1	Effect of alumina on photocatalytic activity of iron oxides for bisphenol A degradation
2	
3	F. B. Li <sup>1, 2#</sup> , X. Z. Li <sup>1*</sup> , C. S. Liu <sup>2</sup> , T. X. Liu <sup>2</sup>
4	<sup>1</sup> Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University,
5	Kowloon, Hong Kong, China.
6	<sup>2</sup> Guangdong Key Laboratory of Agricultural Environment Pollution Integrated Control,
7	Guangdong Institute of Eco-Environment and Soil Science, Guangzhou, 510650, China.
8	
9	Abstract
10	To study the photodegradation of organic pollutants at the interface of minerals and water
11	in natural environment, three series of alumina-coupled iron oxides (Al $_2O_3$ -Fe $_2O_3$ -300, Al $_2O_3$ -
12	Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420, and Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550) with different alumina fraction were prepared and
13	characterized by X-ray diffraction (XRD), Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) and Barret-Joyner-
14	Halender (BJH), and Fourier transform infrared spectra (FTIR). The XRD results showed that
15	existence of alumina in iron oxides could hinder the formation of maghemite and hematite, and
16	also the crystal transformation from maghemite to hematite during sintering. It has been
17	confirmed that the BET surface area and micropore surface area of Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> catalysts
18	increased with an increased dosage of alumina and with decreased sintering temperature. The
19	pore size distribution also depended on the fraction of alumina. Furthermore, all $Al_2O_3$ -Fe $_2O_3$
20	catalysts had a mixed pore structure of micropore, mesopore and macropore. FTIR results
21	showed that FTIR peaks attributable to Fe-O vibrations of maghemite or hematite were also
22	affected by alumina content and sintering temperature. It was confirmed that the crystal structure
23	and crystalline, the surface area and pore size distribution of $Al_2O_3$ -Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> catalysts depend
24	strongly on the content of alumina and also sintering temperature. Bisphenol A (BPA) was
25	selected as a model endocrine disruptor in aquatic environment. The effects of alumina on the
26	photocatalytic activity of iron oxides for BPA degradation were investigated in aqueous
27	suspension. The experimental results showed that the dependence of BPA degradation on the
28	alumina content was attributable to the crystal structure, crystalline and also the properties of
29	their surface structures. It was confirmed that the mixed crystal structure of maghemite and
30	hematite could achieve the higher photocatalytic activity than maghemite or hematite alone.
31	

Keywords: Alumina; Bisphenol A; Hematite; Iron oxides; Maghemite; Photodegradation

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author: phone: (852) 2766 6016; Fax: (852) 2334 6389; Email: cexzli@polyu.edu.hk # First author's email: <u>cefbli@soil.gd.cn</u>

#### 34 **1. Introduction**

35

36 Since soil and water on the earth surface suffer from contamination of organic pollutants extensively at different degrees from ppb to ppm levels, it has become important to better 37 38 understand some abiotic transformations of these organic pollutants naturally occurring in the 39 environment, such as some catalytic processes at mineral surfaces. Actually these processes may 40 play a vital role in decontamination and mineralization of organic pollutants under a natural 41 condition [1-3]. It is necessary to investigate the catalytic properties and activity of these 42 minerals in such catalytic processes. Since these catalytic processes involve some complicated 43 heterogeneous reactions between minerals and water, the interactive reactions occurring at the 44 mineral-water interface become critical to influence the processes of decontamination in the 45 natural environment [4-7].

Iron oxides, including oxyhydroxides, are a kind of natural minerals and geocatalysts, naturally existing in the earth's crust with great content [8]. Since these iron oxides are very reactive, a number of secondary iron oxides such as maghemite ( $\gamma$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>), hematite ( $\alpha$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>), lepidocrocite ( $\gamma$ -FeOOH), goethite ( $\alpha$ -FeOOH), ferrihydrite (Fe<sub>5</sub>HO<sub>8</sub>·4H<sub>2</sub>O), and magnetite (Fe<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>) were found in aqueous streams as suspended materials with a significant amount [1-3]. Hence, the iron oxides in aquatic ecosystems play a vital role in a variety of chemical and biological processes relevant to the transformation of organic compounds.

