cr$^{2+}$ and Fe$^{2+}$ are known as metal ions with relatively strong redox ability. Different MOFs incorporating these metal sites such as Cr$_3$(-btc)$_2$ (H$_3$btc = 1,3,5-benzenetricarboxylic acid), Cr-BTT (H$_3$BTT = 1,3,5-Tris(2H-tetrazol-5-yl)benzene), and Fe-MOF-74 has been intensively investigated. However, Cr$^{II}$-containing MOFs exhibits gradual loss of O$_2$ capacity upon multiple adsorption-desorption cycles, while Fe-MOF-74 is not recyclable at temperatures above 222 K because of its non-reversible oxidation. Subsequently, more efforts were made with Co$^{II}$-containing MOFs. In contrast to previously reported Co-MOFs constructed from weak carboxylate-metal bond, strong N-donor ligands were incorporated into the formation of two MOFs, Co-BTTri (H$_3$BTTri = 1,3,5-tri(1H-1,2,3-triazol-5-yl)benzene) and Co-BDTriP (H$_3$BDTriP = 5,5$\text{-}$(5-(1H-pyrazol-4-yl)-1,3-phenylene)bis(1H-1,2,3-triazole)). Metals in these MOFs display greater tendency to share their electrons with O$_2$ molecules because of their higher energy level in comparison to MOFs with weak ligand-metal interaction. As a result, it gives rise to an appreciable O$_2$ adsorption capacity of 3.3 mmol/g at 0.21 bar and 195 K, and a selectivity of 41 at the same temperature for Co-BTTri. Additionally,
recyclability and stability towards water is improved significantly, which makes Co^{II}-MOFs a promising adsorbent for future O_2/N_2 separations.

1.3.1.4 Direct capture from air

Previously mentioned scenarios were all dealing with capturing CO_2 from stationary point sources to slow down the increasing rate of CO_2 level in the atmosphere. To remove the CO_2 that has already been released into atmosphere, efforts can be made to capture CO_2 directly from air. This concept, which is called direct air capture (DAC), recently has been pushed forward to decrease the level of existing CO_2 in the air. Additionally, DAC can also be applied to reduce CO_2 level in spacecraft and submarines, to maintain a habitable environment. Currently, the level of CO_2 in atmosphere is 400 ppm, so the operational condition for direct air capture process is 0.0004 bar and room temperature. The strategies to develop MOFs suitable for DAC are similar to those mentioned in post-combustion section, involving introduction of functional groups with strong yet reversible interaction with CO_2, and rational design of pore with precise aperture window and suitable interior shape to enhance physical interaction of MOFs with CO_2 at such low concentrations. The DAC using MOFs has been intensively studied recently and outstanding progress has been made.

1.4 Introduction to selected experimental and computational techniques

1.4.1 BET surface area calculations

The BET model is the most widely accepted model by the porous materials community to calculate a material’s apparent surface area. Experiments are usually carried out by measuring a nitrogen isotherm at 77 K (Figure 1.17a as an example). It was found in the past that often the entire isotherm does not fit well with the model (Figure 1.18c is derived from experimental data and supposed to be linear according to the BET equation). In order to obtain a reportable value, researchers have chosen a region of the isotherms which appear to be linear when the BET equation is applied. The choice is often arbitrary and can cause large deviations in surface area depending on the pressure region selected. To regulate this chaos, Walton and Snurr proposed a procedure for deciding on appropriate pressure ranges for calculating BET surface areas, which were followed in this thesis:

1) The isotherm region where \( v(1 - P/P_0) \) increases versus \( P/P_0 \), where \( v \) is the amount of N_2 adsorbed, was identified. Here, \( P/P_0 \) is the relative pressure, \( P \) being the pressure of the adsorbent in equilibrium with the porous material at each point of
measurement and $P_0$ is the condensation pressure of the adsorbent at the temperature of measurement.

2) Within this isotherm region, sequential data points that led to a positive intercept in the plot of $\frac{P/P_0}{v(1-P/P_0)}$ against $P/P_0$, were found. This plot yields a slope $a$, and a positive intercept $b$. The number of gas molecules adsorbed in the initial monolayer is $v_m = \frac{1}{a+b}$.

3) The BET surface area was then calculated according to the following equation:

$$A_{BET} = v_m (cm^3 g^{-1}) \times \frac{1\ (mol)}{22400\ (cm^3)} \times \sigma_0 (Å^2) \times N_A (mol^{-1}) \times 10^{-20} \left( \frac{m^2}{Å^2} \right)$$

(4)

Where $N_A$ is Avogadro’s constant, and $\sigma_0$ is the cross-sectional area of a N$_2$ molecule, which is 16.2 Å$^2$.

![Figure 1.17](image)

**Figure 1.17** (a) An example N$_2$ adsorption isotherm measured at 77K for MUF-7a$^{181}$ (b) A plot to find the pressure region that meets the first consistency criterion for BET surface area calculation according to the method proposed by Walton and Snurr.$^{93}$ (c) A plot to find the pressure region that meets the second consistency criterion. (d) BET plot.

1.4.2 Pore volume calculations

When adsorption reaches saturation, the isotherm plateaus. At this point, the total pore volume of the material can be calculated by assuming that the adsorbed gas is in a condensed liquid-like phase (in case of N$_2$ isotherm, the liquid density of N$_2$ is 0.807 g/ml). Because
the amount of adsorbed gas is known, its corresponding volume is simply calculated based on the density of the liquid adsorbate. The total mass of the adsorbing material is always precisely measured prior to an isotherm measurement.

### 1.4.3 Isosteric heat of adsorption calculations

Heats of adsorption ($Q_{st}$) are quantitative enthalpic measures of the affinity of a porous material for a given guest molecule. These values are calculated according to the method described in the literature. Briefly, two isotherms that are measured at two different temperatures are first fit to a virial equation:

$$\ln P = \ln N + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=0}^{m} a_i N^i + \sum_{i=0}^{n} b_i N^i$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $N$ is the amount of gas adsorbed at the pressure $P$.

Then, to calculate $Q_{st}$, the fitting parameters from the virial equation are used in the following equation:

$$Q_{st} = -R \sum_{i=0}^{m} a_i N^i$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $R$ is the universal gas constant.

### 1.4.4 Introduction to a gas adsorption analyser

Figure 1.18 illustrates the key components of a gas adsorption analyser.

![Figure 1.18 A cartoon showing the essential components of a gas adsorption analyser.](image)
A sample tube containing MOF crystals is evacuated and immersed in to a bath with a constant temperature. The instrument then doses a known amount of gas into the sample tube and reads the pressure frequently. The equilibration of adsorbed and non-adsorbed gas is known to be reached when the pressure reaches a constant value. The amount of gas adsorbed in the MOF sample can be calculated by taking the difference of pressure expected from the real gas law and the equilibrated pressure. This process is repeated so a plot of amount adsorbed versus equilibration pressure is obtained as an adsorption isotherm.

1.4.5 IAST selectivity

The Ideal Adsorbed Solution Theory (IAST) starts by assuming that for a given adsorbent and at fixed temperature $T$, the pure-component isotherms $n_i(P)$ for each gas $i$ of interest is known. Then, given a mixture of ideal gases adsorbing at total pressure $P$ in an host framework and the composition of the gas phases $(y_i)$—such that the partial pressures are $P_i = y_i P$— the goal of the method is to predict the total adsorbed quantity $n_{tot}$ and the molar fractions $(x_i)$ in the adsorbed phase. In order to do so, Myers and Prausnitz\textsuperscript{118} introduced a quantity homogeneous to a pressure, $P_i^*$ for each mixture component. The IAST method links this pressure to the compositions of the gas and adsorbed phases with two equations for each component:

$$P y_i = P_i^* x_i$$ (7)

for all $i$ and $j$,

$$\int_0^{P_i^*} \frac{n_i(p)}{p} dp = \int_0^{P_j^*} \frac{n_j(p)}{p} dp$$ (8)

Equation 7 defines the link between $P_i^*$ the total pressure $P$, the gas phase molar fraction $y_i$ and the adsorbed phase molar fraction $x_i$. Equation 8 is an expression of the equality of chemical potentials at thermodynamic equilibrium. In the simpler case of two-component gas mixture (B, C), these two equations and the conservation of matter, can be rewritten to a set of four equations:

$$P y_A = P_B^* x_B$$ (9)

$$x_B = \frac{P_C^* - P}{P_C^* - P_B^*}$$ (10)

$$\frac{1}{n_{tot}} = \frac{x_B}{n_B P_B^*} + \frac{1 - x_B}{n_C P_C^*}$$ (11)

$$\int_0^{P_B^*} \frac{n_B(p)}{p} dp = \int_0^{P_C^*} \frac{n_C(p)}{p} dp$$ (12)
Solving these equations for $P_B^*$ and $P_C^*$ will give all the information on the system composition.\textsuperscript{182} It can be done with either numerical integration of the isotherms, or by fitting the isotherms to a model, and then integrating the model analytically. The pyIAST package\textsuperscript{182} was used to perform the IAST calculations. In order to predict the sorption performance of MOFs and their derivatives towards the separation of binary mixed gases, the single-component adsorption isotherms were first fit to an appropriate model (as an example, we have presented dual site Langmuir Freundlich model here (DSLF)):

\[
 y = \frac{q_1 b_1 P_{T_1}^{t_1}}{1 + b_1 P_{T_1}^{t_1}} + \frac{q_2 b_2 P_{T_2}^{t_2}}{1 + b_2 P_{T_2}^{t_2}} \quad (13)
\]

Where $q$ is the uptake of a gas; $P$ is the equilibrium pressure and $q_1$, $b_1$, $q_2$, $b_2$, $t_1$ and $t_2$ are constants. These parameters were used subsequently to carry out the IAST calculations. As an example, the IAST selectivity calculation is presented for an equimolar mixture of CO\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4} on MUF-7a at 298 K. Firstly, single gas adsorption isotherms were fitted with DSLF model as shown in Figure 1.19:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Model & DSLF (User) \\
\hline
Equation & $q_1 b_1 P_{T_1}^{t_1} + q_2 b_2 P_{T_2}^{t_2}$ \\
\hline
$P_B$ & $E$ \\
$E_1$ & 0.65815 ± 0.17318 \\
$E_2$ & 1.32595 ± 0.77386 \\
Reduced Chi-Sqr & 0.61228 ± 0.45216 \\
R-Square (COD) & 0.99298 ± 0.74037 \\
Adj. R-Square & 0.99999 \\
\hline
$P_C$ & $E$ \\
$E_1$ & 0.62095 ± 0.17766 \\
$E_2$ & 1.30995 ± 0.77247 \\
Reduced Chi-Sqr & 0.60625 ± 0.44221 \\
R-Square (COD) & 0.99296 ± 0.74037 \\
Adj. R-Square & 0.99999 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure19}
\caption{Single gas adsorption isotherms of CO\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4} by MUF-7a at 298 K fitted by DSLF model.}
\end{figure}

The DSLF parameters were then used to predict the mixed gas isotherm by IAST method using the pyIAST software package. A selectivity of around 11 was found for CO\textsubscript{2} over CH\textsubscript{4} by MUF-7a. The mixed gas adsorption isotherms and selectivity are presented in Figure 1.20.
Figure 1.20 Mixed gas isotherms and IAST selectivity for an equimolar mixture of CO$_2$/CH$_4$ by MUF-7a at 298 K.

The IAST selectivity calculation shows the selectivity of CO$_2$ over CH$_4$ is low at low pressures and it increases at higher pressures. The reason behind such trend of selectivity is not fully understood and it is related to the shape of adsorption isotherms of CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ over the pressure ranges. The mixed gas adsorption capacity of both gases has been decreased due to the competitive adsorption of these two gases, where some portion of the void spaces have been filled with CO$_2$ molecules and some portion has been filled with CH$_4$ molecules.

1.4.6 Breakthrough curve simulation

1.4.6.1 Mathematical modelling

Considering a fixed bed adsorption column of length L filled with MOF, following assumptions were made to develop a mathematical model$^{183-185}$ that could be solved using proper numerical methods to calculate the concentration of gases at different elapsed times along the bed.
The following assumptions were made:

- The dynamic behaviour of the fluid obeys an axial dispersion plug flow model in the bed.
- The gradient of the concentration along the radial and angular directions are neglected.
- The flow velocity is varied along the bed and it is calculated from the total mass balance equation.
- The gas property is described by the Peng-Robinson equation of state.
- Diffusion and adsorption into the particles is assumed as a lump kinetic transfer model.
- The mass transfer rate is represented by the linear driving force model.
- The pressure drop is considered along the bed using the Ergun equation.
- The adsorption columns operate under isothermal conditions.
- Mixed gas isotherms calculated by IAST method were fitted by single site Langmuir model and fitting parameters were used for breakthrough curves simulations.

Based on the preceding assumptions, the component and overall mass balances in the bulk phase of the adsorption column are written as follow:

\[
\frac{\varepsilon}{\partial t} \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z} = -\frac{\partial (uC_i)}{\partial z} + \varepsilon D_{ax,i} \frac{\partial^2 C_i}{\partial z^2} - (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} \quad (14)
\]

\[
\frac{\varepsilon}{\partial t} \frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial (uC)}{\partial z} - (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_s \sum_{1}^{n_c} \left( \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} \right) \quad (15)
\]

Where \( C_i \) and \( q_i \) are, respectively, concentration of components in the gas phase and in the adsorbed phase, \( z \) is the axial coordinate in the bed, \( D_{ax} \) is the effective axial dispersion coefficient, \( u \) is the superficial gas velocity, \( \rho_s \) is the adsorbent density, \( n_c \) is the number of the adsorbed components in the mixture and \( \varepsilon \) is the bed voidage. The value of \( D_{ax} \) was calculated through the following equation\(^{166}\).
\[
\frac{\varepsilon D_{ax,i}}{D_{m,i}} = 20 + 0.5 Sc_i Re
\]

(16)

Where \(Re\) is the Reynolds number and \(Sc\) is the Schmidt number and \(D_{m,i}\) is the molecular diffusivity of component \(i\) in the mixture which was calculated by following equation:

\[
D_{m,i} = \frac{1 - y_i}{\sum_{x=j}^{n} \frac{y_i}{D_{i,x}}}
\]

(17)

Where \(y_i\) is the mole fraction of component I and \(D_{i,x}\) is molecular diffusivity of component I in component x which was calculated by Wile-Lee equation\textsuperscript{187}. Referring to the assumptions, the solid linear driving force (LDF) model is used to describe the mass transfer rate of the gas and solid phase\textsuperscript{188}.

\[
\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} = k_i (q_i^* - q_i)
\]

(18)

Where \(k_i\) is the overall mass transfer coefficient, and a lumped parameter considering three different mass transfer resistances associated with film, macropore and micropore zone. As the overall mass transfer coefficient is in proportion to the steepness of breakthrough curves, the accurate value of it was obtained empirically by tuning its value until the steepness of the predicted and experimental breakthrough curves were the same. A schematic of tuning procedure is shown in Figure 1.22. The steepness of breakthrough curve increases by increasing the value of mass transfer coefficient.

![Figure 1.22 A schematic of breakthrough curve tuning procedure. The steepness of breakthrough curve increases by increasing the value of mass transfer coefficient.](image)

This mass transfer coefficient tuned in this way was later used to predict breakthrough curves for other feed mixtures and operating pressures. \(q_i^*\) is the equilibrium concentration.
of $i$th component in the adsorbed phase and is related to the concentration in the gas phase through isotherms. The IAST method was used to predict mixed gas isotherms and they were fitted by a Dual-Site Langmuir model. The pressure drop is defined by Ergun’s equation as\textsuperscript{99}:

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial z} = - \left( \frac{37.5 (1 - \varepsilon)^2 \mu u}{r_p \varphi^2 \varepsilon^3} + 0.875 \rho \left( \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{r_p \varphi \varepsilon^3} \right) \right)$$

Where $P$ is the local pressure at the $z$ axial coordinate, $\mu$ is the gas viscosity, $\varphi$ is the shape factor and $\rho$ is the gas density. Identical conditions to the experimental breakthrough measurement, including operating pressure, feed flowrate, temperature, bed size and amount of MOF, were used as input for simulations.

1.4.6.2 Numerical methods

Numerical solutions of the nonlinear parabolic PDEs derived from mass and momentum balance were conducted by an implicit method of lines using finite difference method for the spatial derivatives. Firstly, the second and first space derivatives were discreted by central and upwind- differential scheme (backward), respectively. In this way, the sets of partial equations were transformed to the sets of ODEs with respect to the time derivative terms. The length of the bed was divided into 50 increments and the set of equations were solved by the Implicit Euler method with a time step of one second.\textsuperscript{189}
Chapter 2

An Ethane-Trapping Metal-Organic Framework with a High Capacity for Ethylene Purification

2.1 Introduction

Ethylene is one of the most important feedstocks for the production of polymers and high-value organic chemicals. It is usually produced by the thermal cracking of hydrocarbons. The removal of ethane (C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}) by-products that inevitably arise during these processes is one of the most challenging chemical separations due to the similarity of the physicochemical properties of ethane and ethylene. At present, cryogenic distillation is the main technology used to separate these compounds. This process is expensive and comes with a high energy penalty because of the requirement for high pressures and low temperatures (typically at 5–28 bar and 180–258 K using over 100 trays). To avoid such a high consumption of energy, more efficient separation technologies at ambient conditions are highly sought after. Among techniques with lower energy requirements and operating costs, adsorptive separation processes using porous solid materials have risen to prominence. Although conventional porous materials such as zeolites and carbon-based materials have been applied for hydrocarbon separations, in general they are not satisfactory in separation processes due to poor adsorption selectivity and low capacity. Thanks to their high pore volumes, designable pore characteristics, and countless structural possibilities, novel metal-organic frameworks (MOFs) are prime adsorbents. MOFs are of increasing importance in the context of hydrocarbon separation, especially the separation of ethylene from ethane.

MOFs differ widely in their relative affinities for ethane and ethylene (C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}). The design strategy for MOFs that prefer C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} is comparatively straightforward and relies on introducing open metal sites or highly polar groups into the framework. This approach takes advantage of the larger quadrupole moment of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and the presence of \pi electrons, which render it capable of coordinating to metals. In contrast, for ethane selective MOFs, the dominant interactions can be ascribed to dispersion and induction forces as ethane has a higher polarizability than ethylene. Therefore, a MOF with a pore structure enriched
with nonpolar surfaces and pore dimensions that match the size of C₂H₆ may favour the preferential adsorption of this adsorbate.

The implementation of C₂H₄-selective MOFs has two significant disadvantages. First, water vapour is liable to diminish the affinity of the adsorbent for C₂H₄ because it will compete for the same highly polar sites. Second, these adsorbents require an additional desorption step to yield the C₂H₄-rich product stream in a C₂H₆/C₂H₄ separation process, which typically involves a purge gas and high temperatures or the application of a vacuum. In addition, due to the contamination of eluent by adsorbed C₂H₆ during this desorption step, further purification is demanded to reach the >99.95% purity required by C₂H₄ polymerization reactors. On the other hand, the efficiency of C₂H₆-selective MOFs is significantly greater because high-purity C₂H₄ is afforded directly through a single adsorption step, simplifying the process and resulting in an increase in productivity. Such an efficient approach offers an energy saving of 40% in pressure/temperature swing adsorbent technologies for this separation. Despite these advantages, only a few such C₂H₆-selective MOFs have been identified so far, and they either suffer from poor selectivity because of the difficulty indiscriminating C₂H₆ and C₂H₄, or low C₂H₆ uptake due to moderate pore volumes. 

Low selectivities result in a reduced purification efficiency of C₂H₄ and reduced pore volumes are antagonistic to productivity. Thus, fabricating adsorbents that combine good selectivity with high uptake capacity is of special interest. Recently, Chen et al. reported an impressive MOF showing strong affinity towards ethane within channels of [Fe₂(O₂)(dobdc)]. Although [Fe₂(O₂)(dobdc)] exhibits good selectivity and ethane capacity, it suffers from a high energy penalty of regeneration ($Q_{st} = -66.8$ kJ/mol). Moreover, this MOF is not stable in air and requires special handling under inert conditions.

### 2.2 Results and discussion

A mixture of Co(OAc)$_2$·4H$_2$O (0.125 g, 0.5 mmol), isophthalic acid (H$_2$ipa, 0.166 g, 1.0 mmol), MeOH (6 mL), and H$_2$O (0.5 mL) were sonicated for 10 min and sealed in a 25 ml Teflon-lined autoclave and heated at 120 °C for two days. After cooling to room temperature, the resulting purple plate crystals were washed with methanol several times and dried under vacuum (Figure 2.1). It yields 81 mg of guest-free crystal of [Co₃(μ₃-OH)(ipa)$_{2.5}$(H₂O)] with a reaction yield of 78% based on cobalt. We named this MOF, MUF-15 (MUF = Massey University Framework). MUF-15 was discovered during screening of experimental MOFs for ethane/ethylene separation. Around 5000 MOFs were investigated for their ability to separate ethane from ethylene at room temperature and 1 bar and one of these materials was
a MOF synthesized from cobalt acetate and isophthalic acid with slightly different structure compared to MUF-15 (ccdc number: 751783).

![Synthetic route to MUF-15 with an optical microscopy image of single crystals.](image)

**Figure 2.1** Synthetic route to MUF-15 with an optical microscopy image of single crystals.

MUF-15 can also be synthesized in a larger scale by mixing Co(OAc)\(_2\).4H\(_2\)O (0.75 g, 3.0 mmol) and H\(_2\)ipa (0.664 g, 4.0 mmol) in MeOH (40 mL) and H\(_2\)O (3 mL). After sonicating the mixture for 30 min, was sealed in a 100 mL Teflon-lined autoclave and heated at 120 °C for two days. After cooling to room temperature, the resulting purple plate crystals were washed with methanol several times and dried under vacuum (Yield ca. 0.42 g, 66% based on cobalt). MUF-15 is built up from inexpensive precursors and formed in a high yield. Based on commercial prices, we estimate the raw material cost of this material is less than $20 per kg. It should be noted that this price is only an estimated price of starting materials.

Single crystal X-ray diffraction revealed that MUF-15 crystallizes in the orthorhombic space group *Pnna* (Table 2.1).

**Table 2.1** Crystal data and structure refinement for MUF-15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>Co(_3)(µ(_3)-OH)(ipa)(_2)(_3)(H(_2)O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDC deposition number</td>
<td>1892003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
<td>C(<em>{20})H(</em>{13})Co(<em>3)O(</em>{12})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
<td>622.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
<td>orthorhombic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td><em>Pnna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/Å</td>
<td>28.714(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b/Å</td>
<td>21.1265(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/Å</td>
<td>10.9460(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α/°</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β/°</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ/°</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume/Å(^3)</td>
<td>6640.1(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ/mm(^2)</td>
<td>12.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(000)</td>
<td>2480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Θ range for data collection/°</td>
<td>12.044 to 70.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index ranges</td>
<td>-21 ≤ h ≤ 21, -15 ≤ k ≤ 15, -8 ≤ l ≤ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collected</td>
<td>16306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reflections</td>
<td>1426 [R(<em>{int}) = 0.1075, R(</em>{sigma}) = 0.0582]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data/restraints/parameters</th>
<th>1426/219/296</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit on $F^2$</td>
<td>1.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [$I&gt;=2\sigma (I)$]</td>
<td>$R_1 = 0.0878$, $wR_2 = 0.2481$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [all data]</td>
<td>$R_1 = 0.1056$, $wR_2 = 0.2680$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest diff. peak/hole / $e,\text{Å}^{-3}$</td>
<td>0.72/-0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As observed in a related Co$^{II}$-isophthalate material, $^{230}$ MUF-15 is assembled from a hexacobalt cluster connected by ten ipa linkers (Figure 2.2a). The cluster nodes are built up from two symmetry-related sets of three cobalt(II) ions. The ions within each set coordinate to a $\mu_3$ bridging hydroxide ion, and the two sets are connected to each other through shared carboxylate groups. There is one terminal H$_2$O ligand per set of three cobalt ions, which is disordered over two sites. By considering the cobalt clusters as 10-connected nodes linked by ipa ligands (Figure 2.2c), MUF-15 can be depicted as a porous coordination polymer. The framework defines three narrow zigzag 1-dimensional pores that intersect each other, as highlighted in Figures 2.2d and e. These orthogonal channels run along the a, b and c axis with pore limiting windows of 8.5 × 3.5, 7 × 3.8 and 3.2 × 1.2 Å, respectively (Figure 2.3).

**Figure 2.2** (a) The SCXRD structure of MUF-15 comprises of hexanuclear cobalt(II) clusters (cobalt = dark blue; oxygen = red; carbon = grey; hydrogen = pink (most omitted for clarity)). The sites occupied by terminal H$_2$O ligands are marked with a t. (b) The structure of H$_2$ipa linker and its stick representation. (c, d) The cobalt(II) clusters and ipa ligand assemble into network that defines a 3D array of channels. (e) The zig-zag channels of MUF-15 illustrated by the Connolly surface in yellow (probe of diameter 1.0 Å).
Figure 2.3 Pore structure and void space of MUF-15 illustrated by Connolly surface using a probe of diameter of 1 Å along the x (a), y (b), z (c) axes, and a top view showing the connectivity of the pores (d) (Co, blue; O, red; C, grey; and H, white).

Guest-free MUF-15 can be readily produced at 120 °C under vacuum, which preserves the coordinated water molecules. Since these water ligands are lost, together with the crystallinity and porosity, by heating above 200 °C such high temperatures were avoided. The phase purity of the material activated at 120 °C was confirmed by matching its powder X-ray diffraction pattern with that simulated from its SCXRD structure (Figure 2.4), analysis of the $^1$H NMR spectrum of a digested sample (see Appendix A), and elemental analysis.

Figure 2.4 PXRD patterns of MUF-15 showing that its structure remains unchanged after activation at 120 °C under vacuum, after isotherm measurements, after breakthrough experiment and after exposure to an air with a relative humidity of 80% for one week.
The found values for carbon and hydrogen are 37.47 and 2.87, respectively, which are almost identical to their calculated ones of 37.53 and 2.36 obtained from the formula of MUF-15 with one water in its pore ([C\textsubscript{20}H\textsubscript{13}Co\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{12}]\textbullet H\textsubscript{2}O). Thermogravimetry and powder XRD demonstrated that MUF-15 decomposes above 400 °C under nitrogen (Figure 2.5), while it is stable when exposed to a laboratory atmosphere (~80% relative humidity) at ambient temperatures for at least one week (Figure 2.4), after activation, after isotherm measurements, and after breakthrough test.

![Figure 2.5 TGA curve of MUF-15 showing a 2.95% weight loss equivalent to calculated weight loss for one coordinated water molecule.](image)

A N\textsubscript{2} adsorption isotherm at 77 K illustrated the permanent porosity of MUF-15 (Figure 2.6) and gave a BET surface area of 1130 m\textsuperscript{2}/g and a pore volume of 0.51 cm\textsuperscript{3}/g (See appendix A for the calculations).

![Figure 2.6 Experimental adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) of N\textsubscript{2} at 77 K by MUF-15.](image)
These values are nearly identical to the geometric surface area of 1260 m$^2$/g and pore volume of 0.46 cm$^3$/g calculated from the crystallographic coordinates. These data together as well as the limiting pore diameter (i.e., the diameter of smallest pore window) and the largest cavity diameter (i.e., the diameter of the largest sphere that can fit within the pores) are presented in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2 Calculated and experimentally determined structural characteristics of MUF-15.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geometric surface area calculated (RASPA2)</td>
<td>1260 m$^2$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET surface area from experimental N$_2$ isotherm/77K</td>
<td>1130 m$^2$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore volume calculated (RASPA2)</td>
<td>0.46 cm$^3$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore volume from experimental N$_2$ isotherm/77K</td>
<td>0.51 cm$^3$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest cavity diameter calculated (Zeo++)</td>
<td>5.2 Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore limiting diameter calculated (Zeo++)</td>
<td>3.6 Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystallographic crystal density</td>
<td>1.245 g/cm$^3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accessible surface of the MUF-15 channels is largely defined by the phenyl rings of the ipa ligands. Together with the pore dimensions, this surface chemistry signals promise for the capture of the more polarizable ethane in preference to ethylene. Single-component C$_2$H$_6$ and C$_2$H$_4$ adsorption isotherms were measured on guest-free MUF-15 at 293 K (Figure 2.7a) and other temperatures (see Appendix A). These isotherms exhibit type I character with a smooth increase with pressure and full reversibility. Importantly, the isotherms remain identical after exposing a sample to a laboratory atmosphere overnight (Figure 2.7c), and can be reproduced over multiple cycles (Figure 2.7d). MUF-15 has a distinct preference for adsorbing ethane over ethylene: the uptake reaches 4.69 mmol/g (105 cm$^3$/g) and 4.15 (93 cm$^3$/g) for C$_2$H$_6$ and C$_2$H$_4$, respectively, at 293 K and 1 bar. As was mentioned in chapter 1, there are three overall mechanisms for separation systems. Separation based on the difference in equilibrium adsorption uptake, kinetic of adsorption and size of adsorbates. According to appreciable adsorption of both C$_2$H$_6$ and C$_2$H$_4$, the mechanism of separation cannot be molecular sieving as both C$_2$H$_6$ and C$_2$H$_4$ can enter the pores of MUF-15. To investigate the kinetics of adsorption for C$_2$H$_6$ and C$_2$H$_4$, their kinetic uptakes were measured versus time and results are presented in Figure 2.7b. Since the uptake kinetics of the two gases are nearly identical, it can be concluded that separation mechanism in MUF-15 can be ascribed to thermodynamic effect, where due to the favourable adsorption sites, MUF-15 adsorbs C$_2$H$_6$ more stronger than C$_2$H$_4$. 
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Figure 2.7 (a) Experimental C$_2$H$_6$ and C$_2$H$_4$ adsorption isotherms of MUF-15 at 293 K (desorption points not presented for clarity – see Appendix A). (b) Kinetic profiles of gas uptake by MUF-15 at 293 K upon exposing an evacuated sample to a dose of gas equal to its measured total adsorption of that gas at 760 torr. (c) Volumetric C$_2$H$_6$ adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) adsorption isotherms of MUF-15 at 293 K before and after exposing a sample to a laboratory environment with ~80% humidity overnight. (d) Volumetric C$_2$H$_6$ adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of MUF-15 at 293 K measured on the same sample over multiple cycles.

The C$_2$H$_6$ uptake capacity of MUF-15 at 1 bar (4.69 mmol/g) is notably higher than that of the benchmark adsorbents Cu(Qc)$_2$ (1.85 mmol/g)$^{227}$, ZIF-7 (1.85 mmol/g)$^{225}$ and MAF-49 (1.73 mmol/g)$^{119}$ The ethane capacity of MUF-15 stems from its large pore volume (0.51 cm$^3$/g) compared to that of Cu(Qc)$_2$ (0.11 cm$^3$/g)$^{227}$, ZIF-7 (0.078 cm$^3$/g)$^{231}$ and MAF-49 (0.2 cm$^3$/g; calculated by RASPA2$^{232}$ simulation software using a helium probe) (Table 2.4). There is frequently a trade-off between pore dimensions and pore volumes in adsorbent materials. Pore dimensions on par with small guest molecules often correlate with small pore volumes, which in turn lead to low uptake capacities. On the other hand, high pore volumes usually arise from large pores which cannot discriminate between molecules of similar sizes. However, the topology features of MUF-15 embody a rare combination of voluminous pores and wall-to-wall distances on par with small guest molecules. This allows it to simultaneously adsorb a significant quantity of ethane and discriminate it from ethylene.
Coverage-dependent adsorption enthalpies \((Q_{st})\) of MUF-15 for \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\) and \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) were evaluated experimentally from pure component isotherms collected at 288, 293, and 298 K, by the implementation of a virial equation (Figure 2.8a). The resultant \(Q_{st}\) at near-zero coverage is 29.2 and 28.2 kJ/mol for \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\) and \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\), respectively, which underscores the enhanced uptake of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\). At higher coverage, the \(Q_{st}\) values rise for both gases, with the increase for \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\) being markedly steeper. This implies that the adsorption process benefits from intermolecular interactions amongst the adsorbates, which is fully consistent with the crystallographically-observed pore dimensions. In fact, because of the packed accommodation of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\) and \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) in the pores, the intermolecular distance between these gases is very short, and they orientate in a way that hydrogen atoms of a molecules interact strongly with carbon atoms of adjacent molecules. These interactions increase with the adsorption of more molecules, thus increasing the binding energy.

Motivated by the high uptake and preferential binding of ethane by MUF-15, the adsorption selectivity of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) mixtures was predicted on the basis of ideal adsorbed solution theory (IAST)\(^{118}\) using a range of starting compositions (50/50, 25/75 and 10/90 \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\), Figure 2.8b, see Appendix A for the rest).

![Figure 2.8](image)

**Figure 2.8** (a) Isosteric heat of adsorption plots for the adsorption of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\) and \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) by MUF-15. (b) Predicted mixture adsorption isotherms and selectivity of MUF-15 predicted by IAST method for a 50/50 \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) mixture at 293 K.

MUF-15 exhibits a \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) selectivity of around two for all three mixtures. Achieving this combination of good selectivity and high capacity is rare in an adsorbent material. Previously-reported ethane-selective MOFs typically exhibit either very low gas uptakes or poor selectivity (Table 2.4).\(^{119, 220-221, 223, 225-226}\)

First-principles dispersion-corrected density functional theory (DFT-D3)\(^{233}\) calculations as implemented in the software package VASP\(^{234}\) were performed to gain further insight into
the mechanism of selective C2H6/C2H4 adsorption in MUF-15. The calculated static binding energy for C2H6 at its most preferred binding site is around -36.7 kJ/mol, whereas it is -35.0 kJ/mol for C2H4. The stronger host-guest interactions with ethane are in accord with experimental observations. This can be attributed to van der Waals interactions between the ethane and neighbouring π electron clouds. As shown in Figures 2.9a and b, based on DFT calculations, the C2H6 molecules are bound in a pocket defined by four phenyl rings.

