Zeolite Microporosity Studied By Molecular Simulation

Journal:	<i>Molecular Simulation/Journal of Experimental Nanoscience</i>
Manuscript ID:	GMOS-2008-0194.R1
Journal:	Molecular Simulation
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Nov-2008
Complete List of Authors:	Ban, Shuai; Utrecht University, Condensed Matter and Interfaces Vlugt, Thijs; Delft University of Technology, Process & Energy
Keywords:	zeolites, microporosity, argon adsorption

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Zeolite Microporosity Studied By Molecular Simulation

Shuai Ban¹, Thijs J.H. Vlugt^{2*}

¹Condensed Matter and Interfaces, Department of Chemistry,
Utrecht University, P.O. Box 80.000 3508 TA Utrecht
email: s.ban@tudelft.nl

²Process & Energy Laboratory, Delft University of Technology,
Leeghwaterstraat 44, 2628 CA Delft
email: t.j.h.vlugt@tudelft.nl

November 14, 2008

Abstract

A simulation method is presented to efficiently calculate the pore size distribution of microporous materials. The microporosity of several typical zeolites is analyzed. The effects of the inaccessible pores and non-framework cations on the pore size distribution of zeolites have also been studied. Molecular simulations of *Ar* adsorption are used to investigate the correlations between the adsorption isotherms and the pore size distribution. The feasibility to derive the pore size distribution of zeolite micropores directly from adsorption isotherms is discussed.

Keywords: zeolites, microporosity, Argon adsorption, molecular simulation

Submitted to the J. A. Mejías Memorial Issue of Molecular Simulation

*corresponding author: t.j.h.vlugt@tudelft.nl, tel. +31 15 2787551, fax: +31 15 2782460

1 Introduction

In recent years major progress has been made in the synthesis and textual characterization of highly ordered microporous materials, e.g. microporous molecular sieves [1, 2, 3]. Zeolites are important microporous molecular sieves with well-defined crystalline structures [4, 5]. Therefore, the pore structure follows directly from the crystallographic data. Zeolite pores are narrow as the pore width is usually smaller than 1.5 nm. An accurate textural characterization of microporous materials is of crucial importance for their application, for example in catalysis and separation technology [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. The pore architecture, i.e. pore size, pore size distribution, pore volume, and pore topology all have a large influence on adsorption and transport phenomena [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. Although many experimental methods are available for the characterization of porous materials, physical adsorption is still the most popular one as it can access a wide range of pore sizes (from 0.35 nm up to 100 nm) [18]. This includes the complete range from micro- and mesopores to macropores. Moreover, gas adsorption techniques are convenient to use and not cost intensive compared to some other methods such as small angle X-ray and neutron scattering, mercury porosimetry, electron microscopy, thermoporometry and NMR [18].

Physisorption occurs whenever a gas or liquid (the so-called “guest”) is brought into contact with the surface of a porous solid (“host”). The amount of adsorbed material (adsorption isotherm) is determined by the applied pressure and temperature, as well as the interplay between the guest-host and guest-guest interactions in the pores. This is reflected in the shape of the adsorption isotherm. The IUPAC classification of adsorption isotherms [19] distinguishes six types of isotherms. Pores are classified by their internal pore width (the pore width of a cylindrical pore is defined by its diameter; for slit pores the pore width is defined as the distance between opposite walls). Pores smaller than 2 nm are classified as micropores, while mesopores have a pore width between 2 and 50 nm. Pores larger than 50 nm are classified as macropores.

In order to extract the surface area, pore size, pore size distribution, pore volume, pore topology and porosity from gas adsorption isotherms, one needs to apply suitable theoretical models that capture the important underlying adsorption mechanisms. Molecular simulations (Monte Carlo and Molecular Dynamics) have been used to obtain a better understanding of sorption phenomena in porous materials [20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 17, 32, 33]. These microscopic methods describe the guest-host system at a molecular level, in contrast to classical methods that are based on macroscopic thermodynamic assumptions. It has been shown that the application of theoretical and molecular simulation-based methods leads to a much more accurate pore size analysis over the complete micro and mesopore size range [34, 35, 36].

In this work, we present an efficient simulation method to characterize zeolite pores in terms of the micropore size distribution, the micropore volume and the accessibility of micropores. Only the coordinates of the zeolite framework atoms are required, and they can be derived from XRD experiments easily. The details of our approach are presented in the section 2. In section 3, we briefly discuss the pore size distribution of some typical zeolites, and show how this is affected by non-framework cations. We also briefly discuss the fact that for some zeolite structures, some parts are inaccessible. For various framework structures, we study the physisorption of *Ar* using Monte Carlo simulations in the grand-canonical ensemble.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Several models are discussed on how to relate the isotherm of *Ar* adsorption to the pore size distribution. Concluding remark will be given in section 4.

2 Simulation Methods

2.1 Pore Size Distribution

In this work, the pore size of a certain cavity is defined as *the maximum diameter of a sphere that can be located in that cavity*. This definition is applicable to pores with an arbitrary shape. For cylindrical or slit pores, our definition is identical to the IUPAC definition. Using our definition of the pore size, the pore size distribution is computed from the coordinates of the framework atoms using the following algorithm shown in Fig. 1: (1) a three-dimensional grid with a small spacing is constructed. We typically use a grid size of 0.1 Å (in each direction). (2) a spherical test particle is positioned at a random position in the zeolite. The radius of this particle is chosen as the minimum distance between the center of the particle and any of the zeolite framework atoms, minus the radius of the closest framework atom. The radius of an oxygen framework atom is 1.35 Å. Tetrahedral atoms, e.g. *Si*, *Al*, are not considered as for most zeolites they are well screened by adjacent oxygen atoms [37]. (3) The diameter of the test particle is recorded for all grid points that are inside the test particle. (4) This procedure is repeated many times. We found that the number of test spheres should be at least 100 times the number of gridpoints. For each grid point, the maximum recorded diameter is computed and this quantity is defined as the local pore size of a specific grid point. The simulation stops when the local pore size of all gridpoints is converged. (5) The fraction of pores with a diameter between r and $r + \Delta r$ (pore size distribution) is equal to the fraction of gridpoint with a maximum diameter between r and $r + \Delta r$. Note that the channel dimensions of zeolites suggested by Atlas of Zeolite Structures [38] are actually the sizes of the channel openings, directly related to the accessibility. This definition of pore size is slightly different compared to ours.