53  $\gamma$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and  $\alpha$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> are two common iron oxides to show semiconductor properties with 54 a narrow band gap of 2.0-2.3 eV and might be photoactive under solar irradiation as 55 photocatalysts or photosensitizers [9,10] as described by the equations 1-3.

56

$$Fe_2O_3 + h\nu \rightarrow e^- + h^+$$
(1)

$$O_2 + e^- \rightarrow O_2^{\bullet-}$$
(2)

$$O_2^{\bullet} + 2H^+ \rightarrow 2 \cdot OH$$
(3)

- 57
- 51

It has been widely recognized that the iron oxide surface may play an important role as catalysts for photochemical transformations [14-16]. Cunningham et al. [17] obtained the evidence of the photocatalytic formation of  $\cdot$ OH radical in aqueous suspensions of  $\alpha$ -FeOOH under visible illumination, even though the photochemical transformation rate for organic degradation was found to be at a lower level. On the other hand, different Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> as natural minerals exist in our natural environment usually not alone and they very often coexist with silicate and alumina in soil. The fraction of silicate and alumina in clay varies in a board range from very low up to 75% [1-3]. However, these silicate and alumina are normally not photoactive under light irradiation at a wavelength of longer than 200 nm owing to their wide band gaps. Meanwhile, alumina-supported iron oxides were also investigated extensively as a kind of industrial catalysts [18-20].

In this study, three series of alumina-iron oxide (Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) samples with different fraction of alumina up to 70% were prepared as photocatalysts and their photocatalytic activity was evaluated in the degradation of bisphenol A (BPA) as a model endocrine disrupting chemical (EDC) in aqueous solution under UV-A illumination to study the effects of alumina on the photocatalytic activity of iron oxides, since BPA has been extensively used as a raw material of epoxy and polycarbonate resins, and also as antioxidants in softeners, fungicides, and similar products at about 1,700 tons annually all over the world [21,22].

76

#### 77 2. Experimental Section

78

# 79 **2.1** Preparation of $Fe_2O_3$ and $Al_2O_3$ - $Fe_2O_3$ powders

Three Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> powder samples were first prepared from Fe(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>.9H<sub>2</sub>O and glycol by a sol-gel procedure that 0.1 mol of Fe(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>.9H<sub>2</sub>O was dissolved into 160 ml of glycol and stirred sufficiently; then the solution was refluxed in a 250 ml flask at 65 °C for 24 h to get hydrosol; the hydrosol was dried at 100 °C for 24 h to obtain xerogel; then the xerogel was ground and sintered at 300 °C, 420 °C, and 550 °C for 2 h, respectively. The 3 product Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> powders were named "Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300" "Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420" and "Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550".

86 Three series of  $Al_2O_3$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> powders were then prepared from Fe(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>.9H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> Al(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>.9H<sub>2</sub>O, and glycol by the similar procedure, in which 0.1 mol of mixture of 87 Fe(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>.9H<sub>2</sub>O and Al(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>.9H<sub>2</sub>O was dissolved into 160 ml of glycol with different molar 88 89 ratios of Al/(Fe+Al). The first series of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> powder samples with the alumina contents of 70%, 60%, 50%, 40%, 30%, 20%, 10% and 5% were sintered at 300 °C for 2 h and named 90 "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.7)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.6)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.5)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.4)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-91 300", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.3)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.2)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300", 92 and 93 "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.05)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300". Then other two series of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 94 samples were prepared in the same way, but sintered at higher temperatures of 420 °C and 550 °C for 2 h, respectively and named "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.7)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.6)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420", 95 "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.5)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.4)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.3) -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.2)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-96 97 420", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.05)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420"; "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.7)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.6)-98 Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550", " $Al_2O_3(0.5)$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550", " $Al_2O_3(0.4)$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550", " $Al_2O_3(0.3)$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550", 99 "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.2)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550", "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550", and "Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.05)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550", respectively.