![Figure 2.9](image.png)

**Figure 2.9** Comparison of the preferential (a) C2H6 and (b) C2H4 adsorption sites (Co blue, O red, C dark gray, H white) observed by DFT-D3 calculations.

C−H⋯π interactions exist between the C2H6 molecule and the phenyl rings within the cavity. Although C−H⋯π interactions are dominated by dispersion, as compared to other noncovalent interactions involving permanent dipoles/quadrupoles, the cavity of MUF-15 complements the size of the C2H6 molecule to enable C−H⋯π interactions between all six hydrogens of C2H6 and three adjacent phenyl rings. In contrast, the C2H4 molecule shows short contacts only with two parallel edges of the cavity. Thus, its lower binding energy can be attributed to the lack of strong permanent dipoles on the framework and the reduced number of C−H⋯π interactions. Beside the number of C−H⋯π interactions, C2H6 as a more polarizable molecule can interact more strongly by induced dipole interactions with the framework compared to the less polarizable C2H4 molecule.
The underlying mechanism behind C2H6-selective behaviour of MUF-15 was further investigated by the adsorption behaviour of acetylene, as another guest molecule from C2 hydrocarbons family which has the highest polarity and lowest polarizability (Table 2.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boiling point (K)</th>
<th>Molecular dimensions (Å)</th>
<th>Polarizability (Å³)</th>
<th>Quadrupole moment× 10²⁶/esu cm²</th>
<th>Dipole moment ×10¹⁸/esu cm²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₂</td>
<td>188.4</td>
<td>3.32×3.34×5.70</td>
<td>3.33-3.93</td>
<td>+7.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₄</td>
<td>169.4</td>
<td>3.28×4.18×4.84</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₆</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>3.81×4.82×4.08</td>
<td>4.43-4.47</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adsorption isotherms of C₂H₂ for MUF-15 were measured, and interestingly MUF-15 adsorbed less C₂H₂ than both C₂H₄ and C₂H₆ at low pressure (Figure 2.10a).

**Figure 2.10** (a) Experimental adsorption isotherm of C₂H₂ in comparison to C₂H₆ and C₂H₄ by MUF-15 at 293 K. (b) Isosteric heat of adsorption plots for the adsorption of C₂H₂ in comparison to C₂H₆ and C₂H₄ by MUF-15.

The shape of C₂H₂ adsorption isotherm also was more linear than other two, which implies less interaction of C₂H₂ with framework. To calculate adsorption strength of C₂H₂ quantitatively, Qₘ of C₂H₂ was calculated. Expectedly, Qₘ of C₂H₂ (27.5 kJ/mol) was much lower than that of C₂H₄ and C₂H₆ (28.2 kJ/mol and 29.2 kJ/mol, respectively) (Figure 2.10b). This lower affinity for C₂H₂ again confirms that the dominating guest-host interaction in MUF-15 is dispersive (van der Waals) interactions rather than the interaction between permanent dipoles of pore surface and quadrupoles of guest molecules. It is a rare phenomenon for a porous material to selectively adsorb a molecules of low polarity.
(quadrupole moment) over polar molecules. To best of our knowledge, MUF-15 is the first MOF reported that exhibits the selective adsorption of C$_2$H$_6$ over both C$_2$H$_4$ and C$_2$H$_2$.

Building on these results, we then demonstrated the feasibility of using MUF-15 for C$_2$H$_6$/C$_2$H$_4$ separations under the dynamic conditions encountered in industrial processes. A home-built breakthrough apparatus was designed and constructed to measure the gas separation performance of the MOFs under dynamic conditions (Figure 2.11 and 2.12).

![Figure 2.11 A schematic of the experimental column breakthrough apparatus.](image)

A SRS UGA200 mass spectrometer was used to analyse the composition of the feed and outlet gases at 1-1.1 bar at 20 °C. The mass spectrometer was first calibrated to give a reliable quantitative result. As the instrument was factory-calibrated for nitrogen, a nitrogen reservoir with known pressure was introduced to the system to calibrate the instrument for pressure reduction effect (caused by capillary tube and the performance curve of the pumps) and head sensitivity. One of these factors can be kept constant to be able to fix the other one. Both factors cannot be determined; therefore, each time the instrument is calibrated, one of the factors will be assumed to be correct. Here, sensitivity factor was kept as its default number, and reduction factor was adjusted until the pressure determined by mass spectrometer was equal to pressure shown by pressure gauge. After fixing the pressure reduction factor, the mass spectrometer was calibrated for all the gases using in the experiment one by one. This was done by determining scaling factor for each gas in the instrument. To do this, single gas
of all the components with known pressure were introduced to the mass spectrometer and their scaling factors were manipulated until pressure monitored by mass spectrometer was equal to pressure shown by pressure gauge. In the case of ethane/ethylene separation, a mass of 30 was used for ethane, 2 for helium and 28 for ethylene. It should be noted that ethane spectrum also generates a peak at mass 28 with an intensity 47% of that of the total peak. Therefore, during the calculation of composition for ethylene, the contribution of this peak from ethane should be subtracted.

**Figure 2.12** A photo of our breakthrough test apparatus (It should be noted that the upper part of the apparatus is used for the measurement of membrane permeability).

The performance and accuracy of our homemade breakthrough apparatus was established by reproducing breakthrough results reported in the literature and consistent results were obtained.\(^{201, 226, 237}\) As an example, our breakthrough results for the separation of ethane from ethylene by ZIF-4 is compared with that of Hartmann’s group\(^ {226}\) and CO\(_2\) from CH\(_4\) by 13X zeolite is compared with that of Yi’s group\(^ {237}\). The exact feed characteristics and adsorbent amounts was employed to mimic the breakthrough experiments reported by Hartmann’s group.

**ZIF-4 experiment**

Before starting the measurement, an empty bed experiment was performed to obtain the elapsed times of the gas mixture to pass through the adsorption column and reach the mass
spectrometer (Dead volume measurements). At this stage, bed was free of adsorbents and a
gas mixture containing 0.1 mlN/min of helium, 0.45 mlN/min of ethane and 0.45 mlN/min of
ethylene (the same flow rate as presented in literature\textsuperscript{226}) was passed through the bed at 1
bar and 293 K. Mass flow meters were set on the desired flowrates and the composition of
the mixture was monitored by mass spectrometer (by opening the V1 to mass spectrometer).
Once the intended gas compositions were obtained and they were steady state, V1 was closed
and mass flowmeters were set on zero (keeping the gas feed behind the adsorption column).
Upstream and adsorption column was then kept under vacuum for 15 min by opening V3
and V4 to the bed, and then filled with helium gas at 1 bar by closing V4, opening V2 and
opening V3 to adsorption column. Once the bed and upstream pipes were filled with helium
at 1 bar, V2 was closed, V1 was opened to the bed and mass flow controllers were set again
to the previous flowrates. It should be noted that back pressure regulator was connected to
the system to maintain the pressure around 1.1 bar during the whole processes (except
vacuuming the bed). The outlet gas stream from the bed was monitored by mass spectrometer.
The following raw data was obtained from mass spectrometer (Figure 2.13).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{breakthrough_data.png}
\caption{Raw breakthrough data after doing an empty breakthrough test (with no
adsorbent present) for an equimolar mixture of ethane/ethylene at 1.05 bar and 293 K. C_0
is the initial concentration of the component.}
\end{figure}

As can be seen from Figure 2.13, all the gases are detected by the mass spectrometer in
the same time (as a result of good mixing) after approximately three minutes. This three
minute dead time must be subtracted from the breakthrough curves obtained from the bed
packed with adsorbent. While an equimolar mixture of ethane/ethylene passes through the
bed, the outlet concentration of ethylene seems to be significantly higher than that of ethane.
Obviously, this is because of the 47% contribution of 28 mass generated by ethane ionization, and then need to be subtracted from ethylene 28 mass. After subtraction, an identical breakthrough curves were observed for ethylene, as expected (Figure 2.14).

**Figure 2.14** Breakthrough curves of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} from an empty bed after correcting 47% contribution of 28 mass generated by ethane ionization at 1.05 bar and 293 K.

In a typical breakthrough experiment, 0.450 g of activated ZIF-4 (The synthesis of ZIF-4 was performed according to the procedure published by Park et al.\textsuperscript{238}) were placed in an adsorption column (6.4 mm in diameter × 11 cm in length) to form a fixed bed. The column then is left under vacuum for another 5 hours at 150 °C. After the bed was cooled to the 20 °C, the column was purged under a 20 mL\textsubscript{N}/min flow of He gas for 1 hr at 1.05 bar prior to the breakthrough experiment. The same gas compositions and the preparation procedure was employed but for the packed bed this time. The outlet composition was continuously monitored by the mass spectrometer until complete breakthrough was observed (Figure 2.15a). After subtracting the time required by adsorbates to pass through an empty bed and reach mass spectrometer and correcting for ethane mass 28 contribution the following breakthrough curves were obtained (Figure 2.15b).

These breakthrough curves were then compared with the breakthrough curves reported by Hartmann and co-workers and as can be seen from Figure 2.16, they are identical to the previously reported breakthrough curves.
Figure 2.15 Breakthrough curves of $\text{C}_2\text{H}_6$ and $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ in and adsorption column packed with ZIF-4 at 1.05 bar and 293 K (a) before correcting for ethane mass 28 contribution and elapsed time obtained from empty bed test and (b) after correcting for ethane mass 28 contribution and elapsed time obtained from empty bed test.

Figure 2.16 Breakthrough curves obtained from our apparatus for a mixture of ethane/ethylene in an adsorption column packed with ZIF-4 at 293 K and 1.05 bar in comparison with the reported breakthrough curve by Hartmann and co-workers in the exact same operational conditions and feed characteristics.

13X experiment

The same procedure and data processing used for ZIF-4 experiment was employed for 13X experiment. As the adsorption column used in the Yi’s group was large and flowrate was higher, we scaled down the bed characteristics and flow rate equally to mimic their breakthrough performance. In this regard, flowrate, adsorption column volume and amount of adsorbents was divided by 10. Our adsorption bed (6.4 mm in diameter × 11 cm in length) was packed with 1 g of 13X zeolite and a flowrate of 1.1 ml/s/min for CH₄ and 0.9 ml/s/min
for CO\(_2\) and 0.2 ml\(_8\)/min for He was passed through the adsorption bed at 1.05 bar and 293 K. A mass of 44 was chosen for CO\(_2\) and 15 for CH\(_4\). The following empty bed breakthrough curves was achieved (Figure 2.17), thus 1.9 min was subtracted from packed bed breakthrough experiments. The final breakthrough also was achieved and is compared with the literature in Figure 2.18.

![Figure 2.17](image1)

**Figure 2.17** Breakthrough curve of CO\(_2\) and CH\(_4\) from empty bed at 1.05 bar and 293 K.

![Figure 2.18](image2)

**Figure 2.18** Breakthrough curves obtained from our apparatus for a mixture of CO\(_2\)/CH\(_4\) in an adsorption column packed with 13X at 293 K and 1.05 bar in comparison with the reported breakthrough curved by Yi and co-workers.

After validating our breakthrough apparatus, breakthrough measurements using a fixed adsorbent bed containing ~1 g of MUF-15 were conducted at room temperature. C\(_2\)H\(_6\)/C\(_2\)H\(_4\) mixtures of 50/50, 25/75 and 10/90 were used as feeds to mimic a range of industrial process conditions (Figures 2.19a, and see Appendix A for the rest). C\(_2\)H\(_4\) eluted through the bed first to yield an outflow of pure gas. Conversely, because C\(_2\)H\(_6\) is more efficiently adsorbed...
by the MUF-15 bed, it breaks through following a substantial time lapse. These results indicate that MUF-15 can efficiently trap C₂H₆ to yield pure C₂H₄. The separation performance of MUF-15 was quantified in terms of its productivity for comparison with other high-performance C₂H₆-selective MOFs. The productivity of these adsorbents is defined as the quantity of ethylene with a purity in excess of 99.95% produced per unit mass of material starting from an equimolar ethane/ethylene mixture.¹¹⁹, ²²⁷ Productivity was calculated based on both experimental and simulated breakthrough curves for MUF-15 and materials previously reported in the literature (Table 2.4). MUF-15 possesses a productivity of 14 litres of polymer-grade ethylene gas per kg of material with a single adsorption step, which exceeds that of other top-performing ethane-selective MOFs such as MAF-49¹¹⁹ (5.3 L/kg), Cu(Qc)₂²²⁷ (4.3 L/kg), IRMOF-8²¹⁶ (2.5 L/kg) and PCN-250²²² (10 L/kg), but trails the recently-reported MOF [Fe₂(O₂)(dobdc)]²²⁹ (19.3 L/kg).

Figure 2.19 (a) Simulated and experimental breakthrough curves for a 50/50 C₂H₆/C₂H₄ mixture at 293 K and 1.1 bar in an adsorption column packed with MUF-15. (b) Ethane uptake from an equimolar mixture of C₂H₆/C₂H₄ as a function of IAST selectivity for the best ethane-selective materials reported to date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>P (bar)</th>
<th>( Q_{st,\text{ethane}} ) (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>( Q_{st,\text{ethylene}} ) (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>( q_{\text{ethane,mixed}} ) (mmol/g)</th>
<th>( q_{\text{ethylene,mixed}} ) (mmol/g)</th>
<th>Selectivity ((\text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4))</th>
<th>Productivity(_{\text{sim}}) (L/kg)</th>
<th>Productivity(_{\text{exp}}) (L/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRMOF-8\textsuperscript{119}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF-49\textsuperscript{119}</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>5.3\textsuperscript{[a]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL-142A\textsuperscript{219}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni(bdc)(ted)\textsuperscript{224}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN-245\textsuperscript{220}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIF-4\textsuperscript{226}</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN-250\textsuperscript{222}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIF-7\textsuperscript{225}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIF-8\textsuperscript{223}</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu(Qc)\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{227}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>4.34\textsuperscript{[b]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}dobdc\textsuperscript{229}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>45.02</td>
<td>19.3\textsuperscript{[c]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{[a]} The reported productivity value is 6.2 L/kg. \textsuperscript{[b]} The reported productivity value is 4.4 L/kg. \textsuperscript{[c]} The reported productivity value is 19.93 L/kg.
In isolation, neither high uptake nor good selectivity are sufficient for highly productive MOFs. Both attributes are required in tandem, but they are seldom simultaneously combined in the same material. Relative to other materials, MUF-15 benefits from particularly good uptake. As highlighted in Figure 2.19b, the uptake of ethane from a 50/50 mixture of ethane and ethylene at 1 bar (ethane uptake_{mix}) calculated for MUF-15 exceeds that of other known ethane-selective adsorbents. This results in a longer period of time during which pure C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} can be obtained from the column outlet i.e. it underpins the excellent productivity of MUF-15. Looking ahead, since improvements in selectivity tend to come associated with costs relating to regeneration and instability, high-performance materials that can operate under realistic operating conditions in the future are likely to arise from further enhancements in ethane capacity.

To investigate separations at low C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} concentrations and higher operating pressures, we simulated breakthrough curves under these conditions. First, a reliable mass transfer coefficient for the simulated breakthrough curves was estimated from experimental data (see the section 1.4 of the Chapter 1 for further detail about this calculations). Upon optimization, this coefficient leads to an excellent match between simulated and experimental breakthrough curves. We subsequently predicted breakthrough curves using feed compositions of 1/99 and 0.1/99.9 C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} (Figures 2.20a and see Appendix A for the 0.1/99.9 mixture). These calculations revealed that MUF-15 is capable of eliminating trace quantities of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} from C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}, as often required in industrial settings, and we anticipate that this result could be verified experimentally. To investigate the performance of MUF-15 at higher pressure, as required by pressure-swing adsorption processes, breakthrough curves were predicted at different pressures. Firstly, isotherms of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} were measured at 298 K up to 10 bar (Figure 2.20b). From IAST calculations for a 25/75 C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} mixture (Figure 2.20c) at 10 bar, we found that MUF-15 maintains its preferential adsorption of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} over C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} with a selectivity of 1.79. This selectivity result was then used to predict breakthrough curves of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} across a range of elevated pressures (Figure 2.20d). These predicted breakthrough curves demonstrate that MUF-15 is capable of removing C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} from C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} at high pressures under dynamic conditions. This is notable since productivity gains arise from working at higher pressures. For example, the productivity of MUF-15 nearly doubles in going from atmospheric pressure to 20 bar (See appendix A).
Figure 2.20 (a) Simulated breakthrough curves for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 C₂H₆/C₂H₄ at 293 K and 1.1 bar. (b) High pressure C₂H₆ and C₂H₄ adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of MUF-15 at 298 K. (c) Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-15 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 25/75 C₂H₆/C₂H₄ at 293 K at high pressures. (d) Predicted breakthrough curves at different operating pressures for a 25/75 mixture of C₂H₆/C₂H₄ at 298 K.

To enable economical deployment in industrial settings, the adsorbent should also possess good regenerability and recyclability. To test the recyclability of MUF-15, breakthrough separation experiments were cycled numerous times (Figure 2.21a). The experimental cycling results indicate that there was no noticeable loss in the C₂H₆ adsorption and separation capacity for MUF-15 over 12 cycles. The regenerability of MUF-15 was also investigated by either placing it under vacuum or by purging with an inert gas. The framework can be fully regenerated between cycles in this manner, specifically by placing it under vacuum for around 10-15 mins or by purging with helium at 70 °C and 1.1 bar (Figure 2.21b).
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Figure 2.21 (a) \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) separation cycles for a 25/75 \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) mixture lasting for 600 min. Each separation process was carried out at 293 K and 1.1 bar and MUF-15 was regenerated by being kept under vacuum at ambient temperature for 20-30 min. (b) Desorption behaviour of the adsorbates through heating the column at 1.1 bar under a helium flow of 5 mL/min. Ethane and ethylene are both completely removed from the column upon heating to 70 °C. No adsorbates are removed upon further heating to 130 °C.

2.3 Conclusion

We have targeted a unique MOF for the direct production of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) by selectively adsorbing \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) over \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) from a \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) mixture at ambient condition. Owing to its high selectivity and appreciable \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) uptake, MUF-15 possesses one of the highest \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) productivity among those found in the well-established \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \)-selective MOFs. The underlying mechanism behind this \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) selectivity are the close contacts between guest molecules and pore surfaces decorated with aromatic rings (inert surface) that induce optimal van der Waal’s interactions. Furthermore, due to its moderate heat of adsorption, MUF-15 can be easily regenerated by purging at moderate temperatures or introduction of vacuum for a short time. MUF-15 is readily synthesized from simple and inexpensive reagents and can be recycled for repeated separations cycles without any loss of performance. The combination of these attributes represents significant addition to the portfolio of known \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \)-selective MOFs. By providing a clear illustration of how such selectivity and uptakes may be achieved using simple components, this framework defines the way forward for challenging separations.

2.4 Experimental and computational section

2.4.1 General procedures

All starting compounds and solvents were used as received from commercial sources without further purification unless otherwise noted. Zeolite 13X with a batch number of
84107 was purchased in the form of 4-8 mesh beads from Ajax chemicals. Elemental analyses were performed by the Campbell Microanalytical Laboratory at the University of Otago, New Zealand. Care was taken to limit the exposure of all MOFs to the atmosphere.

2.4.2 Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA)

Thermogravimetric analyses were performed on a TA Instruments Q50 instrument. Freshly prepared MOF samples were washed with MeOH, and then activated at 120 °C under vacuum for 10 hours. Samples were exposed to air for 1 hour and then transferred to an aluminum sample pan, and then measurements were commenced under an N₂ flow with a heating rate of 5 °C /min.

2.4.3 Single crystal X-ray diffraction

A Rigaku Spider diffractometer equipped with a MicroMax MM007 rotating anode generator (Cuₖ radiation, 1.54180 Å), high-flux Osmic multilayer mirror optics, and a curved image plate detector was used to collect SCXRD data. As-synthesized samples were washed several times with MeOH before being mounted on the instrument. All the data were collected at room temperature. The SCXRD data were integrated, scaled and averaged with FS Process. SHELX (under OLEX) was used for structure solution and refinement. The Solvent Mask function in OLEX was used to mask out contributions from guest molecules occluded in the framework pores.

All atoms were found in the electron density difference map. Electron density difference maps were carefully analyzed for the possible presence of disordered framework components. All non-hydrogen atoms and coordinated waters were refined anisotropically. A solvent mask was calculated and 582.0 electrons were found in a volume of 2654 Å³ in 1 void. This is consistent with the presence of 4[CH₃OH] per formula unit which accounts for 576.0 electrons. Methanol was chosen as uncoordinated molecules in the pores as it was the main solvent used for MUF-15 synthesis.

2.4.4 Powder X-ray diffraction patterns

All powder X-ray diffraction experiments were carried out on a Rigaku Spider X-ray diffractometer with Cu Kα radiation (Rigaku MM007 microfocus rotating-anode generator), monochromated and focused with high-flux Osmic multilayer mirror optics, and a curved image plate detector. The data were obtained from freshly prepared MOF samples that had been washed several times with MeOH. The two-dimensional images of the Debye rings were integrated.
with 2DP to give 2θ vs I diffractograms. Predicted powder patterns were generated from single crystal structures using Mercury.

2.4.5 Low-pressure gas adsorption measurements

Gas adsorption isotherms were measured with a volumetric adsorption apparatus (Quantachrome-Autosorb-iQ2). Ultrahigh-purity gases were used as received from BOC Gases. The as-synthesized samples were washed with anhydrous methanol several times and about 100 mg was transferred into a pre-dried and weighed sample tube and heated at rate of 10°C/min to a temperature of 120 °C under a dynamic vacuum with a turbomolecular pump for 20 hours. Accurate sample masses were calculated using degassed samples after sample tubes were backfilled with nitrogen. Surface areas were determined from the N₂ (77 K) adsorption isotherm collected by application of the BET model. Bath temperatures of 273 K and 293 K were precisely controlled with a recirculating control system containing a mixture of ethylene glycol and water. The low temperature (77 K) was controlled by a Dewar filled with liquid N₂.

2.4.6 High-pressure gas adsorption measurements

High-pressure adsorption isotherms were measured on a PCT Pro instrument from Setaram. About 0.4 g of activated sample (activated at 120 °C under vacuum overnight) was transferred into a 4 mL stainless steel sample holder inside a glove box under an Ar atmosphere, the sample mass was weighed using decrement method due to the insufficient measuring range of the balance for the sample holder. The sample holder was then transferred to the PCT Pro, connected to the instrument’s analysis station via a VCR fitting, and evacuated at 40 °C for at least 2 h. The sample holder was placed inside a stainless-steel recirculating dewar connected to a Julabo F12-E0 isothermal bath filled with Ethylene glycol aqueous solution (1:3, v/v), for which the temperature stability is ± 0.02 °C.

To eliminate the influence of fluctuations in room temperature, the manifold was set as 40 °C. He was used to determine the void volume in the sample holder by using the method of expanding from the dosing manifold to the evacuated sample holder and recording the change in pressure, assuming He adsorption is negligible. The PCT Pro is equipped with a 15 bar transducer (accuracy of ± 0.12% of the reading) for the measurements up to 10 bar. By default, the direct method was used to calibrate the void volume. Ultrahigh grade (99.999%) of C₂H₆, C₂H₄ and He were used for all the adsorption measurements. The background adsorption was measured with empty holder at 273 and 298 K by the direct approach.
method. The background correction on all isotherms was performed with the “subtract” function directly within Origin.

2.4.7 Physical properties and pore characteristics calculations

The Zeo++\textsuperscript{242} code and RASPA2\textsuperscript{232} were used to characterize the geometric features of the crystal structure of MUF-15 by calculating the pore volume with the use of a helium probe atom, the pore limiting diameter (i.e., the diameter of smallest pore window), the largest cavity diameter (i.e., the diameter of the largest sphere that can fit within the pores), and the surface area accessible to a H\textsubscript{2} probe (a N\textsubscript{2} probe produce a surface area of zero) using the coordinated found by X-ray crystallography. The Accelrys Materials Studio 7.0 software package was used to visualize the MOF structure and pore topology.

2.4.8 IAST selectivity calculations for binary gas mixtures

Mixed gas adsorption isotherms and gas selectivities for five different mixtures of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} (25/75, 50/50, 10/90, 1/99, 0.1/99.9) were calculated at 293 K based on the ideal adsorbed solution theory (IAST) proposed by Myers and Prausnitz (See selected experimental and computational methods in chapter 1 for more details)\textsuperscript{118}. The pyIAST package\textsuperscript{182} was used to perform the IAST calculations. In order to predict the sorption performance of MUF-15 towards the separation of binary mixed gases, the single-component C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} adsorption isotherms were first fit to a dual site angmuir model as below:

\[
q = \frac{q_1 b_1 P}{1 + b_1 P} + \frac{q_2 b_2 P}{1 + b_2 P}
\]

(1)

Where q is the uptake of a gas; P is the equilibrium pressure and q\textsubscript{1}, b\textsubscript{1}, q\textsubscript{2} and b\textsubscript{2} are constants. The fitting parameters are shown in Appendix A, section IAST. These parameters were used subsequently to carry out the IAST calculations.

2.4.9 Breakthrough separation experiment

In a typical breakthrough experiment, 1 g of an activated sample of MUF-15 was placed in an adsorption column (6.4 mm in diameter × 11 cm in length) to form a fixed bed. The adsorbent was activated \textit{in situ} at 120 °C under high vacuum for 6 hours and then the column was left under vacuum for another 2 hours while being cooled to 20 °C. The column was then purged under a 20 mL/min flow of He gas for 1 hr at 1.1 bar prior to each breakthrough.
experiment. A gas mixture containing different mixtures of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and He gas was introduced to the column at 1.1 bar and 20 °C at 8 mL\textsubscript{N}/min. The flow rate of inert He gas in all the experiments was kept constant at 4 mL\textsubscript{N}/min. The operating pressure was controlled at 1.1 bar with a back-pressure regulator. The outlet composition was continuously monitored by the mass spectrometer until complete breakthrough was observed. The adsorbent was regenerated under vacuum for 15-20 minutes between each cycle.

**Regeneration profile**

The desorption behaviour of ethane and ethylene from the adsorption column was also investigated. Once the adsorbent was saturated with an equimolar mixture of ethane and ethylene, the column was purged with a helium flow of 5 mL\textsubscript{N}/min for 7 mins at 20 °C at 1.1 bar. Then column was then heated to 70 °C with a ramp of 10 °C/min for 23 mins. Finally it was heated to 130 °C with the same ramping for 12 min before cooling to 20 °C. A breakthrough measurement was then performed, which showed that the absorbent had been fully regenerated.

**2.4.10 Breakthrough curve simulations**

Breakthrough curves were simulated based on the procedure presented earlier. Adsorption bed characteristics and other related parameters for simulation are presented in Table 2.5.

| **Table 2.5** Adsorption column parameters and feed characteristics used for the simulations. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Adsorption bed**             | **Feed**                        |
| Length: 110 mm                  | Flow rate: 8 mL\textsubscript{N}/min |
| Diameter: 6.4 mm                | Temperature: 293 K               |
| Amount of adsorbent in the bed: 1 g | Pressure: 1.1 bar                |
| Bed voidage: 0.77               | Carrier gas (He) flow rate: In all the |
| Adsorbent average radius: 0.2 mm| simulated breakthrough curves feed |
| \( k_{\text{ethane}} \): 0.009 s\(^{-1}\) | was diluted with 4 mL\textsubscript{N}/min of |
| \( k_{\text{ethylene}} \): 0.013 s\(^{-1}\)  | helium unless otherwise stated. |
|                                | Purge gas: He with a flow rate of 20 |
|                                | mL\textsubscript{N}/min           |

**Langmuir fitting**

See Appendix A
2.4.11 Comparison of separation performance for different MOFs

To unambiguously compare the separation performance of different materials, ethylene productivity, IAST selectivity and mixture uptakes (the amount of gas uptake taken by adsorbent in presence of other gases, \(q_{i,mix}\)) for an equimolar mixture of ethane/ethylene and isosteric heats of adsorption for the top-performing ethane-selective MOFs reported in the literature were compared. The \(C_2H_4\) productivity was defined by the breakthrough amount of ethylene (defined as a volume of gas at STP) from an adsorption bed packed with 1 kg of MOF. The breakthrough amount was calculated by integration of the breakthrough curves during a period from \(t_1\) to \(t_2\) during which the \(C_2H_4\) purity is higher than or equal to a threshold value of 99.95%:

\[
(C_2H_4)_{\text{Productivity}} = \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} F_{C_2H_4, out} dt}{m_{\text{MOF}}}
\]  

(2)

Where \(F_{C_2H_4, out}\) the flowrate of effluent ethylene and \(m_{\text{MOF}}\) is the amount of MOF packed in the bed. Ethylene productivity was calculated based on both experimental and simulated breakthrough curves (termed as \(\text{Productivity}_{\text{exp}}\) and \(\text{Productivity}_{\text{sim}}\)). Simulated breakthrough curves for an equimolar mixture of ethane/ethylene (without helium as a carrier gas) at 293 K and 1 bar were estimated using the method outlined earlier and assuming that gases quickly reach their equilibrium uptake during the dynamic breakthrough process. The single gas isotherms presented in the references were used to calculate IAST selectivity and to simulate breakthrough curves. Experimental breakthrough curves presented in the references were used to calculate \(\text{Productivity}_{\text{exp}}\). It should be noted that experimental breakthrough curves data were extracted from these literature references using a plot digitizer program. Therefore, the \(\text{Productivity}_{\text{exp}}\) values are estimates and not strictly based on threshold values of exactly 99.95% as we did not have the breakthrough data with sufficient precision.

2.4.12 DFT calculations

Static binding energies for ethane and ethylene in MUF-15 framework were calculated using density functional theory (DFT) as implemented in the software package VASP 5.4.4.\(^\text{234}\) It is well-known that standard DFT methods based on generalized gradient approximation do not fully account for the long-range dispersion interactions between the framework and the bound gaseous adsorbates. To accurately estimate static binding energies for the guest molecules with MUF-15 framework, we implemented dispersion corrections
using DFT-D3 method. Electron exchange and correlation were described using the
generalized gradient approximation Perdew, Burke, and Ernzerhof (PBE) form and the
projector-augmented wave potentials were used to treat core and valence electrons. In all
cases, we used a plane-wave kinetic energy cutoff of 600 eV and a Gamma-point mesh for
sampling the Brillouin zone. The ionic coordinates were relaxed until the Hellman-Feynman
ionic forces were less than 0.02 eV/Å. The initial location of the guest molecule (one guest
molecule per cell) in the unit cell of MUF-15 was obtained from the classical simulated
annealing technique using classical force field as implemented in sorption module in
Materials Studio. In the simulated annealing method, the temperature was lowered
stepwise, allowing the gas molecule to reach a desirable configuration based on different
moves such as rotation, translation and repositioning with preset probabilities of occurrence.
This process of heating and cooling the system was repeated in several heating cycles to find
the local minima. Forty heating cycles were performed where the maximum temperature and
the final temperature were $10^5$ K and 100 K, respectively. Static binding energies ($\Delta E$) at 0
K in vacuum and in solvent (both water and methanol) were calculated using the following
expression:

$$\Delta E = E_{MOF+Guest} - E_{MOF} - E_{Guest}$$ (3)

Where $E_\alpha$ refers, respectively, to the total energies of the MOF + guest complex, the MOF
alone, and guest molecule.
Chapter 3

Isoreticular Analogues of MUF-15: Pore Tuning, Flexibility and C2 hydrocarbon separations

3.1 Introduction

The ability to tune the pore size and nature of MOF structures without changing their underlying topology has given rise to the isoreticular principle. Some of the most fascinating families of MOFs are porous compounds whose physical structure and chemical affinity can be fine-tuned, whilst keeping the basic topology of the framework unchanged. This has allowed for the design of MOFs with a wide variety of applications. For instance, isoreticular chemistry enables design of MOFs with precise pore dimensions and favourable affinity by the right selection of organic linkers or metal ions so that they selectively adsorb specific guest molecules, while excluding other gases. As an example, Chen and co-workers developed two isoreticular MOFs, [Cu(ina)₂] (Hina = isonicotinic acid) and [Cu(Qc)₂] (HQc = quinoline 5-carboxylic acid), to demonstrate the control of pore electrostatics and dimensions for improving C₂H₆/C₂H₄ selectivity through isoreticular approach. Substitution of HQc ligand with Hina ligand resulted in an isoreticular MOF but with smaller pore size and stronger affinity towards C₂H₆, thus leading to a preferential adsorption of C₂H₆ over C₂H₄. These capabilities also enable substantial enhancement of gas storage in MOFs and have led to the design of materials with exceptional surface areas and pore volumes. Additionally, the isoreticular approach has been a great help for design and development of effective MOFs for catalysing reactions, luminescence, drug deliveries, sensing and so on. This unique ability has also led to significant improvements in design and development of MOFs with high thermal and physical stability compared to that of the parent MOF. As one of the main strategies to design isoreticular MOFs, ligand functionalization in MOFs has been studied extensively and has been demonstrated to enhance gas adsorption and chemical stability of many MOFs. More interestingly, ligand functionalization can induce interesting gas adsorption behaviour by designing flexible/dynamic MOFs. When exposing to certain stimuli, the structure of some MOFs can change. These frameworks which are referred as
Flexible/dynamic MOFs are a unique subclass of these materials while other solid porous materials such as zeolites have a rigid framework.\textsuperscript{46-47,266-268}

Suitable pore characteristics and chemistry of MUF-15 motivated us to investigate the effect of different functional groups on its structural properties and gas separation performance. Based on the result of Chapter 2, crystal structure of MUF-15 shows that the hydrogen atom of 5-position carbon in phenyl ring is positioned towards the pore aperture. Thus substituting it with different functional groups may drastically change the properties and adsorption performance of MUF-15. For example, introduction of fluoro group in the structure of MUF-15 may improve pore affinity towards CO\(_2\) molecules through strong electrostatic interactions between fluorine and CO\(_2\) molecules. As another example, introduction of large methoxy group in the structure of MUF-15 can significantly affect the pore dimensions and pore volume of MUF-15 as these groups occupy part of the pore volumes. Thus, different organic groups such as fluoro, hydroxy, bromo, nitro, methyl and methoxy, representing a broad range of different sizes and functionalities, were incorporated to the structure of MUF-15 to achieve six isostructural materials to MUF-15 as shown in Figure 3.1. It should be noted that phenyl ring itself has a significant impact on the electrostatics and affinity of the framework towards guest molecules as it was previously demonstrated by close interaction of C\(_2\)H\(_6\) and C\(_2\)H\(_4\) with phenyl rings revealed by DFT.