N_2/Ar physisorption experiments are the most often methods to measure the total pore volume experimentally. These methods can only detect the pores larger than 4.5 Å [2]. Using our calculated pore size distribution, the micropore volume is calculated by integrating the pore size distribution up to 20 Å, starting from pore sizes of 4.5 Å or 3.5 Å. It is important to note that some zeolites (e.g. LTA-type zeolite) may contain inaccessible cavities, that are (in principle) large enough to accommodate adsorbate molecules. In this case, the largest entrance to the cavities is often a small six membered ring. The contribution of the inaccessible cavities to the total micropore volume should be subtracted, depending on the size of the guest molecules. In this work, we will try to establish a relation between the pore size distribution and adsorption isotherms computed using molecular simulations. Therefore, to make this comparison it is not necessary to artificially block inaccessible cages. However, for a comparison between computed isotherms and measured isotherms one needs to take care that in the simulations, the inaccessible cages are really inaccessible for guest molecules.

2.2 Ar Physisorption

Gas physisorption is the most popular method for the characterization of pore sizes as it allows accessing a wide range of pore sizes (from 0.35 nm to 100 nm). *Ar* shows nearly perfect physisorption behavior at cryogenic conditions (87.3 K) [19]. Compared to *N*₂ and *CO*₂, *Ar* has weaker attractive interactions with the host structure, in particular for zeolites with non-framework cations [39]. As a consequence, micropores of 0.5 – 1 nm are filled with *Ar* at much higher relative pressures, i.e. $10^{-5} < p/p_0 < 10^{-3}$ than for *N*₂ (p_0 being the saturation pressure). However, analysis of *Ar* physisorption is problematic for small zeolite micropores. The reason for this is that when the pore size is close to the kinetic diameter of *Ar*, the local density of *Ar* inside zeolite micropore becomes smaller than the density of liquid *Ar* due to confinement effects. Therefore, the pore volume can not be computed directly from the density of liquid *Ar* as this will lead to an underestimation of the micropore volume.

In this study, simulations of *Ar* adsorption in zeolites at 77 K are conducted. This will be used to develop the correlation between the *Ar* adsorption isotherms and the simulated micropore size distributions. Adsorption isotherms are calculated using Monte Carlo simulations in grand-canonical ensemble, for details we refer the reader to Refs. [40, 41, 42, 43]. Lennard-Jones (LJ) interactions are used to describe interactions between *Ar* and zeolite atoms. The intermolecular interactions are truncated and shifted at 12 Å [44]. Periodic boundary conditions in all directions are applied. The pressure is varied between 10^{-5} and 10^2 kPa at 77 K. A typical simulation consists of at least 2×10^6 cycles. In each cycle, trial moves are attempted to translate or to exchange a molecule with the reservoir [42]. The number of trial moves per cycle is equal to the number of molecules with a minimum of 20. As we want to make a comparison between the computed pore size distribution and the computed adsorption isotherms, it is not necessary to identify or block inaccessible cages. We would like to point out that for comparison with experimental isotherms it is necessary to block inaccessible cages in the simulations.

In our simulations, the zeolites are considered rigid as framework flexibility only results in very small deviations of adsorption properties [45]. For MFI-type zeolite however, a phase transition of the zeolite framework may occur upon *Ar* adsorption [46, 47, 48, 49, 50]. A detailed study of this is beyond the scope of the present work. In our adsorption simulations, all zeolites are considered as all-silica structures. The Lennard-Jones interaction parameters are chosen as $\sigma_{Ar-Ar} = 3.42$ Å, $\epsilon_{Ar-Ar}/k_B = 124.07$ K, $\sigma_{Ar-O} = 3.17$ Å and $\epsilon_{Ar-O}/k_B = 95.61$ K [51]. The Lennard-Jones interaction between *Si* and *Ar* is not taken into account [52].

The Dubinin-Astakhov (DA) adsorption equation was used to model the filling of a pore of diameter r [53]:

$$N(r, p) = \rho(r) \exp \left[- \left(\frac{RT \ln(p_0/p)}{\alpha E_0(r)} \right)^{n(r)} \right] \quad (1)$$

in which $N(r, p)$ is the loading of adsorbed molecules at pressure p , ρ (in units of mmol/ml) is the saturation loading of *Ar* in pores of diameter r , $P(r)$ is the pore size distribution in units of ml g⁻¹ Å⁻¹, α is the (dimensionless) affinity parameter (0.31 for *Ar* [53]), E_0 is the characteristic adsorption energy (kJ/mol), p_0 is the saturation vapor pressure, and $n(r)$ is a constant that only depends on r . The total loading $\theta(p)$ of *Ar* in the zeolite is computed by

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

integration over all pores [54, 55, 56, 35, 36],

$$\theta(p) = \int_{r=3.5\text{\AA}}^{r=20\text{\AA}} P(r')N(r', p)dr' \quad (2)$$

This integration is from the minimum considered pore diameter 3.5 Å to the maximum pore diameter of micropores (20 Å). In total, three parameters depend on the pore diameter r : $\rho(r)$, $E_0(r)$ and $n(r)$. The function $\rho(r)$ determines the saturation loading at which the adsorption isotherm levels off. The adsorption energy $E_0(r)$ determines at which pressure the guest molecules start to enter the zeolite cavities. The function $n(r)$ defines the slope of the isotherm prior to saturation.