100 Alumina content is defined as the molar ratios of Al/(Fe+Al) from aluminum salt and ferric salt

101 in this investigation.

102

## 103 2.2 Characterization of Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> samples

104 To determine the crystal phase composition of the prepared catalysts, X-ray diffraction 105 (XRD) measurement was carried out at room temperature using a Rigaku D/MAX-IIIA diffractometer with CuK<sub> $\alpha$ </sub> radiation ( $\lambda = 0.15418$  nm). The accelerating voltage of 35 kV and the 106 107 emission current of 30 mA were used. The BET surface area, micropore surface area, and total 108 pore volume of all samples were measured by the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) method, in 109 which the N<sub>2</sub> adsorption at 77 K using a Carlo Erba Sorptometer was applied. The pore-size 110 distribution of the catalysts was determined by the Barrett-Joyner-Halenda (BJH) method [23,24]. 111 Fourier transform infrared spectra of the catalysts were also recorded with a FT-IR spectrometer 112 (Bruker Optics EQUINOX 55) at room temperature [25].

113

# 114 **2.3 Experimental setup and procedures**

115 A Pyrex cylindrical photoreactor with an effective volume of 250 ml was used to conduct 116 photocatalytic degradation experiments, which is surrounded by a Pyrex circulating water jacket 117 to control the temperature at  $25\pm2$  °C during the reaction. An 8-W UV lamp (Luzchem Research, 118 Inc.) with a main emission at 365 nm is positioned at the centre of the cylindrical vessel and used 119 for photoreaction under UV-A irradiation at the light intensity of 1.2 mW cm<sup>-2</sup>. The photoreactor 120 is covered with aluminium foil to keep it away from any indoor light interference.

121

122 BPA chemical (2,2-bis(4-hydroxyphenyl)propane) with analytical grade was purchased 123 from Aldrich and used without further purification to prepare aqueous BPA solution. The 124 reaction suspension was prepared by adding 0.25 g of catalyst powder into 250 ml of aqueous 125 BPA solution. Prior to the photoreaction, the suspension was magnetically stirred in the dark for 126 30 min to establish an adsorption/desorption equilibrium between solution and solid catalyst first 127 and then was irradiated by the UV lamp with constant aeration. At the given time intervals, the 128 analytical samples were taken from the suspension with immediate centrifugation for 20 min and 129 then filtered with a 0.45 µm Millipore filter to remove the particles. All samples were then 130 stored in the dark prior to analyses.

131

## 132 2.4 Analytical Methods

BPA in aqueous samples were analyzed by high pressure liquid chromatography (Finnigan LCQ DUO), which consists of a gradient pump (Spectra System P4000), an autosampler (Spectra System Tem AS3000) with a 20  $\mu$ l injection loop, and a photodiode array UV detector (Spectra SYSTEM UV6000LP). A Pinnacle II column (C18, 5 $\mu$ m, 250 × 4.6 mm ID) was used for BPA separation with a mobile phase (70% HCN: 30% water) at a flow rate of

138 0.8 ml min<sup>-1</sup>. The BPA concentration was determined by the UV detector at 278 nm. Total

139 dissolved Fe ions (TD-Fe) was analyzed by atomic absorption spectrometry.

140

## 141 **3. Results and Discussion**

142

#### 143 3.1 The effect of alumina on the crystal structure of catalysts

144 Three series of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> samples including Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> samples were examined by XRD and their XRD patterns are shown in Fig. 1. For the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 series, while Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 145 146 sample showed 5 peaks (220, 311, 421, 511, and 440) attributable to maghemite and 3 peaks 147 (012, 104, and 113) attributable to hematite, based on the Joint Committee on Powder 148 Diffraction Standards, indicating a mixed crystal structure of maghemite and hematite, the 149 Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 samples showed a relatively weaker crystal structure of maghemite with an 150 increased fraction of alumina. Furthermore, it can be seen that while Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.05)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300, 151 Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.2) -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 showed 5 strong peaks of maghemite, 152 Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.3)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.4)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300, and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.5)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 showed only 4 peaks 153 (220, 311, 511 and 440) with much lower intensity, and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.6)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.7)-154 Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 showed almost an amorphous structure. These results indicate that introducing 155 alumina could delay the crystallization of iron oxides during the sintering treatment.