![Figure 3.1 Composition of MUF-18-23 by introducing six different functional groups to the 5-position carbon of the phenyl ring.](image)

### 3.2 Results and discussion

#### 3.2.1 Design and synthesis of functionalized MUF-15 series

As described in the previous chapter, MUF-15 defines three intersected narrow zigzag 1-dimensional pores. These orthogonal channels run along the a, b, and c axes with pore-limiting windows of 8.5 \(\times\) 3.5, 7 \(\times\) 3.8, and 3.2 \(\times\) 1.2 Å, respectively. As shown in Figure 3.2, phenyl rings of isophthalic ligands are pointing towards the pore windows. Such an interesting orientation of phenyl rings in the structure of MUF-15 suggests the introduction
of functional groups into these rings may hugely change the pore dimension of MUF-15 as illustrated in Figure 3.2. Moreover, as these functional groups are well located in the pore surface they can largely enhance the affinity of frameworks to guest molecules through electrostatic interactions. Therefore, we decided to fabricate an isoreticular series of MOF-15 by substituting the hydrogen atom of 5-position carbon atom in phenyl rings with different functional groups as it has the highest impact in pore aperture size and closest contact with guest molecules.

![Figure 3.2](image)

**Figure 3.2** A schematic of MUF-15 pore architecture, showing the effect of ligand functionalization on the pore aperture size.

Six different functional groups, including fluoro, hydroxy, bromo, nitro, methyl and methoxy were incorporated into the structure of MUF-15 to represent a broad range of functionalities in terms of size and polarity. Functionalized MUF-15 series were synthesized based on a procedure similar to that of MUF-15 with slightly modification as shown in Table 3.1. A mixture of Co(OAc)₂·4H₂O (0.125 g, 0.5 mmol), ligand (refer to Table 3.1 for the quantity), MeOH (6 mL), and H₂O (0.5 mL) were sonicated for 10 min and sealed in a 25 ml Teflon-lined autoclave and heated according to the conditions mentioned in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOFs</th>
<th>ligand</th>
<th>ligand/salt ratio</th>
<th>Reaction temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Duration of reaction (h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUF-18</td>
<td>5-fluoroisophthalic acid</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-19</td>
<td>5-hydroxyisophthalic acid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-20</td>
<td>5-bromoisophthalic acid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-21</td>
<td>5-nitroisophthalic acid</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-22</td>
<td>5-methylisophthalic acid</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-23</td>
<td>5-methoxyisophthalic acid</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Synthesis conditions for analogous MUF-15 series and corresponding naming.
After cooling to room temperature, the resulting purple crystals were washed with methanol for several times and dried under vacuum. Table 3.1 shows the synthesis conditions for each MOF and assigned naming. It should be noted that we tried to synthesize the amino-functionalized version of MUF-15 as well, but amino-functionalized MUF-15 was not achieved under the same conditions of MUF-15. We tried to change the synthesis conditions, but either no crystals formed or different phases were obtained.

3.2.2 X-ray crystal structure and pore architecture of analogous MUF-15 series

After synthesizing the isoreticular MUF-15 series with different functional groups, PXRD pattern was first obtained to investigate the structural similarity of these MOFs to parent MOF. As can be seen from Figure 3.3, the powder pattern of MUF-18 and MUF-21 are nearly identical to that of MUF-15 and they are clearly isostructural to MUF-15. Other structures show slightly change either in number of peaks or peak angles, but they all possess the main low-angle peak in the same position with MUF-15.

![Simulated PXRD pattern of MUF-15 and experimental patterns and optical micrograph of MUF-15 and its derivatives.](image)

**Figure 3.3** Simulated PXRD pattern of MUF-15 and experimental patterns and optical micrograph of MUF-15 and its derivatives.
Positional change in other peaks of PXRD patterns is not fully understood. Our initial guess was that the introduced functional groups in the structure of MUF-15 has caused these changes. However, the simulated PXRD of hypothetically functionalized MOFs (simply introducing the functional groups into the structure of MUF-15 and simulating their PXRD) revealed that introduction of functionalized groups would not change the major peaks in PXRD patterns (Figure 3.4). These peak changes might be attributed to the effects of functional groups indirectly, where incorporation of these groups has slightly changed the position and orientation of atoms in the framework due to the new electrostatic interactions between functionalization groups and MUF-15 framework atoms. Similar changes were seen in the PXRD patterns of solved structure of MUF-18, MUF-22 and MUF-23. While the topology and main structure of these frameworks remained same as MUF-15, but their PXRD patterns is still different with MUF-15.

![Simulated PXRD patterns](image)

**Figure 3.4** Simulated PXRD patterns of simulated MUF-15, MUF-19, MUF-20 and MUF-21. These patterns were obtained from a hypothetically determined structure of MUF-19, MUF-20 and MUF-21 by simply introducing a hydroxyl, bromo or nitro group in an appropriate position in the structure of MUF-15.

SCXRD experiments were implemented to obtain the structure of MUF-18 to MUF-23. Out of these six derivative MOFs, we were only able to solve the structure of MUF-18, MUF-22 and MUF-23. Crystal structures and refinement details of MUF-18, MUF-22 and MUF-23 are shown in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2 Crystal data and structure refinement of MUF-18, MUF-22 and MUF-23 in comparison to those of MUF-15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MUF-15</th>
<th>MUF-18</th>
<th>MUF-22</th>
<th>MUF-23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>Co₆(µ₃-OH)₂(ip)₃(H₂O)₂</td>
<td>Co₆(µ₃-OH)₂(ip-F)₃(H₂O)₄</td>
<td>Co₆(µ₃-OH)₂(ip-Me)₃(H₂O)₄</td>
<td>Co₆(µ₃-OH)₂(ip-OMe)₃(H₂O)₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
<td>C₄₀H₂₆Co₆O₂₄</td>
<td>C₄₀H₂₃Co₆F₂O₂₆</td>
<td>C₄₅H₄₀Co₆O₂₆</td>
<td>C₄₅H₄₀Co₆O₃₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
<td>1244.18</td>
<td>1368.16</td>
<td>1350.35</td>
<td>1428.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature/K</td>
<td>293.15</td>
<td>293(2)</td>
<td>273.15</td>
<td>293.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
<td>orthorhombic</td>
<td>orthorhombic</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>orthorhombic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td>Pnna</td>
<td>Pnna2₁</td>
<td>P₂₁/n</td>
<td>P₂₁2₁2₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/Å</td>
<td>28.714(2)</td>
<td>28.668(6)</td>
<td>10.909(2)</td>
<td>22.6822(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b/Å</td>
<td>21.1265(7)</td>
<td>10.875(2)</td>
<td>28.582(6)</td>
<td>28.614(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/Å</td>
<td>10.9460(3)</td>
<td>20.623(4)</td>
<td>21.999(4)</td>
<td>10.9041(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α/°</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β/°</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98.74(3)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ/°</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume/Å³</td>
<td>6640.1(5)</td>
<td>6430.0(2)</td>
<td>6780.0(2)</td>
<td>7077.1(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ calc /g cm⁻³</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>1.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µ/mm⁻¹</td>
<td>12.006</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>1.501</td>
<td>11.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(000)</td>
<td>2480.0</td>
<td>2712.0</td>
<td>2720.0</td>
<td>2872.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation</td>
<td>λ = 1.54178</td>
<td>λ = 0.71073</td>
<td>λ = 0.71073</td>
<td>λ = 1.54178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2θ range for data collection/°</td>
<td>12.044 to 70.240</td>
<td>3.460 to 60.264</td>
<td>5.104 to 45.970</td>
<td>11.256 to 60.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index ranges</td>
<td>-21 ≤ h ≤ 21, -15 ≤ k ≤ 15, -</td>
<td>-40 ≤ h ≤ 40, -15 ≤ k ≤ 15, -</td>
<td>-11 ≤ h ≤ 11, -31 ≤ k ≤ 31, -</td>
<td>-14 ≤ h ≤ 14, -18 ≤ k ≤ 18, -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collected</td>
<td>16306</td>
<td>89636</td>
<td>55287</td>
<td>18857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reflections</td>
<td>1426 [R int = 0.1075, R sigma = 0.0582]</td>
<td>16227 [R int = 0.1049, R sigma = 0.0595]</td>
<td>9124 [R int = 0.1219, R sigma = 0.0820]</td>
<td>2088 [R int = 0.2735, R sigma = 0.1566]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/restraints/parameters</td>
<td>1426/219/296</td>
<td>16227/1699</td>
<td>9124/0/705</td>
<td>2088/1003/664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit on F²</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [I&gt;2σ (1)]</td>
<td>R₁ = 0.0867, wR₂ = 0.2409</td>
<td>R₁ = 0.0536, wR₂ = 0.1344</td>
<td>R₁ = 0.1680, wR₂ = 0.4518</td>
<td>R₁ = 0.0938, wR₂ = 0.2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [all data]</td>
<td>R₁ = 0.1043, wR₂ = 0.2606</td>
<td>R₁ = 0.0596, wR₂ = 0.1409</td>
<td>R₁ = 0.1979, wR₂ = 0.4810</td>
<td>R₁ = 0.1214, wR₂ = 0.2643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest diff. peak/hole / e Å⁻³</td>
<td>0.73/-0.42</td>
<td>0.71/-0.76</td>
<td>1.76/-1.20</td>
<td>0.43/-0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rest did not show high stability in air and after few hours their structure collapsed. Soaking these MOFs in non-volatile solvents such as DMF or DBF also was not a practical solution as these solvents changed the structure of these MOFs. As an example, PXRD patterns of as-synthesized MUF-19 in methanol and after soaking it in DMF for 10 minutes are presented in Figure 3.5.

![Figure 3.5 PXRD patterns](image)

Figure 3.5 PXRD patterns of as-synthesized MUF-19 in comparison to its pattern after soaking in DMF for 10 minutes.

The validity of crystal structure solution and phase purity of MUF-18, MUF-22 and MUF-23 was firstly validated by the comparison of simulated PXRD pattern and experimental ones as shown in Figure 3.6.

Although the crystal system and space group of these MOFs are different from those of MUF-15, they all share the same topology, i.e., having the same cluster. These clusters have been connected to each other with the same coordination and geometry of MUF-15 and they have the similar unit cells. Similar to MUF-15, they are assembled from a hexacobalt cluster connected by ten organic linkers. The cluster nodes are built up from two symmetry-related sets of three cobalt(II) ions. The ions within each set coordinate to a μ3-bridging hydroxide ion, and the two sets are connected to each other through shared carboxylate groups. There is one terminal H2O ligand per set of three cobalt ions, which is disordered over two sites. By considering the cobalt clusters as 10-connected nodes linked by organic linkers, all of
these MOFs can be depicted as porous coordination polymers. Therefore, these structures are topologically identical and can be regarded as isoreticular structures.

![Figure 3.6](image)

**Figure 3.6** Experimental PXRD patterns of MUF-18, MUF-22 and MUF-23 in comparison with simulated patterns derived from single-crystal structure data.

### 3.2.3 Thermal and physical stability and pore characteristics

Guest-free derivatives of MUF-15 can be readily produced by placing them under vacuum overnight at 120 °C (except MUF-19, which was activated under vacuum at room temperature for two hours), which preserves the coordinated water molecules. These water ligands are lost, together with crystallinity and porosity, by heating above 200 °C. As shown in Figure 3.7, a N\(_2\) adsorption isotherm at 77 K illustrated the permanent porosity of these MOFs. Calculated BET surface area and pore volume based on N\(_2\) isotherm at 77 K are shown in Table 3.3. These values are nearly identical to the geometric surface area and pore volume calculated from the crystallographic coordinates. It should be noted that the metrics derived from the structure data of MUF-19, MUF-20 and MUF-21 are not presented here because the single crystal structures of these materials could not be determined.
As expected, introduction of the functional group into the structure of MUF-15 reduces the pore volume and surface area of all the derivative MOFs in comparison to MUF-15. This decrease can be simply explained by the occupancy of a portion of void space by functional groups. Moreover, BET surface area calculations showed that introduction of more bulky functional groups is not proportionally in line with the decrease of surface area and pore volume. For instance, both BET surface area (gravimetric) and pore volume of MUF-22 (methyl-functionalized MUF-15) are higher than those of MUF-18 (fluoro-functionalized...
MUF-15), while the size of methyl group is relatively larger than that of fluoro group. MUF-15 N\textsubscript{2} adsorption isotherm shows a stepped one. The reason behind this is not fully understood. It may come from some sort of flexibility or by the filling of multiple layers of pore space. MUF-19 shows the lowest surface area and pore volume amongst the derivatives. We believe it is because of its structural change and/or partial structural collapse after removal of guest molecules as its N\textsubscript{2} isotherm at 77 K is completely different from other derivatives both in shape and adsorption capacity. To investigate structural collapse or change of MUF-19 upon activation, PXRD pattern after activation (and further gas adsorption) was measured and compared with as-synthesized states (Figure 3.8). As expected, MUF-19 shows some peak shift upon activation compared to its as-synthesized pattern. It should be noted that, PXRD patterns cannot prove whether the structure of all MUF-19 crystals is not collapsed. In fact, structure of MUF-19 could be partially collapsed while PXRD patterns still show that the structure remains intact.

![Figure 3.8 PXRD patterns of as-synthesized MUF-19 and after gas adsorption.](image)

Next, to compare the pore architecture and dimensions of MUF-15 before and after functionalization, a Connolly surface with a probe of 1 Å was plotted for MUF-15 and its derivatives as illustrated in Figure 3.9.
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Figure 3.9. Pore structure and void space of (a) MUF-15, (b) MUF-18, (c) MUF-22 and (d) MUF-23 illustrated by Connolly surface using a probe of diameter of 1 Å.

Comparing the MUF-15 pore structure with its derivatives, it can be seen that MUF-15 has the widest channels compared to its derivatives due to less occupancy of its pore space (only hydrogen atoms in 5-position carbon atom of phenyl rings). In comparison, pore structure of MUF-18 is very similar to that of MUF-15 with respect to its shape (Figure 3.9a,b), but substitution of hydrogen atom with fluoro has led to a decrease in channel size.
and a subsequent drastic reduction of both surface area and pore volume from 1130 m²/g and 51 cm³/g to 783 m²/g and 0.36 cm³/g, respectively (Table 3.3). Unlike fluoro group, introduction of methyl and methoxy group not only changed the pore metrics, but also altered the shape of the pores (Figure 3.9c,d). MUF-22 and MUF-23 both show lower surface area and pore volume compared to MUF-15, which is again an indicator of occupancy of a portion of void space by these bulky groups. Interestingly, although more bulky groups have been incorporated to the structure of MUF-15, both MUF-22 and MUF-23 possess higher surface area and pore volume compared to MUF-18, which has been functionalized with relatively small fluoro group. It can be explained by the formation of larger cavities in MUF-22 and MUF-23 compared to MUF-18, thus accommodating larger volumes of guest molecules.

In addition to their high porosity and ability to take up gases, MUF-15 derivatives also display excellent thermal and water stability. Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) of activated MUF-15 derivatives crystals shows a mass loss of 10-20% (depending on the adsorbed water content in the pores and the duration they have been exposed to air) when the samples were heated to 100 °C, due to the escape of guest molecules.

![TGA curves of MUF-15 and its derivatives showing complete removal of guest molecules at 130 °C.](image)

**Figure 3.10** TGA curves of MUF-15 and its derivatives showing complete removal of guest molecules at 130 °C.

A complete removal of guest molecules can be seen for all the derivative MOFs at 130 °C. The remaining desolvated framework is stable up to 300 °C before the removal of coordinated water is observed (Figure 3.10). MUF-21 shows an earlier structural collapse, which might be attributed to the departure of NO₂ group.
We were delighted to find that MUF-22 and MUF-23 showed extraordinary stability towards water vapour. Following the removal of occluded solvent, a sample was exposed to ambient air (70-80 % RH) at 20 °C for 180 days. No changes to the morphology or transparency of the crystals were detected by optical microscopy (Figure 3.11).

![Microscopy images of MUF-22 before and after being aged at 70-80 % RH for 180 days.](image)

**Figure 3.11.** Microscopy images of MUF-22 (a) before and (b) after and MUF-23 (c) before and (d) after being aged at 70-80 % RH for 180 days.

PXRD patterns were recorded throughout the exposure period and they were found to remain unchanged (Figure 3.12 and 3.13). As a point of comparison, activated MUF-15 is stable in air for only a week and PXRD pattern indicates a loss of crystallinity.

![Powder X-ray diffraction patterns of MUF-22; freshly activated and aged samples exposed to 70-80 % relative humidity at 20 °C for the stated period.](image)

**Figure 3.12.** Powder X-ray diffraction patterns of MUF-22; freshly activated and aged samples exposed to 70-80 % relative humidity at 20 °C for the stated period.
To quantify the stability of MUF-22 and MUF-23 towards humid air, we turned to the measurement of gas adsorption isotherms before and after periods of exposure to ambient air. This allows the porosity of an aged sample to be compared to its pristine state. Following the exposure of MUF-22 and MUF-23 to humid air (RH = 70-80%) for 180 days, CO₂ isotherm was measured at 293 K (Figure 3.14). The uptake of CO₂ by aged MUF-22 and MUF-23 after 180 days are 63.6 and 60.2 cm³/g (at 1 bar), respectively, which are almost identical to their pristine samples (64.7 cm³/g for MUF-22 and 60.6 cm³/g for MUF-23).

**Figure 3.14.** Left: CO₂ adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms measured at 293 K for pristine and aged MUF-22 under 70-80% relative humidity. Right: CO₂ adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms measured at 293 K for pristine and aged MUF-23 under 70-80% relative humidity.
The water vapour stability was investigated for other derivatives as well. Unlike MUF-22 and MUF-23, they did not show great stability in presence of humidity. MUF-18 maintains its crystallinity for about a week, MUF-19 loses its crystallinity in few minutes and MUF-20 and MUF-21 are stable in air not for more than 4 hours and 14 hours (based on their PXRD patterns, see Appendix B for PXRD patterns). The observed stability of MUF-22 and MUF-23 indicates that they can be handled indefinitely under typical laboratory conditions, which is a surprising revelation. MUF-15, MUF-22 and MUF-23 are built from similar ligand sets and identical SBUs. Why does their stability towards humid air differ so remarkably? The procedure of MOF degradation in water vapour or liquid water can be considered as a series of substitution reactions in which the metal-coordinated linkers are replaced by water or hydroxide ions. On this basis, there are two plausible reasons behind the superior stability of MUF-22 and MUF-23: isolation of SBUs by functionalized ligands and introduction of hydrophobic groups into the ligands. In MUF-22 and MUF-23, SBUs are excluded from exposure to water and other guest molecules. As can be seen from Figure 3.15, hexa-cobalt clusters are surrounded by more bulky methoxy and methyl groups, thus preventing water molecules to attack the clusters, while pore channels in MUF-15 are open to the surface of SBUs. Secondly, methyl and methoxy groups are known as hydrophobic groups and have lower affinity for adsorbing water vapour. Therefore, introduction of these groups increase water resistance by enhancing the hydrophobicity of these frameworks.

![Figure 3.15](image)

**Figure 3.15.** Left: Water molecules route towards hexa-cobalt clusters in MUF-15 showing their easy access to the surface of clusters. Right: Water molecules route towards hexa-cobalt clusters in MUF-23, which is blocked by methoxy groups.

### 3.2.4 Gas sorption studies, heat of adsorption and IAST selectivity calculations

Motivated by great separation performance of parent MOF (MUF-15) for \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4/\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \) separations, gas adsorption studies were performed to evaluate separation
performance of functionalized MOFs. Hence, single gas adsorption isotherms of $C_2H_6$, $C_2H_4$, $C_2H_2$ and $CO_2$ were measured up to 1 bar at various temperatures for these MOFs (Figure 3.16).

As observed by $N_2$ isotherms at 77 K, MUF-15 also exhibits the highest uptake amongst derivatives for $C_2H_6$, $C_2H_4$, $C_2H_2$ and $CO_2$ at 1 bar and 293 K because of its higher pore volume and surface area. As expected, MUF-18 has the closest gas uptake to MUF-15 for all the gases because fluoro and hydrogen atoms have similar size. MUF-19 also shows the poorest adsorption capacity, which can be again explained by its structural change or collapse (partially) after activation. Interestingly, the difference in gas uptakes of derivative MOFs compared to MUF-15, reduces moving from non-polar gases to polar ones. As can be seen from Figure 3.16, $C_2H_6$ uptake of MUF-15 is 105 cm$^3$/g, which is at least two-thirds of that of other derivatives. This difference decreases to at least 75% and (almost identical) for $C_2H_4$ and $C_2H_2$, respectively. An initial conclusion of these results is that introduction of functional groups increases the polarity of the pore surface, thus enhancing the affinity of framework towards more polar gases and a subsequent increase in gas uptake (bearing in mind that overall pore volume is reduced by functionalization). Additionally, it was again
confirmed that the separation mechanism in MUF-15 is based on the recognition of non-polar but highly polarizable molecules over polar molecules, as the difference between the uptake of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \), \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) and \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \) decreases with the introduction of more polar groups. Another interesting observation from Figure 3.16 is the affinity of frameworks for different gases. This can be discussed based on the uptake of gases at low pressure, i.e., the steepness of isotherm curves. For \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \), MUF-15 exhibits the highest uptake capacity and steepness in comparison to its derivatives. It can be explained by the high aromatic pore surface of MUF-15 compared to its derivatives, which favours non-polar but polarizable \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) molecules. In fact, introduction of functional groups does not play a key role in the framework’s affinity towards \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \), because all the derivative MOFs show similar steepness of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) isotherm and their uptakes vary mostly because of their different pore volumes. Moving towards more polar gases, the effect of functional groups can be clearly seen. For instance, MUF-21 shows similar affinity towards \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) and higher affinity towards \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \) compared to MUF-15, or MUF-18 with highly electronegative fluoro groups indicates stronger interaction with \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \) compared to MUF-15. The effect of pore surface polarity after introduction of functional groups can be observed by the adsorption behaviour of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \) molecules (as the most polar molecules of the \( \text{C}_2 \) adsorbates). As can be seen from Figure 3.17, among functionalized MOFs, MUF-21 and MUF-18 that are functionalized by relatively more polar groups of nitro and fluoro possess the highest affinity to \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \) molecules.

**Figure 3.17.** Volumetric \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \) adsorption isotherms measured at 293 K for MUF-15 and its derivatives in low pressure range (desorption points are not presented for clarity).

Then, as expected, MUF-23 which is functionalized by methoxy group (which is less polar than fluoro and nitro group but more polar than methyl group) surpasses MUF-22 which is functionalized by methyl group. And at the end, MUF-20 functionalized by
relatively less polar group of bromo shows the lowest C2H2 uptake at low pressures. The affinity of these MOFs towards different gases will be compared quantitatively by calculation of their isosteric heat of adsorptions in the next sections.

More interestingly, we were excited by observing the sign of flexibility in gas adsorption isotherms of C2H6, C2H4, C2H2 and CO2 by MUF-21 and MUF-23 at low pressures (0-1 bar). Flexible (or dynamic) MOFs are referred as a class of MOFs that respond to an external stimuli such as pressure, heat, solvent, and electric field or magnetic field through changing its internal structure without breaking the overall network. This structural transformation generally occurs by bond breaking/making, change of coordination number of the metal ion, change of coordination mode of ligand, ligand length squeezing, solvent exchange, solvent removal, etc.46, 269

To evaluate the binding strength between MUF-15 derivatives and guest molecules, coverage-dependent isosteric heat of adsorptions \( Q_{st} \) for C2H6, C2H4, C2H2 and CO2 were evaluated experimentally from pure component isotherms collected at 273 and 293 K by the implementation of a virial equation.122 These results are presented in Figure 3.18.

**Figure 3.18.** Isosteric heat of adsorption plots for the adsorption of (a) C2H6, (b) C2H4, (c) C2H2 and (d) CO2 by MUF-15 and its derivatives.
It should be noted that low pressure areas, just before breathing point, were chosen for flexible MOFs (to achieve a better fit with virial equation) to calculate $Q_{st}$. A $Q_{st}$ calculation is not presented for MUF-19, as the adsorption uptakes were low and isotherms were not smooth. As can be seen from Figure 3.18, functionalization has not significantly affected the $Q_{st}$ values of C$_2$H$_6$ for derivatives compared to that of MUF-15 at low loadings. At higher loadings, MUF-18 and MUF-20 show considerably higher $Q_{st}$ values for C$_2$H$_6$, which can be attributed to the intermolecular interaction of C$_2$H$_6$ molecules.

C$_2$H$_4$ is a more polar molecule compared to C$_2$H$_6$, and hence MUF-18 and MUF-21 show a comparatively high heat of adsorption (~35 kJ/mol) at low loadings which is higher than that of MUF-15 and other derivatives (less than 30 kJ/mol). As was discussed earlier, it can be attributed to the highly polar surface of MUF-18 and MUF-21, which are functionalized by fluoro and nitro groups, respectively. Moving towards C$_2$H$_2$, as shown earlier by a steep adsorption isotherm, MUF-21 exhibits a considerably high $Q_{st}$ for C$_2$H$_2$ (40 kJ/mol) which drastically surpasses all the other derivatives and MUF-15. Such a high $Q_{st}$ of MUF-21 for C$_2$H$_2$ originates from the strong interaction of nitro groups with highly polar C$_2$H$_2$ molecules. For CO$_2$, MUF-18 shows the highest heat of adsorption (38 kJ/mol), which was significantly higher than that of other MOFs (less than 31 kJ/mol). High interaction of fluorinated MOFs with CO$_2$ has been observed several times in literature. Such an appreciable affinity of these MOFs for CO$_2$ are explained by strong hydrogen bonding of fluoro atoms with carbon atoms of CO$_2$ molecules.

Motivated by interesting adsorption behaviour of functionalized MOFs, the adsorption selectivity of C$_2$H$_6$/C$_2$H$_4$, C$_2$H$_4$/C$_2$H$_2$ and C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ mixtures at 293 K was predicted on the basis of ideal adsorbed solution theory (IAST). First, single gas adsorption isotherms of C$_2$H$_6$, C$_2$H$_4$, C$_2$H$_2$ and CO$_2$ for MUF-15 and its derivatives are presented in Figure 3.19.
A Dual-Site Langmuir-Freundlich model was used to fit the single gas isotherms. An equimolar mixture was chosen as a representative mixture composition to evaluate the selectivity of MUF-15 and its derivatives. The result of these calculations are presented in Figure 3.20.
Figure 3.20. Predicted IAST selectivity of MUF-15 and its derivatives for an equimolar mixture of (a) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}, (b) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and (c) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}/CO\textsubscript{2} at 293 K.

For C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} separation, MUF-15 indicates the highest selectivity (~2) over the whole range of pressures. This again confirms that the introduction of functionalized groups does not improve the C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} separation performance of MUF-15. As these functional groups enhance the polarity of pore surface, they mainly increase the interaction of frameworks with C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} as the more polar gas, thus decreasing the selectivity of frameworks for adsorption of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} over C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}. This can be clearly seen from Figure 3.20a, where MOFs functionalized with less polar groups, including methyl, methoxy and bromo show greater C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} selectivity (1.57, 1.54 and 1.19, respectively, at 1 bar) compared to MOFs functionalized with more polar groups, such as fluoro and nitro (1.08 and 0.39, respectively at 1 bar). Interestingly, MUF-21, which is functionalized with nitro group shows revere selectivity for C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}, where its selectivity for C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} drop to 0.39 at 1 bar. It can be explained by the introduction of polar nitro groups into the structure of MUF-15 that interact more strongly with more polar C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} molecules. These results again support the underlying mechanism proposed for ethane-selectivity of MUF-15: More inert surfaces enhance the C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} selectivity of the frameworks, while a highly polar surface favours the adsorption of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}.
As another industrially relevant gas separation application, MUF-15 and its derivatives were evaluated for $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ separations.\textsuperscript{198} As can be observed from Figure 3.20b, functionalization has affected the selectivity of MOFs for $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ separation significantly. MUF-15 shows virtually no selectivity towards C$_2$H$_2$ and C$_2$H$_4$, while MUF-23 and MUF-18 are C$_2$H$_2$ selective with a selectivity of around 3, and three other MOFs (MUF-20, MUF-21 and MUF-22) exhibits reverse selectivity, i.e. they adsorb C$_2$H$_4$ over C$_2$H$_2$. The underlying mechanism behind these selectivities is not easy to be explained. MUF-18 is functionalized by electronegative fluoro groups that probably interact strongly with the electropositive hydrogen atoms of C$_2$H$_2$. MUF-23 also shows gate opening behaviour with rapid increase of C$_2$H$_2$ uptake compared to C$_2$H$_4$ that might account for its C$_2$H$_2$ selective nature (C$_2$H$_2$ molecules interact with framework more strongly and thus induce the flexibility of the structure stronger). On the other hand, MUF-21 shows C$_2$H$_2$ selective behaviour at low pressures, while selectivity unexpectedly drops below 1 with the increase of pressure. Such adsorption behaviour might be originated from the intermolecular interactions. At low pressures MUF-21 interact favourably with polar C$_2$H$_2$ molecules and therefore shows a selectivity towards C$_2$H$_2$, while at high pressures intermolecular interaction of C$_2$H$_4$ molecules favours the adsorption of C$_2$H$_4$ over C$_2$H$_2$.

Interestingly, MUF-19 shows the highest selectivity of 22 at 1 bar and 293 K for an equimolar mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$. As MUF-19 does not show high stability and we are not sure of it has been activated properly or its structure has changed during the activation, it is hard to be fully confident about its high calculated selectivity. Moreover, the adsorption uptake of this MOF is quite low compared to other MOFs.

The final gas pair that was investigated was C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$, which is another important gas separation application for producing high purity C$_2$H$_2$.\textsuperscript{198} The first observation from Figure 3.20c is that all of these MOFs are selective towards C$_2$H$_2$. Comparing their selectivity at low pressures, MUF-21 indicates the highest selectivity of 3.8. Its selectivity rapidly decreases to 1.8 at 1 bar; the same behaviour that was observed for C$_2$H$_4$/C$_2$H$_2$ mixture. Interestingly, MUF-15 shows the highest selectivity (~4) At 1 bar followed by MUF-23 and MUF-22. The selectivity drops to its lowest value by MUF-18 (~1). Such a low selectivity of MUF-18 for C$_2$H$_2$ over CO$_2$ can be readily explained by strong adsorption of CO$_2$ by the fluoro functionalized materials. To sum up, apparently, MOFs functionalized with less polar groups such as methoxy and methyl show higher selectivity of C$_2$H$_2$ over CO$_2$, while the selectivity drops upon the introduction of polar groups such as nitro and fluoro. Such a behaviour is not well understood at a molecular level but may relate to the effect of intermolecular interactions, or pore geometry and orientation of guest molecules in the pores.
3.2.5 Flexible analogues of MUF-15 and their separation performance

Among the various unique characteristics of MOFs, the flexibility of the framework and their dynamic behaviour have recently attracted great attention. In comparison to non-flexible porous materials, such as zeolites or activated carbons, some MOFs show structural flexibility when they are exposed to certain stimuli. This flexibility generally comes from at least one of these factors: a) the nature of the organic ligands, b) the moderate metal–ligand interactions, c) the versatile configuration of metal ions/clusters, and d) the movement of interpenetrated subnets.\textsuperscript{46, 269} One of the characteristics of the ligands that can trigger flexibility in MOFs is its ability to rotate i.e., the spatial alignment of a linker is changed by turning around a rotational axis.\textsuperscript{46, 269} Such flexible behaviour has been revealed in ZIF-8 (Zeolitic Imidazolate Framework, [Zn(mIm)\textsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{n}, mIm = 2-methylimidazole). A series of comprehensive experimental and theoretical studies have underscored the conclusion that the rotation of the organic linkers in the structure of ZIF-8 leads to the expansion of the pore windows, thus resulting in the adsorption of molecules that are larger than the pore size of framework.\textsuperscript{274}

The first sign of flexibility in the MUF-15 family was observed by a slight change of its structure upon exposure to some solvents such as DMF and DEF (Figure 3.5). The flexible nature of MUF-15 was then further confirmed by measuring its PXRD pattern under vacuum. As can be seen from Figure 3.21, the PXRD pattern of MUF-15 under vacuum shows a peak at $2\theta = 7.5^\circ$ completely disappears and the peak at $2\theta = 9.2^\circ$ is shifted in comparison to as-synthesized state. MUF-15 structure turns back to its as-synthesized state after removing vacuum and exposing it to the atmosphere.

We believe this flexibility originates from the rotation of phenyl rings upon the reversible inclusion of guest molecules, such as water, resulting in a structural deformation. A schematic of a possible transition is shown in Figure 3.22. It should be noted that these explanations are based on our observations and limited studies. Future comprehensive studies are needed to be done to investigate the mechanism behind these flexibilities.
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Figure 3.21. PXRD pattern of MUF-15 under vacuum in comparison to its as-synthesized state and exposed to air after vacuum.

Figure 3.22. A hypothetical schematic of the pore shape in MUF-15, showing the rotation of phenyl rings upon adsorption of water molecules opens up more space.

