Water–Ethanol and Methanol–Ethanol Separations Using In Situ Confined Polymer Chains in a Metal–Organic Framework
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ABSTRACT: This study presents a straightforward approach for the in situ polymerization of poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) (PNIPAM) chains within the one-dimensional (1D) pores of the five-coordinated zinc-based metal–organic framework DMOF in order to obtain new MOF-based composites. The loading amount of PNIPAM within DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites can be tuned by changing the initial weight ratio between NIPAM, which is the monomer of PNIPAM, and DMOF. The guest PNIPAM chains in the composites block partially the 1D pores of DMOF, thus leading to a narrowed nanospace. The water adsorption studies reveal that the water uptake increased by increasing the loading of PNIPAM in the final DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites, indicating that the exposed amide groups of PNIPAM gradually alter the hydrophobicity of pristine DMOF and lead to hydrophilic DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites. The composite with the highest loading of PNIPAM displays a selective adsorption for water and methanol over ethanol when using equimolar mixtures of methanol–ethanol and water–ethanol. This is confirmed by the single-component adsorption measurements as well as ideal adsorbed solution theory molecular simulations. Additionally, the water stability of pristine DMOF has been greatly improved after the incorporation of PNIPAM in its pores. PNIPAM can undergo a phase transition between hydrophobic and hydrophilic phases in response to a low temperature change. This property is used in order to control the desorption of water and methanol molecules, thus enabling an efficient and cost-effective regeneration process.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Bioethanol is foreseen to play a key role as an environmentally benign and renewable source of energy.1 Currently, the raw product of bioethanol is a dilute mixture containing not only ethanol, but also impurities such as water and other organic alcohol byproducts. These impurities may reduce the conversion efficiency of bioethanol when used as fuel.2,3 Thus, a process to remove impurities from the raw product of bioethanol until it reaches fuel-grade is necessary before further applications.4 In industry, distillation technology is often used to remove impurities from the raw product of bioethanol, but the formation of azeotrope limits the purification of ethanol into fuel-grade and makes the entire process highly energy-intensive and inefficient.5 Therefore, an energy-efficient adsorptive separation method has been proposed as an alternative approach.6 Metal–organic frameworks (MOFs) have demonstrated potential to be used as adsorbent materials for molecular storage and separations.7,8 This is because of their high surface area, tunable size, and shape of the pores as well as their specific chemical functionality.9,10 Not surprisingly, some MOFs are also utilized in the field of water–alcohol adsorptive separation.3,11–14 There are two main strategies employed for the synthesis of MOFs used in water–alcohol adsorptive separations. One approach focuses on using organic linkers with specific functionalities to tune the hydrophobic or hydrophilic properties of the porous framework. For example, {[Dy(ox)(bpybc)(H2O)](OH)·13H2O}n, is a charge-polarized MOF built from a zwitterionic organic linker, namely, 1,1′-bis(4-carboxybenzyl)-4,4′-bipyridinium dichloride (H2bpybcCl2).5 This MOF separates water–alcohol mixtures based on the polarity difference between water and alcohol molecules.9 ZIF-8 is a hydrophobic MOF constructed from Zn2+ ions and 2-methylimidazole (Hmim).11 It selectively adsorbs alcohols through capillary condensation while repelling water molecules because of its high hydrophobicity.11 The second approach utilizes flexible organic ligands because the flexibility of MOFs’ structure can be inherited from the flexibility of the ligand. Such MOFs can undergo structural rearrangements in response to specific adsorbate molecules, leading to unconventional adsorption behavior due to the occurrence of breathing effects or gate-opening phenomena.15 [Cu(mtpm)Cl2]·2OH2O,12 TetZB,13 and [Zn(ox)1.5]·4DMA·10DEF·10H2O14 are such examples of flexible MOFs. These MOFs have water–alcohol adsorptive separation properties as a result of their flexible frameworks which
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require different energies to rearrange for water and alcohol 
molecules. However, there are two main challenges remaining 
in achieving efficient water–alcohol separation using MOFs. 
The first one is that most MOFs with potential in water– 
 alcohol separations are not tested for their stability in the 
presence of water. 12–14 The second one is that none of the 
reported MOFs are prepared through a method that starts 
from a rational design of suitable pore sizes as well as tailor-
made adsorptive affinity.