156 For the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 series, while the Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 sample showed a crystal structure 157 of almost hematite with 8 peaks (012, 104, 110, 113, 024, 116, 214, and 300), the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.05)-158 Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 samples showed a mixed structure of maghemite and 159 hematite with both types of peaks (012, 220, 104, 311, 113, 024, 116, 511, and 440), the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.2)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.3)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.4)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.5)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 and 160 161  $Al_2O_3(0.6)$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 samples showed 4 peaks of maghemite (220, 311, 511 and 440), and the 162 Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.7)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 sample showed almost an amorphous structure. These results indicate that 163 introducing alumina does not only delay the crystallization, but also could hinder the crystal 164 transformation of iron oxides from maghemite to hematite during sintering treatment.

For the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 series, while the Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.05)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 samples showed a typical structure of hematite with 8 peaks (012, 104, 110, 113, 024, 116, 214, and 300), the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.2)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 samples showed a mixed structure of maghemite and hematite with the 9 peaks (012, 104, 113, 024, 116, 214, 300, 311 and 220), and the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.3)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.4)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.5)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550, and 170  $Al_2O_3(0.6)$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 samples showed almost a crystal structure of maghemite only. In the 171 meantime, the  $Al_2O_3(0.7)$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 sample remained its amorphous structure. From the above 172 results, it is clear that the increase of sintering temperature will enhance crystal transformation of 173 iron oxides from maghemite to hematite significantly. Furthermore, it can be indicated that the 174 existence of alumina would delay the crystallization of iron oxides and also might hinder the 175 crystal transformation of iron oxides from maghemite to hematite as well.

The three series of catalysts with different crystal structures are summarized in Table 1. Therefore, no any peak presented was attributable to alumina or the solid solutions of  $Al_2O_3$  and Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. That implies that alumina should be amorphous structure. In fact, crystallized alumina such as  $\gamma$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> might present under thermal treatment at 800°C and  $\alpha$ -Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> might present under thermal treatment at 1000°C [19,20].

181

182 [Fig. 1]

183 [Table 1]

184

## 185 3.2 The effect of alumina on the BET surface area and pore size distribution of catalysts

186 The BET surface area and the pore structure of different catalysts were determined from 187 nitrogen isothermal analyses. Their nitrogen adsorption-desorption isothermal curves are shown 188 in Fig. 2 (A for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300; B for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 and C for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550). It can be 189 seen that the adsorbed nitrogen volume decreased with increased temperature significantly and 190 their isotherms had a combined shape of type I and type IV with two distinct regions: at a low 191 relative pressure, isotherms exhibited high adsorption, indicating that the catalyts contained 192 micropores (type I) [23,24,26,27]. In addition, the curves also exhibited hysteresis loops at a high 193 relative pressure, indicating the presence of micropores and also mesopores. The distribution of 194 these hysteresis loops depended on the content of alumina. The shape of the hysteresis loops are 195 of type H3.

196

## 197 **[Fig. 2]**

198

The results of pore size distribution for different catalysts are shown in Fig. 3 (A for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300, B for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420, and C for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550). It can be seen that the pore size distribution strongly depended on the alumina content and also sintering temperature. Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 showed a mixture pore size of mesopores and macropores with a significant peak at 18.36 nm, while Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 showed a mixture pore size of mesopores and macropores with the peak at 30.17 nm. For three series, all catalysts except for Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 and Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 showed a mixture pore size of micropore, mesopores and macropores, while pore sizes distributed from 1
 up to 160 nm, and pore volumes decreased significantly with the increase of pore sizes for other
 catalysts.