However, MUF-15 exhibits no sign of flexibility upon the adsorption of guest molecules such as CO$_2$, C$_2$H$_6$, C$_2$H$_4$ and C$_2$H$_2$ at different temperatures ranging from 195 K to 323 K and low pressures (0-1 bar). Recent studies have demonstrated that flexibility of MOFs can be tuned by substituent effects at the linker, i.e., by introducing functional groups.$^{46, 266-268}$

An early example of introducing different groups at the backbone of the ligand for inducing the flexibility was demonstrated in the prototypical MIL-53-series proposed by Férey et al.$^{277}$ The bdc ligand was functionalized with $-\text{CH}_3$, $-\text{Br}$, $-\text{Cl}$, $-\text{NO}_2$, and $-(\text{OH})_2$ groups. It was revealed that these functionalities, varying in polarity, hydrophilicity, and acidity, can trigger the flexibility of MIL-53 through the presence of intraframework
interactions. Another series of functionalized MOFs, $[\text{Zn}_2(L)_2\text{-}(\text{dabco})]_n$ (where L is ligand) prepared by Henke et al. showed adjustable flexibility through functionalization of the ligands with a series of dialkoxy groups.\(^{276}\) It was demonstrated that the flexibility of the frameworks is dependent on the length, polarity, and grade of saturation of the added alkoxy chains. A similar behaviour was observed through functionalization of MUF-15 by different groups. As demonstrated earlier by measuring adsorption isotherms of different gases, MUF-21 and MUF-23 functionalized by nitro and methoxy group, respectively, shows flexibility upon adsorption of guest molecules.

The flexibility of these MOFs was further confirmed by measuring their PXRD patterns under vacuum and comparing them to as-synthesized MOF. MUF-21 shows weak stability in the atmosphere, so we were not able to measures its PXRD pattern under vacuum as sample preparation involves loading the MOF into a capillary, and the sample gets exposed to the atmosphere several times.

![Figure 3.23. PXRD pattern of MUF-23 under vacuum in comparison to its as-synthesized state and after removing vacuum and exposing to atmosphere.](image)

As can be seen from Figure 3.23, the PXRD patterns of MUF-23 under vacuum shows that peak at $2\theta = 7.5^\circ$ completely disappears and the one at $2\theta = 8^\circ$ and $2\theta = 9^\circ$ are shifted to high angles compared to as-synthesized state. MUF-23 structure turns back to its as-synthesized state after removing vacuum and exposing it to atmosphere. MUF-21 shows flexibility during the adsorption of CO$_2$ and C$_2$H$_6$. MUF-23 shows flexibility upon
adsorption of C₂H₆, C₂H₄, C₂H₂ and CO₂ in a range of different temperatures and low pressures (0-1 bar). These isotherms are presented in Figure 3.24 and 3.25.

![Gross plots](image)

**Figure 3.24.** Volumetric (a) C₂H₆, (b) C₂H₄, (c) C₂H₂ and (d) CO₂ adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms measured at different temperatures for MUF-21.

Apparently, interaction of guest molecules and pore surfaces in a certain gas uptake (or pressure) triggers a rotation of functionalized linkers and opens up more space for further adsorption of guest molecules. This uptake (pressure) at which frameworks open up more space (so-called gate opening point) varies upon inclusion of different guest molecules or by the change of temperatures. Generally, inclusion of polar molecules at low temperatures can increase the interaction energy between framework and guest molecules and consequently induce the frameworks flexibility. In the case of MUF-21, we were able to see flexibility upon adsorption of C₂H₆ and CO₂ by measuring their adsorption isotherms at three different temperatures of 293, 273 and 263 K, while C₂H₂ and C₂H₄ shows type I Langmuir isotherms.
at these temperatures in the whole pressure range. As both C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} are more polar than C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} and CO\textsubscript{2}, we believe these gases can induce framework for gate opening behaviour right after they are introduced to the pores as the interaction between them and frameworks is strong enough to trigger the rotation of linkers, while CO\textsubscript{2} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} need to reach a certain uptake (pressure) to induce framework flexibility. This behaviour can be clearly justified by comparing the shape of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} adsorption isotherm at different temperatures of 293, 273 and 263 K. At 293 K, the gate opening pressure can be clearly observed showing a smooth jump in uptake capacity before and after frameworks expansion. Moving towards lower temperatures, the interaction between C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} molecules and framework increases and the boundary before and after expansion is disappearing leading to an isotherm shape similar to the type I Langmuir isotherm.

![Graphs showing adsorption isotherms for different gases at various temperatures.](image)

**Figure 3.25.** Volumetric (a) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}, (b) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}, (c) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} and (d) CO\textsubscript{2} adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms measured at different temperatures for MUF-23.

In contrast to MUF-21, MUF-23 indicates flexibility for all the four gases of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}, and CO\textsubscript{2} at different temperatures. In addition, the gate opening behaviour is more pronounced in MUF-23 compared to MUF-21. MUF-23 indicates a sharp jump in gas uptake at gate opening pressure (an uptake of 45 cm\textsuperscript{3}/g for acetylene at 263 K), pointing out a
significant structural change. This abrupt change compared to the gradual gate opening of MUF-21 might be explained by two factors. Rotation of lengthy methoxy group can open up more spaces compared to smaller nitro groups and different polarity of these substituent, thus resulting in different host-guest interactions. More interestingly, MUF-23 shows a clear dependence of the gate-opening pressure to temperature. As can be seen from Figure 3.25a, reducing temperature from 293 K to 263 K, the gate opening pressure decreases from 400 torr to 100 torr for adsorption of C$_2$H$_2$ molecules. This is obviously because of stronger interaction of guest molecules with framework at low temperatures, at which only a small quantity of adsorbed guest molecules are required to trigger framework flexibility. As observed by adsorption isotherms of MUF-21, MUF-23 also shows that gate opening behaviour disappears at a certain temperatures. For instance, we measured C$_2$H$_4$ and CO$_2$ adsorption isotherm at 195 K and as can be seen from Figure 3.26, there is no sign of gate opening phenomena at this temperature for C$_2$H$_6$. CO$_2$ isotherm at this temperature also exhibits gate opening behaviour at much lower pressure (85 torr) and a high uptake (130 cm$^3$/g). The gate opening uptake of CO$_2$ at 195 K is much higher than that of other temperatures (263-293 K). It can be attributed to insufficient thermal energy at this temperature, thus higher amount of CO2 is required to induce the flexibility.

![Figure 3.26. Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of (a) C$_2$H$_4$ and (b) CO$_2$ by MUF-23 at 195 K in comparison with higher temperatures, showing the disappearance of gate opening phenomena.](image)

Moreover, MUF-23 shows different gate opening pressure upon inclusion of different guest molecules. As can be seen from Figure 3.27, C$_2$H$_2$ has the lowest gate opening pressure (190 torr) with an uptake of 70 cm$^3$/g, while C$_2$H$_4$ and C$_2$H$_6$ open up the frameworks in almost the same pressures (210 torr) and uptakes (43 cm$^3$/g). Compared to the rest, CO2
exhibited the highest gate opening pressure (600 torr) and uptakes (70 cm$^3$/g). Such a trend of gate opening pressures for these molecules can be attributed to their polarity as C$_2$H$_2$ with higher polarity triggers framework flexibility at lower pressures and uptakes, and less polar CO$_2$ (compared to C$_2$H$_2$) at relatively higher pressures and uptakes.

Figure 3.27. Volumetric adsorption isotherms measured at 273 K for MUF-23, showing different gate opening pressures for various gases.

Such gas-induced behaviour and resulting differences in gate opening pressure caused by host–guest interactions could be a unique advantage for gas separation. As a promising application for flexible MOFs, energetically favourable pressure swing adsorption processes can be employed to separate gases as a result of adsorption discrepancy of different gases in these frameworks. Adsorptive separation of CO$_2$ over O$_2$ and N$_2$ on a flexible two-dimensional framework CID-3 (constructed from interdigitated [Zn(2,7-ndc)-(bipy)]$_n$ layers (2,7-ndc = 2,7-naphthalene dicarboxylate) is a good example proposed by Kitagawa and co-workers.$^{278}$ The flexible MOF, MIL-53(Al) was also employed to study CO$_2$/N$_2$ separation. Rodriguez et al., incorporated MIL-53(Al) and its amino-functionalized analogues into the mixed matrix membranes for CO$_2$/CH$_4$ separation.$^{279}$ This membrane (6FDA–ODA polyimide (6FDA = 4,40-(hexafluoroisopropylidene)-dipthalic anhydride; ODA = 4,40-oxydianiline) used as polymers) exhibits a high ideal selectivity of up to 77 with a separation factor up to 53. $^{280}$ In another interesting work, Chen and co-workers, discovered a microporous material [Zn(dps)$_2$(SiF$_6$)] (UTSA-300, dps = 4,4'-dipyridylsulfide) with two-dimensional channels of about 3.3 Å in size, well-matched for the separation of small molecules such as C$_2$H$_2$. The network is transformed to its closed-pore phase upon activation, while inclusion of C$_2$H$_2$ molecules opens up its structure, resulting in an appreciable
adsorption of C$_2$H$_2$ molecules. More interestingly, the structure remains closed upon exposure of CO$_2$ and C$_2$H$_4$ molecules, making this material an excellent adsorbent for C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ and C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ separations.\textsuperscript{281}

As an example of such flexible behaviour for gas separation applications, we have investigated the application of MUF-23 for separating CO$_2$ from N$_2$ at 273 K. The reason why we chose these two gases and this temperature was that MUF-23 shows gate opening behaviour at 273 K for CO$_2$ while N$_2$ isotherm at this temperature shows no sign of flexibility. Adsorption isotherms of CO$_2$ and N$_2$ at 273 and DSLF fitting parameters are presented in Figure 3.28. It should be noted that the CO$_2$ isotherm at entire pressure range has been considered to predict IAST selectivity (considering the flexible nature of MUF-23).

![Figure 3.28](image-url)

**Figure 3.28.** (a) Volumetric adsorption isotherms of CO$_2$ and N$_2$ at 273 K for MUF-23 fitted with DSLF model.

These isotherms show MUF-23 can be a good candidate for efficient separation of CO$_2$ from N$_2$ at 273 K and 1 bar, as it shows an abrupt jump at 600 torr in gas uptake, resulting a CO$_2$ uptake of 90 cm$^3$/g at 750 torr. However, single gas adsorption isotherms are not the ideal metrics to evaluate an adsorbent for its separation performance in real operating conditions, as it does not consider the kinetics of adsorption and possible competitive adsorption by other impurities in the mixture. This is even more prominent in case of flexible MOFs, as upon gate opening, there would be more space for other existing gases in the mixture as well. In addition, as the guest-host interaction is one of the main factors for
inducing the framework, existence of other gases in the mixture may affect drastically on the occurrence or the pressure of gate opening. On the other hand, single gas isotherms hint at the dependency of separation performance of MUF-23 on pressure. Hence, to demonstrate the effect of flexibility on separation performance of MUF-23 under dynamic conditions and pressure-dependent separation performance of MUF-23, we measure its breakthrough curve before and after gate opening pressures.

Firstly, we measured the single gas breakthrough curves of CO₂ at different partial pressures to see if we can detect different gate opening behaviour which may then underlie a pressure-dependent separation performance. To do this, a mixture of CO₂ and an inert gas (helium) was introduced to an adsorption column packed with 0.85 g of MUF-23 at 273 K and 1.02 bar. Four different mixtures of CO₂/He as shown in Table 3.4 were introduced to the column. Three of them have a CO₂ partial pressure before gate opening pressure and the other one has a CO₂ partial pressure after gate opening pressure. It should be noted that in all of these experiments, the inlet flow rate of CO₂ was kept constant (3 mlN/min).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet mixture (CO₂/He)</th>
<th>CO₂ partial pressure (torr)</th>
<th>CO₂ flow rate (mlN/min)</th>
<th>Helium flow rate (mlN/min)</th>
<th>Total pressure (bar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/5</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4. Feed composition for single gas breakthrough experiments.

Single gas breakthrough curves are presented in Figure 3.29. As expected, CO₂ broke through from the column earlier in a mixture of CO₂/He 50/50, compared to the mixture with higher percentage of CO₂. This is due to the lower CO₂ uptake capacity at low partial pressures, which leads to an early saturation of adsorption column i.e. the bed takes up a lower amount of CO₂, thus leading to an earlier breakthrough of CO₂. This breakthrough time increases to 22 min for the mixture with 95% CO₂. Comparing the breakthrough time between two inlet feeds with 70 and 95% CO₂, there seems to be a significant difference in breakthrough time. This might correspond to the abrupt jump in gas uptake brought about by the structural deformation of the MOF which is expected in this region.
To investigate this, we decided to simulate the breakthrough curves of CO$_2$, assuming there is not any jump in its adsorption isotherm, i.e. no gate opening phenomena and compare it with experimental breakthrough and simulated breakthrough with the assumption that there is gate opening phenomena. If CO$_2$ breaks through earlier for MUF-23 under the assumption of no gate opening phenomena compared to the inclusion of the gate opening phenomena, then it can be concluded that the flexible nature of MUF-23 has improved its separation performance through a pressure-dependent mechanism. First, a reliable mass transfer coefficient should be obtained. We proceeded under the assumption that the mass transfer coefficient before and after flexing should be different. Breakthrough curves were simulated for the four mixtures of CO$_2$ and compared with the experimental breakthrough curves (Figure 3.30). It should be noted that the simulated breakthrough for the 95% CO$_2$ mixture is predicted considering the flexible nature of MUF-23 (using the DSLF model, Figure 3.28). Also we assumed zero adsorption of helium by MUF-23. A reliable mass transfer coefficient for the simulated breakthrough curves was then estimated from the experimental breakthrough curves. A mass transfer coefficient of 0.0085 s$^{-1}$ and 0.0133 s$^{-1}$ was found to be the optimum value, leading to a satisfactory match between predicted and experimental breakthrough curves before and after flexing, respectively (Figure 3.30).
Identical operating conditions, feed characteristics, adsorbent amount and bed dimension was used to predict these breakthrough curves.

**Figure 3.30.** Predicted single-component breakthrough curves of CO$_2$ for gas streams with different partial pressure of CO$_2$ in a column packed with MUF-23 at 273 K and 1.02 bar in comparison with experimental breakthrough curves (from Fig. 3.29).

Having the tuned mass transfer coefficient in hand for the framework structure prior to flexing, a breakthrough curve was then estimated for a mixture of 95/5 CO$_2$/He (at 1 bar). This assumes no gate opening process occurs (Figure 3.32). To simulate breakthrough curve with this assumption, the CO$_2$ adsorption isotherm of MUF-23 was refitted only using the adsorption data points up to the gate opening pressure, as indicated in Figure 3.31 (red line).

These new fitting parameters were used further for the simulation of breakthrough curves. A comparison of breakthrough curves for MUF-23 that both consider (black line) and neglect (pink line) the gate opening phenomena are presented in Figure 3.32. It shows the flexibility of MUF-23 has improved the performance of MUF-23 by increasing the CO$_2$ breakthrough time from 20 min to 24 min. This jump in breakthrough time corresponds to the gate opening phenomena in MUF-23. In this way the flexibility of MOFs can be used to enhance gas separation performance under dynamic conditions.
Figure 3.31. Fitting parameters for CO\(_2\) adsorption isotherm by MUF-23 at 273 K before and after cut-off. DSLF model was used before cut-off and Langmuir model after cut-off.

Figure 3.32. Predicted single gas breakthrough curves of CO\(_2\) for a mixture of 95/5 CO\(_2\)/He in a column packed with MUF-23 at 273 K and 1.02 bar, assuming MUF-23 as a rigid MOFs in comparison with a flexible model.

At the end of this chapter, the performance of MUF-23 for separation of CO\(_2\) from N\(_2\) is presented as an example of a binary mixture with only one of the components (CO\(_2\)) benefitting from the gate opening behaviour. This case study exemplifies the positive effect
gate opening phenomena can have on competitive gas separation processes. Thus, experimental breakthrough curves were measured for two mixtures - 60/40 and 85/15 CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} - at 273 K and 1.02 bar. The CO\textsubscript{2} partial pressure in the 60/40 mixture is lower than the gate opening pressure, while its partial pressure in the 85/15 mixture is expected to induce gate opening.

The experimental breakthrough curves are shown in Figure 3.33. These breakthrough curves show MUF-23 can successfully separate CO\textsubscript{2} from N\textsubscript{2}, as N\textsubscript{2} elutes through the bed first to yield an outflow of pure N\textsubscript{2} gas. Mass transfer coefficients were then obtained by tuning the predicted breakthrough curves to best match the experimental ones. A mass transfer coefficient of 0.0133 s\textsuperscript{-1} was deduced for CO\textsubscript{2} in this way.

![Figure 3.33. Experimental and predicted breakthrough curves for a mixture of (a) 60/40 CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} and (b) 85/15 CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} in column packed with MUF-23 at 273 K and 1.02 bar.](image-url)

As before, this mass transfer coefficient was then used to predict breakthrough curves for a mixture of 85/15 CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} under two different assumptions: (i) that MUF-23 is inflexible (red line) and (ii) that MUF-23 is flexible (Figure 3.34). The predicted breakthrough curves assuming no flexibility shows that CO\textsubscript{2} elutes 2.5 min earlier than MUF-23 compared to assuming flexibility. This 2.5 min difference correspond to the beneficial effect of the gate opening phenomenon, where framework opens up more space, thus resulting in an enhanced preferential adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2}. The elution times of N\textsubscript{2} passing through a bed of MUF-23 are similar considering both flexibility and inflexibility. This indicates that little extra N\textsubscript{2} is adsorbed upon framework expansion, and CO\textsubscript{2} is the main beneficiary of the additional pore space created in the gate-opened framework. This is consistent with the high calculated selectivity for CO\textsubscript{2} over N\textsubscript{2} at 1 bar based on single-component isotherms (Figure 3.28).
3.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, the synthesis, characterization and separation performance of an isoreticular family of MUF-15 frameworks functionalized with a series of different functional groups, namely fluoro (MUF-18), hydroxy (MUF-19), bromo (MUF-20), nitro (MUF-21), methyl (MUF-22) and methoxy (MUF-23), representing a broad range of sizes and functional properties, was reported. As these functionalities point into the void spaces, the pore characteristics and surface polarities of these MOFs vary significantly, resulting in different adsorption behaviour for guest molecules. As expected, introducing the functional groups into MUF-15 reduces the pore volume and surface area. However, BET surface area and void fraction calculations based on N\textsubscript{2} isotherms at 77 K showed that the introduction of bulkier functional groups is not proportionally in line with the decrease of surface area and pore volume. For instance, both the BET surface area and pore volume of MUF-22 (methyl functionalized MUF-15) are higher than that of MUF-18 (fluoro functionalized MUF-15), while the methyl group is larger than the fluoro group. Isosteric heat of adsorptions calculation demonstrated that MUF-18 and MUF-21 interact stronger with guest molecules (C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}, CO\textsubscript{2}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}) compared to MUF-15 and other derivatives. Interestingly, the water stability of these derivatives also significantly changed upon introduction of different functional groups. MUF-22 and MUF-23 indicated extraordinary water stability, i.e. these frameworks maintains their porosity and structure after six months exposure to humid air, which is much longer than the one week stability of MUF-15.
Further, the separation performance of these MOFs was evaluated based on IAST for three binary mixtures of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \), \( \text{C}_3\text{H}_2/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) and \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2/\text{CO}_2 \). MUF-15 indicated the highest selectivity (~2) at the whole range of pressures for \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) mixture, showing that introduction of functionalized groups do not improve the \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) separation performance of MUF-15. As these functional groups mainly enhance the polarity of pore surface, they increase the interaction of frameworks with \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) as more polar gas, thus decreasing the selectivity of the frameworks for adsorption of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) over \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \). Interestingly, MUF-21 which is functionalized with nitro groups shows reverse selectivity for \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \), wherein its selectivity for \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) drops to 0.39 at 1 bar. That can be explained by the introduction of polar nitro groups that interact more strongly with the polar \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) molecules. These results proves the underlying mechanism of ethane-selective MOFs: More inert surfaces enhance the ethane selectivity of frameworks, while a highly polar surface favours the adsorption of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \).

Surprisingly, MUF-21 and MUF-23 showed flexibility upon inclusion of guest molecules such as \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \), \( \text{CO}_2 \), \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \) and \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) at ambient conditions. We believe this flexibility originates from the rotation of phenyl rings upon the inclusion of guest molecules, thus opening up more space. This is also believed that MUF-15 and all of its family have flexible structures varying in the gate opening pressure and temperature. MUF-23 was further investigated to see the effect of flexibility on its separation performance. A combination of predicted and experimental breakthrough proved that the gate opening process improves the performance of MUF-23 for the separation of \( \text{CO}_2 \) from \( \text{N}_2 \).

### 3.4 Experimental and computational section

#### 3.4.1 General procedures

All starting compounds and solvents were used as received from commercial sources without further purification unless otherwise noted.

#### 3.4.2 Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA)

Thermogravimetric analyses were performed on a TA Instruments Q50 instrument. Measurements were made under a \( \text{N}_2 \) flow with a heating rate of 5 \( ^\circ \text{C} \) /min. The mother liquor of the as-synthesized MOF crystals was replaced with fresh methanol multiple times. The MOF crystals were then evacuated under high vacuum to afford desolvated MOFs. The exposure time to atmosphere for these MOFs before doing TGA was around 5-20 minutes.
3.4.3 Single crystal X-ray diffraction

As per Chapter 2, except that MUF-18 and MUF-22 data were collected at the Australian Synchrotron.

As-synthesized MUF-18, MUF-22 and MUF-23 were soaked in fresh methanol and was replenished few times within a day to produce crystals suitable for single crystal X-ray diffraction analyses. MOF crystals were analysed right after removing them from methanol.

Room temperature data collection also produced better refinement statistics than low temperature data collection.

3.4.4 Powder X-ray diffraction patterns

As per Chapter 2. The data were obtained from freshly prepared MOF samples that had been washed several times with MeOH. MOF crystals were analysed right after removing them from methanol. Predicted powder patterns were generated from single crystal structures using Mercury.

3.4.5 Powder X-ray diffraction patterns under vacuum

The PXRD pattern for samples were measured under vacuum using a 0.5 mm capillary. After washing as-synthesized samples several times with methanol, they were dried under vacuum at room temperature for 2 hours. Then they were ground gently using a pestle and mortar. The ground samples were then transferred to a 0.5 mm. The very top of capillary was then blocked with glass wool to make sure MOFs are kept in the capillary upon vacuum. The capillary was connected to a Quantachrome Autosorb iQ2 and kept under vacuum for 10 hours while being heated at 110 °C. The very top of the capillary was then burned using a flame gun. The burned capillary was then mounted to Rigaku Spider X-ray diffractometer for further PXRD studies.

3.4.6 Aging experiments on activated frameworks

After washing as-synthesized samples several times with MeOH, they were activated and were aged in air at 70-85% relative humidity and 20 °C.
3.4.7 Modeling, calculations and simulations

Single crystal structures of MUF-18, MUF-22 and MUF-23 were used directly for all the calculations and simulations without modification. The Zeo++ code and RASPA were used to characterize the geometric features of the crystal structures and its derivatives by calculating the pore volume with the use of a helium probe atom, the pore limiting diameter, the largest cavity diameter, and the surface area accessible to a H₂ probe (a N₂ probe produce a surface area of zero) using the coordinated found by X-ray crystallography.

3.4.8 Gas adsorption measurements

As per Chapter 2. The as-synthesized samples were washed with anhydrous methanol several times and about 25-100 mg was transferred into a pre-dried and weighed sample tube and heated at rate of 10°C/min to a temperature of 120-130 °C under a dynamic vacuum with a turbomolecular pump for 20 hours (MUF-19 was activated at room temperature).

3.4.9 IAST calculations

As per Chapter 2.

3.4.10 Breakthrough curve measurements

In a typical breakthrough experiment, 0.85 g of activated MUF-23 was placed in an adsorption column (6.4 mm in diameter × 11 cm in length) to form a fixed bed. The adsorbent was activated at 130 °C under high vacuum for 12 hours and then the column was left under vacuum for another 3 hours while being cooled to 20 °C. The column was then purged under a 20 mL/min flow of He gas for 1 hr at 1.1 bar prior to the breakthrough experiment. A gas mixture containing either CO₂/He or CO₂/N₂ with different compositions was introduced to the column at 1.02 bar and 20 °C (See table 3.4). The operating pressure was controlled at 1.1 bar with a back-pressure regulator. The outlet composition was continuously monitored by the mass spectrometer until complete breakthrough was observed.

Table 3.5. Feed composition for single and multiple gas breakthrough experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inlet mixture</th>
<th>CO₂ partial pressure (torr)</th>
<th>CO₂ flow rate (mlN/min)</th>
<th>N₂ flow rate (mlN/min)</th>
<th>Total pressure (bar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60/40</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85/15</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.11 Breakthrough curve simulations

As per Chapter 2. A bed with dimension of 100 mm in length and 6.4 mm in diameter with 0.85 g adsorbent was considered for simulation.
Chapter 4

A Series of Isostructural Metal-Organic Frameworks for Efficient Adsorption of CO$_2$

2.1 Introduction

One of the most critical environmental issues of our age is the escalating release of CO$_2$ into the atmosphere. CO$_2$ release principally stems from the combustion of fossil fuels. Atmospheric CO$_2$ levels can be reduced by using less petroleum and natural gas, sequestering the CO$_2$ at point sources where significant quantities are released, or capturing it directly from air. In addition to fossil fuel combustion, significant amounts of CO$_2$ are released during the production of electricity from geothermal vents and the sweetening of natural gas and biogas (natural gas produced from biomass). Currently, state-of-the-art technology for CO$_2$ capture involves absorption of CO$_2$ using wet amine chemisorptions such as primary and secondary alkyl because of their large capacity and high selectivity for acidic gas. However, implementation of these methodologies is associated with several drawbacks including high energy consumption during the regeneration, solvent loss due to the degradation and evaporation, and corrosive nature of amines. Hence, the search for materials that not only show high CO$_2$ capacity and selectivity but also require mild regeneration condition is of major importance. More broadly, adsorbents that are specific to CO$_2$ can also be implemented for the purification of important industrial gas streams such as syngas and to eliminate CO$_2$ from enclosed atmospheres.

Many MOFs are effective CO$_2$ sequestration materials. Unlike the classical zeolites, which have a limited number of structures, more than 75,000 MOFs have been synthesized through the selection availability of a rich library of inorganic and organic building blocks. Moreover, thanks to their inherent modularity, MOFs can enable exquisite control over pore-size and pore-chemistry. Several strategies have been employed to improve the CO$_2$ capture performance of MOFs for carbon capture processes, such as functionalization of the pores with highly polar groups or introduction of exposed metal sites within the framework. These endow the frameworks with electric dipoles that align with the CO$_2$ quadrupole to enhance the uptake and selectivity towards this guest. Even though these approaches have led to materials with enhanced separation performance, they
typically suffer from low selectivities, particularly at high pressures, or a loss in capacity in the presence of water due to the competitive adsorption of other impurities in the mixture.\textsuperscript{38, 142, 292-301} Furthermore, the underlying mechanism of such a separation originates from the increased affinity of the material for CO\textsubscript{2} which incurs high energy penalty during regeneration when it is removed from the framework. For example, CuBTTri with a pores functionalized by N,N'-dimethylethylenediamine shows adsorption enthalpies of $-96$ kJ/mol.\textsuperscript{302}

As an alternative to enhancing the affinity for CO\textsubscript{2} through strong electrostatic interactions, it can be adsorbed through cooperative effect of appropriate pore size and optimal electrostatic interactions. A pore dimension of similar to molecular size of CO\textsubscript{2} molecule enables close contact of CO\textsubscript{2} and pore surface, and favourable host-guest interaction guarantee an efficient adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2}. However, this is very hard to achieve in practice since it requires exquisite control over the structure of materials to produce rigid pores with apertures fixed precisely between the kinetic diameters of the species of interest, and in the same time a favourable orientation of electrostatics forces between adsorbate and adsorbent. Please refer to Chapter 1 regarding CO\textsubscript{2} adsorption in MOFs and their different adsorption behaviour.

\textbf{4.2 Results and discussion}

A family of MOFs with the formula of [M(Haip)\textsubscript{2}], where M = Co(II), Mn(II), or Ni(II) and H\textsubscript{2}aip is 5-aminoisophthalic acid, was synthesized. These materials are coordination polymers built up from reaction of metal salts and 5-aminoisophthalic acid. This structure was first reported in 2006 with cobalt(II) as the metal ion.\textsuperscript{303} We have termed this material MUF-16. Few years later, its manganese(II) analogous was synthesized in 2015 (termed MUF-16(Mn)).\textsuperscript{304} We also added the nickel(II) version to this family, MUF-16(Ni). MUF-16(Mn) and MUF-16(Ni) were synthesized based on the reported procedure with slightly modification.\textsuperscript{304}

A mixture of M(ClO\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{2}·6H\textsubscript{2}O (where M = Mn or Ni) (1.25 mmol), 5-aminoisophthalic acid (2.50 mmol, 0.45 g), and NH\textsubscript{4}NO\textsubscript{3} (2.50 mmol, 0.20 g) with a mixed-solvent of CH\textsubscript{3}CN (20 mL) and CH\textsubscript{3}OH (15 mL) were sonicated for 20 min and sealed in 100 mL of Teflon-lined stainless steel vessel, and heated at 160 °C for two days under autogenous pressure. After cooling the oven to room temperature, the resulting brownish crystals were isolated by decanting off the mother liquor, washed with methanol several times and dried under
vacuum at 130 °C for 20 h. It yielded 0.21 g (36% based on Mn) of guest free MUF-16(Mn) and 0.28 g (47% based on Ni) of guest-free MUF-16(Ni) (Figure 4.1).

MUF-16 synthesis procedure was developed in our group to afford higher yield, shorter reaction time and milder synthesis condition. A mixture of Co(OAc)\(_2\).4H\(_2\)O (0.625 g, 2.5 mmol), 5-aminoisophthalic acid (1.8 g, 10 mmol), methanol (80 mL), and H\(_2\)O (5 mL) were sonicated for 20 min in a sealed in a 500 mL Schott bottle then heated in a pre-heated oven at 85 °C for 2 hours under autogenous pressure. After cooling the oven to room temperature, the resulting pink crystals were isolated by decanting off the mother liquor, washed with methanol several times and dried under vacuum at 130 °C for 20 h, yielding 0.99 g (90% based on cobalt) guest-free MUF-16 (Figure 4.1).

![Figure 4.1](image)

**Figure 4.1** Synthetic routes to the MUF-16 family and optical micrographs of the reaction products.

The crystal structures of MUF-16 family were resolved by single crystal X-ray diffraction analysis thanks to their excellent crystallinity. The MUF-16 family is isostructural, crystallizing in the \(I2/a\) space group (Table 4.1), in agreement with the previous reports.\(^{303-304}\) The frameworks consist of M(II) atoms with octahedral geometry lining up into a 1D chain along the crystallographic b axis through sharing two carboxylate groups from two Haip ligands (Figure 4.2a). Two adjacent chains are further pillared into 2D sheets by Haip ligands spreading along the bc plane (Figure 4.2b).
### Table 4.1. Crystal data and structure refinement for MUF-16, MUF-16(Mn) and MUF-16(Ni).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MUF-16</th>
<th>MUF-16(Mn)</th>
<th>MUF-16(Ni)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formula</strong></td>
<td>Co(Haip)(_2).2H(_2)O</td>
<td>Mn(Haip)(_2).3H(_2)O</td>
<td>Ni(Haip)(_2).3H(_2)O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCDC deposition #</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empirical formula</strong></td>
<td>C(<em>{16})H(</em>{16})CoN(<em>2)O(</em>{10})</td>
<td>C(<em>{16})H(</em>{16})MnN(<em>2)O(</em>{11})</td>
<td>C(<em>{16})H(</em>{18})N(<em>2)NiO(</em>{11})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formula weight</strong></td>
<td>455.24</td>
<td>471.28</td>
<td>473.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temperature/K</strong></td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crystal system</strong></td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space group</strong></td>
<td>I2/a</td>
<td>I2/a</td>
<td>I2/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a/Å</strong></td>
<td>15.3514(15)</td>
<td>25.2367(14)</td>
<td>15.4963(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b/Å</strong></td>
<td>4.4232(4)</td>
<td>4.57990(10)</td>
<td>4.5780(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c/Å</strong></td>
<td>25.614(4)</td>
<td>15.4895(11)</td>
<td>25.230(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>α/°</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>β/°</strong></td>
<td>94.294(10)</td>
<td>96.046(8)</td>
<td>96.177(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>γ/°</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume/Å(^3)</strong></td>
<td>1734.4(4)</td>
<td>1780.34(17)</td>
<td>1779.5(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ρ(_{calc}) /g cm(^{-3})</strong></td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>1.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>μ/mm(^{-1})</strong></td>
<td>8.357</td>
<td>6.682</td>
<td>2.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F(000)</strong></td>
<td>932.0</td>
<td>972.0</td>
<td>856.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2Θ range for data collection/°</strong></td>
<td>11.56 to 100.864</td>
<td>7.044 to 143.852</td>
<td>11.488 to 88.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index ranges</strong></td>
<td>-13 ≤ h ≤ 15, -4 ≤ k ≤ 4, -25 ≤ l ≤ 24</td>
<td>-24 ≤ h ≤ 30, -5 ≤ k ≤ 5, -18 ≤ l ≤ 18</td>
<td>-14 ≤ h ≤ 14, -3 ≤ k ≤ 4, -22 ≤ l ≤ 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflections collected</strong></td>
<td>5496</td>
<td>14132</td>
<td>5778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent reflections</strong></td>
<td>908 [R(<em>{int}) = 0.0848, R(</em>{sigma}) = 0.0719]</td>
<td>1668 [R(<em>{int}) = 0.1054, R(</em>{sigma}) = 0.1158]</td>
<td>698 [R(<em>{int}) = 0.0863, R(</em>{sigma}) = 0.0668]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data/restraints/parameters</strong></td>
<td>908/2/137</td>
<td>1668/1/149</td>
<td>698/0/126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goodness-of-fit on F(^2)</strong></td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>1.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final R indices [I&gt;2σ(I)]</strong></td>
<td>R(_1) = 0.0822, wR(_2) = 0.2236</td>
<td>R(_1) = 0.0740, wR(_2) = 0.1821</td>
<td>R(_1) = 0.1344, wR(_2) = 0.3363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final R indices [all data]</strong></td>
<td>R(_1) = 0.1020, wR(_2) = 0.2763</td>
<td>R(_1) = 0.1350, wR(_2) = 0.2421</td>
<td>R(_1) = 0.1714, wR(_2) = 0.4053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Largest diff. peak/hole / e Å(^3)</strong></td>
<td>0.81/-0.49</td>
<td>0.57/-0.51</td>
<td>0.76/-0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interestingly, only one of the two carboxylate groups of each Haip ligand coordinates, while the other one acts as a hydrogen-bond acceptor and donor (Figure 4.2a). This hydrogen bond assembles the layers into a 3D supramolecular open framework (figure 4.2c), exhibiting one-dimensional channels running along the crystallographic $a$ axis with an approximate dimension of $\sim 3.1 \times 5.9 \, \text{Å}^2$ (Figure 4.2d,e).