For a large collection of zeolites, we have fitted $\rho(r)$, $E_0(r)$ and $n(r)$ using the pore size distribution computed using the scheme described in section 2.1. This is done as follows: (1) For zeolites with only one pore type or adsorption site, the value of $\rho(r)$ can be computed directly from the pore volume and the saturation loading. Some care is needed for zeolites with more than one pore type. In this case, we identify the number of adsorption sites by the inflection behavior [57, 58]. If the inflection behavior is absent, then we only consider a single adsorption site. Inflection behavior of the adsorption isotherm is not necessarily caused by the presence of multiple adsorption sites, as it may also be caused by rearrangement of the guest molecules. Simulation snapshots have been used to identify whether or not multiple adsorption sites are present. (2) The other parameters $E_0(r)$ and $n(r)$ are fitted to the computed adsorption isotherm. (3) The fitting procedure is repeated for many zeolites and we will investigate general trends in the obtained values for $\rho(r)$, $E_0(r)$ and $n(r)$.

From the functions, $\rho(r)$, $E_0(r)$ and $n(r)$, now fitted for all zeolites, we will investigate whether or not it is possible to predict the earlier computed pore size distribution from the computed adsorption isotherm. This is done as follows. For pore diameters r in the range (4 – 13 Å), the corresponding pore volume equals $\theta(p_0)/\rho(r)$. We compute the absolute error between the computed isotherm (using GCMC) and the fitted isotherm (calculated using Eqs. 1,2 and the functions $\rho(r)$, $E_0(r)$ and $n(r)$ fitted for all zeolites simultaneously). The pore diameter that leads to the smallest difference is selected. For zeolites with more than one adsorption site, the simulated Ar adsorption isotherm is separated using the inflection pressure corresponding to the adsorption of Ar in different pore types. The pore diameters that lead to the smallest difference between the computed and fitted isotherm are selected.

3 Results and Discussions

3.1 Micropores of All-silica Zeolites

The pore size distributions have been computed for most of zeolite structures taken from IZA zeolite database [38]. The total micropore volume is calculated by integrating the pore size distribution in the range of pore diameters 3.5 – 20 Å and 4.5 – 20 Å. Results for typical all-silica zeolites are listed in Table 1. It is trivial to see that the pore volume integrated from 3.5 Å ($V_{3.5}$) is slightly larger than the pore volume integrated from 4.5 Å ($V_{4.5}$). In particular, MON-type zeolite has an unique 4 Å pore, which leads to $V_{4.5} = 0$.

Detailed information of the zeolite porosity for BEA, MFI, RHO can be seen in the pore size distributions and the corresponding contours in Figure 2. Zeolite BEA has two different channels running along the *crystallographic* x and y axis respectively. The sizes of these channel openings are 6.6×6.7 Å and 5.6×5.6 Å. The simulated pore size distribution for zeolite BEA in Fig. 2 (a) shows a slightly disperse pore size ranging from 6.25 to 6.55 Å, corresponding to the channel interiors shown from the contour plot. In Figure 2 (b), the pore size distribution of MFI shows a large peak at 6.7 Å and some smaller ones between 5.4 and 5.7 Å. The corresponding contour map suggests that the large peak corresponds to the intersections of the straight channel (5.3×5.6 Å) and the zigzag channel (5.1×5.5 Å). Peaks in the range of 5.4 – 5.7 Å represent the channel interiors of MFI. The RHO-type framework has a cage-like structure, where large *Ita* cages are connected by small eight-membered rings (3.6×3.6 Å). The pore size distribution of RHO shows two sharp peaks at pore diameter 12 Å and 4.5 Å respectively. The corresponding contour map indicates that the cage interiors with a pore diameter 12 Å and the small windows in size of 4.5 Å have the largest contribution to the pore volume.

As mentioned earlier, the zeolite framework may contain inaccessible cages which consist of six membered (or smaller) rings. As the six membered opening is smaller than 3 Å, it will prevent most molecules with a kinetic diameter larger than 3 Å to enter the cage. The LTA zeolite has two types of cages: (1) the *sod* cage consisting of four and six membered rings; and (2) the *ita* cage possesses extra eight membered rings which make it accessible [38]. From the contour map in Fig. 3 (b), it can be seen that there are four *sod* cages located in the center, edges and corners on the y - z slice of a LTA unit cell. The pore size distribution in Fig. 3 (a) shows two pores of diameters 6.5 and 11.3 Å, corresponding to the interiors of the inaccessible *sod* cage and the accessible *ita* cages. The total pore volume larger than 3.5 Å equals 0.457 ml/g. This volume decreases to 0.347 ml/g when the contribution of the *sod* cage is excluded.

Compared to all-silica zeolites, many zeolites have much more complex compositions, as they may contain framework atoms like *Al*, *P*, *Co* and non-framework compounds like *Li*, *Na*, *Ca*, *Mg* and H_2O etc. Non-framework cations occupy a certain volume and therefore they influence the pore size distribution. Fig. 4 shows the effect of non-framework *Na* cations on the pore size distribution of *Na*-MOR framework in the *Pbcn* space group. The framework of MOR consists of two distinct cavities, which are twelve membered main channels (7.0×6.5 Å) in the direction of the z axis and eight membered side pockets (3.4×4.8 Å) in y direction [38]. In *Na*-MOR, the adsorption of guest molecules is very sensitive to the distribution of aluminum atoms [59, 60]. In our present study, we randomly distribute Al atoms over all tetrahedral sites of the *Na*-MOR supercell, in such a way that the Löwenstein rule as well as the guidelines outlined by Alberti et al. [61] are satisfied. This fixes the *Al* content for each of the crystallographic T-sites in MOR-type zeolite. The pore size distribution of all-silica MOR (*Pbcn*) has two major peaks at pore diameters of 4.5 and 5.9 Å, corresponding to the side pocket and the main channel, see Fig. 5 (a). When non-framework *Na* cations present, both peaks become 60% lower than those of the all-silica MOR, while some minor peaks appear at smaller pore diameters around 4.2 and 5.7 Å. The reason for this is that non-framework *Na* cations make the pore less uniform. This can be seen from Fig. 5 (b). This figure also shows that non-framework *Na* cations sitting near the opening of the side pockets partially or fully block the entrance of the side pockets, and narrow the main channels to some extent. The