208

209 The analytical data for the BET surface area, micropore surface area, and micropore volume of different catalysts are also summarized in Table 1. It is clear that both the BET 210 211 surface area and micropore surface area of all catalysts are dependent on sintering temperature 212 and also alumina content and increased with increased amount of alumina content significantly, 213 but decreased with increased sintering temperature at the same content of alumina. These results revealed that the Al<sub>0.7</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 catalyst had the largest BET surface area of 115.32 m<sup>2</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> and 214 also the highest micropore volume of 28.57 m<sup>2</sup> g<sup>-1</sup>, while the Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 catalyst had the lowest 215 BET surface area of 7.82 m<sup>2</sup> g<sup>-1</sup>. 216

217

219

## 220 3.3 The effect of alumina on the chemical state of catalysts

The FTIR transmittance spectra from 4000 to 400 cm<sup>-1</sup> are shown in Fig. 4 (A for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-221 Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300, B for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420, and C for Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550) to investigate the effect of 222 alumina on the chemical state of catalysts. For all catalysts, the broad peaks in the range of 3350-223 3450cm<sup>-1</sup> and the narrow peak at about 1620 cm<sup>-1</sup> are attributable to the O-H stretching vibration 224 of water and an OH group on the surface of iron oxides. The peaks at 470 and 540 cm<sup>-1</sup> should 225 226 be attributable to the Fe-O vibration of hematite for Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300, Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420, Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550, Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550, and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.2)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550, while the peaks at 560, 640, 227 and 696 cm<sup>-1</sup> should be attributable to the Fe-O vibration of maghemite, as labelled in Fig. 4 228 229 [8,18-20].

- 230
- 231 [Fig. 4]
- 232

## 233 3.4 The effect of alumina on the photocatalytic degradation of BPA

Under UV-A illumination, iron oxides can be excited to generate holes and electrons, and the excited electrons are further transferred to oxygen to form hydroxyl radicals as described by the equations 1-3. BPA in the reaction solution is then attacked by the hydroxyl radicals to be degraded. To investigate the effect of alumina on the photocatalytic activity of iron oxides in BPA degradation, three sets of experiments were carried out in aqueous BPA suspension with an initial concentration of 0.044 mM and 1 g l<sup>-1</sup> of catalyst under UV-A illumination and each

<sup>218 [</sup>Fig. 3]

experiment lasted for 150 min. The experimental results are shown in Fig. 5. By assuming that the photocatalytic degradation of BPA in aqueous suspension follows the first-order kinetics, the first-order kinetic constants, k, can be calculated by fitting the experimental data and are compared in Table 2.

244

245 [Fig. 5]

246 [Table 2]

247

248 For the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 series, it can be seen that while the Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 catalyst had the 249 highest k value, the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 catalysts had lower k values that are decreased with 250 increased fraction of alumina. Since the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 catalysts with higher fraction of 251 alumina were more amorphous, it implies that the higher crystalline of maghemite might lead to 252 the higher photocatalytic activity. For the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 series and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 series, 253 both the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>(0.1)-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 catalysts had the highest k values in 254 their temperature series, respectively, which indicate that the iron oxides with 10% alumina had the highest activity for BPA degradation under UV-A illumination. Comparing three series of 255 256 catalysts sintered at different temperatures, it is significant that the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-420 series had 257 higher k values than the Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-300 and Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-550 series.

258 From the above experimental results, it may be summarized that although the 259 photocatalytic activity of iron oxides should depend on a number of their characteristics such as 260 crystalline, crystal structure, surface structure properties, surface area and so on. Among them, 261 the crystalline and crystal structure might play more critical roles than the surface structure 262 properties in BPA degradation under these experimental conditions. For the catalysts sintered at 263 a same temperature, the effect of alumina on photocatalytic activity might result from their 264 different crystalline and crystal structure. The experiments in this study demonstrated that the 265 catalysts containing a mixture of maghemite and hematite had the higher activity than those 266 containing either maghemite or hematite alone. Actually two band gaps of maghemite (2.03 eV) 267 and hematite (2.02 eV) are very close, but they have different positions. While hematite has a 268 conduction band level at -0.62 V and a valence band level at +1.40 V, maghemite has the two band levels at -0.08 V and +1.94 V, respectively [10]. In their mixture, the excited electrons at 269 270 the conduction band of hematite would transfer to the conduction band of maghemite easily, 271 which results in an effective electron separation and transformation within the iron oxides. 272 Furthermore, the maghemite catalysts with a higher crystalline degree had the higher 273 photocatalytic activity.