**Figure 4.2** The structure of MUF-16 can be viewed as the connection of 1D Co–O–C–O chains (a) by Haip ligands pillared by strong hydrogen bonds (b), resulting in a 3D framework (c) (cobalt, cyan; oxygen, red; carbon, grey; hydrogen white). (d,e) 1D channels and pore dimension of MUF-16 illustrated by the Connolly surface defined with a probe of diameter 1.0 Å.

Guest-free MUF-16 was readily produced at 130 °C *in vacuo*. The phase purity of activated MUF-16 was confirmed by matching the experimental and simulated powder X-ray diffraction patterns (Figure 4.3-4.5) and elemental analysis (Table 4.2).

**Table 4.2** Elemental analysis of MUF-16 family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C: calcd./found</th>
<th>H: calcd./found</th>
<th>N: calcd./found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUF-16.H$_2$O</td>
<td>43.91/43.49</td>
<td>3.20/3.23</td>
<td>6.40/6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-16(Mn).H$_2$O</td>
<td>44.31/44.05</td>
<td>3.23/3.42</td>
<td>6.46/6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-16(Ni).H$_2$O</td>
<td>43.93/44.18</td>
<td>3.20/3.57</td>
<td>6.40/6.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.3 PXRD patterns of MUF-16 showing that its structure remains unchanged after activation at 130 °C under vacuum, after isotherm measurements, after breakthrough experiments, after exposure to an air with relative humidity of >80% for at least 10 months and after immersion in water for two weeks.

Figure 4.4. PXRD patterns of MUF-16(Mn) showing that its structure remains unchanged after activation at 130 °C under vacuum, after isotherm measurements, after exposure to an air with relative humidity of >80% for at least 6 months and after immersion in water for 40 days.
Figure 4.5 PXRD patterns of MUF-16(Ni) showing that its structure remains unchanged after activation at 130 °C under vacuum, after isotherm measurements, after exposure to an air with relative humidity of >80% for at least 6 months and after immersion in water for 40 days.

Thermogravimetry and PXRD demonstrated that the MUF-16 family is stable up to 350 °C under nitrogen (Figure 4.6), in a laboratory atmosphere (80% humidity) for at least six months (Figure 4.3-4.5) and in water for two weeks (Figure 4.3-4.5).

Figure 4.6 TGA curve of MUF-16, MUF-16(Mn), and MUF-16(Ni).

The high stability of MUF-16 towards water can be attributed to the strong metal-ligand bonds including nitrogen- and oxygen-bonding with metal ions as well as strong hydrogen bonding between ligands. The stability of MUF-16 family was further confirmed by
measuring CO₂ adsorption isotherms of MUF-16 after exposure to a humid laboratory atmosphere for 6 months or soaking in water for 48 hours, where the adsorption capacity remained constant.

Figure 4.7 CO₂ adsorption isotherms (293 K) of as-synthesized MUF-16 after four consecutive adsorption-desorption cycles, after exposing it to air with ~80% humidity for 6 months, and after immersion in water for 48 hours.

A N₂ adsorption isotherm at 77 K established the permanent porosity of the MUF-16 family and gave BET surface areas of 215, 209 and 238 m²/g for Co, Mn and Ni, respectively, and a pore volume of around 0.11 cm³/g for all of them (Figure 4.8 and see appendix C for BET calculations). These values are comparable with the geometric surface area and pore volume calculated from the crystallographic coordinates (Table 4.3).

Figure 4.8 Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of N₂ for MUF-16 (black), MUF-16(Mn) (red) and MUF-16(Ni) (blue) measured at 77 K.
Table 4.3. Some calculated and experimentally determined properties of MUF-16 family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>MUF-16</th>
<th>MUF-16(Mn)</th>
<th>MUF-16(Ni)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geometric surface area (m²/g, Zeo++)</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET surface area (m²/g, from experimental N₂ isotherm/77 K)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore volume (cm³/g, RASPA2)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore volume (cm³/g, from experimental N₂ isotherm/77 K)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest cavity diameter (Å)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore limiting diameter (Å)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pore dimension is perfectly matched with that of CO₂ molecules (3.32 × 3.34 × 5.7 Å³), enabling excellent accommodation of CO₂ molecules. Equally important, the pore surface of MUF-16 possesses a favourable distribution of electrostatic forces. In the middle, the electron-donor oxygen atoms of non-coordinated carboxyl groups create a negatively charged environment, while on the corners electron-acceptor hydrogen atoms of amine group and phenyl rings make a strong positive adsorption sites. Such an arrangement of electrostatics forces in narrow channels of MUF-16 is particularly favourable for adsorption of molecules like CO₂ with an electropositive carbon atom at the centre and partially negatively charged oxygen atoms in the termini. Hence, low-pressure CO₂ adsorption isotherms were collected on MUF-16 at two temperatures of 293 K and 273 K (Figures 4.9). These frameworks take up a considerable amount of CO₂ for MUF-16 and MUF-16(Ni) (2.13 mmol g⁻¹, 48 cm³(STP) g⁻¹), and slightly higher for MUF-16(Mn) (2.25 mmol g⁻¹, 50.5 cm³(STP) g⁻¹) at 293 K and 1 bar (Figure 4.9a), which equates to approximately 0.9 molecules of CO₂ per metal site and occupation of 50% of the overall pore volume by CO₂ molecules (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4 Uptake capacity of CO₂ at 293 K and 1 bar for MUF-16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uptake (Wt%)</th>
<th>Molecules of adsorbate per unit cell</th>
<th>Molecules of adsorbate per cobalt</th>
<th>Occupied fraction of void volume*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This the fraction of the total free volume of MUF-16 that is occupied by adsorbate molecules. This was calculated from the accessible void volume given by the N₂ isotherms at 77K, the molecular volume of the adsorbates and the total number of adsorbate molecules.
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Figure 4.9 Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of CO$_2$ measured at (a) 293 K and (b) 273 K for MUF-16 (black), MUF-16(Mn) (red), and MUF-16(Ni) (blue).

The slightly higher adsorption uptake of MUF-16(Mn) can be attributed to stronger interaction of Mn sites with CO$_2$ molecules or larger pore volume of MUF-16(Mn). CO$_2$ adsorption isotherms of MUF-16 family at 293 K are relatively steep at low pressures and becomes almost plateau at higher pressures, indicating strong affinity of frameworks with CO$_2$ molecules and thus saturation at pressures around 1 bar. In other words, due to the high affinity of MOF for CO$_2$, framework can adsorb quite a high amount of CO$_2$ even at very low pressures leading to an early saturation of framework. This can be confirmed with the adsorption isotherm at 273 K, where CO$_2$ adsorption uptake at saturation is not enhanced much for this family (2.32 mmol g$^{-1}$, 52 cm$^3$(STP) g$^{-1}$).

To evaluate the binding strength between MUF-16 and CO$_2$, the isosteric heat of adsorption ($Q_m$) was calculated from experimental adsorption isotherms using a virial method. The $Q_m$ at zero-coverage is around 32 kJ/mol for MUF-16 and 37 kJ/mol for MUF-16(Mn) and MUF-16(Ni), which increases at higher loadings (Figure 4.10). This rise can be attributed to the intermolecular interactions amongst the adsorbates, which is fully consistent with the crystallographically-observed pore dimensions and the requirement for close packing of adsorbate molecules in the pores as the adsorbent approaches saturation. This was experimentally verified by SCXRD (vide infra).
The $Q_{st}$ for CO$_2$ is moderately high compared to other MOFs that lack open metal sites or polar functional groups and lower than that of MOFs with open metal sites. For example CO$_2$ heat of adsorption by Mg-MOF-74 at low coverage is around 43 kJ/mol which is quite higher than that of MUF-16 family.$^{305}$ From a practical standpoint, the moderately high value of $Q_{st}$ at different loadings is a positive attribute as regeneration energies in separation processes are expected to be low and the risk of irreversible poisoning by impurities such as H$_2$O and H$_2$S is diminished.

To visualize and structurally understand this adsorption behaviour of MUF-16, single-crystal studies was conducted to determine binding conformation of CO$_2$ molecules in MUF-16. Single crystal structure, PXRD patterns and CO$_2$ adsorption isotherms of MUF-16 family confirmed earlier that they are isostructural with similar CO$_2$ adsorption behaviour, so individual single crystals of MUF-16(Mn), which are brown colour, were used for single crystal X-ray studies (single crystals of MUF-16 were not visible in the capillary due to their light colour). We successfully loaded CO$_2$ molecules in the channel of MUF-16(Mn) using a flame-sealed glass capillary. After transferring the single crystal into the capillary, it was first activated in vacuo and the guest-free structure was determined crystallographically (Table 4.4). By backfilling the capillary with CO$_2$ to a pressure of around 1 bar following activation, the structure of MUF-16(Mn) loaded with this guest was determined crystallographically (Table 4.5 and see section 4.4 of this chapter for further details). The
great challenge in this experiment was making sure there is not any water left in the capillary as could be adsorbed over CO$_2$ even if a tiny amount of it exists.

Table 4.5 SCXRD data and refinement details of vacuumed and CO$_2$-loaded MUF-16(Mn).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>Under vacuum (Mn)</th>
<th>Loaded with CO$_2$ (Mn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>Mn(Haip)$_2$</td>
<td>Mn(Haip)$_2$:CO$_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
<td>C$<em>{16}$H$</em>{12}$MnN$_2$O$_8$</td>
<td>C$<em>{17}$H$</em>{12}$MnN$<em>2$O$</em>{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
<td>415.22</td>
<td>459.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature/K</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td>I$2/a</td>
<td>I$2/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/Å</td>
<td>15.4872(11)</td>
<td>15.5719(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b/Å</td>
<td>4.51930(10)</td>
<td>4.52010(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/Å</td>
<td>25.4913(13)</td>
<td>25.438(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α/°</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β/°</td>
<td>97.080(16)</td>
<td>97.108(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ/°</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume/Å$^3$</td>
<td>1770.56(17)</td>
<td>1776.7(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{calc}$/g cm$^{-3}$</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>1.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ/mm$^{-1}$</td>
<td>6.512</td>
<td>6.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(000)</td>
<td>844.0</td>
<td>932.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Θ range for data collection/°</td>
<td>11.514 to 117.84</td>
<td>12.672 to 91.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index ranges</td>
<td>-17 ≤ h ≤ 11, -4 ≤ k ≤ 4, -28 ≤ l ≤ 28</td>
<td>-14 ≤ h ≤ 14, -4 ≤ k ≤ 4, -23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collected</td>
<td>7515</td>
<td>8177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reflections</td>
<td>1214 [R$<em>{int}$ = 0.1632, R$</em>{sigma}$ = 0.1964]</td>
<td>713 [R$<em>{int}$ = 0.1104, R$</em>{sigma}$ = 0.0804]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/restraints/parameters</td>
<td>1214/0/129</td>
<td>713/90/136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit on F$^2$</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>1.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [I&gt;=2σ (I)]</td>
<td>R$_1$ = 0.0510, wR$_2$ = 0.0954</td>
<td>R$_1$ = 0.0868, wR$_2$ = 0.2280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [all data]</td>
<td>R$_1$ = 0.1341, wR$_2$ = 0.1112</td>
<td>R$_1$ = 0.1278, wR$_2$ = 0.2915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest diff. peak/hole / e Å$^{-3}$</td>
<td>0.35/-0.48</td>
<td>0.56/-0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the diffraction data revealed little change to the framework itself. The CO$_2$ guest molecules were clearly visible in its 1D channels in the Fourier difference map. There was found, in total, one CO$_2$ molecules per cobalt ion which is in agreement with the adsorption isotherms. The CO$_2$ molecules are positioned at an angle to the pore axis (Figure 4.11a). Individual CO$_2$ molecules occupy either of two sites that are related by crystallographic symmetry. A strong electron density was observed in the middle of pore and two weaker dense area in the angles. The central dense area then was assigned to be oxygen with a fixed occupancy of 1, while the other two area were set to be oxygen and carbon atoms with a fixed occupancy of half. It equates with one CO$_2$ molecules with occupancy of one.
In accord with the increase contribute to the moderately high $Q_{st}$, the oxygen atoms of one of the CO$_2$ guest molecules forms close N-H···O and C-H···O interactions with the phenyl and amino functionalities of Haip ligand with a distance of 2.42 and 2.83 Å, respectively (Figure 4.11a). Similarly, the carbon atom of adsorbed CO$_2$ molecule forms a C···O interaction with oxygen atom of uncoordinated carboxylate group with a distance of 3.04 Å. This suggests that the adsorbed CO$_2$ molecules are perfectly surrounded by favourable adsorption sites both in the corners and middle of pores in MUF-16(Mn). Notably, due to the diagonally-oriented adsorption sites of the pores, adsorbed CO$_2$ molecules are distributed in the 1D channels in a Z-shaped manner (Figure 4.11b). Such an orientation of CO$_2$ molecules in the channels lead to intermolecular C$\delta^+$$\cdots$O$\delta^-$ interactions between adjacent CO$_2$ molecules with a C···O distance of 3.91 Å. These underlie the observed increase in $Q_{st}$ as a function of gas loading.

**Figure 4.11** (a) The adsorption sites of CO$_2$ molecules in MUF-16(Mn) as determined experimentally by single-crystal X-ray diffraction (The other CO$_2$ site is equivalent by symmetry). (b) The intermolecular interactions observed between adsorbed CO$_2$ molecules in the channels of MUF-16(Mn). The dashed lines indicate a C···O distance of 3.91 Å. The CO$_2$ molecules are shown in representative orientations that do not take the crystallographic disorder into consideration (manganese, light purple; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; carbon, grey; hydrogen, white; pore surface, light blue).

The propensity of MUF-16 to adsorb CO$_2$ can be also explained by the complementarity of its electric dipole with the polarization of the MUF-16 pore surface. The electron-rich oxygen atoms of the non-coordinated carboxyl groups of the framework create an environment with a build-up of partial negatively charge, while at the pore corners the electron-deficient hydrogen atoms of the amino group and the phenyl rings generate regions of partial positive charge. Now, considering the adsorption of CO$_2$, this guest molecule will occupy sites that are compatible in terms of both size and electrostatics. The CO$_2$ adsorbates can align their quadrupole to in the channels so that its regions of high electron density on
its oxygen atoms sit alongside the positively charged regions of the pore surface. In addition, the carbon atom of CO₂, which has a partial positive charge, complements the framework oxygen atoms. This framework pocket has an ideal size to optimize the noncovalent interactions with the CO₂ guests (Figure 4.12).

![Figure 4.12 Complementarity of CO₂ molecule electrostatic distribution with the polarization of the MUF-16 pore surface.](image)

The validity of this model of CO₂ binding in MUF-16 was strengthened by assessing its adsorption of nitrous oxide. N₂O was chosen as a reference gas as its molecular size and electrostatic distribution is nearly identical to that of CO₂ (Figure 4.13 and Table 4.6).

![Figure 4.13 Electrostatic potential maps of (a) CO₂ and (b) N₂O. Blue/green = positive; red/orange = negative.](image)

### Table 4.6. Physicochemical characteristics of CO₂ and other relevant gases.¹¹⁰,²³⁵-²³⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boiling point (K)</th>
<th>Molecular dimensions (Å)</th>
<th>Molecular volume (from CPK model) (Å³)</th>
<th>Polarizability (Å³)</th>
<th>Dipole moment ×10¹⁸/esu cm²</th>
<th>Quadrupole moment×10²⁶/esu cm²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>3.18×3.33×5.36</td>
<td>38.84</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>184.6</td>
<td>3.03×3.04×5.32</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adsorption isotherms of N₂O were measured at different temperatures (Figure 4.14). MUF-16 adsorbs a significant amount of N₂O (1.91 mmol/g, 43 cm³/g) at 1 bar and 293 K. This is only slightly less than the uptake of CO₂. In parallel with CO₂, N₂O possesses atoms
with partial negative charges at its termini that can bind to positively-charged regions of the pore surface, and vice-versa for its central positive nitrogen atom.

![Figure 4.14](image)

**Figure 4.14.** Volumetric adsorption isotherms of N\textsubscript{2}O measured at two temperatures for MUF-16.

### 4.3 Conclusion

We have discovered a series of isostructural porous metal–organic frameworks, MUF-16 family, towards efficient adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2} molecules. In principle, fine-tuning of pore size and appropriate surface chemistry in MOFs can gain favourable adsorbate-adsorbent interactions and sieving effects for gas separation. For such an approach to work, the small and size-matched pores of MUF-16 lead to an intimate contact between gas molecules and the pore environment. In addition, the favourable orientation of electrostatic potential in the pore surface enables strong interaction between polarized surface of the framework and quadrupole of CO\textsubscript{2} molecules. The recognition mechanism of MUF-16 for gas molecules is well supported by direct crystallography studies and adsorption isotherm measurement in which the adsorption sites within the framework interact favourably with CO\textsubscript{2} molecules. This approach is likely applicable to other gas mixtures with impurities that possess opposite electrostatic distribution, which will facilitate the design and implementation of novel porous MOF materials for other important gas separations. Moreover, easy and inexpensive preparation of MUF-16 as well as its low heat of adsorption and high stability offer this material as a promising candidate for future industrial separation processes.
Chapter 4 A Series of Isostructural Metal-Organic Frameworks for Efficient Adsorption of CO₂

4.4 Experimental and computational section

4.4.1 General procedures

All starting compounds and solvents were used as received from commercial sources without further purification unless otherwise noted. Elemental analyses were performed by the Campbell Microanalytical Laboratory at the University of Otago, New Zealand.

4.4.2 Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA)

As per chapter 2. Freshly prepared MOF samples were washed with MeOH, and then activated at 130 °C under vacuum for 10 hours. Samples were exposed to air for 1 hour and then transferred to an aluminum sample pan, and then measurements were commenced under an N₂ flow with a heating rate of 5 °C /min.

4.4.3 Single crystal X-ray diffraction

As per Chapter 2. MOF crystals were analysed right after removing them from methanol. Room temperature data collection also produced better refinement statistics than low temperature data collection.

All atoms were found in the electron density difference map. Electron density difference maps were carefully analyzed for the possible presence of disordered framework components. All atoms were refined anisotropically, except hydrogen atoms, loaded CO₂ molecules in MUF-16(Mn) and one of the uncoordinated water in MUF-16.

4.4.4 Single crystal X-ray crystallography under vacuum and loaded with CO₂

Capillary SCXRD was performed for a single crystal of MUF-16 both under vacuum and loaded with CO₂ at around 0.8 bar and 20 °C based on the following steps:

1. First a single crystal was chosen with an appropriate size (~ 0.1 × 0.1 × 0.1 mm).

2. A small capillary tube with around 0.2 mm in diameter and 50 mm in length (which is open at both ends) was made by burning and shaping the neck of a glass pipette (referred as the ‘home-made capillary’).

3. The crystal was soaked in Fomblin oil and then the home-made capillary was used to trap the crystal inside it. Normally, the crystal will flow through the capillary by the oil stream.

4. Then home-made capillary was transferred into a standard 0.3 mm capillary. A lengthy capillary with 0.2 mm in diameter was used to push the home-made capillary to the very bottom of the 0.3 mm capillary.
5. Around 6 or 7 crystals of cobalt chloride was then transferred to the 0.3 mm capillary and placed on the top of home-made capillary. The cobalt chloride was used a visual indicator of the level of water vapour in the capillary base on its pink/blue colour change.

6. The top of the 0.3 mm capillary was then covered by glass wool to avoid the elutriation of cobalt chloride crystals during activation.

7. The capillary assembly was then connected to adsorption apparatus (Quantachrome-Autosorb-iQ2) using appropriate Swagelok fittings (Figure 4.15) and was kept under vacuum and a temperature of 140 °C for around 5 hours so that the vacuum level reached 0.0008 torr. At this point the cobalt chloride crystals were blue in colour.

8. The capillary was flame sealed at this point to trap the crystal under vacuum test. Alternatively, the capillary can be filled with CO\textsubscript{2} and then flame sealed to trap the crystal under CO\textsubscript{2}.

Figure 4.15 Swagelok fittings for connecting capillary to Quantachrome-Autosorb-iQ2.

Figure 4.16. Schematic and dimensions of capillaries used for SCXRD.
4.4.5 Powder X-ray diffraction patterns

As per Chapter 2. The data were obtained from freshly prepared MOF samples that had been washed several times with MeOH. MOF crystals were analysed right after removing them from MeOH. The two-dimensional images of the Debye rings were integrated with 2DP to give 2θ vs I diffractograms. Predicted powder patterns were generated from single crystal structures using Mercury.

4.4.6 Aging experiments on activated frameworks

After washing as-synthesized samples several times with MeOH, they were activated and were aged in air at 70-85% relative humidity or water at 20 °C.

4.4.7 Low-pressure gas adsorption measurements

As per Chapter 2. The as-synthesized samples were washed with anhydrous methanol several times and about 50-100 mg was transferred into a pre-dried and weighed sample tube and heated at rate of 10°C/min to a temperature of 130 °C under a dynamic vacuum with a turbomolecular pump for 20 hours.

4.4.8 Structure, physical properties and pore shape

Single crystal structures of MUF-16, MUF-16(Mn) and MUF-16(Ni) were used directly for all the calculations and simulations without modification. The Zeo++\textsuperscript{242} code and RASPA\textsuperscript{232} were used to calculate their pore volumes and surface areas with the use of H\textsubscript{2} and He probes, respectively, pore limiting diameter (i.e., the diameter of smallest opening along the pore) and largest cavity diameter (i.e., the diameter of the largest sphere that can fit within the pores). Accelrys Materials Studio 7.0 software package was performed to visualize the MOF structures and pore topologies.
Chapter 5

Application of MUF-16 for Adsorptive Separation of CO$_2$ from Different Gas Mixtures

5.1 Introduction

The selective trapping of CO$_2$ is of prime importance in industrial and environmental settings. For example, it is estimated that 50% of the volume of known natural gas reservoirs contain more than 2% CO$_2$.\textsuperscript{306} Reducing the levels of carbon dioxide in natural gas allows transportation and prevents the corrosion of equipment and pipeline. Moreover, CO$_2$ has no heating value and it has to be removed to meet gas quality specifications before distribution to end users via pipelines.\textsuperscript{306-307}

CO$_2$ impurities in acetylene, ethylene and ethane streams need to be removed before they can be used as feedstocks for the production of fine chemicals, fuels and polymers. This contamination is not only a barrier to optimal heat release from gas combustion, it adversely influences reactions involving these feedstocks.\textsuperscript{306, 308-309}

In terms of the environment, the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere continues to rise, which underlies the greenhouse gas effect and subsequent temperature increases.\textsuperscript{144, 158} It is necessary to develop economical and practical pathways to reduce both carbon dioxide emissions and current carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere. Atmospheric CO$_2$ levels can be reduced by using less petroleum and natural gas, decarbonizing fossil fuel (pre-combustion capture), capturing CO$_2$ by at point sources where significant quantities are released (post-combustion carbon), or capturing it directly from air (direct air capture).\textsuperscript{138, 310}

Currently, conventional separation methods involve absorption using aqueous amines, solvent extraction or cryogenic distillation.\textsuperscript{138} However, implementation of these methodologies is associated with several drawbacks including high capital cost, high energy consumption, difficult and expensive maintenance, solvent loss due to the degradation and evaporation, and the corrosive nature of solvents.\textsuperscript{138, 141, 286, 311-312} Hence, the search for materials that not only show high CO$_2$ capacity and selectivity but also require mild
operational conditions and are economical to be implemented is of major importance. Unfortunately, traditional porous materials, such as activated carbon and zeolites, exhibit poor characteristics against some of these metrics. For example, the surface area of these materials are relatively low, thus resulting in lower CO₂ capacity and they are not tunable, i.e., their structure cannot be modified for enhancing their selectivity or surface area. Conversely, metal–organic frameworks (MOFs) are effective materials for highly challenging separations. More than 75,000 MOFs have been synthesized by combining a rich library of inorganic and organic building blocks. Thanks to their inherent modularity, MOFs can enable exquisite control over pore sizes and electrostatics. The current challenge in MOF area for gas separation is their expensive end price, which can be overcome with the development of less expensive MOFs.

While dozens of MOFs are now known for CO₂/C₂ hydrocarbon separations, most of them have shown strong affinity towards the hydrocarbon component rather than CO₂. This has been achieved through the implementation of strategies including the formation of host-guest hydrogen-bonds and coordinative bonds between π electrons on the hydrocarbons and unsaturated metal sites on the framework. On the other hand, the selective adsorption of CO₂ over C₂ hydrocarbons have been seldom reported phenomenon despite the fact that adsorbents that selectively capture CO₂ from C₂ hydrocarbons are likely to be more energy efficient: High purity products can be achieved only through one single breakthrough step, while hydrocarbon-selective MOFs require additional processes involving the capture of the desired hydrocarbon and its subsequent release (Figure 5.1). In addition, further purification is demanded if the eluent is contaminated by adsorbed CO₂ during this desorption step.

Despite these advantages, the separation performance of most of the CO₂-selective MOFs that have been identified so far are restricted to cryogenic temperatures, or their separation performance has not been assessed experimentally under dynamic conditions but simply inferred from single-component adsorption isotherms. For the separation of CO₂ from C₂H₂, we are aware of only three reported materials, CD-MOF-1, CD-MOF-2 and SIFSIX-3-Ni that have shown such ability at ambient conditions through experimental breakthrough measurements, where a mixture of CO₂ and C₂H₂ passes through an adsorption column and pure acetylene is obtained through selective adsorption of the CO₂ by the sorbent. Furthermore, to best of our knowledge, there are not any MOFs reported in the literature that selectively adsorb CO₂ over all three C₂ hydrocarbons; previously reported materials are confined to either CO₂/C₂H₂ or CO₂/C₂H₄ and CO₂/C₂H₆ separations.
Figure 5.1 A simplified adsorption processes for production of pure acetylene by (a) a C$_2$H$_2$-selective MOFs through multiple adsorption-desorption stages and (b) a CO$_2$ selective OFs through one single adsorption stages.

In the first section of this chapter, MUF-16 is presented as an effective material for selective adsorption of CO$_2$ over C$_2$ hydrocarbon. As was discussed in Chapter 4, MUF-16’s high affinity and selective recognition for CO$_2$ arises from complementary electrostatic properties and perfectly-matched pore dimensions. In contrast, C$_2$ hydrocarbons has an opposite electrostatic distribution, so MUF-16 may show a very low adsorption of these gases.

Additionally, the potential of MUF-16 derivatives for carbon capture applications by selectively capturing CO$_2$ from N$_2$ and natural gas sweetening processes through adsorptive removal of CO$_2$ from CH$_4$ is investigated in the second section of this chapter. Its performance to selectively adsorb CO$_2$ from air and natural is then compared with that of benchmark materials in the literature.\textsuperscript{40, 142, 147, 291, 305, 339-351} The efficiency of MUF-16 for direct air capture is also investigated at the end of this section.
5.2 Results and discussion

5.2.1 CO\textsubscript{2}/C2 hydrocarbons separation

As was discussed earlier in Chapter 4, efficient adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2} by MUF-16 family stems from suitable distribution of electrostatic potential, where CO\textsubscript{2} molecules can orientate their electric quadrupoles to complement the electrostatic potential of the pore surface. In contrast to CO\textsubscript{2}, C2 hydrocarbons including C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4}, and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} have an opposite quadrupole moments as shown in Figure 5.2. This would lead to repulsive interactions between these molecules and the same framework pore spaces. In turn, the affinity for these guests would be substantially reduced.

![Electrostatic potential maps](image)

**Figure 5.2** Electrostatic potential maps of (a) CO\textsubscript{2}, (b) N\textsubscript{2}O, (c) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}, (d) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and (e) C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} (Blue/green = positive; red/orange = negative). (a) Attractive interaction between pore surface of MUF-16 with CO\textsubscript{2} and (g) repulsive forces with C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}.

This unique pore chemistry of MUF-16 and opposite quadrupole of C2 hydrocarbons provided us the initial motivation to evaluate its sorption performance for adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2} over C2 hydrocarbons. Adsorption isotherms of C2 hydrocarbons were measured at two temperatures of 293 K and 273 K. In contrast to CO\textsubscript{2}, only minor quantities of C2 hydrocarbons are adsorbed by MUF-16 (3.1, 3.2 and 4.0 cm\textsuperscript{3} g\textsuperscript{-1}, for C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}, respectively, at 293 K, Figure 5.3).
The CO₂/C₂ uptake ratios are 15.7 (C₂H₆), 15.1 (C₂H₄) and 12.0 (C₂H₂). These metrics indicate that MUF-16 drastically outperforms other MOF materials that have been reported to be selective for CO₂ (Figure 5.4 and Table 5.1), including SIFSIX-3-Ni (CO₂/C₂H₂ = 1.2 at 298 K and 0.1 bar),³²⁷ [Mn(bdc)(dpe)] (CO₂/C₂H₂ = 6.4 at 273 K and 1 bar),³³³ K₂[Cr₃O(OOCH)₆(4-ethylpyridine)₃]₂[aSiW₁₂O₄₀] (CO₂/C₂H₂ = 4.8 at 278 K and 1 bar)³²⁵ and CDMOF-2 (CO₂/C₂H₂ = 1.3 at 298 K and 1 bar).³³⁶

The separation performance of MUF-16 also exceeds that of benchmark materials that show an inverted selectivity (preference for C₂H₂ over CO₂) such as MAF-2 (4.7),³²³ HOF-
3 (2.3),\textsuperscript{320} and UTSA-74 (1.6)\textsuperscript{322} (Figure 5.4). The CO\textsubscript{2} adsorption capacity of MUF-16 at 1 bar (2.14 mmol/g) and ambient temperature is comparable to other CO\textsubscript{2}-selective materials (in the range of 0.5-2.87 mmol/g).

**Table 5.1** Separation metrics of MUF-16 in comparison to other top-performing materials reported in the literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>P (bar)</th>
<th>CO\textsubscript{2} uptake (mmol/g)</th>
<th>C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} uptake (mmol/g)</th>
<th>IAST selectivity*</th>
<th>Uptake ratio*</th>
<th>Q\textsubscript{S} of CO\textsubscript{2} (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>Q\textsubscript{S} of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} (kJ/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO\textsubscript{2}-selective MOFs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn(bdc)(dpe)\textsuperscript{333}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K\textsubscript{2}[Cr(4OOCCH\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{6}] Ionic crystal\textsuperscript{215}</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-3-Ni\textsuperscript{277}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-MOF-1\textsuperscript{336}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-MOF-2\textsuperscript{336}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}-selective MOFs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZJU-10a\textsuperscript{288}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIFSIX-2-Cu\textsuperscript{1}\textsuperscript{327}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2'0</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicro-4-Ni\textsuperscript{326}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKMOF-1-Ni\textsuperscript{325}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZJU-196a\textsuperscript{324}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF-2\textsuperscript{325}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSA-74a\textsuperscript{322}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSA-300a\textsuperscript{281}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZJU-60a\textsuperscript{290}</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCM-1\textsuperscript{1}\textsuperscript{211}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOF-3a\textsuperscript{320}</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSA-50a\textsuperscript{320}</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-BTC\textsuperscript{305, 319-320}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFM-188\textsuperscript{318}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ni\textsubscript{3}(HCOO\textsubscript{3})\textsuperscript{352}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJU-90a\textsuperscript{353}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IAST selectivities and uptake ratios are given with respect to the ratio of the highly adsorbed component to the weakly adsorbed component.

Additionally, for better comparison, a good summary of adsorption performance of top-performing MOFs, including adsorption uptakes, uptake ratio, IAST selectivity and isosteric heat of adsorption at low coverage for CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} separation has been presented in Table 5.1. Owing to its exceptional adsorption performance, the selectivities calculated for MUF-16 by the ideal adsorbed solution theory (IAST) are 603, 596 and 513 for equimolar mixtures of CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}, CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}, respectively, at 293 K and 1 bar (Figure 5.5 and see appendix D for other compositions). This remarkable selectivity for CO\textsubscript{2} sets new
benchmarks for all three CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbon separations (Table 5.1). This is highlighted in Figure 5.4 for the case of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}, where the performance of MUF-16 exceeds all frameworks that are selective towards CO\textsubscript{2}.

![Figure 5.5 Predicted IAST selectivity of MUF-16 for a 50/50 CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbon mixtures at (a) 293 K and (b) 273 K.]