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

pore volume ($V_{3.5}$) of the all-silica MOR is 0.199 ml/g ($0.35V_{\text{unitcell}}$) and that of *Na*-MOR decreases to 0.176 ml/g ($0.327V_{\text{unitcell}}$, V_{unitcell} being the volume of the unit cell). This indicates that non-framework *Na* cations occupy the void space of zeolites and cause a volume loss of $0.023V_{\text{unitcell}}$. For a fixed *Al* content of the four T sites, we found only very small differences in the total pore volume for different distributions of *Al* atoms. However, for a different *Al* content of the T-sites, the pore volume will be different due to a different fraction of *Na* in the side pockets.

3.2 Ar Physisorption

The computed adsorption isotherm of *Ar* in MFI-type zeolite at 77 K is plotted in Fig. 6, along with its fit to Eqs. 1,2. The computed adsorption isotherm shows an inflection point at 0.01 kPa. The pore size distribution in Fig. 2 shows that MFI has two different pores at 5.5 and 6.7 Å, corresponding to the channel interiors and channel intersections respectively. In principle, from the isotherm only, one may relate the inflection to different adsorption capacities of different adsorption sites. However, a simulation snapshot of *Ar* at 0.01 kPa (Fig. 6) shows that both the channel interiors and intersections are simultaneously filled by *Ar* molecules. The step-like behavior of the *Ar* adsorption isotherm in these simulations is therefore not caused by the *Ar* adsorption in different pores of MFI [46]. Therefore, it is convenient here to consider MFI as a zeolite containing a single adsorption site. The fitted isotherm agrees well with the isotherm for simulations. The fitting parameters are $\rho = 26.33$ mmol/ml, $E_0 = 21.21$ kJ/mol and $n = 4.24$ at the selected diameter 5.7 Å. The typical pore diameter is chosen from the major peaks of the pore size distribution, which covers the largest pore volume.

The typical fitting results for *Ar* adsorption in zeolite CAN at 77 K are shown in Fig. 7. Similar to MFI, the adsorption isotherm of *Ar* in CAN shows two inflection points at the pressure of 10^{-4} and 1 kPa respectively. The snapshots of the simulations (Fig. 8) confirm that the first inflection point at 2.5×10^{-4} corresponds to saturation of the small *can* cages (4.3 Å), while the second inflection at 1 kPa is attributed to the packing of *Ar* in the large channels along *z* axis. Therefore, two different DA isotherms are used to fit the complete isotherm. For the *can* cages, the fitted parameters are $\rho = 11.61$ mmol/ml, $E_0 = 32.21$ kJ/mol and $n = 17.31$ using a pore diameter 4.3 Å. For the large channel, the fitted parameters are $\rho = 22.40$ mmol/ml, $E_0 = 19.15$ kJ/mol and $n = 3.60$ for a pore diameter 6.3 Å. By comparing the two sets of DA parameters, it can be seen that the large channel always has a higher loading capacity but weaker adsorption strength than the small pore. Note that the parameter n is much more sensitive to the pore shape and the molecular packing than the other parameters.

This fitting of computed isotherms to Eqs. 1, 2 was conducted for nearly forty zeolite frameworks types. The collection of the fitted DA parameters in the range of 4 – 13 Å are shown in Fig. 9. In Fig. 9 (a), the general trends can be identified for $\rho(r)$ and $E_0(r)$. Fluctuation in their values is caused by the dependence of the zeolite adsorption on the pore shapes and the molecular packing.

Starting from a pore diameter of $r = 4$ Å, $\rho(r)$ has a sharp increase up to 25 mmol/ml at 6 Å followed by a slow convergence to 33 mmol/ml at the pore diameter 13 Å. Furthermore, at the maximum micropore diameter 20 Å, ρ equals 35.6 mmol/ml, which agrees well with the standard density of the liquid *Ar* (35.8 mmol/ml). This means that *Ar* will stay in the

liquid phase when the pore is large enough. However, for zeolite micropores smaller than 20 Å, calculation of the micropore volume using the density of liquid *Ar* (35.8 mmol/ml) will result in an underestimation of the pore volume up to about 30%. For the adsorption energy $E_0(r)$, a reverse trend can be observed. Starting from a large adsorption energy of 34 kJ/mol at $r = 4$ Å, E_0 gradually decreases and levels off around 15 kJ/mol at the diameter 13 Å. This is because small pores have a stronger adsorption strength than large pores. The slope parameter $n(r)$ plotted in Fig. 9 (b) shows a larger scatter due to the large sensitivity on the adsorption isotherm.

The collected DA parameters in the range of 4 – 13 Å for *Ar* at 77 K can be fitted using:

$$\rho(r) = 5.04 \ln[r - 4.18] + 21.68 \quad (3)$$

$$E_0(r) = 121.37 \exp[-0.46r] + 14.45 \quad (4)$$

$$n(r) = 6 \quad (5)$$

in which r is the pore diameter in Å, ρ and E_0 are in units of mmol/ml and kJ/mol respectively. From the concentration parameter $\rho(r)$ in Eq. 3, it can be seen that the minimum pore diameter that can be estimated from the *Ar* adsorption isotherm is about 4 Å, and any pores smaller than that exceed the measurement capability of the *Ar* physisorption.