It is well known that many iron oxides in an acidic solution can be dissolved by light irradiation to release  $Fe^{3+}$  ion as shown below:

276

277 
$$Fe_2O_3 + H^+ + h\nu \rightarrow Fe^{3+} + H_2O$$
 (4)

278 
$$\operatorname{Fe}_2(\operatorname{OH})_2^{4+} + h\nu \to \operatorname{Fe}^{2+} + \cdot \operatorname{OH}$$
 (5)

279

280 In this study, the concentration of total dissolved Fe (TD-Fe) during photoreaction was determined by atom adsorption spectra (AAS) and the results are shown in Fig. 6. The 281 experiments demonstrated that most iron oxides released Fe<sup>3+</sup> into the aqueous suspension 282 during the reaction and the TD-Fe concentrations were quickly increased after a short reaction 283 284 time and then gradually reached their maximum levels and maintained until the end of 285 experiments at 150 min. It can be seen that the iron oxides with 40%-60% alumina released more Fe<sup>3+</sup> than others for three series of catalysts sintered at different temperatures. In fact, such 286 287 a photo-dissolution of iron oxides depends on the crystalline and also crystal structure of iron 288 oxides. In general, maghemite is more easily photo-dissolved than hematite, and iron oxides with 289 higher crystalline are more difficult to be photo-dissolved than those with lower crystalline. On 290 the other hand, the degree of iron dissolution also depends on pH. The dominant specie in the absence of organic ligand is  $Fe_2(OH)_2^{4+}$  in weak acidic solution, which could be further 291 photoreduced to form hydroxyl radical and  $Fe^{2+}$  as shown by reaction 5. However, the quantum 292 293 yield for the formation of hydroxyl radical is only 0.017 at 360 nm [28-30], the BPA degradation 294 under UV-A illumination at 365 nm was affected by the dissolution of iron oxides and the 295 formation of dissolved ferric ion at a minor degree for iron oxides with a higher crystalline and 296 activity, and at a significant degree for iron oxides with a lower crystalline under this 297 experimental condition. The excitation of dissolved ferric ion under UV-A illumination might 298 play a sole role in BPA degradation for catalysts with amorphous structure.

299

300 [Fig. 6]

301

# **4. Conclusions**

303 It could be confirmed that the crystal structure and crystalline, the surface area and pore 304 size distribution of  $Al_2O_3$ -Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalysts depend strongly on the content of alumina and also 305 sintering temperature. The existence of alumina could hinder the crystallization of iron oxides 306 and also crystal transformation from maghemite to hematite during sintering. The BET surface 307 area and micropore surface area increased significantly with an increased content of alumina, but 308 decreased with an increased sintering temperature. The dependence of BPA degradation on the

309 alumina content was attributable to the crystal structure, crystalline and also the properties of 310 surface structures of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> catalysts.

311

#### 312 Acknowledgement

313 The authors would thank the Hong Kong Government Research Grant Committee for a 314 financial support to this work (RGC No: PolyU 5148/03E), and also would think China National 315 Natural Science Foundation (Project No.: 20377011) and Guangdong Natural Science 316 Foundation Key (Project No.: 036533).