While the pore characteristics of MUF-16 clearly favour the uptake of CO\textsubscript{2} over C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons, the adsorption mechanism could potentially be molecular sieving where the hydrocarbon adsorbates are excluded from the framework on the basis of their size. This was ruled out by measuring gas adsorption isotherms at 195 K, which revealed that MUF-16 can take up significant amounts of large molecules such as C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} at this temperature (Figure 5.6). Thus, these molecules can freely enter the pore network of MUF-16 around room temperature but their interactions with the framework are weak so their uptake is low.

![Figure 5.6 Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of CO\textsubscript{2} (black), C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} (red), C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} (blue) and CH\textsubscript{4} (purple) measured at 195 K for MUF-16.]
Further, the kinetics of adsorption of all four guest molecules were measured. Since the uptake kinetics of CO$_2$ and C2 hydrocarbons are nearly identical (Figure 5.7), the differences in their differential affinity for MUF-16 can be ascribed to thermodynamic – rather than kinetic – effects.

**Figure 5.7** Kinetic profiles of gas uptake by MUF-16 at 293 K upon exposing an evacuated sample to a dose of gas equal to its measured total adsorption at 760 torr.

As can be seen from Figure 5.7 all the gases reach their equilibrium gas uptake in less than 50 seconds, thus exhibiting a fast kinetics of MUF-16 for adsorbing CO$_2$ and C2 hydrocarbons. However, the equilibrium adsorption capacity of MUF-16 is significantly higher than C2 hydrocarbons which confirms that the mechanism of adsorption is differences in the equilibrium capacity of CO$_2$ with these gases.

Building on these results, we then investigated the feasibility of CO$_2$/C2 hydrocarbon separations under dynamic conditions. We measured experimental breakthrough curves for various gas mixtures at 293 K and 1.1 bar: CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_6$ (50/50), CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ (50/50) and CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_2$ (50/50 and 5/95). Figure 5.8 shows the relative concentration of CO$_2$ and the three C2 hydrocarbons (measured independently) exiting the adsorbent bed packed with 0.9 gram of MUF-16 as a function of time.

Complete separation was realized by MUF-16, whereby the C2 hydrocarbons broke through from the column at an early stage because of their low affinity for the framework. Conversely, the signal of CO$_2$ was not detected for at least 12 minutes due to its adsorption by MUF-16 (Figure 5.8a). It equates to a dynamic adsorption capacity of 1.8 mmol/g which is very close to its equilibrium adsorption capacity of 1.92 mmol/g at studied partial pressure. Significant volumes of pure C2 hydrocarbons can be obtained in this way.
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Figure 5.8 Experimental breakthrough curves for (a) 50/50 mixtures of CO₂ and the three C₂ hydrocarbons (measured independently) and (b) 5/95 mixtures of CO₂/C₂H₂ and at 293 K and 1.1 bar in an adsorption column packed with MUF-16.

The ability of MUF-16 to selectively adsorb CO₂ is an important advantage of this MOF as pure C₂ hydrocarbons can be produced directly in a single adsorption step using a fixed-bed adsorption operation. For the other MOFs that have been suggested in the literature as C₂H₂-selective materials, pure C₂H₂ can only be produced in the desorption step, which is considerably more difficult and burdensome. Subsequent multiple breakthrough tests revealed that MUF-16 maintained its CO₂ uptake and complete removal of CO₂ over 12 cycles (Figure 5.9a).

Figure 5.9 (a) Twelve separation cycles for a CO₂/C₂H₂ mixture (50/50 mixture). Each separation process was carried out at 293 K and 1.1 bar. MUF-16 was regenerated between cycles by placing it under vacuum at ambient temperature for 20-25 min. (b) Experimental desorption profile of MUF-16 following the separation of CO₂ and C₂H₂ upon heating under a helium flow of 5 ml/min at 1.1 bar. No adsorbates were removed upon further heating at 130 °C indicating that they had been fully expelled at lower temperatures.
The regeneration of MUF-16 was achieved by placing it under vacuum or purging with an inert gas. Full regenerated was observed under vacuum for around 25 mins (Figure 5.9a). As an alternative, regeneration by purging with a helium gas at elevated temperatures also was investigated. First CO$_2$ adsorption isotherms of MUF-16 at different temperatures were obtained Figure 5.10. As can be seen from Figure 5.10, temperature increase from 353 K (80 °C) does not decrease much the CO$_2$ adsorption uptake of MUF-16 so this temperature was found to be an optimum temperature for regenerating MUF-16 under helium flow.

Figure 5.10. Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of CO$_2$ at different temperatures for MUF-16.

As can be seen from Figure 5.9b, in the case of acetylene, all of the adsorbed hydrocarbon and half of the CO$_2$ can be removed from the bed by purging at room temperature. The remainder can be fully desorbed at 80 °C. Such a low temperature of activation makes MUF-16 an economical adsorbent for TSA processes where all the adsorbed CO$_2$ gases can be completely removed from adsorbent. This temperature is much lower than required regeneration temperature with conventional materials.\(^\text{354}\)

To investigate separations at low CO$_2$ concentrations, we simulated breakthrough curves under these conditions. First, the mass transfer coefficient used for the simulated breakthrough curves was empirically tuned based on experimental breakthrough curves (as the overall mass transfer coefficient is in proportion to the steepness of breakthrough curves, the accurate value of it was obtained empirically by tuning its value until the steepness of the predicted and experimental breakthrough curves were the same). This produces an excellent match between simulated and experimental breakthrough curves. With this realistic mass transfer coefficient in hand, we predicted breakthrough curves using feeds containing
trace CO₂ (0.1%) in the three C2 hydrocarbons (Figure 5.11). These calculations revealed that MUF-16 is capable of eliminating such small quantities of CO₂, as often required in industrial processes.

![Simulated breakthrough curves for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 CO₂/C2 hydrocarbons at 293 K and 1.1 bar.](image)

**Figure 5.11** Simulated breakthrough curves for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 CO₂/C2 hydrocarbons at 293 K and 1.1 bar.

Pelletized MOFs are generally more compatible with industrial processes than MOF crystals. In this light, we investigated the feasibility of pelletizing MUF-16 using various polymers and found polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) to be an effective binder. A photo of pelletized MOFs is presented in Figure 5.12. Further details about practical procedure of making MUF-16 in pellets are discussed in the last section of this chapter. The PXRD patterns and CO₂ adsorption isotherm exhibit no notable differences compared to MUF-16 powders, indicating that the separation performance of MUF-16 is maintained (Figure 5.13).

![A photograph of MUF-16/PVDF pellets.](image)

**Figure 5.12** A photograph of MUF-16/PVDF pellets.
Figure 5.13 (a) PXRD patterns of MUF-16 showing that its structure remains unchanged after making it into pellet with a PVDF binder. (b) CO₂ adsorption isotherm of MUF-16 at 293 K showing that the inherent adsorption performance of the MOF towards CO₂ remains unchanged after making it into pellet with a PVDF binder. The observed drop in capacity for the pellets arises from the 10 wt% PVDF, which is non-adsorbing.

5.2.2 CO₂/N₂ and CO₂/CH₄+C₂H₆ separations

Similar to the case of CO₂/C₂ hydrocarbons separation, the unique pore chemistry and appropriate pore aperture size of MUF-16 family for adsorbing CO₂, motivated us to evaluate its sorption performance for separation CO₂ over N₂ and CH₄. Hence, low-pressure N₂ and CH₄ sorption data at two temperatures of 293 K and 273 K were measured. These isotherm together with C₂H₆ are compared with that of CO₂ in Figure 5.14.

Figure 5.14 Experimental CO₂, N₂, CH₄, and C₂H₆ adsorption (solid) and desorption (open) isotherms of MUF-16 at (a) 293 K and (b) 273 K.
The MUF-16 family showed highly selective adsorption of CO$_2$ by taking up a large amount of CO$_2$ at ambient conditions, while adsorbing negligible amounts of N$_2$, CH$_4$ and C$_2$H$_6$. MUF-16 with cobalt(II) centres was superior to its Mn(II) and Ni(II) analogues because of its limited uptake of N$_2$ and CH$_4$ (1.32 and 1.20, respectively). MUF-16(Mn) and MUF-16(Ni) adsorb similar quantities of CO$_2$ (50.5 and 48 cm$^3$/g, respectively) but relatively higher amounts of N$_2$, CH$_4$ and C$_2$H$_6$ (Figure 5.15, Table 5.2). Therefore, we focused on the separation performance of MUF-16 and investigated its potential to separate CO$_2$ from N$_2$ and CO$_2$ from CH$_4$.

**Figure 5.15** Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of (a) N$_2$ and (b) CH$_4$ measured at 293 K for MUF-16 (black), MUF-16(Mn) (red), and MUF-16(Ni) (blue).

**Table 5.2** Summary of gas adsorption data and associated metrics for the MUF-16 family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>BET surface area (m$^2$/g)$^a$</th>
<th>CO$_2$ uptake (cm$^3$/g)$^b$</th>
<th>N$_2$ uptake (cm$^3$/g)$^b$</th>
<th>CH$_4$ uptake (cm$^3$/g)$^b$</th>
<th>CO$_2$/N$_2$ uptake ratio</th>
<th>CO$_2$/CH$_4$ uptake ratio</th>
<th>$Q_a$ of CO$_2$ (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>$S_{CN}$$^c$</th>
<th>$S_{CM}$$^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUF-16</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>4327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-16(Mn)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUF-16(Ni)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>47.97</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ From the N$_2$ adsorption isotherm at 77 K. $^b$ At 1 bar and 293 K. $^c$ CO$_2$/N$_2$ and CO$_2$/CH$_4$ selectivity for a 15/85 and 50/50 mixture, respectively, at 1 bar and 293 K as calculated by IAST.

As a result of the difference between its uptake capacity of CO$_2$ and other gases, MUF-16 exhibits uptake ratios of 36.2 and 39.8 for CO$_2$/N$_2$ and CO$_2$/CH$_4$, respectively, at 293 K and 1 bar. Such a separation performance is unprecedented, and the framework outperforms benchmark adsorbents including Cu-BTC$^{305, 355}$ (uptake ratio of 23 and 5.5 for CO$_2$/N$_2$ and CO$_2$/CH$_4$, respectively), Mg-MOF74$^{40, 142}$ (uptake ratio of 11.8 and 7.2 for CO$_2$/N$_2$ and CO$_2$/CH$_4$, respectively), SIFSIX-3-Zn$^{40}$ (uptake ratio of 11.2 and 3.3 for CO$_2$/N$_2$ and
CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}, respectively), and zeolite 13X\textsuperscript{339} (uptake ratio of 18.7 and 8.6 for CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} and CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}, respectively) (Table 5.2). The performance of MUF-16 is comparable with top-performing MOFs such as SIFSIX-2-cu\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{40} (uptake ratio of 34 and 12 for CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} and CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}, respectively), DICRO-3-Ni\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{349} (uptake ratio of 20 for CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2}), and en-Mg-dobpdc\textsuperscript{147} (uptake ratio of 47 for CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2}).

In addition, MUF-16 also takes up negligible amount of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}, which makes it suitable for removing CO\textsubscript{2} from natural gas which mainly consists of CH\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}.\textsuperscript{306} Composition of natural gas in three different locations are presented in table 5.3.\textsuperscript{356}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>methane</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethane</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C\textsubscript{3}+</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H\textsubscript{2}S</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>trace</td>
<td>trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>trace</td>
<td>trace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>trace</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In light of appreciable adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2} over other gases, MUF-16 shows an extraordinary ideal adsorbed solution theory (IAST) selectivity of 554, 4327 and 539 for 15/85 mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2}, 50/50 mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} and 10/10+80 mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}+CH\textsubscript{4}, respectively, at 293 K and 1 bar. These selectivity values together with those of other member of MUF-16 family are presented in Figure 5.17 (see Appendix D for other mixture compositions and temperatures). As anticipated, based on their higher CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2} uptake, they showed lower selectivity compared to MUF-16.
Figure 5.16 IAST calculations for (a) a 15/85 mixture of CO$_2$/N$_2$, (b) an equimolar mixture of CO$_2$/CH$_4$ and (c) 10/80+10 CO$_2$/CH$_4$+C$_2$H$_6$ at 293 K for the MUF-16 family.

This exceptional selectivity for CO$_2$, surpassing the majority of reported CO$_2$ selective materials, positions MUF-16 as one of the top-performing materials for CO$_2$/N$_2$ and a new benchmark for CO$_2$/CH$_4$ and CO$_2$/CH$_4$+C$_2$H$_6$ separations. Remarkably, IAST selectivity of 4327 for equimolar mixture of CO$_2$/CH$_4$ at 293 K and 1 bar is the highest value ever reported for porous materials. For the case of CO$_2$/CH$_4$, separation performance of MUF-16 family is compared with top-performing MOFs in the Figure 5.17.

As can be seen from both Figure 5.17a and 5.17b, MUF-17 has the highest IAST selectivity compared to the top-performing MOFs ever reported. The second high selective MOF is also still from MUF-16 family, MUF-16(Ni). Comparing to other MOFs, MUF-16 family has a medium CO$_2$ uptake of 2.14 mmol/g at 1 bar and 293 K, which is lower than Mg-dobdc (7.2 mmol/g) and CAU-13 (6.1 mmol/g), but still higher than half of top-performing MOFs (Figure 5.17a). MUF-16 also has one of the highest CO$_2$/CH$_4$ uptake ratio (39.8 for MUF-16, the highest ones are SIFSIX-14-Cu-I and [Cd$_2$L(H$_2$O)]2.5H$_2$O with an uptake ratio of 116 and 42.9, respectively. They are not presented in Figure 5.17 because
their IAST selectivity is not reported). MOF with the second high uptake ratio is [Cu(tba)$_2$] with an uptake ratio of 23.2 which is much lower than MUF-16. The third and fourth one also are from MUF-16 family, MUF-16(Ni) and MUF-16(Mn) respectively.

**Figure 5.17** IAST selectivity of MUF-16 family for an equimolar mixture of CO$_2$/CH$_4$ in comparison to top top-performing MOFs at 1 bar and ambient temperature versus their (a) CO$_2$ uptake and (b) uptake ratio at 1 bar.

The CO$_2$/N$_2$ and CO$_2$/CH$_4$ separation parameters of MUF-16 in comparison to theses top-performing MOFs also are presented in Table 5.4. IAST selectivities are presented for a 15/85 mixture of CO$_2$/N$_2$ and 50/50 CO$_2$/CH$_4$ at 1 bar, unless otherwise stated. $Q_{st}$ values are reported at low loading, unless otherwise stated. Uptake ratios are calculated by dividing the uptake of CO$_2$ by that of N$_2$ or CH$_4$ (all at 1 bar and specified temperature in the Table 5.4). These were taken from either a direct statement of relevant details in the manuscript or were extracted from figures by a digitizer software.
Table 5.4 Separation metrics of MUF-16 in comparison to other top-performing materials reported in the literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>T (°C)</th>
<th>P (bar)</th>
<th>CO₂/N₂</th>
<th>CO₂/CH₄</th>
<th>IAST selectivity</th>
<th>Uptake ratio</th>
<th>Qₖ(CO₂) (kJ/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeolite 13X³⁴⁰, ³³⁹</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPL Activated carbon³⁴⁰-³⁴¹</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-SSZ-13³⁵⁷</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeolite 5A³⁵⁸-³⁵⁹</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeolite 4A³⁶⁰-³⁶¹</td>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg-dobdc³⁴⁰, ³⁴², ³⁵⁵, ³⁴²</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-Mg-dobpdc¹⁴⁷</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>230³</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mmen-Mg-dobdc³⁴³</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKUST-1³⁵⁰, ³⁵⁵, ³⁶²</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAU-1³⁶³</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>101³</td>
<td>28³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCN-88³⁶⁴</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIF-78³⁶⁵</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50³</td>
<td>10.6³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIL-101(Cr)³⁶⁶</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mmen-Cu-BTTr³⁴⁴</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>327³</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIF-8³⁶⁷-³⁶⁸</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bio-MOF-1³⁴⁵</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>75³</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-1-Cu³⁴⁶-³⁴⁷</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>27³</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNIFSIX-1-Cu³⁴⁷</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>22³</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-2-Cu³⁴⁰</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-2-Cu-i³⁴⁰</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-3-Zn³⁴⁰</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-3-Cu³⁵²</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15500³</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-3-Ni³⁶⁹</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIFSIX-3-Ni³⁶⁹</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIFSIX-1-Cu³⁴⁷</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>30³</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIFSIX-2-Cu-i³⁶⁹</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-14-Cu-i³⁴⁸</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>NbOFFIVE-Ni&lt;sup&gt;369&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>UTSA-120&lt;sup&gt;170&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>DICRO-3-Cu-i&lt;sup&gt;349&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>MOOFOUR-1-Ni&lt;sup&gt;350&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>WOFOUR-1-Ni&lt;sup&gt;371&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Qc-5-Ni-dia&lt;sup&gt;201&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NbOFFIVE-Ni&lt;sup&gt;369&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.69</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSA-120&lt;sup&gt;170&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICRO-3-Cu-i&lt;sup&gt;349&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>146a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOOFOUR-1-Ni&lt;sup&gt;350&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOFOUR-1-Ni&lt;sup&gt;371&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>179a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qc-5-Ni-dia&lt;sup&gt;201&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Selectivity is calculated from the uptake ratio/partial pressure ratio. b Selectivity is calculated from the slope of isotherms at low pressures (Henry constant). c Heat of adsorption averaged over CO₂ uptakes. *IAST is calculated for a 15/75 mixture (10% other gases assumed). # IAST is calculated for a 10/90 mixture. & IAST is calculated for a 15/85 mixture. ¥ Molecular sieving mechanism.
Based on these results, we then investigated the feasibility of CO₂/N₂ (post-combustion carbon capture), CO₂/CH₄ (biogas separation) and CO₂/CH₄+C₂H₆ (natural gas upgrading) separations under dynamic conditions through experimental breakthrough tests. For the case of CO₂/N₂, five different mixtures of 50/50, 15/85, 1/99, 0.4/99.6, and 0.2/99.8 (relevant to the composition of flue gas and the carbon dioxide content in enclosed atmospheres such as submarines) were passed through an adsorption column packed with MUF-16 and their breakthrough curves were obtained (Figure 5.18 and see Appendix D for 0.2/99.8 mixture).

**Figure 5.18** Experimental breakthrough curves for (a) 50/50 mixture, (b) 15/85 (c) 1/99 and (d) 0.4/99.6 mixture of CO₂/N₂ at 293 K and 1.1 bar in an adsorption column packed with MUF-16 in comparison to simulated breakthrough curves.

In all of these mixtures, MUF-16 efficiently separate CO₂ from N₂, with a stream of pure N₂ for 11, 24, 40 and 22 minutes for 50/50, 15/85, 1/99, and 0.4/99.6 CO₂/N₂ mixture, respectively. It equates to a dynamic capacity of 1.40, 1.00, 0.17 and 0.044 mmol/g for 50/50, 15/85, 1/99, and 0.4/99.6 CO₂/N₂ mixture, respectively, which are nearly identical to the equilibrium capacity of MUF-16 at these partial pressures of CO₂. Breakthrough curves also were simulated and were compared to the experimental ones and a good agreement was found between them.
Experimental breakthrough curves for different mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} (50/50, 15/85) and CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}+C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} (10/80+10, relevant to the composition of natural gas) at 293 K and 1.1 bar was also measured in an adsorption column packed with MUF-16. Figure 5.19 (see appendix D for 15/85 CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} mixture) shows a complete separation by MUF-16, whereby CH\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} broke through quickly because of low uptake capacity; nevertheless, the signal of CO\textsubscript{2} was not detected longer than 10 for 50/50 and 20 min for 10/10+80 mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}+C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}, denoting that pure CH\textsubscript{4} and CH\textsubscript{4}+C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} could be obtained until CO\textsubscript{2} was eluted. The dynamic uptake capacity of CO\textsubscript{2} by MUF-16 obtained from breakthrough curves equates to 1.47 and 0.53 mmol/g which is nearly identical to its equilibrium capacity at the studied partial pressure of CO\textsubscript{2}. Simulated breakthrough also was calculated and compared with experimental ones. A good agreement was found for the case of CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} mixture, but predicted breakthrough curves for CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}+C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} were slightly different from the experimental breakthrough curves. In particular, the CO\textsubscript{2} broke through from the column much earlier than expected. This can be attributed to the deviation of IAST selectivity from real selectivity of CO\textsubscript{2} over a CH\textsubscript{4}+C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} mixture.

![Figure 5.19 Experimental breakthrough curves for (a) 50/50 mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} and (b) 10/80/10 mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} at 293 K and 1.1 bar in an adsorption column packed with MUF-16.](image)

Subsequently, multiple breakthrough tests revealed that MUF-16 maintained its CO\textsubscript{2} uptake and complete removal of CO\textsubscript{2} over 12 cycles for a CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} 50/50 mixture (Figure 5.20). This illustrates the recyclability of MUF-16 for the separation of CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} mixtures (as shown in previous section for CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} mixture as well).
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Figure 5.20 (a) CO₂/N₂ separation cycles for a 50/50 mixture lasting for 10 cycles. Each separation process was carried out at 293 K and 1.1 bar and MUF-16 was regenerated by being kept under vacuum at ambient temperature for 20-25 min. (b) Desorption profile of CO₂ and N₂ upon heating under a helium flow of 8 mlN/min at 1.1 bar. No adsorbates removed upon further heating at 130 °C.

The regenerability of MUF-16 was also investigated by placing it under vacuum or purging with an inert gas. The framework can be fully regenerated between cycles by placing it under vacuum for around 15-20 mins (Figure 5.20a) or by purging with a helium gas at 1 bar. As can be seen from Figure 5.20b, the whole N₂ and half of adsorbed CO₂ can be removed from the bed by purging at room temperature and the rest can be fully desorbed at 80 °C. We did the same experiment for two mixtures of CO₂/N₂ 0.4/99.6 and 0.2/99.8 and again same results were achieved. All of the adsorbed CO₂ was desorbed at 80 °C (see appendix D for the desorption profiles). Facile regeneration of MUF-16 motivated us to investigate the regenerability of MUF-16 at ambient temperature by a purge gas other than helium (helium is not a practical gas for purging in industrial gas adsorption units). Thus, we further investigated the regenerability of MF-16 at ambient temperature by purging with N₂ or dry air. A higher flowrate of 15 mlN/min of either N₂ or dry air (water content less than 20 ppm, CO₂ content less than 200 ppm) passed through the adsorption column packed with MUF-16 which is already saturated with CO₂ (A mixture of CO₂/N₂ 0.15/0.85 at room temperatures was passed through the column). The CO₂ profile eluting from adsorption column after regeneration is presented in Figure 5.21 for both N₂ and dry air.
5.2.3 Direct air capture

As was mentioned earlier, CO₂ can be captured from air directly. This approach, referred to as direct air capture (DAC), has the advantage of location flexibility and a cleaner environment where the concentrations of SOₓ and NOₓ are low compared to post-combustion processes. However, DAC has the distinct disadvantage that the concentration of CO₂ in air is only 400 ppm. The relatively high affinity of MUF-16 for CO₂ encouraged us to investigate the efficiency of MUF-16 for direct air capture processes. To do this, ambient air (N₂:0.778, O₂:0.195, Ar:0.008, CO₂:400 (ppmv), H₂O: 0.0188) with a flowrate of 3.5 mL/min was passed through the column packed with MUF-16. The obtained breakthrough curves for water, CO₂, Ar, N₂ and O₂ are presented in Figure 5.22.
Figure 5.22 Experimental breakthrough curves of different compounds in the air after passing air through an adsorption column packed with MUF-16 at 1 bar and 293 K.

As can be seen from Figure 5.22, N₂, O₂ and Ar break through very quickly because of their near zero adsorption by MUF-16. The breakthrough curve of CO₂ shows MUF-16 has two steps. The first one from zero concentration of CO₂ to 200 ppmv, and the second from 200 ppmv to 400 ppmv (its initial concentration in the feed stream). The first breakthrough occurs just after starting the experiment, indicating MUF-16 is unable to produce much eluent air with a zero concentration of CO₂. The second breakthrough lasts around 50 minutes, producing effluent with a CO₂ concentration of 200 ppmv. Here, MUF-16 can capture about half of the CO₂ present in air. Its inability to capture all of the CO₂ probably stems from its low adsorption uptake at low partial pressures of CO₂ (and/or co-adsorption of water molecules).

The breakthrough curve of water is interesting. In the beginning, the water concentration is relatively high, showing weak adsorption of water. It then gradually drops to below 0.0025 (mole fraction). Comparing breakthrough curves of water and CO₂, one scenario could be competition of water with CO₂. In the beginning (First 50 minutes), CO₂ will be mostly
adsorbed in competition with water, thus the CO$_2$ concentration in the effluent is low and water concentration remains high. Later, the water concentration decreases, while CO$_2$ starts breaking through, indicating a displacement of previously-adsorbed CO$_2$ adsorption by incoming water. To investigate this better, single-component breakthrough curves for CO$_2$ and water were predicted, assuming only one gas passes through the bed with an infinite mass transfer coefficient (quick adsorption). These breakthrough curves are presented in Figure 5.23 in comparison with their experimental breakthrough curves (which involve the above-stated gas mixture).

![Figure 5.23](image)

**Figure 5.23** Single gas predicted breakthrough curves for (a) CO$_2$ and (b) water after passing a 0.0004/0.9996 CO$_2$/He or 0.0188/0.9812 H$_2$O/He mixture through an adsorption column packed with MUF-16 at 1.02 bar and 293 K in comparison to their mixture experimental breakthrough curve.

The single breakthrough curves of CO$_2$ (simulated) indicates that MUF-16 could produce air with near zero concentration of CO$_2$ in absence of water for a short period of time (60 minutes). On the other hand, predicted and experimental breakthrough curves of water match, showing that water is adsorbing ideally and all the capacity of MUF-16 is taken by water. Therefore, water displaces CO$_2$ during the breakthrough measurement.

Superior adsorption of water compared to CO$_2$ was demonstrated by the adsorption isotherms of water, indicating water adsorption uptake at low pressure is much higher than that of CO$_2$ (Figure 5.24a). Kinetic traces for water and CO$_2$ adsorption were compared and they showed that the rates of uptake of CO$_2$ is slightly higher than water molecules (Figure 5.24b).
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5.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, the performance of MUF-16 for selective adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2} over C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbon, N\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4} was investigated. MUF-16 exhibits appreciable selectivity for CO\textsubscript{2} by taking up significant amount of CO\textsubscript{2}, while adsorbing near zero amount of C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons. In the context of CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons separation, the favourable orientation of electrostatic potential in the pore surface has enlarged the tiny difference of CO\textsubscript{2} and C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons that have opposite electrostatic distribution, i.e., C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons have quadrupole moment of different signs. This results in an attractive interaction of CO\textsubscript{2} molecules and thus a high adsorption of CO\textsubscript{2} molecules, while the interaction of C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons with framework is repulsive, resulting in negligible adsorption of them. For the case of CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} and CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}, the same mechanism is applied. The combined effect of small pore size of MUF-16 and the weaker interaction of N\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4} with framework leads to a negligible adsorption of these gases.

The efficiency of MUF-16 for separating CO\textsubscript{2} from C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbon, CH\textsubscript{4}+C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} and N\textsubscript{2} was well demonstrated by breakthrough experiments. Complete separation was achieved by very early breakthrough of N\textsubscript{2}, CH\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons, while CO\textsubscript{2} was being adsorbed on the bed up to its near equilibrium capacity. The ability of MUF-16 for capturing CO\textsubscript{2} from air also was investigated through breakthrough experiment and MUF-16 was not successful to produce an air with near zero concentration of CO\textsubscript{2} mostly because of co-adsorption of water by framework.

Pelletized MUF-16 also was successfully achieved by incorporating a PVDF binder. Besides, MUF-16 indicated an easy regeneration, excellent recyclability and stability.

Figure 5.24 (a) Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherm of water measured at 298 K for MUF-16. (b) Kinetic profiles of gas uptake by MUF-16 at 293 K upon exposing an evacuated sample to a dose of gas equal to taking up 3.27 mg of CO\textsubscript{2} or H\textsubscript{2}O.
towards water. Therefore, MUF-16 shows great potential in the practical separation of CO₂ from different gas streams.

5.4 Experimental and computational section

5.4.1 General procedures

Heat of adsorption and BET calculation were calculated based on the methods presented in Chapter 2. See appendix D for related curves and fitting parameters.

5.4.2 Gas adsorption isotherm measurements

The same instrument as mentioned in Chapter 2 was used to measure adsorption isotherms. 500-1000 mg was transferred into a pre-dried and weighed sample tube and heated at rate of 10°C/min to a temperature of 130 °C under a dynamic vacuum with a turbomolecular pump for 20 hours.

5.4.3 IAST selectivity calculations

Mixed gas adsorption isotherms and gas selectivities for different mixtures of CO₂/C₂ hydrocarbons, CO₂/N₂, CO₂/CH₄ and CO₂/CH₄/C₂H₆ at 293 K were calculated based on the method and procedure explained in chapter 1. For binary and ternary mixtures, the adsorption selectivity is defined as follows:

\[ S_{binary} = \frac{q_1/p_1}{q_2/p_2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ S_{ternary} = \frac{q_1/p_1}{(q_2 + q_3)/(p_2 + p_3)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

5.4.4 Breakthrough separation experiment and simulation

**CO₂/C₂ hydrocarbon separations**

In a typical breakthrough experiment, 0.9 g of activated MUF-16 was placed in an adsorption column (6.4 mm in diameter × 11 cm in length) to form a fixed bed. The adsorbent was activated at 120 °C under high vacuum for 7 hours and then the column was left under vacuum for another 3 hours while being cooled to 20 °C. The column was then purged under a 20 mL/min flow of He gas for 1 hr at 1.1 bar prior to the breakthrough experiment. A gas mixture containing different gas pair of CO₂, C₂H₂, C₂H₆ and C₂H₄ along with He as a carrier gas was introduced to the column at 1.1 bar and 20 °C. A feed flowrate of 6 and 6.85 mL/min (including helium) was set for the experiments with 50/50 and 5/95 mixture of
gases, respectively, and the flowrate of He in the feed was kept constant at 2 mL/min for all the experiments except for CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_2$ 5/95 mixture which no helium was used. The operating pressure was controlled at 1.1 bar with a back-pressure regulator. The outlet composition was continuously monitored by the mass spectrometer until complete breakthrough was observed. The adsorbent was regenerated under vacuum for 20-25 minutes between each cycle.

The desorption behaviour of CO$_2$ and C$_2$H$_2$ from the adsorption column was also investigated. Once the adsorbent was saturated with an equimolar mixture of CO$_2$ and C$_2$H$_2$, the column was purged with a helium flow of 5 mL/min for 18 mins at 20 °C at 1 bar while monitoring the effluent gas. Then the column was then heated to 80 °C with a ramp of 10 °C/min for 20 mins. Finally, the column was heated to 130 °C with the same ramping for 15 min before cooling to 20 °C.

Breakthrough curves simulation was performed based on the method presented previously. A summary of Adsorption column parameters and feed characterizations are presented in table 5.5.

**Table 5.5 Adsorption column parameters and feed characterizations used for the simulations for MUF-16.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Adsorption bed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Feed</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length: 110 mm</td>
<td>Flow rate: 6 mL/min for equimolar and 0.1/99.9 mixture, and 6.85 mL/min for 5/95 mixture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter: 6.4 mm</td>
<td>Temperature: 293 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of adsorbent in the bed: 0.9 g</td>
<td>Pressure: 1.1 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed voidage: 0.84</td>
<td>Carrier gas (He) flow rate: 2 mL/min for equimolar and 0.1/99.9 mixture, and no He for 5/95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adsorbent average radius: 0.2 mm</td>
<td>Purge gas: He with a flow rate of 20 mL/min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$_{CO_2}$: 0.021 s$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$_{C_2H_2}$: 0.024 s$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$_{C_2H_4}$: 0.017 s$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$_{C_2H_6}$: 0.018 s$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CO$_2$/N$_2$, CO$_2$/CH$_4$+C$_2$H$_6$ separations**

In a typical breakthrough experiment, 0.9 g of activated MUF-16 was placed in an adsorption column (6.4 mm in diameter × 11 cm in length) to form a fixed bed. The adsorbent was activated at 130 °C under high vacuum for 7 hours and then the column was left under vacuum for another 3 hours while being cooled to 20 °C. The column was then purged under a 20 mL/min flow of He gas for 1 hr at 1.1 bar prior to the breakthrough experiment. A gas mixture containing different mixture of CO$_2$/N$_2$, CO$_2$/CH$_4$ and CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_6$/CH$_4$ was introduced to the column at 1.1 bar and 20 °C. A feed flowrate of 10 mL/min and 6
mL/min was set for the experiments with gas mixture containing 1% or less CO\textsubscript{2} and more than 1%, respectively. The operating pressure was controlled at 1.1 bar with a back-pressure regulator. The outlet composition was continuously monitored by the mass spectrometer until complete breakthrough was observed.

The desorption behaviour of CO\textsubscript{2} and N\textsubscript{2} from the adsorption column packed with MUF-16 was also investigated. Once the adsorbent was saturated with a mixture of CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2}, the column was purged with a helium flow of 8 mL/min and 20 mL/min for the experiments with gas inlet mixture containing 1% or less CO\textsubscript{2} and more than 1%, respectively, at 20 °C at 1 bar while monitoring the effluent gas. Column was first purged with helium at ambient temperature (20 °C). The column was then heated to 80 °C with a ramp of 10 °C/min for 20 mins. Finally, the column was heated to 130 °C with the same ramping before cooling to 20 °C.