Using the fitted DA adsorption parameters of Eqs. 3, 4, 5, we re-computed the pore volume and pore size of zeolites directly from the computed *Ar* adsorption isotherms, and compared the results to the direct computation using the algorithm described in section 2.1. Nearly forty framework types have been tested in this way, see table 2. For most zeolites, the pore volume and size are correctly reproduced compared to the pore size distributions simulated earlier (using the method of section 2.1). In general, this procedure is more accurate for zeolites containing a single adsorption site than for zeolites containing multiple adsorption sites. For the latter, the difficulty is that the adsorption isotherms may contain inflections corresponding to the self packing of *Ar*. To identify the number of the adsorption sites prior to fitting the adsorption isotherms requires knowledge of the zeolite structure. Many zeolites may be subject to some severe chemical pretreatments. This can amorphize the zeolite framework into a less well-defined structure.

4 Conclusions

A method to characterize the zeolite microporosity has been developed. The pore volume and the pore size distribution of zeolites can be computed accurately. The contour maps of zeolites clearly show the position and diameter of the zeolite pores. In this way, it is possible to easily identify the locations and the local pore volume of the inaccessible cages for some zeolites. The simulations of *Na*-MOR show that the non-framework *Na* cations may occupy the internal space and cause a decline for both the pore volume and the pore size compared to all-silica frameworks.

Based on the calculated pore size distributions for various zeolites, adsorption isotherms of *Ar* have been fitted by the Dubinin-Astakhov (DA) equations. The collection of three DA parameters show clear trends as a function of the pore diameter. By using fitted functions for all three DA parameters, it is possible to identify the pore volumes and the pore sizes directly

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

from the corresponding *Ar* adsorption isotherm. The fitted results of zeolite microporosities agree well with the ones directly calculated.

5 Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge funding from the ACTS/ASPECT program from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO-CW). T.J.H. Vlugt acknowledges financial support from NWO through a VIDI grant.

For Peer Review Only

References

- [1] Cejka, J. and van Bekkum, H. (editors). *Zeolites and Ordered Mesoporous Materials: Progress and Prospects*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2005.
- [2] Cejka, J., van Bekkum, H., Corma, A., and Schüth, F. (editors). *Introduction to Zeolite Science and Practice 3th*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2007.
- [3] Lu, M. and Zhao, X.S. (editors). *Nanoporous Materials: Science and Engineering*. Imperial College Press, London, 2004.
- [4] Breck, D.W. *Zeolite Molecular Sieves*. Wiley, New York, 1974.
- [5] Barrer, R.M. *Zeolites and Clay Minerals as Sorbents and Molecular Sieves*. Academic Press, London, 1979.
- [6] Bouyermaouen, A. and Bellemans, A. (1998). “Molecular Dynamics simulation of the diffusion of n-butane and i-butane in silicalite”, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **108**, 2170–2172.
- [7] Clark, L.A. *Confinement and pore shape effects on adsorption, diffusion and reaction in zeolites*. PhD thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA, 2000.
- [8] Demontis, P., Fois, E.S., Suffritti, G.B., and Quartieri, S. (1990). “Molecular dynamics studies on zeolites. 4. Diffusion of methane in Silicalite”, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **94**, 4329–4334.
- [9] Gupta, S., Nivarthi, S.S., McCormick, A.V., and Danish, H.T. (1995). “Evidence for single file diffusion of ethane in the molecular sieve $\text{AlPO}_4\text{-5}$ ”, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **247**, 596–600.
- [10] Smit, B. and Maesen, T.L.M. (2008). “Towards a molecular understanding of shape selectivity”, *Nature*, **451**, 671–678.
- [11] Harmandaris, V.A., Angelopoulou, D., Mavramtzas, V.G., and Theodorou, D.N. (2002). “Atomistic molecular dynamics simulation of diffusion in binary liquid n-alkane mixtures”, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **116**, 7656–7665.
- [12] Hernández, E. and Catlow, C.R.A. (1995). “Molecular dynamics simulations of n-butane and n-hexane diffusion in silicalite”, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, **448**, 143–160.
- [13] Kapteijn, F., Moulijn, J.A., and Krishna, R. (2000). “The generalized Maxwell-Stefan model for diffusion in zeolites: sorbate molecules with different saturation loadings”, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, **55**, 2923–2930.
- [14] Kärger, J., Vasenkov, S., and Auerbach, S. “Diffusion in zeolites,”. In *Handbook of zeolite catalysis and microporous materials*, Auerbach, S., Carrado, K.A., and Dutta, P.K., editors, New York, 2002. Marcel Dekker Inc.
- [15] Beerdsen, E., Dubbeldam, D., and Smit, B. (2006). “Understanding diffusion in nanoporous materials”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **96**, 044501.