317

#### 318 References

- 319 [1] M. A. A. Schoonen, Y.Xu, D. R. J.Strongin, Geochem. Exploration 62 (1998) 201-215.
- 320 [2] F. E. Rhoton, J. M. Bigham, D. L. Lindbo, Appl. Geochem. 17 (2002) 409-419.
- 321 [3] C. Swearingen, S. Macha, A. Fitch, J Mol. Catal. A: Chem. 199 (2003) 149-160.
- 322 [4] P. Behra, L. Sigg, Nature 344 (1990) 419-421
- 323 [5] T. J. Grundl, D. L. Sparks, Kinetics and mechanisms of reactions at the mineral-water interface: an 324 overview. In: D. L. Sparks, T. J. Grundl (eds), Mineral-Water Interfacial Reactions: Kinetics and 325 Mechamisms. American Chemical Society, Washington, DC, 1998. pp. 2-13.
- 326 [6] P. M. Huang, Advances in Agronomy 82 (2004) 391-472.
- 327 [7] F. Keppler, R. Eiden, V. Niedan, J. Pracht, H. F. Scholer, Nature 403 (2000) 298-301.
- 328 [8] R. M. Cornell, U. Schwertmann, The Iron Oxides: Structure, Properties, Reactions, Occurrences and Uses. 329 Wiley-VCH, New York. 2003.
- 330 [9] B. C. Faust, M. R. Hoffmann, D. W. Bahnemann, J. Phys. Chem. 93 (1989) 6371-6381.
- 331 [10] J. K. Leland, A. J. Bard, J. Phys. Chem. 91 (1987) 5076-5083.
- 332 [11] R. Andreozzi, V. Caprio, R. Marotta, Water Res. 37 (2003) 3682-3688.
- 333 [12] B. C. Faust, J. Allen, Environ. Sci. Technol. 27 (1993) 2517-2522.
- 334 [13] H. B. Fu, X. Quan, Z. Y. Liu, S. Chen, Langmuir 20 (2004) 4867-4873.
- 335 [14] C. Kormann, D. W. Bahnemann, M. R. Hoffmann, J. Photochem. Photobio. A: Chem. 48 (1989) 161-169.
- 336 [15] B. Pal, M. J. Sharon, Chem. Technol. Biotechnol. 73 (1998) 269-273.
- 337 [16] C. L. Hsueh, Y. H. Huang, C. Y. Chen, J. Hazard. Mater. B129 (2006) 228-233
- 338 [17] K. M. Cunningham, M. C. Goldberg, E. R. Weiner, Environ. Sci. Technol. 22 (1988) 1090-1097.
- 339 [18] M. A. Karakassides, D. Gournis, A. B. Bourlinos, P. N. Trikalitis, T. Bakas, J. Mater. Chem. 13 (2003) 340 871-876.
- 341 [19] E. A. El-Sharkawy, S. A. El-Hakam, S. E. Samra, Mater. Lett. 42 (2000) 331-338
- 342 [20] W. M. Shaheen, K. S. Hong, Thermochimica Acta, 381 (2002) 153-164
- 343 [21] I. T. Cousins, C. A. Staples, G. M. Klecka, D. Mackay, Human and Ecological Risk Assessment 8 (2002) 344 1107-1135.
- 345 [22] N. Watanabe, S. Horikoshi, H. Kawabe, Y. Sugie, J. C. Zhao, H. Hidaka, Chemosphere 52 (2003) 851-346 859.

- 347 [23] J. G. Yu, J. C. Yu, M. K.-P. Leung, W., K. Ho, B. Cheng, X. J. Zhao, J. C. Zhao, J. Catal. 217 (2003) 69348 78.
- 349 [24] S. L. Gregg, K. S. W. Sing, Adsorption, Surface Area and Porosity, Academic Press, London. 1982.
- 350 [25] H. D. Ruan, R. L. Frost, J. T. Kloprogge, L. Duong, Spectrochimica Acta Part A 58 (2002) 967-981.
- [26] J. Lei, C. S. Liu, F.B. Li, X. M. Li, S. G. Zhou, T. X. Liu, M. H. Gu, Q. T. Wu, J. Hazard. Mater.
   137(2006) 1016–1024
- 353 [27] M. H. Zhou, J. G. Yu, B. Cheng, J. Hazard. Mater. 138(2006) 1838–1847
- 354 [28] Y. G. Zuo, J. Holgné, Environ. Sci. Technol. 26 (1992) 1014-1022.
- 355 [29] M. E. Balmer, B. Sulzberger, Environ. Sci. Technol. 33 (1999) 2418-2424.
- 356 [30] P. Huston, J. J. Pignatello, Environ. Sci. Technol. 30 (1996) 3457-3463.
- 357