Breakthrough curves simulation was performed based on the method presented previously. A summary of Adsorption column parameters and feed characterizations are presented in table 5.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adsorption bed</th>
<th>Feed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length: 110 mm</td>
<td>Flow rate: 6 mL/min for all the mixture containing 1% or more CO\textsubscript{2} and 10 mL/min for all the mixture containing less than 1% CO\textsubscript{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter: 6.4 mm</td>
<td>Temperature: 293 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of adsorbent in the bed: 0.9 g</td>
<td>Pressure: 1.1 bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed voidage: 0.84</td>
<td>Carrier gas flow rate: No carrier gas was used for all the experiments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adsorbent density: 1.674 g/cm\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Purge gas: He with a flow rate of 20 mL/min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adsorbent average radius: 0.2 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6 Adsorption column parameters and feed characterizations used for the simulations for MUF-16.**

**Direct air capture**

In a typical breakthrough experiment, 0.9 g of activated MUF-16 was placed in an adsorption column (6.4 mm in diameter \times 11 cm in length) to form a fixed bed. The adsorbent was activated at 130 °C under high vacuum for 7 hours and then the column was left under vacuum for another 3 hours while being cooled to 20 °C. Ambient air (N\textsubscript{2}:0.778, O\textsubscript{2}:0.195, Ar:0.008, CO\textsubscript{2}:400 (ppmv), H\textsubscript{2}O: 0.0188) with a flowrate of 3.5 mL/min was passed through the column.

Single gas breakthrough curves were predicted for water and CO\textsubscript{2} at 1.1 bar and 293 K. To simulate CO\textsubscript{2} and water composition relevant to typical air, water and CO\textsubscript{2} were
diluted with He to achieve gas mixtures of 0.0004/0.9996 CO₂/He and 0.0188/0.9812 H₂O/He to introduce to the adsorption column.

5.4.5 Pelletisation

MOF pellets were fabricated based on the following procedure:

1. MUF-16 (~0.5 g) was gently ground using mortar and pestle.
2. The ground sample was transferred to a 20 mL vial and 0.5 mL of DMF was added. A viscous suspension was obtained after sonicating for half an hour. The suspension was stirred for another 30 mins.
3. PVDF powder (~ 50 mg) was gradually added over the course of 1 hour to make a viscous paste.
4. The paste was transferred into a plastic syringe using a spatula and pressed it out in one thin noodle onto a glass slide.
5. The noodle was cut into small pellets and dried under vacuum at 120 °C for 4 hours.
Chapter 6

A Multipurpose Metal-Organic Framework MUF-17 for Selective Adsorption of Acetylene over Ethylene and Carbon Dioxide

6.1 Introduction

Ethylene (C\(_2\)H\(_4\)) and acetylene (C\(_2\)H\(_2\)) are two major petrochemical products. They have been widely used as fuels and as feedstocks for the production of valuable compounds such as polyethylene and 1,4-butanediol.\(^{190, 385-386}\) Ethylene is produced by the pyrolysis of hydrocarbons, and crude streams contain trace acetylene that acts as a catalyst poison during polymerization to polyethylene.\(^{387-388}\) When acetylene is required, it is typically generated by the combustion of natural gas or the cracking of hydrocarbons. Both methods generate a suite of gaseous impurities.\(^{389-390}\) Acetylene purification is thus important from two distinct angles: the removal of trace quantities of it from ethylene mixtures and its isolation in pure form by eliminating contaminants. Conventional separation and purification methods for acetylene\(^{391}\) involve solvent extraction,\(^{392}\) cryogenic distillation,\(^{393}\) or chemical reactions.\(^{394}\) These technologies incur several drawbacks. Solvent absorption technologies typically show low selectivities and high energy consumption during regeneration. They also suffer from rapid degradation and environmental pollution due to volatile organic solvents. Cryogenic distillation is expensive and incurs a high energy penalty due to the similarity of the boiling points of acetylene and ethylene, ethane, and carbon dioxide (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1 Physicochemical characteristics of different gases.\(^{110, 235-236}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boiling point (K)</th>
<th>Molecular dimensions (Å)</th>
<th>Polarizability (Å(^3))</th>
<th>Dipole moment (\times 10^{18})/esu cm(^2)</th>
<th>Quadrupole moment (\times 10^{26})/esu cm(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C(_2)H(_2)</td>
<td>188.4</td>
<td>3.32×3.34×5.7</td>
<td>3.33-3.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO(_2)</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>3.18×3.33×5.36</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(_2)H(_4)</td>
<td>169.4</td>
<td>3.28×4.18×4.84</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(_2)H(_6)</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>3.81×4.82×4.08</td>
<td>4.43-4.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant challenges thus remain in the development of effective, sustainable and energy-efficient methods for the separation and purification of acetylene. One process that
meets many of these goals is selective adsorption in porous media. Adsorption can take place efficiently at ambient temperature and pressures. It can be employed for both gas separation and purification by adsorbing either the major or trace component, respectively. In this light, we targeted a single material that can be used to both trap low levels of acetylene in ethylene and to take up large quantities of acetylene when it is in the presence of unwanted gases such as carbon dioxide. The key challenge here is to develop a porous material that possesses both a high selectivity and adsorption capacity for acetylene, particularly at low pressures. The similar sizes, shapes and physicochemical properties of acetylene and the competing guest molecules mean that such an adsorbent must present pores that are specific to acetylene. This can be achieved by a complementary match between the host and guest in terms of both size and electric polarity. Unfortunately, traditional porous materials, such as activated carbon and zeolites, exhibit poor characteristics in this regard. Conversely, metal–organic frameworks are effective materials for highly challenging separations. More than 75,000 MOFs have been synthesized by combining a rich library of inorganic and organic building blocks. Thanks to their inherent modularity, MOFs can enable exquisite control over pore sizes and electrostatics.

Recently, MOFs and related materials have been developed for C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ and C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ separations. For example, the mixed MOFs (M’MOFs) family and hydrogen-bonded framework (HOF-3) exhibit very high selectivities for C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ (up to 45) and C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ separations (up to 21). However, a common drawback is a relatively low capacity for C$_2$H$_2$ narrow micropore windows and low pore volumes. In contrast, the well-known MOF-74 series shows exceptionally high C$_2$H$_2$ uptake capacity (e.g., 6.66 mmol/g for Fe-MOF-74 at 45 °C) due to their high density of open metal sites. However, since the pores are too wide to achieve size-discriminating effects, both C$_2$H$_2$ and C$_2$H$_4$ show strong interactions with the pore surfaces and thus the selectivity is low (2.1, at 1 bar and 45 °C). This underscores a key notion. Both high uptake and good selectivity are jointly necessary in high-performance materials. In addition, in the case of trace gas removal, a steep adsorption isotherm is desired for the target impurity, so it can be removed when present at low partial pressures.

6.2 Results and discussion

Similar to MUF-16, MUF-17 also is built up from solvothermal reaction of cobalt acetate and 5-aminoisophthalic acid but at different synthesis condition and different ligand/metal salt ratio. Specifically, a mixture of Co(OAc)$_2$·4H$_2$O (0.125 g, 0.5 mmol), 5-
aminoisophthalic acid (H$_2$aip, 0.046 g, 0.25 mmol), MeOH (7 mL), and H$_2$O (0.5 mL) were sonicated for 20 min and sealed in a 50 mL Schott bottle and heated at 85 °C for 24 hours. After cooling the oven to room temperature, the resulting purple crystals (Figure 6.1) of MUF-17 [Co$_5$(OH)$_2$(aip)$_4$(H$_2$O)$_2$] were isolated by decanting off the mother liquor, then washed with methanol several times and dried under vacuum at 130 °C for 20 h. It yields 62 mg of guest-free MUF-17 with a reaction yield of 92% based on H$_2$aip.

As can be seen from Figure 6.1, single crystals of MUF-17 obtained from this synthesis procedure are very small, thus not appropriate for single crystal X-ray diffraction studies. We developed another method to yield bigger crystals. A mixture of Co(OAc)$_2$.4H$_2$O (0.125 g, 0.5 mmol), H$_2$aipBoc (0.281 g, 1 mmol), MeOH (6 mL), and H$_2$O (0.5 mL) were sonicated for 20 min and sealed in a Teflon-lined autoclave and heated at 120 C for 3 days. After cooling the oven to room temperature, the resulting product was isolated by decanting off the mother liquor, then washed with methanol several times and dried under vacuum to give approximately 0.3 g of MUF-17 as a dark purple solid (Figure 6.2). Appropriate single crystals were chosen for SCXRD studies.
MUF-17 is built up from inexpensive precursors and formed in a high yield. Based on commercial prices, we estimate the raw material cost of this material to be less than $30 per kg: 1 kg of H$_2$aip = 15USD; 1 kg of Co(OAc)$_2$.4H$_2$O = 10USD. Therefore, 2 kg of Co(OAc)$_2$.4H$_2$O (20USD) requires 736 g of H$_2$aip (11USD) and produces 1 kg of MUF-17 for approx. USD30.

Single crystal X-ray diffraction revealed that MUF-17 crystallizes in the monoclinic space group C2/c (Table 6.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2 Crystal data and structure refinement for MUF-17.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCDC deposition number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b/Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α/°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β/°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ/°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume/Å$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ$_{calc}$/g cm$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ/mm$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data range for refinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/restraints/parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit on F$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [I&gt;=2σ (I)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [all data]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest diff. peak/hole / e Å$^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It comprises a pentanuclear cobalt(II) cluster connected by twelve dianionic aip linkers (Figure 6.3a). The five cobalt ions exhibit tetrahedral (Co4), square pyramidal (Co2), or octahedral (Co1, Co3 and Co5) coordination environments. Each of the eight carboxyl groups from the aip ligands bridges two cobalt ions, and two µ$_3$-OH groups are present within each cluster. Amino groups of four aip ligands and two terminal aquo ligands complete the coordination spheres within each cluster. By considering the cobalt clusters as
12-connected nodes linked by aip ligands (Figure 6.3b), MUF-17 can be depicted as a porous coordination polymer (Figure 6.3c, d). The framework defines narrow zigzag 1-dimensional pores including relatively large cavities with pore aperture size of $4.7 \times 4.8$ Å (accounting for the van der Waals surface of the framework) that are connected by narrow channels of around $3.1 \times 3.5$ Å, as highlighted in Figure 6.3e. The pore topology of MUF-17 is suitable for trapping and discriminating small molecules like $C_2H_2$, $C_2H_4$ and $CO_2$.

**Figure 6.3** (a) The structure of MUF-17, as determined by SCXRD, comprises pentanuclear cobalt(II) clusters (cobalt = dark blue; oxygen = red; carbon = black; nitrogen = light blue; hydrogen = pink (most omitted for clarity)). The sites occupied by terminal $H_2O$ ligands are marked with a t. (b) The structure of the aip linker and its stick representation. (c, d) The cobalt(II) clusters and aip ligand assemble into network that defines a 3D array of channels. (e) The structure of the pore network in MUF-17 illustrated by the Connolly surface in orange/gray (probe of diameter 1.0 Å).

Guest-free MUF-17 can be readily produced at 130 °C under vacuum, which preserves the coordinated water molecules. These water ligands are lost (as are the crystallinity and porosity) by heating above 200 °C, therefore high temperatures were avoided. The phase purity of the material activated at 130 °C was confirmed by matching its powder X-ray diffraction pattern with that simulated from its SCXRD structure (Figure 6.4), and by
elemental analysis (Anal. calcd. (found) for \([\text{Co}_5(\text{OH})_2(\text{aip})_4(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2] \cdot 8\text{H}_2\text{O}: \text{C}, 35.58 (35.32); \text{H}, 3.71 (3.70); \text{N}, 5.18 (4.79))

Figure 6.4 PXRD patterns of MUF-17 showing that its structure remains unchanged after activation at 130 °C under vacuum (red), after isotherm measurements (green), after breakthrough experiments (dark blue), and after exposure to air with relative humidity of >80% for at least 12 months (orange).

Thermogravimetric analysis and PXRD demonstrated that MUF-17 decomposes above 300 °C under nitrogen (Figure 6.5), while it is stable when exposed to a laboratory atmosphere (~80% humidity) at ambient temperatures for at least one year (Figure 6.4).

Figure 6.5 TGA curve of MUF-17.
A CO$_2$ adsorption isotherm at 273 K showed the permanent porosity of MUF-17 and gave a BET surface area of 247 m$^2$/g and a pore volume of 0.14 cm$^3$/g (see appendix E for BET calculation). These values are consistent with the geometric surface area of 323 m$^2$/g and pore volume of 0.20 cm$^3$/g calculated from the crystallographic coordinates. These data together with pore limiting diameter and largest cavity diameter are presented in Table 6.3.

### Table 6.3 Some calculated and experimentally determined properties of MUF-17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geometric surface area (RASPA2)</td>
<td>323 m$^2$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET surface area (from experimental CO$_2$ isotherm/273 K)</td>
<td>247 m$^2$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET surface area (from experimental N$_2$ isotherm/77 K)</td>
<td>211 m$^2$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystallographic density</td>
<td>1.65 g/cm$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore volume (RASPA2)</td>
<td>0.20 cm$^3$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore volume (from experimental CO$_2$ isotherm/273 K)</td>
<td>0.14 cm$^3$/g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest cavity diameter (Zeo++)</td>
<td>4.63 Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pore limiting diameter (Zeo++)</td>
<td>3.15 Å</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the high stability, permanent porosity, and suitable pore size and chemistry of MUF-17, we were intrigued by its potential to meet the challenges of separating C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ and C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ under ambient conditions. Low pressure C$_2$H$_2$, C$_2$H$_4$, and CO$_2$ adsorption isotherms were collected up to 1 bar at different temperatures (Figures 6.6a,b and see appendix E for other temperatures and gases).

![Figure 6.6 Experimental C$_2$H$_2$, C$_2$H$_4$ and CO$_2$ adsorption (solid symbols) and desorption (open symbols) isotherms of MUF-17 at (a) 293 K and (b) 273 K.](image)

The adsorption results show that MUF-17 adsorbs considerably more C$_2$H$_2$ than C$_2$H$_4$ under the same conditions. At 293 K and 1.0 bar, the C$_2$H$_2$ uptake of MUF-17 is 111.58 STP
cm³/cm³ (3.01 mmol/g, 0.68 C₂H₂ per cobalt, 67.42 STP cm³/g), while the C₂H₄ uptake is only 79.70 STP cm³/cm³ (2.15 mmol/g, 48.16 STP cm³/g) and the CO₂ uptake is 93.05 cm³/cm³ (2.51 mmol/g, 56.22 STP cm³/g).

Figure 6.7 C₂H₂ uptake capacity of MUF-17 in comparison with selected reported high-performance materials at 0.01 bar and ambient temperature.

Importantly in the context of gas separations, the C₂H₂ isotherms rise steeply in the low pressure region. For instance, at 293 K and 0.01 bar (7.5 Torr) (which is the indicator of partial pressure of C₂H₂ in industrially encountered C₂H₂/C₂H₄ mixture), the capacity of C₂H₂ reaches 51.53 STP cm³/cm³, more than double that of C₂H₄ and CO₂. This exceptional affinity for C₂H₂ at low pressure indicates that MUF-17 has the potential to separate C₂H₂/C₂H₄ and C₂H₂/CO₂ mixtures with high efficiency, including the removal of trace acetylene. At 0.01 bar, MUF-17 adsorbs more C₂H₂ than top-performing materials such as SIFSIX-2-Cu-i⁴¹⁷ (41.9 cm³/cm³), Fe-MOF-74⁴⁰⁸ (31.7 cm³/cm³) SIFSIX-3-Zn³¹⁷ (30.0 cm³/cm³), UTSA100-a⁴⁹⁷ (18.03 cm³/cm³) and NOTT-300⁴⁰¹ (5.4 cm³/cm³) at ambient temperature and 0.01 bar, and is comparable to that of the benchmark materials UTSA-200a⁴⁹⁵ (57.8 cm³/cm³) and NKMOF-1-Ni⁴²⁵ (67.8 cm³/cm³) (Figure 6.7). Also, a summary of adsorption metrics of top-performing MOFs in comparison with MUF-17 are presented in Table 6.4.
### Table 6.4 The separation parameters of MUF-17 compared with selected MOFs reported in the literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>$C_2H_2$ uptake $^a$ (cm$^3$/cm$^3$)</th>
<th>$C_3H_3$ uptake at 0.01 bar (cm$^3$/cm$^3$)</th>
<th>$C_2H_4$ uptake $^a$ (cm$^3$/cm$^3$)</th>
<th>$CO_2$ uptake $^a$ (cm$^3$/cm$^3$)</th>
<th>IAST selectivity $^b$ ($C_2H_2/C_2H_4$)</th>
<th>IAST selectivity $^b$ ($C_2H_2/CO_2$)</th>
<th>$Q_\text{st} C_2H_2$ $^c$ (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>$Q_\text{st} C_2H_4$ $^c$ (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>$Q_\text{st} CO_2$ $^c$ (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>$T$ (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOTT-300$^{401, 409}$</td>
<td>162.49</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>109.87</td>
<td>138.62</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-3-Ni$^{417, 410}$</td>
<td>119.01</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>63.11</td>
<td>97.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-1-Cu$^{417}$</td>
<td>164.70</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>79.54</td>
<td>98.70</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTS-100$^{397}$</td>
<td>101.58</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeMOF-74$^{408, 411}$</td>
<td>167.98</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>153.86</td>
<td>92.31$^d$</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-2-Cu$^{417}$</td>
<td>112.01</td>
<td>41.90</td>
<td>61.17</td>
<td>135.47</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTS-67a$^{405}$</td>
<td>121.46</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFSIX-2-Cu$^{417}$</td>
<td>76.53</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>28.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'MOF-3a$^{402}$</td>
<td>44.73</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCM-1$^{321}$</td>
<td>101.67</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>50.68</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP-33$^{412}$</td>
<td>164.08</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>122.47</td>
<td>77.58</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJU-22a$^{413}$</td>
<td>125.42</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>94.13</td>
<td>121.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.9$^f$</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTS-200a$^{395}$</td>
<td>115.85</td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKMFO-1-Ni$^{325}$</td>
<td>107.51</td>
<td>67.78</td>
<td>81.41</td>
<td>88.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZJU-196a$^{324}$</td>
<td>108.16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF-2$^{323}$</td>
<td>102.21</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJU-90$^{353}$</td>
<td>146.78</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88.83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTS-74a$^{322}$</td>
<td>144.08</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOF-3a$^{320}$</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ni$_2$(HCOO)$_4$]$^{352}$</td>
<td>164.81</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>119.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-BTC$^{305, 319-320}$</td>
<td>216.90</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>124.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFM-188$^{318}$</td>
<td>152.32</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MUF-17  | 111.59                        | 51.53                                       | 79.70                                 | 93.05                               | 8.73                                    | 6.01                                   | 49.5                           | 31.1                           | 33.8                           | 20     |

$^a$ At a pressure of 1 bar. $^b$ For an equimolar mixture of $C_2H_2/C_3H_3$ or $CO_2/C_2H_2$ and a total pressure of 1 bar. $^c$ At low loading. $^d$ At 298 K. $^e$ Molecular sieving. $^f$ Determined experimentally.
Motivated by the high uptake and preferential binding of $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2$ by MUF-17, the adsorption selectivity towards $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2$ in mixtures with $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ was predicted on the basis of ideal adsorbed solution theory using a range of starting compositions (50/50, 5/95 and 0.1/99.9 $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$) at 273 and 293 K (Figures 6.8 and see appendix E for the remainder). For 50/50 $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ mixtures, the selectivity of MUF-17 at 293 K and 1 bar is 8.73. Although the separation selectivity of MUF-17 is lower than benchmark materials such as SIFSIX-2-Cu-i$^{317}$ (41.0) and UTSA-100$^{a397}$ (19.6), it is still high and on par with SIFSIX-1-Cu$^{317}$ (8.3) and superior to frameworks such as UTSA-67$^{a405}$ (4.5), FeMOF-74$^{408}$ (2.1), SIFSIX-2-Cu$^{317}$ (5.0) and M’MOF-3$^{a402}$ (5.2) (Table 6.4). With respect to $\text{CO}_2$, acetylene is found in crude product streams in approximately equimolar ratios with this gas.$^{414}$ Therefore, the IAST selectivity was calculated for a 50/50 mixture of $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2/\text{CO}_2$ and it is also presented in Figure 6.8 (see appendix E for other mixture compositions). This value is 6.01 at 293 K and 1 bar, which is comparable to the previously-reported high-performing MOF UTSA-74$^{a322}$ and higher than others such as UTSA-50$^{a415}$, HKUST-1$^{320}$ and MFM-188, $^{318}$ while it dips below that of NKMOF-1-Ni$^{325}$ and $[\text{Ni}_3(\text{HCOO})_6]^{352}$ (Table 6.4). These results imply that MUF-17 can separate $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2$ from $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ and $\text{CO}_2$ under typically-encountered industrial conditions.

![Figure 6.8 Predicted IAST selectivity of MUF-17 for 50/50 $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ and $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2/\text{CO}_2$ mixtures at 293 K and 273 K.](image)

To evaluate the binding strength between MUF-17 and guest molecules, coverage-dependent adsorption enthalpies ($Q_{st}$) for $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2$, $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ and $\text{CO}_2$ were evaluated from pure component isotherms collected at 273, 288, 293, and 298 K by the implementation of a virial equation (see Appendix E for virial fitting curves). The $Q_{st}$ profiles show values of 49.5, 31.1
and 33.8 kJ/mol for C$_2$H$_2$, C$_2$H$_4$ and CO$_2$, respectively, at zero loading. The high $Q_{st}$ of C$_2$H$_2$ compared to that of C$_2$H$_4$ and CO$_2$ illustrates that the interaction of MUF-17 with C$_2$H$_2$ is energetically more favourable than the other gases. This is only true up to intermediate pressures since the $Q_{st}$ for C$_2$H$_2$ decreases with an increase of gas loading. This indicates that MUF-17 presents a range of binding sites with various affinities for C$_2$H$_2$. Interestingly, the $Q_{st}$ of C$_2$H$_4$ rises at higher pressures, possibly due to interactions between the absorbed gas molecules as the pores fill.

![Figure 6.9](image)

**Figure 6.9** Isosteric heat of adsorption plotted as a function of gas uptake for the adsorption of C$_2$H$_2$, C$_2$H$_4$ and CO$_2$ by MUF-17.

To gain further insight into the mechanism of adsorption in MUF-17 first-principles dispersion-corrected density functional theory (DFT-D3$^{233}$ calculations were implemented in the software package VASP.$^{234}$ The calculated static binding energy for C$_2$H$_2$ at its preferred binding site (one guest per unit cell) is around -61.9 kJ/mol, whereas it is -40.4 and -48.6 kJ/mol for C$_2$H$_4$ and CO$_2$, respectively. The stronger host-guest interaction calculated for C$_2$H$_2$ are in accord with the earlier $Q_{st}$ values. In the density functional theory optimized host–guest structures, it can be seen that C$_2$H$_2$, C$_2$H$_4$ and CO$_2$ are all adsorbed in the narrowest channel neck, but they interact differently with the pore surface. As shown in Figure 6.10a, the C$_2$H$_2$ molecules form two strong and three weak electrostatic interactions with MUF-17. Coordinated oxygen atoms of a framework carboxyl group interact with a highly polar hydrogen atom of C$_2$H$_2$, through C≡C•••O hydrogen bonding with a very short distance of 2.34 Å. The carbon atom of the C$_2$H$_2$ guest, which carries a partial negative charge, interacts with a hydrogen atom of a coordinated amino group through a C≡C•••H-N contact with a separation of 2.46 Å, much shorter than the sum of van der Waals radii of
hydrogen (1.20 Å) and carbon (1.85 Å) atoms. Three other attractive interactions involve the carbon atom of C\(_2\)H\(_2\) with hydrogen atoms of the framework. For example, a coordinated amino group forms C≡C···H-N contacts with distances of 4.16 - 4.33 Å (Figure 6.10a).

![Diagram showing C\(_2\)H\(_2\), C\(_2\)H\(_4\), and CO\(_2\) adsorption sites.](attachment:image)

**Figure 6.10** Comparison of the preferential (a) C\(_2\)H\(_2\), (b) C\(_2\)H\(_4\), and (c) CO\(_2\) adsorption sites (Co dark blue, N light blue, O red, C gray, H white) observed by DFT-D3 calculations. Black and red dashed lines indicate attractive and repulsive electrostatic interactions, respectively.

For C\(_2\)H\(_4\), the strongest interactions involve a guest CH\(_2\) group and coordinated water at the narrowest channel neck (C=C-H···N) at particularly short distances of 1.95 and 2.87 Å. Weaker interactions involve coordinated oxygen atoms of a carboxyl group (C=C-H···O). These interactions are similar in geometry and type with those observed for C\(_2\)H\(_2\). Naturally, the geometry of C\(_2\)H\(_4\) prevents its carbon atoms from forming strong C=C···H interactions with the narrow channel neck in the manner of C\(_2\)H\(_2\) (Figure 6.10b). Furthermore, there is significant electrostatic repulsion between the partial positive charges of N–H moieties of the two amino groups from the host channel and the hydrogen atoms of the guest C\(_2\)H\(_4\) (H···H = 2.85 Å and 3.84 Å). These prevent the guest from assuming a position that would allow further attractive interactions. Evidently, the size and electrostatic characteristics of the pores...
play critical roles in distinguishing C$_2$H$_2$ and C$_2$H$_4$ and underlie the large adsorption enthalpy difference. In the simulated adsorption location of CO$_2$, the guest carbon atom is located at the centre of the host channel neck in a head-on orientation (Figure 6.10c). Both of its oxygen atoms adopt favourable short contacts with hydrogen atoms of two amino groups (2.47 and 2.67 Å), and its carbon atom interacts on both sides with oxygen atoms of coordinated carboxyl groups (distances of 4.06 and 3.05 Å). Although these host–guest interactions seem relatively strong, they are counteracted by O…O repulsive forces involving the CO$_2$ oxygen atoms. These atoms are surrounded by four oxygens from two coordinated carboxyl groups at short distances of ~3.2 Å.

Based on the promising gas adsorption results, we investigated the feasibility of C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ and C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ separations under dynamic conditions. We measured experimental breakthrough curves for 50/50 and 1/99 gas mixtures of C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ at 293 K and 1.1 bar. Figure 6.11a shows the relative concentration profile of C$_2$H$_2$, C$_2$H$_4$ exiting an adsorption bed packed with MUF-17 as a function of time. Complete separation was realized by MUF-17, whereby the C$_2$H$_4$ broke through from the column at an early stage because of its low adsorption capacity and affinity for the framework. This occurred after around 10 minutes, which means the uptake of C$_2$H$_4$ under these dynamic conditions is 1.10 and 0.55 mmol/g for 1/99 and 50/50 mixtures, respectively. Dynamic capacity of a gas component was obtained by calculating the amount of the gas adsorbed until the breakthrough point and it is usually less than equilibrium capacity because of limited contact time during dynamic breakthrough condition where gas components have lesser time to be adsorbed compared to equilibrium adsorption.

Conversely, the signal of C$_2$H$_2$ was not detected for at least 37 and 99 minutes for 50/50 and 1/99 mixtures, respectively. This equates to dynamic uptake capacities of 1.92 and 0.11 mmol/g, respectively. These results indicate that MUF-17 can efficiently trap small quantities of C$_2$H$_2$ when it is present in both bulk and trace quantities. Advantageously, the breakthrough trace of C$_2$H$_2$ is steep, which arises from the high affinity of MUF-17 for this guest. This indicates the mass transfer zone (the area of the bed in which adsorption is taking place) of C$_2$H$_2$ in the adsorption will be narrow, which decreases the unused bed length to maximize the capture efficiency. The C$_2$H$_4$ productivity, defined by the amount of this gas with a purity of at least 99.95% that can be produced from an adsorption bed packed with 1 kg of MUF-17 under these conditions, is 192 L.
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Figure 6.11 (a, b) Experimental breakthrough curves for 50/50 and 1/99 mixtures of C₂H₂/C₂H₄ and C₂H₂/CO₂ at 293 K and 1.1 bar in an adsorption column packed with MUF-17.

Subsequent multiple breakthrough tests revealed that MUF-17 maintains its performance over at least 10 cycles (Figure 6.12a). The full regeneration of MUF-17 was achieved by simply placing it under vacuum or purging with an inert gas. As evident in Figure 6.12b, almost all of the adsorbed C₂H₄ and half of the C₂H₂ can be removed from the bed by purging with helium at 80 °C. The remaining guests can be fully desorbed at 130 °C.

Figure 6.12 (a) C₂H₂/C₂H₄ separation cycles for a 50/50 mixture lasting for 10 cycles. Each separation process was carried out at 293 K and 1.1 bar and MUF-17 was regenerated between cycles in vacuo at 60 °C for 40–50 min. (b) Desorption profile of CO₂ and C₂H₂ from a MUF-17 bed upon heating under a helium flow of 5 mL/min at 1.1 bar. All of the adsorbates were removed upon heating at various stages up to 130 °C.

The multipurpose capabilities of MUF-17 were experimentally verified by its ability to separate C₂H₂ from an equimolar mixture with CO₂, which mimics typical process conditions (Figure 6.11b). The framework accomplishes this by sequestering the C₂H₂ and
allowing the CO$_2$ to escape. The long time lag before the acetylene breaks through from the adsorption bed speaks to a high productivity. The dynamic capacity obtained from breakthrough curves were 0.44 and 2.12 mmol/g for CO$_2$ and C$_2$H$_2$, respectively. As expected, the breakthrough performance is further improved when a 1/99 C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ mixture is used as a feed (Figure 6.11b).

The PXRD patterns (Figure 6.4) and C$_2$H$_2$ adsorption isotherm of MUF-17 (Figure 6.13) exhibit no notable differences after consecutive adsorption-desorption cycles nor after exposure to air with ~80% humidity for 8 months, in accord with the high stability of MUF-17. Therefore, MUF-17 is relevant to the removal and sequestration of acetylene in practical operating situations.

![C$_2$H$_2$ adsorption isotherms (293 K) of MUF-17 after four consecutive adsorption-desorption cycles and after exposing it to air with high humidity for 8 months.](image)

**Figure 6.13** C$_2$H$_2$ adsorption isotherms (293 K) of MUF-17 after four consecutive adsorption-desorption cycles and after exposing it to air with high humidity for 8 months.

To investigate the elimination of highly dilute quantities of C$_2$H$_2$, we simulated breakthrough curves under these conditions. First, the mass transfer coefficient used for the simulated breakthrough curves was empirically tuned to produce a match between the simulated and experimental breakthrough curves. With this realistic mass transfer coefficient in hand, we predicted breakthrough curves using feed compositions comprising 0.1% C$_2$H$_2$ in C$_2$H$_4$ or CO$_2$ (Figure 6.14). These calculations revealed MUF-17 eliminates vanishingly small quantities of C$_2$H$_2$, as often required in industrial processes.
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Figure 6.14 Simulated breakthrough curves for 0.1/99.9 mixtures of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}/CO\textsubscript{2} at 293 K and 1.1 bar.

Taken together, these data reveal MUF-17 to be a highly effective multipurpose acetylene adsorbent. Its capabilities rely on a combination of affinity-based selectivity and uptake capacity. These characteristics arise from its structure, in which relatively large pockets are connected by narrow necks (Figure 6.3). The selectivity for acetylene over the other gases draws from the size and polarity of the neck regions, which provides high levels of discrimination (Figure 6.10). The pockets provide the capacity for significant amounts of acetylene to be sequestered by the framework. These characteristics operate in tandem to underpin the effectiveness of MUF-17.

6.3 Conclusion

MUF-17 efficiently separates C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} from both C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and CO\textsubscript{2}. Owing to its unique pore structure and the intimate contact between small guest molecules and the pore necks, MUF-17 exhibits a steep C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} adsorption isotherm and a high capacity at low pressures. This exceptional affinity arises from ideal structural features: its narrow channel neck is rich with polar residues that are complementary to acetylene in terms of both geometry and electrostatics. The underlying host-guest noncovalent interactions were elucidated by first-principles dispersion-corrected density functional theory calculations. The unique structure of MUF-17 underpins its ability to remove trace acetylene where required, for example in the clean-up of ethylene, or to sequester bulk acetylene in other circumstances, such as the purification of acetylene itself in a typical industrial process. Combining these functional attributes in a single multipurpose material is an attractive step forward, especially when embodied in an inexpensive, robust, stable and recyclable material such as MUF-17.

6.4 Experimental and computational section

6.4.1 General procedures

All starting compounds and solvents were used as received from commercial sources without further purification unless otherwise noted. Elemental analyses were performed by the Campbell Microanalytical Laboratory at the University of Otago, New Zealand. IAST selectivity and heat of adsorption were calculated based on the methods presented in previous sections.

6.4.2 Thermogravimetric Analysis (TGA)

As per Chapter 2. Freshly prepared MOF samples were washed with MeOH, and then activated at 130 °C under vacuum for 18 hours. Samples were exposed to air for few hours and then transferred to an aluminum sample pan, and then measurements were commenced under an N₂ flow with a heating rate of 4 °C /min.

6.4.3 Single crystal X-ray diffraction

As per Chapter 2. All atoms were found in the electron density difference map. Electron density difference maps were carefully analyzed for the possible presence of disordered framework components. All atoms were treated isotropically except metal centres.

6.4.4 Powder X-ray diffraction patterns

As per Chapter 2. The data were obtained from freshly prepared MOF samples that had been washed several times with MeOH.

6.4.5 Gas adsorption measurements

As per Chapter 2.

6.4.6 Physical properties and pore characteristics calculations

The Zeo++\textsuperscript{242} code and RASPA2\textsuperscript{232} were used to characterize the geometric features of the framework by calculating the pore volume (with the use of a helium probe), surface area (with the use of a H₂ probe), pore limiting diameter and largest cavity diameter. Accelrys Materials Studio 7.0 software package was performed to visualize the MOF structure and pore topology.
6.4.7 BET surface area calculations

The BET surface area was calculated from the both CO$_2$ adsorption isotherm at 273 K and N2 adsorption isotherms at 77 K according to the procedures presented in Chapter 2. A cross-sectional area of a 21.8 was used for CO$_2$.