- [16] Dubbeldam, D. and Snurr, R.Q. (2007). "Recent developments in the molecular modeling of diffusion in nanoporous materials", *Mol. Sim.*, **33**, 305–325.
- [17] Fuchs, A.H. and Cheetham, A.K. (2001). "Adsorption of guest molecules in zeolite materials: Computational aspects", *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **105**, 7375–7383.
- [18] Rouquerol, J., Avnir, D., Fairbridge, C.W., Everett, D.H., Haynes, J.H., Pernicone, N., Ramsay, J.D.F., and Sing, K.S.W. (1994). "Recommendations for the characterization of porous solids", *Pure Appl. Chem.*, **66**, 1739–1758.
- [19] Sing, K.S.W., Everett, D.H., Haul, R.A.W., Moscou, L., Pierotti, R.A., Rouquerol, N., and Siemieniewska, T. (1985). "Reporting Physisorption Data For Gas/Solid Systems With Special Reference To The Determination Of Surface Area And Porosity", *Pure Appl. Chem.*, **57**, 603–619.
- [20] Gelb, L.D., Gubbins, K.E., Radhakrishnan, R., and Sliwinski-Bartkowiak, M. (1999). "Phase Separation in confined system", *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, **62**, 1573–1659.
- [21] Evans, R., Marconi, U.M.B., and Tarazona, P. (1986). "Capillary condensation and adsorption in cylindrical and slit-like pores", *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 2*, **82**, 1763–1787.
- [22] Tarazona, P., Marconi, U.M.B., and Evans, R. (1987). "Phase equilibria of fluid interfaces and confined fluids", *Mol. Phys.*, **60**, 573–595.
- [23] Bock, H., Gubbins, K.E., and Schoen, M. (2007). "Anisotropic self-diffusion in nanofluidic structures", *J. Phys. Chem. C*, **111**, 15493–15504.
- [24] Neimark, A.V. (1995). "The Method of Indeterminate Lagrange Multipliers in Nonlocal Density Functional Theory", *Langmuir*, **11**, 4183–4184.
- [25] Ravikovitch, P.I. and Neimark, A.V. (2002). "Density Functional Theory of Adsorption in Spherical Cavities and Pore Size Characterization of Templated Nanoporous Silicas with Cubic and Three-Dimensional Hexagonal Structures", *Langmuir*, **18**, 1550–1560.
- [26] Coasne, B., Jain, S.K., Naamar, L., and Gubbins, K.E. (2007). "Freezing of argon in ordered and disordered porous carbon", *Phys. Rev. B*, **76**, 085416.
- [27] Jain, S.K., Gubbins, K.E., Pellenq, R.J.M., and Pikunic, J.P. (2006). "Molecular modeling and adsorption properties of porous carbons", *Carbon*, **44**, 2445–2451.
- [28] June, R.L., Bell, A.T., and Theodorou, D.N. (1992). "Molecular dynamics of butane and hexane in silicalite", *J. Phys. Chem.*, **96**, 1051–1060.
- [29] Macedonia, M.D., Moore, D.D., Maginn, E.J., and Olken, M.M. (2000). "Adsorption Studies of Methane, Ethane, and Argon in the Zeolite Mordenite: Molecular Simulations and Experiments", *Langmuir*, **16**, 3823–3834.

- [30] Gupta, A., Clark, L.A., and Snurr, R.Q. (2000). "Grand canonical Monte Carlo Simulations of nonrigid molecules: Siting and segregation in silicalite zeolite", *Langmuir*, **16**, 3910–3919.
- [31] June, R.L., Bell, A.T., and Theodorou, D.N. (1990). "Prediction of low occupancy sorption of alkanes in silicalite", *J. Phys. Chem.*, **94**, 1508–1516.
- [32] Bates, S.P., van Well, W.J.M., van Santen, R.A., and Smit, B. (1996). "Energetics of n-alkanes in zeolites: a configurational-bias Monte Carlo investigation into pore size dependence", *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **118**, 6753–6759.
- [33] Smit, B. and Maesen, T.L.M. (2008). "Molecular Simulations of Zeolites: Adsorption, Diffusion, and Shape Selectivity", *Chem. Rev.*, **108**, 4125–4184.
- [34] Ustinov, E.A., Do, D.D., and Fenelonov, V.B. (2006). "Pore size distribution analysis of activated carbons: Application of density functional theory using nongraphitized carbon black as a reference system", *Carbon*, **44**, 653–663.
- [35] Furmaniak, S., Terzyk, A.P., Gauden, P.A., Lota, K., Frackowiak, E., Beguin, F., and Kowalczyk, P (2008). "Determination of the space between closed multiwalled carbon nanotubes by GCMC simulation of nitrogen adsorption", *J. Coll. Inter. Sci.*, **317**, 442–448.
- [36] Furmaniak, S., Terzyk, A.P., Jaroniec, M., and Gauden, P.A. (2008). "Argon adsorption in channel-like mesoporous carbons at 77 K: Grand Canonical Monte Carlo simulations and pore size analysis", *Micropor. Mesopor. Mater.*, **116**, 665–669.
- [37] Smit, B. and den Ouden, C.J.J. (1988). "Monte Carlo simulations on the relation between the structure and properties of zeolites: The adsorption of small hydrocarbons", *J. Phys. Chem.*, **92**, 7169–7171.
- [38] Baerlocher, C., McCusker, L.B., and Olson, D.H. *Atlas of Zeolite Framework Types*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2007.
- [39] Sing, K.S.W. and Williams, R.T. (2004). "The use of molecular probes for the characterization of nanoporous adsorbents", *Part. Part. Syst. Charact.*, **21**, 71–79.
- [40] Smit, B. (1995). "Grand-canonical Monte Carlo simulations of chain molecules: Adsorption isotherms of alkanes in zeolites", *Mol. Phys.*, **85**, 153–172.
- [41] Smit, B. (1995). "Simulating the adsorption isotherms of methane, ethane, and propane in the zeolite silicalite", *J. Phys. Chem.*, **99**, 5597–5603.
- [42] Vlugt, T.J.H., Krishna, R., and Smit, B. (1999). "Molecular Simulations of Adsorption Isotherms for Linear and Branched Alkanes and their Mixtures in Silicalite", *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **103**, 1102–1118.
- [43] Frenkel, D. and Smit, B. *Understanding Molecular Simulation: from Algorithms to Applications*. Academic Press, San Diego, 2nd edition, 2002.