Iron ovidos	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.7)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.5)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.3)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.2)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.1)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300
Iron oxides	300	300	300	300	300	
Crystal structure	amorphous	γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>		γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	$\gamma + \alpha - Fe_2O_3$
BET surface area $(m^2 g^{-1})$	115.32	88.46	87.25 81.36		63.37	26.93
Micropore surface area $(m^2 g^{-1})$	28.57	7.45	4.56	4.56 3.65		1.27
Micropore volume ( $cm^3 g^{-1}$ )	0.012	0.0033	0.00016	0.0029	0.0012	0.0003
Iron avidas	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.7)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.5)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.3)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.2)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.1)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420
II OII OXIDES	420	420	420	420	420	
Crystal structure	amorphous	γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	γ+α-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	α-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>
BET surface area $(m^2 g^{-1})$	98.96	68.65	61.43	55.69	40.737	12.92
Micropore surface area $(m^2 g^{-1})$	25.23	4.107	2.924	2.57	1.351	0.15
Micropore volume $(m^3 g^{-1})$	0.010	0.00066	0.00057	0.00071	0.0012	0.0000
Iron oxidos	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.7)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.5)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.3)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.2)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.1)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -	Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550
ITOII OXIDES	550	550	550	550	550	
Crystal structure	amorphous	γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	γ-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	$\gamma + \alpha - Fe_2O_3$	γ+α-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	a-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>
BET surface area $(m^2 g^{-1})$	72.17	67.66	60.63	41.87	27.94	7.82
Micropore surface area $(m^2 g^{-1})$	5.0455	2.3066	1.0396	0.7295	0	0
Micropore volume ( $m^3 g^{-1}$ )	0.00223	0.00117	0.00059	0.00043	0	0

Table 1 The crystal structure, BET surface area, micro pore surface area and micropore volume of iron oxides

Catalysts	k	$R^2$	Catalysts	k	$R^2$	Catalysts	k	$R^2$
Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0018	0.9928	Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0034	0.9612	Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0016	0.9689
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.05)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0016	0.9710	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.05)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0075	0.9959	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.05)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0022	0.9773
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.1)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0012	0.9982	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.1)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0080	0.9988	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.1)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0028	0.9882
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.2)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0009	0.9817	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.2)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0058	0.9958	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.2)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0015	0.9655
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.3)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0008	0.9905	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.3)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0039	0.9612	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.3)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0006	0.9662
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.4)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0008	0.9690	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.4)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0031	0.9585	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.4)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0005	0.9625
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.5)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0007	0.9480	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.5)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0021	0.9967	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.5)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0004	0.9832
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.6)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0005	0.9569	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.6)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0016	0.9928	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.6)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0003	0.9848
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.7)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -300	0.0005	0.9818	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.7)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -420	0.0015	0.9916	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (0.7)-Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> -550	0.0003	0.9858

Table 2 The first-order kinetic constants  $k (min^{-1})$  for BPA degradation under UV-A illumination using different catalysts

#### List of figure captions

- Fig. 1. The XRD patterns of different iron oxides sintered at 300 °C (A), 420 °C (B) and 550 °C (C).
- Fig. 2. The nitrogen adsorption-desorption isothermal curves of Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> powders sintered at 300 °C (A), 420 °C (B) and 550 °C (C)
- Fig. 3. The pore size distribution of Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> powders sintered at 300 °C (A), 420 °C (B) and 550 °C (C)
- Fig. 4. The FTIR transmittance spectra of Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> powders sintered at 300 °C (A), 420 °C (B) and 550 °C (C)
- Fig. 5. The photocatalytic degradation of BPA under UV-A illumination using different iron oxides sintered at 300 °C (A), 420 °C (B) and 550 °C (C)
- Fig. 6. The photo-dissolution of different iron oxides sintered at 300 °C (A), 420 °C (B) and 550 °C (C) under UV-A illumination vs. reaction time.



Fig.1



Fig. 2











Reaction time (min)

Ò

Fig. 6