6.4.8 Breakthrough separation experiment

In a typical breakthrough experiment, 1.2 g of activated MUF-17 was placed in an adsorption column (6.4 mm in diameter × 11 cm in length) to form a fixed bed. The adsorbent was activated at 130 °C under high vacuum for 12 hours and then the column was left under vacuum for another 3 hours while being cooled to 20 °C. The column was then purged under a 20 mL/min flow of He gas for 1 hr at 1.1 bar prior to the breakthrough experiment. A gas mixture containing either C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ or C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ with different compositions along with He as a carrier was introduced to the column at 1.1 bar and 20 °C. A total feed flowrate of 6 mL/min was set for the experiments with 50/50 and 1/99 mixtures of gases, and the flowrate of He in the feed was kept constant at 3 mL/min for all the experiments. The operating pressure was controlled at 1.1 bar with a back-pressure regulator. The outlet composition was continuously monitored by the mass spectrometer until complete breakthrough was observed. The adsorbent was regenerated under vacuum for 40-50 minutes at 60 °C between each cycle.

Regeneration profile

The desorption behaviour of C$_2$H$_2$, CO$_2$ and C$_2$H$_4$ from the adsorption column was also investigated. Once the adsorbent was saturated with an equimolar mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ or C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$, the column was purged with a helium flow of 5 mL/min for 11 mins at 20 °C at 1 bar, while monitoring the effluent gas. The column was then heated to 80 °C with a ramp of 10 °C/min for 18 mins. Finally, the column was heated to 130 °C with the same ramping rate for 30 min before cooling to 20 °C. A breakthrough measurement was then performed, which showed that the absorbent had been fully regenerated.

6.4.9 Breakthrough curves simulation

Breakthrough curves were simulated based on the procedure presented earlier. Adsorption bed characteristics and other related parameters for simulation are presented in Table 6.5.
### Table 6.5 Adsorption column parameters and feed gas metrics used for the simulations for MUF-17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adsorption bed</th>
<th>Feed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length: 110 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter: 6.4 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of adsorbent in the bed: 1.2 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed voidage: 0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adsorbent average radius: 0.05 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{CO}_2}$: 6.12 s$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{C}_2\text{H}_2}$: 5.95 s$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{C}_2\text{H}_4}$: 6.02 s$^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total flow rate (including He): 6 mL N/min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature: 293 K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure: 1.1 bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier gas (He) flow rate: 3 mL N/min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purge gas: He with a flow rate of 20 mL N/min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.4.10 Productivity calculation

The $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ productivity was defined by the breakthrough amount of ethylene (defined as a volume of gas at STP) from an adsorption bed packed with 1 kg of MOF. The breakthrough amount was calculated by integration of the breakthrough curves (for a mixture of 1/99 $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2/\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$) during a period from $t_1$ to $t_2$ during which the $\text{C}_2\text{H}_4$ purity is higher than or equal to a threshold value of 99.95%:

$$(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)_{\text{Productivity}} = \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} F_{\text{C}_2\text{H}_4,\text{out}} dt}{m_{\text{MOF}}}$$

Where $F_{\text{C}_2\text{H}_4,\text{out}}$ is the flowrate of effluent ethylene and $m_{\text{MOF}}$ is the amount of MOF packed in the bed.

#### 6.4.11 DFT calculations

Static binding energies for guest molecules in the MUF-17 framework were calculated using density functional theory (DFT) as implemented in the software package VASP 5.4.4. It is well-known that standard DFT methods based on generalized gradient approximation do not fully account for the long-range dispersion interactions between the framework and the bound adsorbates. Therefore, to accurately estimate static binding energies for the guest molecules within the MUF-17 framework, we implemented dispersion corrections using DFT-D3 method. Electron exchange and correlation were described using the generalized gradient approximation Perdew, Burke, and Ernzerhof (PBE) form, and the projector-augmented wave potentials were used to treat core and valence electrons. In all cases, we used a plane-wave kinetic energy cutoff of 600 eV and a Gamma-point mesh for sampling the Brillouin zone. The ionic coordinates were relaxed until the Hellman-Feynman ionic forces were less than 0.02 eV/Å. The initial location of the guest molecule (one guest molecule per cell) in MUF-17 was obtained from a classical simulated annealing.
technique using classical force fields, as implemented in the sorption module in *Materials Studio*. In the simulated annealing method, the temperature was lowered stepwise, allowing the gas molecule to reach a desirable configuration based on different moves such as rotation, translation and repositioning with preset probabilities of occurrence. This process of heating and cooling the system was repeated over several heating cycles to find the local minima. Forty heating cycles were performed where the maximum temperature and the final temperature were $10^5$ K and 100 K, respectively. Static binding energies ($\Delta E$) at 0 K in vacuum were calculated using the following expression

$$
\Delta E = E_{MOF+Guest} - E_{MOF} - E_{Guest}
$$

Where $E_x$ refers, respectively, to the total energies of the MOF + guest complex, the MOF alone, and the guest molecule.
Chapter 7

Summary and perspectives

7.1 Thesis summary

The study presented in this thesis involves the design, synthesis and evaluation of metal-organic frameworks for gas separation applications with a focus on development of inexpensive and highly stable MOFs. Three families of MOFs were synthesized and characterized followed by a comprehensive evaluation of their performance for a variety of different gas separation applications.

In Chapter 2, a MOF termed MUF-15 was developed showing great potential for producing pure ethane through a single adsorption stage by selectively adsorbing ethane over ethylene. Built from isophthalic acid and cobalt acetate, MUF-15 features three narrow zigzag 1-dimensional channels mainly decorated with phenyl rings. As revealed by DFT calculations and confirmed by gas adsorption studies, an optimal pore dimensions that allowed optimal van der Waals interactions between the guest and the framework surface and the avoidance of built-in regions of high polarity (such as open metal sites) underlie its ethane-selective nature. Owing to these pore characteristics, MUF-15 combines a high uptake capacity and good selectivity, where it exhibits one of the highest productivities amongst materials with reverse selectivity (preference for ethane over ethylene). Additionally, MUF-15 shows a relatively good stability to laboratory atmospheres, is synthesized from inexpensive precursors and maintains its adsorption capacity over multiple adsorption-desorption cycles. Remarkably, heat of adsorption calculations revealed MUF-15 has a moderate heat of adsorption which enables a facile regeneration by purging at moderate temperatures or in vacuo over a short period of time. Taken together, these attributes represent a significant addition to the portfolio of known C$_2$H$_6$-selective MOFs. Also, a clear illustration of how such selectivity may be achieved using straightforward components are presented which can defines the way forward to design materials for challenging separations.

Suitable pore characteristics and chemistry of MUF-15 motivated us to investigate the effect of different ligand functional groups on its structural properties and gas separation performance. From the crystal structure of MUF-15, the hydrogen atom of the 5-position of the isophthalate phenyl ring is positioned towards the pore aperture. Therefore, substituting
it with different functional groups might drastically change the pore characteristics and adsorption performance of MUF-15. Hence, in Chapter 3, six different groups (fluoro, hydroxy, bromo, nitro, methyl and methoxy) representing a broad range of sizes and functionalities, were substituted into the structure of MUF-15 to produce six isostructural analogues. As anticipated, the introduction of these functionalities greatly changed the stability and gas sorption behaviour of these MOFs. Generally, these groups reduced the surface area and pore volumes, but had a diverse impact in framework stability. Furthermore, selectivity of ethane over ethylene also decreased or reversed upon functionalization, as most of these functionalities enhance the polarity of the surface which favours the adsorption of ethylene.

Surprisingly, MUF-21 (functionalized by a nitro group) and MUF-23 (functionalized by a methoxy group) showed flexibility upon inclusion of guest molecules such as $C_2H_2$, $CO_2$, $C_2H_4$ and $C_2H_6$ at ambient conditions. We believe this flexibility originates from the rotation of phenyl rings upon the inclusion of guest molecules, thus opening up more space. We also hypothesize that MUF-15 and its isoreticular analogues all have flexible structures varying in their gate opening pressures and temperatures. MUF-21 was further investigated to see the effect of flexibility on its separation performance. A combination of predicted and experimental gas breakthrough measurements proved that gate opening phenomena improves the performance of MUF-23 to efficiently separate $CO_2$ from $N_2$.

Additionally, MUF-22 (functionalized by a methyl group) and MUF-23 (functionalized by a methoxy group) indicated extraordinary stability upon exposure to a humid air mostly because of the hydrophobic nature of these groups and shielding of the SBUs from incoming $H_2O$ molecules.

In Chapter 4, we introduced the MUF-16 family. It is a series of isostructural MOFs built up from 5-aminoisophthalic acid and a divalent metal ion: cobalt (MUF-16), manganese (MUF-16(Mn)) or nickel (MUF-16(Ni)). We found that the structures of MUF-16 and MUF-16(Mn) had previously been reported$^{303-304}$ We added the nickel version of MUF-16 to this family and developed a synthesis procedure for MUF-16 to afford a higher yield, shorter reaction time and milder synthesis condition. These frameworks feature narrow one-dimensional channels with a pore windows of about $3.1 \times 5.9 \text{ Å}^2$ decorated with amino functionalities and non-coordinated carboxylate groups.

The MUF-16 family features a pore size that perfectly matches the size of $CO_2$ molecules ($3.33 \times 3.18 \times 5.36 \text{ Å}^3$). This combines with an optimal distribution of electrostatic forces on the pore surface to enable high levels of $CO_2$ adsorption. Single-crystal studies of samples loaded with $CO_2$ was successfully conducted to determine binding location of the $CO_2$
molecules in MUF-16. This revealed that the adsorbed CO$_2$ molecules are orientated in a way that perfectly surrounded by favourable adsorption sites both in the corners and middle of the pores. The oxygen atoms of one of the CO$_2$ guest molecules forms close N-H⋯O and C-H⋯O interactions with the phenyl and amino functionalities of the Haip ligand. Similarly, the carbon atom of adsorbed CO$_2$ molecule forms a C⋯O interaction with an oxygen atom of uncoordinated carboxylate group.

The electrostatic properties of the pore surface of MUF-16 family as well as its suitable pore dimension motivated us to investigate its performance for separating CO$_2$ from different gas mixtures in Chapter 5. As revealed by gas adsorption measurements, MUF-16 exhibited appreciable selectivity for CO$_2$ by taking up significant amount of CO$_2$, while adsorbing near-zero amounts of C$_2$ hydrocarbons. This material sets a benchmark for MOFs that are selective for CO$_2$ over C$_2$ hydrocarbons. In the context of CO$_2$/C$_2$ hydrocarbons separation, the favourable orientation of electrostatic potential in the pore surface has amplifies the small difference between CO$_2$ and C$_2$ hydrocarbons that have opposite electrostatic distributions, i.e., C$_2$ hydrocarbons have quadrupole moment of different signs to CO$_2$. This results in an attractive interaction of CO$_2$ molecules and thus a high adsorption amount. On the other hand, the interaction of C$_2$ hydrocarbons with the framework is repulsive, resulting in negligible adsorption. For the case of CO$_2$/N$_2$ and CO$_2$/CH$_4$, the same mechanism is applied. The combined effect of the small pore size of MUF-16 and the weaker interaction of N$_2$ and CH$_4$ with framework leads to a negligible adsorption of these gases.

The efficiency of MUF-16 for separating CO$_2$ from C$_2$ hydrocarbon, CH$_4$+C$_2$H$_6$ and N$_2$ was well demonstrated by breakthrough experiments. Complete separation was achieved by very early breaking through of N$_2$, CH$_4$ and C$_2$ hydrocarbons, while CO$_2$ was adsorbed on the bed at nearly its equilibrium capacity. The ability of MUF-16 to capturing CO$_2$ directly from air was also investigated via breakthrough experiments. MUF-16 could not completely eliminate the 400 ppm of CO$_2$ from the air mostly because of co-adsorption of water by the framework.

Pelletization of MUF-16 also was successfully achieved by incorporating a polymeric PVDF binder. In addition, MUF-16 is built up from inexpensive reactants and indicated an easy regeneration and excellent recyclability. Surprisingly, MUF-16 exhibited an extraordinary water stability, where it maintains its adsorption capacity upon exposure to humid environment for a long time and immersion in water. Therefore, MUF-16 shows great potential in the practical separation of CO$_2$ from different gas streams.

Finally, in Chapter 6, we introduced a MOF termed MUF-17 which efficiently separates C$_2$H$_2$ from both C$_2$H$_4$ and CO$_2$. MUF-17 also was synthesized from the same ligand (5-
aminoisophthalic acid) and metal salt (cobalt acetate) that was used for the synthesis of MUF-16 under different synthesis conditions and with different ligand/metal salt ratios. Therefore, the end price of this MOF is also expected to be quite cheap. Single-crystal structure determination revealed that MUF-17 is a porous coordination polymer featuring narrow zigzag 1-dimensional pores including relatively large cavities with pore aperture size of $4.7 \times 4.8 \, \text{Å}$. Adsorption isotherm measurements followed by selectivity calculations demonstrated that MUF-17 is capable of efficiently adsorbing acetylene over ethane and CO$_2$ with steep isotherms and high capacities at low pressures of acetylene. The underlying host-guest noncovalent interactions were elucidated by first-principles dispersion-corrected density functional theory calculations, where it was revealed that its narrow channel neck which is rich with polar residues are complementary to acetylene in terms of both geometry and electrostatics. MUF-17 thus adsorbs significant amounts of acetylene especially at low pressures.

The efficiency of MUF-17 for separating acetylene from both CO$_2$ and ethylene was successfully demonstrated by breakthrough experiments and simulated breakthrough curves. Moreover, MUF-17 is extremely stable when exposed to humid atmosphere and maintains its adsorption capacity upon several adsorption-desorption cycles. Combining these functional attributes in a single multipurpose material is an attractive step forward for designing efficient materials for challenging gas separation applications.

### 7.2 Perspectives and future directions

#### 7.2.1 Propane/propylene separations with MUF-15 family

In Chapters 2 and 3, the MUF-15 family was presented as efficient set of materials with relatively small pore window apertures and pore surfaces decorated with aromatic or aliphatic moieties (phenyl rings). Such pore surfaces favour the adsorption of highly polarizable molecules such as ethane over polar gases like ethylene. C$_2$H$_6$-selective MOFs are significantly more important than C$_2$H$_4$-selective MOFs since high-purity C$_2$H$_4$ is afforded directly through a single adsorption step, simplifying the process and resulting in an increase in productivity. Another important olefin/paraffin mixture that is in high demand to be separated is propane/propylene. Pure propylene may be produced by selectively adsorbing propane. The MUF-15 family could be a great choice to do this because of the similar properties of this mixture with ethane/ethylene mixtures. To best of our knowledge, if the MUF-15 family adsorbs propane over propylene it would be the first material in the literature with such an adsorption behaviour.
7.2.2 Investigating the flexibility of other members of MUF-15 family

As was revealed by gas sorption studies followed by PXRD measurements under vacuum, two members of MUF-15 family namely MUF-21 (functionalized by nitro group) and MUF-23 (functionalized by methoxy groups) exhibited flexibility upon inclusion of different gas molecules under ambient conditions (pressure from 0.1 to 1 bar and temperatures from 263 K to 293 K) or under vacuum. Later, a sign of flexibility in MUF-15 was observed by a slight structural change upon exposure to some solvents such as DMF and DEF. The flexible nature of MUF-15 was afterwards confirmed by measuring PXRD patterns under vacuum.

However, we did not see any sign of flexibility for the other members - including the parent MOF - based on their adsorption isotherms. As three members of this family have shown flexible nature, there is some promise that the remainder also might have some extent of flexibility. Hence, as a future work, this family can be comprehensively investigated for their flexibility by measuring isotherms at high pressure, lower temperatures or exposure to different guest molecules or solvents. PXRD measurement at different pressures and neutron diffraction studies are helpful techniques to understand the flexibility, and host-guest interaction of these frameworks.

7.2.3 Synthesis of MUF-15 with other interesting substituents and investigation of their gas separation performance

In Chapter 3, we substituted the hydrogen atoms of phenyl groups with six different functional groups. As these substituents are pointing towards the pore surface of framework, they significantly change the pore dimensions and electrostatics. Hence, further attempts can be made to introduce other interesting functional groups such as amino groups (highly polar) or ethyl groups (relatively large). These functionalities can greatly alter the pore characteristics of these frameworks and thus boost their separation performance in interesting ways.

Four of isophthalate ligands functionalized by ethyl, thiol, iodo and boronic acid groups are presented in Figure 7.2. As these functionalities have different sizes and electrostatic properties, their introduction into the pore structure of MUF-15 can be interesting to improve the separation performance of MUF-15. All of these linkers are also commercially available.
Additionally, other linkers with the same linking geometry of isophthalic acid might be able to be substituted in the structure of MUF-15. In this way, a MOF with the same topology as MUF-15 but larger pores with higher surface area and pore volumes can be achieved. Three possible ligands are presented in Figure 7.1.

As these linkers are consist of phenyl rings (aromatic moieties) they can improve ethane/ethylene selectivity of MUF-15 through stronger interaction of ethane with the framework. It should be noted that incorporation of these linkers might drastically increase the pore dimension of MUF-15 and thus weaken the overall strength of the interaction between guest molecules and the frameworks. These linkers are all commercially available and can be purchased from available providers.

### 7.2.4 Investigation of MUF-16 family separation performance in presence of water and H₂S

As was demonstrated in Chapter 5, MUF-16 loses its CO₂ adsorption capacity during direct air capture experiments. Here, the ratio of water content (0.01-0.03 mole fraction) to CO₂ content (400 ppmv) in air is extremely high. These water molecules occupy adsorption sites within the framework, thus leading to near-zero adsorption of CO₂. MUF-16 was successfully applied for post-combustion capture processes and natural gas upgrading but this assumed there exists only CO₂, N₂, CH₄ and C₂H₆ and not any other impurities such as
water vapor and H$_2$S. In the context of CO$_2$/N$_2$ separation for post-combustion processes there exists around 10% water vapor and 14% CO$_2$. Although the ratio of CO$_2$/water is not comparable with direct air capture processes, it still seems that water vapour greatly influences the adsorption capacity of MUF-16. So as future work, breakthrough curves for CO$_2$/N$_2$ separation can be performed in the presence of water to investigate the feasibility of using MUF-16 under simulated process conditions. In the case of CO$_2$/CH$_4$ separation for natural gas upgrading, small quantities of H$_2$S exist in the raw feed that need to be removed. H$_2$S might have two negative effects: Similar to water, it might occupy adsorption sites and reduce the adsorption of CO$_2$. Or it may damage the porosity of the framework by collapsing its structure.$^{417}$ Thus it is necessary to investigate the effect of H$_2$S on separation performance of MUF-16 in natural gas processing applications.

7.2.5 Large-scale synthesis of MUF-16 family using less solvents and under milder synthesis conditions

The largest scale we synthesized MUF-16 was one gram in a single batch. To investigate the application of MUF-16 for industrial adsorption processes such as PSA and TSA, a larger amount of material is required. So it is of great importance to synthesize the MOF on large scales. As future work, the feasibility of synthesizing MUF-16 on a kilogram scale or more can be explored. For this, designing synthetic methods with milder synthesis conditions (near room temperature and atmospheric pressures) are critical. Additionally, synthesis methods using less amount of solvents are highly recommended as an environmentally friendly approach. It is notable that solvent free methods for synthesizing MOFs have gained significant attention recently.$^{58}$

7.2.6 A comprehensive comparison of MUF-16 family with current industrial adsorbent for carbon capture processes and natural gas upgrading

Currently, MUF-16 has been compared with current CO$_2$ selective MOFs for carbon capture processes and natural gas upgrading in terms of their uptake capacity, IAST selectivity, uptake ratio and heat of adsorption, separately. The design of an efficient adsorptive separation units including PSA, TSA and VSA combines the effects of all of those metrics. For example, for an optimal TSA process, besides a high adsorption capacity and selectivity, a MOF should possess a moderate heat of adsorption to enable a facile regeneration. Furthermore, it should have a fast kinetics (a high adsorption rate or mass transfer coefficient) where it minimizes the unused length of the adsorbent bed. This is reflected by steep breakthrough curves. Additionally, all of these metrics together dictate the
energy efficiency and productivities of the unit and they need to be considered together to assess the performance of a porous material. Thus, as future work, reported materials can be compared with MUF-16 through a comprehensive analysis considering the effect of all of these metrics simultaneously.

### 7.2.7 Exploring separations of C3 hydrocarbons (propane/propylene and propyne/propylene) with MUF-17

As was discussed in Chapter 6, MUF-17 features one-dimensional channels including relatively large cavities that are connected to each other by narrow channels. These narrow channel necks are rich with highly polar residues. Such pore characteristics promise two possible applications of MUF-17 for gas separations. Separating highly polar gases from gases with lower polarity and separating smaller gases from larger gases through molecular sieving of them by channel neck windows. Therefore, this MOF can be a potential material for separating highly polar propylene from propane and/or propyne from propylene to produce polymer grade propylene. Furthermore, these gases can be separated based on the difference in their molecular size which again MUF-17 can be an efficient material because of its narrow channel necks that can act as molecular sieve.

### 7.2.8 Neutron powder diffraction studies for better understanding of host-guest interactions in MUF-15 and MUF-17 and X-ray diffraction studies of flexible MOFs

The underlying mechanism behind the ethane-selective nature of MUF-15 and acetylene-selective nature of MUF-17 was investigated through DFT calculations. As a future work, these materials can be loaded with these gases and then analyzed by neutron diffraction studies to achieve a better understandings of the guest binding conformation in the frameworks. Such valuable information can be a great help to design efficient materials for gas separation applications. In the context of flexible MOFs, PXRD studies can be performed at different pressures and temperatures to address the breathing behaviour of those MOFs. Neutron powder diffraction analysis as well as SCXRD studies also can be performed to solve the structure of flexible MOFs before and after breathing points. Some preliminary neutron powder diffractions analysis has initiated by our collaborators on MUF-23, however sensible conclusions from these measurements were precluded by crystallographic disorder.
7.2.9 The applicability of high-throughput screening of MOFs for gas separation applications

Apparently, combination of isophthalate ligands and cobalt clusters can results in MOFs with interesting gas adsorption behaviour and gas separation performance. High-throughput screening of MOFs through computational techniques can be an interesting tool to discover new MOFs with the same or close characteristics of MUF-15, MUF-16 or MUF-17. These tools along with deep understanding of adsorption mechanism in mentioned MOFs also can be exploited to explore huge library of known MOFs to find even better materials with enhanced adsorption capability and separation performance.

7.2.10 Incorporation of MUF-15, MUF-16 and MUF-17 in mixed matrix membranes

Membrane technologies are one of the most energy-efficient and operationally easy processes that can be sometimes alternatively used instead of adsorption column separation processes.\textsuperscript{129,418} In the context of MOFs, instead of being packed into an adsorption column, they can be incorporated into or used as membranes in two ways: MOF membranes where MOFs grow into a membrane shapes using a support and mixed matrix membranes where they are incorporated into a polymeric media.\textsuperscript{419-420} All of the MUF-15 family, MUF-16 family and MUF-17 can be explored for their applicability as components of polymer-based mixed-matrix MOF membranes in the future.
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1. $^1$H NMR spectroscopy analysis of digested MOF samples

For $^1$H NMR spectroscopy, guest-free crystals were digested using the following protocol: 150 µL of a 35% DCl solution in D$_2$O was mixed with 500 µL of DMSO-$d_6$ to give a DCl/DMSO-$d_6$ stock solution. Around 5 mg of OMOF-2 was digested in 150 µL of this stock solution together with 450 µL of DMSO-$d_6$. 5 mg of MUF-15 was also digested in 5 mL of NaOD/D$_2$O. Spectra were acquired immediately following dissolution. The resulting spectra are presented below.

![Figure A1](image_url)  
**Figure A1** $^1$H NMR spectrum of MUF-15 digested in D$_2$O/NaOD.
2. BET surface area calculations

Figure A2 N$_2$ adsorption isotherm at 77 K and BET surface area plots for MUF-15.

3. Single gas adsorption isotherms

Figure A3 Volumetric C$_2$H$_6$ adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms measured at different temperatures for MUF-15.
3. IAST calculations

**Figure A4** Volumetric C$_2$H$_4$ adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms measured at different temperatures for MUF-15.

**Figure A5** Dual-site Langmuir fits of the MUF-15 isotherms at 293 K.
Figure A6 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-15 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 25/75 C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} at 293 K.

Figure A7 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-15 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 10/90 C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} at 293 K.
Figure A8 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-15 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 1/99 C₂H₆/C₂H₄ at 293 K.

Figure A9 Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-15 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 C₂H₆/C₂H₄ at 293 K.
4. Experimental breakthrough curves

Figure A10 Overlay of experimental breakthrough curves for a mixture of 25/75 ethane/ethylene at 1.1 bar and 293 K for 12 cycles. The helium curve has been removed from the figure.

Figure A11 Overlay of experimental breakthrough curves of a mixture of 10:90 ethane/ethylene at 1.1 bar and 293 K for 12 cycles. The helium curve has been removed from the figure.
5. Simulated breakthrough curves

![Simulated breakthrough curves](image)

**Figure A12** Predicted breakthrough curves for a mixture of 0.1/99.90 of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} (black) and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} (red) at 293 K and 1.1 bar using a mass transfer coefficient of \textit{k_\text{ethane}}: 0.009 1/s and \textit{k_\text{ethylene}}: 0.013 1/s.

6. Productivity calculations

![Productivity calculations](image)

**Figure A13** Productivity of ethylene at different operating pressures for a 25/75 mixture of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} at 293 K.
Appendix B for Chapter 3

1. PXRD patterns after exposure to air

Figure B14. PXRD patterns of MUF-19, MUF-20 and MUF-21 after exposure to air.
1. BET surface area calculations

Figure C15 N\textsubscript{2} adsorption isotherm at 77 K and BET surface area plots for MUF-16.
Figure C16 \( \text{N}_2 \) adsorption isotherm at 77 K and BET surface area plots for MUF-16(Mn).

Figure C17 \( \text{N}_2 \) adsorption isotherm at 77 K and BET surface area plots for MUF-16(Ni).
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1. IAST calculations

Figure D18 Dual-site Langmuir fits of the MUF-16 isotherms at 293 K.

Figure D19 Dual-site Langmuir fits of the MUF-16 isotherms at 273 K.
**Figure D20** Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 50/50 CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_2$ at 293 K.

**Figure D21** Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 5/95 CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_2$ at 293 K.
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**Figure D22** Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_2$ at 293 K.

**Figure D23** Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 50/50 CO$_2$/C$_2$H$_2$ at 273 K.
Figure D24 Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 5/95 CO₂/C₂H₄ at 273 K.

Figure D25 Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 50/50 CO₂/C₂H₆ at 293 K.
**Figure D26** Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} at 293 K.

**Figure D27** Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 50/50 CO\textsubscript{2}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} at 293 K.
**Figure D28** Mixed isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 CO₂/C₂H₄ at 293 K.

**Figure D29** Dual-site Langmuir fits of the MUF-16 isotherms at 293 K.
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Figure S30. Dual-site Langmuir fits of the MUF-16(Mn) isotherms at 293 K.

Figure D31 Dual-site Langmuir fits of the MUF-16(Ni) isotherms at 293 K.
Figure D32 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 50/50 CO$_2$/N$_2$ at 293 K.

Figure D33 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 15/85 CO$_2$/N$_2$ at 293 K.
Figure D34 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 1/99 CO$_2$/N$_2$ at 293 K.

Figure D35 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.4/99.6 CO$_2$/N$_2$ at 293 K.
Figure D36 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.2/99.8 CO$_2$/N$_2$ at 293 K.

![Graph showing mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.2/99.8 CO$_2$/N$_2$ at 293 K.]

Figure D37 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 CO2/N2 at 293 K.

![Graph showing mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.1/99.9 CO2/N2 at 293 K.]
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Figure D38 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 0.04/99.96 CO$_2$/N$_2$ at 293 K.

Figure D39 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 50/50 CO$_2$/CH$_4$ at 293 K.
Figure D40 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 15/85 CO$_2$/CH$_4$ at 293 K.

Figure D41 Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-16 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 10/80/10 CO$_2$/CH$_4$/C$_2$H$_6$ at 293 K.
2. Experimental breakthrough curves

Figure D42. Predicted breakthrough curves for a mixture of 50/50 of CO$_2$ (black) and C$_2$H$_2$ (red) at 293 K and 1.1 bar compared with experimental breakthrough curves after tuning of the mass transfer coefficients ($k_{CO_2}$: 0.021 s$^{-1}$, $k_{C_2H_2}$: 0.024 s$^{-1}$).
**Figure D43.** Predicted breakthrough curves for a mixture of 5/95 of CO$_2$ (black) and C$_2$H$_2$ (red) at 293 K and 1.1 bar compared with experimental breakthrough curves after tuning of the mass transfer coefficients ($k_{CO2}$: 0.021 s$^{-1}$, $k_{C2H2}$: 0.024 s$^{-1}$).

![Predicted breakthrough curves for a mixture of 5/95 of CO$_2$ (black) and C$_2$H$_2$ (red) at 293 K and 1.1 bar compared with experimental breakthrough curves after tuning of the mass transfer coefficients ($k_{CO2}$: 0.021 s$^{-1}$, $k_{C2H2}$: 0.024 s$^{-1}$).](image1)

**Figure D44.** Predicted breakthrough curves for a mixture of 50/50 of CO$_2$ (black) and C$_2$H$_6$ (red) at 293 K and 1.1 bar compared with experimental breakthrough curves after tuning of the mass transfer coefficients ($k_{CO2}$: 0.021 s$^{-1}$, $k_{C2H6}$: 0.018 s$^{-1}$).

![Predicted breakthrough curves for a mixture of 50/50 of CO$_2$ (black) and C$_2$H$_6$ (red) at 293 K and 1.1 bar compared with experimental breakthrough curves after tuning of the mass transfer coefficients ($k_{CO2}$: 0.021 s$^{-1}$, $k_{C2H6}$: 0.018 s$^{-1}$).](image2)
**Figure D45.** Predicted breakthrough curves for a mixture of 50/50 of CO$_2$ (black) and C$_2$H$_4$ (red) at 293 K and 1.1 bar compared with experimental breakthrough curves after tuning of the mass transfer coefficients ($k_{CO2}$: 0.021 s$^{-1}$, $k_{C2H4}$: 0.017 s$^{-1}$).

![Predicted breakthrough curves](image)

**Figure D46** Experimental breakthrough curves for a mixture of 0.2/99.8 CO$_2$/N$_2$ at 1.1 bar and 293 K in an adsorption column packed with MUF-16.

![Experimental breakthrough curves](image)

**Figure D47** Experimental breakthrough curves for a mixture of 15/85 CO$_2$/CH$_4$ at 1.1 bar and 293 K in an adsorption column packed with MUF-16.
Figure D48 Desorption behaviour of CO$_2$ from a MUF-16 bed saturated with a 0.4/99.6 CO$_2$/N$_2$ mixture by heating the column at 1 bar under a helium flow of 20 mL$_N$/min. CO$_2$ is completely desorbed from the column upon heating to 80 °C. No CO$_2$ remains to be removed upon further heating to 130 °C.

Figure D49 Desorption behaviour of CO$_2$ from a MUF-16 bed saturated with a 0.2/99.8 CO$_2$/N$_2$ mixture by heating the column at 1 bar under a helium flow of 20 mL$_N$/min. CO$_2$ is completely desorbed from the column upon heating to 70 °C. No CO$_2$ remains to be removed upon further heating to 130 °C.
3. Heat of adsorption

![Graph of Uptake vs Temperature](image1.png)

**Figure D50** Virial equation fits for CO$_2$ adsorption isotherms of MUF-16.

![Graph of Uptake vs Temperature](image2.png)

**Figure D51** Virial equation fits for CO$_2$ adsorption isotherms of MUF-16(Mn).
**Figure D52** Virial equation fits for CO\(_2\) adsorption isotherms of MUF-16(Ni).
1. Single gas isotherm measurements

\[
\frac{P}{P_0} = (a \times x) + b
\]

\[
\text{MUF-17 surface Area} = 247 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}
\]

**Figure E53** CO\(_2\) adsorption isotherm at 273 K and BET surface area plots for MUF-17.
Figure E54 $N_2$ adsorption isotherm at 77 K and BET surface area plots for MUF-17.

Figure E55 Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of $C_2H_6$ (black), $CH_4$ (pink) and $N_2$ (green) measured at 293 K for MUF-17.
Figure E56 Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of C$_2$H$_6$ (black), CH$_4$ (pink) and N$_2$ (green) measured at 273 K for MUF-17.

Figure E57 Volumetric adsorption (filled circles) and desorption (open circles) isotherms of N$_2$ and H$_2$ measured at 77 K for MUF-17.
2. IAST calculations

![Graph](image)

**Figure E58.** Dual-site Langmuir fits of the MUF-17 isotherms at 293 K.

![Graph](image)

**Figure E59.** Dual-site Langmuir fits of the MUF-17 isotherms at 273 K.
Figure E60. Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-17 predicted by IAST for a 50/50 mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ at 293 K.

Figure E61. Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-17 predicted by IAST for a 1/99 mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ at 293 K.
Figure E62. Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-17 predicted by IAST for a 0.1/99.9 mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ at 293 K.

Figure E63. Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-17 predicted by IAST for a 50/50 mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/C$_2$H$_4$ at 273 K.
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Figure E64. Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-17 predicted by IAST for a 50/50 mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ at 293 K.

Figure E65. Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-17 predicted by IAST for a 1/99 mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ at 293 K.
Figure E66. Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-17 predicted by IAST for a 0.1/99.9 mixture of C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ at 293 K.

Figure E67. Mixed-gas isotherms and selectivity of MUF-17 predicted by IAST for a mixture of 50/50 C$_2$H$_2$/CO$_2$ at 273 K.
3. Heat of adsorption

Figure E68 Virial equation fits for C$_2$H$_2$ adsorption isotherms of MUF-17.

Figure E69 Virial equation fits for C$_2$H$_4$ adsorption isotherms of MUF-17.
Figure E70 Virial equation fits for CO₂ adsorption isotherms of MUF-17.