- [44] Dubbeldam, D., Calero, S., Vlugt, T.J.H., Krishna, R., Maesen, T.L.M., and Smit, B. (2004). "United Force Field for Alkanes in Nanoporous Materials", *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **108**, 12301–12313.
- [45] Vlugt, T.J.H. and Schenk, M. (2002). "Influence of Framework Flexibility on the Adsorption Properties of Hydrocarbons in the Zeolite Silicalite", *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **106**, 12757–12763.
- [46] García-Pérez, E., Parra, J.B., Ania, C.O., Dubbeldam, D., Vlugt, T.J.H., Castillo, J.M., Merklings, P.J., and Calero, S. (2008). "Unraveling the Argon Adsorption Processes in MFI-Type Zeolite", *J. Phys. Chem. C*, **112**, 9976–9979.
- [47] Hay, D.G. and Jaeger, H. (1984). "Orthorhombic Monoclinic Phase-Changes In Zsm-5 Zeolite Silicalite", *J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun.*, **21**, 1433–1433.
- [48] Fyfe, C.A., Strobl, H., Kokotailo, G.T., Kennedy, G.J., and Barlow, G.E. (1988). "Ultra-high-resolution ^{29}Si solid-state MAS NMR investigation of sorbate and temperature-induced changes in the lattice structure of zeolite ZSM-5", *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **110**, 3373–3380.
- [49] Wu, E.L., Lawton, S.L., Olson, D.H., Rohrman, A.C., and Kokotailo, G.T. (1979). "ZSM-5-type materials. Factors affecting crystal symmetry", *J. Phys. Chem.*, **83**, 2777–2781.
- [50] Snurr, R.Q., Bell, A.T., and Theodorou, D.R. (1993). "Prediction of Adsorption of Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Silicalite from Grand Canonical Monte Carlo Simulations with Biased Insertions", *J. Phys. Chem.*, **97**, 13742–13752.
- [51] Skoulidas, A.I. and Sholl, D.S. (2002). "Transport Diffusivities of CH_4 , CF_4 , He, Ne, Ar, Xe, and SF_6 in Silicalite from Atomistic Simulations", *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **106**, 5058–5067.
- [52] Kiselev, A.V., Lopatkin, A.A., and Shulga, A.A. (1985). "Molecular statistical calculation of gas adsorption by silicalite", *Zeolites*, **5**, 261–267.
- [53] McEnaney, B (1987). "Estimation of the dimensions of micropores in active carbons using the Dubinin-Radushkevich equation", *Carbon*, **25**, 69–75.
- [54] Terzyk, A.P., Furmaniak, S., Gauden, P.A., Harris, P.J.F., Wloch, J., and Kowalczyk, P. (2007). "Hyper-parallel tempering Monte Carlo simulations of Ar adsorption in new models of microporous non-graphitizing activated carbon: effect of microporosity", *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, **19**, 406208.
- [55] Terzyk, A.P., Furmaniak, S., Harris, P.J.F., Gauden, P.A., Woch, J., Kowalczyk, P., and Rychlicki, G. (2007). "How realistic is the pore size distribution calculated from adsorption isotherms if activated carbon is composed of fullerene-like fragments", *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, **9**, 5919–5927.
- [56] Do, D.D. and Do, H.D. (2003). "Pore characterization of carbonaceous materials by DFT and GCMC simulations: A review", *Adsorp. Sci. Tech.*, **21**, 389–423.

- [57] Vlugt, T.J.H., Zhu, W., Kapteijn, F., Moulijn, J.A., Smit, B., and Krishna, R. (1998). "Adsorption of Linear and Branched Alkanes in the Zeolite Silicalite-1", *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **120**, 5599–5600.
- [58] Maris, T., Vlugt, T.J.H., and Smit, B. (1998). "Simulation of Alkane Adsorption in the Aluminophosphate Molecular Sieve AlPO_4-5 ", *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **102**, 7183–7189.
- [59] García-Pérez, E., Dubbeldam, D., Liu, B., Smit, B., and Calero, S. (2006). "A Computational Method To Characterize Framework Aluminum in Aluminosilicates", *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, **45**, 276–278.
- [60] Liu, B., García-Pérez, E., Dubbeldam, D., Smit, B., and Calero, S. (2007). "Understanding Aluminum Location and Non-framework Ions Effects on Alkane Adsorption in Aluminosilicates: A Molecular Simulation Study", *J. Phys. Chem. C*, **111**, 10419–10426.
- [61] Alberti, A. (1997). "Location of Brønsted sites in mordenite", *Zeolites*, **19**, 411–415.
- [62] Meier, W.M. (1961). "The crystal structure of mordenite (ptilolite)", *Z. Kristallogr.*, **115**, 439–450.
- [63] Pamba, M., Maurin, G., Devautour, S., Vanderschueren, J., Giuntini, J.C., Renzo, F.D., and Hamidi, F. (2000). "Influence of framework Si/Al ratio on the Na^+ /mordenite interaction energy", *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, **2**, 2027–2031.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Zeolite Type	$V_{3.5}$ [ml/g]	$V_{4.5}$ [ml/g]	Zeolite Type	$V_{3.5}$ [ml/g]	$V_{4.5}$ [ml/g]
AEL	0.136	0.126	AET	0.172	0.165
AFI	0.192	0.184	AFO	0.129	0.119
AFR	0.341	0.280	AFS	0.405	0.366
AFY	0.489	0.452	ATN	0.179	0.149
ATO	0.118	0.107	BEA	0.322	0.314
BOG	0.299	0.286	BPH	0.289	0.273
CHA	0.357	0.332	EAB	0.299	0.281
EUO	0.192	0.179	FER	0.225	0.210
GME	0.357	0.315	KFI	0.344	0.315
LEV	0.324	0.303	LTN	0.304	0.261
MAZ	0.282	0.221	MEI	0.387	0.351
MEL	0.210	0.198	MER	0.308	0.120
MFI	0.211	0.201	MFS	0.199	0.164
MON	0.200	0.000	MOR	0.238	0.208
MTT	0.126	0.106	MWW	0.270	0.253
OFF	0.301	0.289	RHO	0.381	0.350
TON	0.134	0.121	VFI	0.337	0.328
AWW	0.246	0.230	CAN	0.247	0.136
DDR	0.249	0.226	ERI	0.293	0.281
EMT	0.452	0.439	FAU	0.481	0.468
LTA	0.457	0.440	LTL	0.211	0.203

Table 1: Micropore volumes of various all-silica zeolites computed using the scheme described in section 2.1. Zeolite framework coordinates were taken from the IZA zeolite database [38]. V_x denotes the micropore volume calculated in the range $x\text{\AA}-20\text{\AA}$. Zeolites in the bottom table contain cages that are inaccessible for most guest molecules. To calculate the density of the zeolite (in g/ml), all framework atoms other than Si have been replaced by Si. Note that this only influences the value for the pore volume per gram zeolite, and not the pore volume per unit cell. Non-framework cations have not been considered here.

Zeolite Type	Adsorption Sites	Fitted V [ml/g]	Calculated $V_{3.5}$ [ml/g]	Fitted r [Å]	Calculated r [Å]
AEL	1	0.142	0.136	5.6	5.6
AET	1	0.170	0.172	13.0	8.3
AFI	1	0.179	0.192	8.7	8.1
AFO	1	0.138	0.129	5.8	5.6
AFR	2	0.397	0.341	4.8, 9.6	4.4, 8.1
AFS	1	0.375	0.405	9.5	9.7
AFY	1	0.477	0.489	8.0	8.5
ATN	1	0.182	0.179	5.4	5.7
ATO	1	0.083	0.118	6.1	5.5
AWW	1	0.231	0.246	6.2	7.4
BEA	1	0.301	0.322	10.9	6.5
BOG	2	0.270	0.299	5.2, 7.7	7.2, 8.4
BPH	1	0.307	0.289	7.7	8.8
CAN	2	0.324	0.247	4.4, 8.4	4.3, 6.3
DDR	1	0.291	0.249	5.8	7.7
EAB	1	0.268	0.299	7.2	7.5
EUO	1	0.246	0.192	5.9	6.7
FAU	1	0.439	0.481	13.0	11.7
FER	1	0.235	0.225	5.7	5.5
GME	2	0.350	0.357	5.3, 7.9	5.0, 7.9
KFI	1	0.399	0.344	7.0	10.8
LEV	1	0.304	0.324	7.4	7.2
LTA	1	0.393	0.457	13.0	11.3
LTL	1	0.201	0.211	9.7	9.9
MAZ	2	0.267	0.282	5.2, 7.3	6.3, 8.1
MEI	1	0.396	0.387	9.1	8.2
MEL	1	0.204	0.210	6.2	5.6
MER	1	0.392	0.308	5.8	6.1
MFI	1	0.225	0.211	6.0	5.7
MFS	1	0.186	0.199	6.1	6.6
MTT	1	0.173	0.126	5.8	5.6
MOR	2	0.274	0.238	4.6, 7.5	5.1, 6.7
MWW	1	0.282	0.270	6.1	7.8
OFF	1	0.280	0.301	7.5	7.5
RHO	2	0.437	0.381	5.0, 9.8	4.5, 10.3
TON	1	0.125	0.134	5.3	5.3
VFI	1	0.345	0.337	13.0	12.5

Table 2: Comparison of fitted pore volumes (V) and pore sizes (r) and the calculated ones for various all-silica zeolites. The calculated pore volume $V_{3.5}$ is calculated using the algorithm described in section 2.1. The fitted pore volume is obtained by fitting Eqs. 1, 2 to the adsorption isotherms (computed from GCMC simulations) using Eqs. 3, 4, 5 for ρ , E_0 and n . The pore diameters are obtained in a similar way. Note that the MOR-type framework has space group $Cmcm$.

Figure 1: Schematic representation of the simulation scheme to compute the pore size distribution of porous materials. The red spheres are the zeolite atoms, and the blue circle represents the particle inserted randomly in the zeolite framework. The black dots are the grid points inside the inserted particle with a diameter r .

Figure 2: Left: Computed pore size distributions of various zeolites: (a) BEA, (b) MFI and (c) RHO. Right: corresponding contour plots for BEA, MFI and RHO. The contour planes are chosen as follows: x - z plane at $y = 0.75b$ for BEA, x - z plane at $y = 0.25b$ for MFI and x - y plane at $z = 0.5c$ for RHO (a, b, c being the length of the basisvectors of the unit cell). The color of the contour maps denotes the pore diameter. The dark area in the contour plots denotes cavities with a pore diameter smaller than 6 Å for BEA, pore diameters smaller than 5 Å for MFI and pore diameter smaller than 4 Å for RHO.

Figure 3: (a) Computed pore size distribution and (b) the contour map for the LTA-type zeolite. The contour plane is chosen as y - z plane at $x = 0.5a$. The color of the contour maps denotes the pore diameter. The dark area in contour plot denotes cavities with a pore diameter smaller than 3 Å.

Figure 4: Simulated pore size distributions for all-silica MOR and *Na*-MOR with $Si/Al = 5$. The pore size distribution of *Na*-MOR is obtained by averaging ten *Na*-MOR samples with $Si/Al = 5$. The non-framework *Na* cations are preferentially located at three adsorption sites: the main channels, the opening of the side pocket and the eight membered rings [62, 63].

Figure 5: (a) Typical snapshots of simulated contours for the all-silica MOR and *Na*-MOR with $Si/Al = 5$. The contour planes are chosen as the y - z plane at $x = 0.5a$. The color of the contour maps denotes the pore diameter. The dark area in contour planes denotes cavities with a pore diameter smaller than 3.5 Å.

Figure 6: Left: Adsorption isotherms of *Ar* in MFI-type zeolite, along with a fit to Eqs. 1,2. Right: Typical snapshot (*x-y* plane) at 0.01 kPa at 77 K.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 7: Left: Simulated adsorption isotherms of Ar in CAN at 77 K. The dashed lines are the fitted isotherms for the two distinct adsorption sites. Right: the calculated pore size distribution of CAN. The blocking of the inaccessible cages is not considered.

Figure 8: Typical snapshots (x - y plane) of *Ar* adsorbed in CAN-type zeolite at a pressure of 2.5×10^{-4} kPa (left) and 10^2 kPa (right). The blocking of the inaccessible cages is not considered.

Figure 9: The fitted parameters for the DA adsorption isotherm, i.e. ρ , E_0 and n , as a function of the pore diameter in the range from 4 to 13 Å for various zeolites. In Fig. (a), the density ρ of the liquid Ar (35.8 mmol/ml) is drawn as a dashed line.