This study presents the synthetic design of a water stable 
MOF-based composite having the size of the pores and their 
functionality tailored specifically for the selective separation of 
water and methanol. Li et al. 16 reported that 
\[\text{Zn}(bdc)_{2}(\text{DABCO})\] (where \(H_bdc = \text{benzene-1,4-dicarbox-
 ylic acid and DABCO = 1,4-diazabicyclo[2.2.2.]octane}\), also 
known as DMOF, is suitable for the separation of water– 
alcohol mixtures because of its high hydrophobicity. 
Their studies have shown that water molecules are repelled by 
the hydrophobic pores whilst alcohol molecules are adsorbed 
through capillary condensation. Subsequent studies by Walton 
et al. 17 demonstrated that DMOF has very weak water stability 
as its crystal structure is completely changed after water 
adsorption thereby inhibiting its further application in water– 
alcohol separation processes. Therefore, it is very important to 
modify DMOF to improve its water stability while retaining its 
water–alcohol separation ability. DMOF has ordered one-
dimensional (1D) pores (ca. 7.5 × 7.5 Å² along c-axis) which 
have smooth and flat walls. 18 These specific features allow the 
porous structure of DMOF to be tuned precisely at a 
nanoscale. Our goal was to directly narrow the size of 
DMOF’s pores by incorporating organic polymers into its 
pores, in which the polymers can block partially the free 
volume available. This approach was inspired by the work of 
Umura et al., 19–22 which focused on the development of 
synthetic strategies to confine linear polymer chains in MOFs 
but they studied the thermal behavior of such composites. We 
aimed at designing DMOF–polymer composites with a pore 
size that enables the separation of water and alcohols based on 
the differences in their kinetic diameters. In this work, 
N-isopropylacrylamide (NIPAM), a monomer of poly(N-
isopropylacrylamide) (PNIPAM) was chosen because it has 
amide groups that have high affinity for interaction with polar 
molecules, such as water and alcohols. 23 We hypothesized that 
the amide groups of the polymer will function as preferential 
adsorption sites for polar molecules, such as water, thus 
limiting their interaction with the DMOF framework. 
Moreover, PNIPAM is a thermo-responsive polymer. At 
temperatures below the lower critical solution temperature (LCST = 33 °C), 
PNIPAM is hydrophilic because the amide groups 
participate in hydrogen bonding interactions with polar 
molecules through hydrogen bonds. It exhibits hydrophobicity 
above LCST because of the breaking of the hydrogen bonds 
between the amide groups and the polar molecules. 24 
Therefore, PNIPAM undergoes a structural phase transition 
from a linear to coil structure. 25 Related to water–alcohol 
adsorptive separations, we hypothesized that the thermo-
responsive properties of the PNIPAM can be used to trigger 
the desorption of adsorbate molecules at lower temperature. 
This would enable lower energy costs in the regeneration 
process of the composite, thus increasing the energy efficiency 
of the process as compared with other adsorbent materials. For 
example, the zeolite Linde Type 4A requires a thermal 
treatment at 200–300 °C for the desorption of water 
molecules. 26 

To the best of our knowledge, there is only one study 
reporting on the use of polynaphthylene to block partially the 
pores of MOF-5 to achieve selective CO2 capture. 25 Therefore, 
it is demonstrated here the general applicability of such 
approach for other MOF structures, which in turn enables the 
extension of the applicability range of the MOF–polymer 
composites. We discuss the synthesis and characterization of 
the composites obtained by confining the PNIPAM polymer 
in the 1D pores of DMOF as well as their water–alcohol 
separation properties studied experimentally and in terms of 
the grand-canonical Monte Carlo (GCMC) simulations.

2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

2.1. Materials and Methods. All chemicals and solvents were 
purchased from commercial suppliers and used without further 
purification. Infrared spectra (IR, 4000–400 cm⁻¹, resol, 0.5 cm⁻¹) 
were recorded on a Varian 660 FTIR spectrometer equipped with a 
GladiATR devise using KBr pellets as the transmission technique. 
Raman spectra were carried out using an Olympus BX51M upright 
microscope with excitation at 632.8 nm (Thorlabs HNL 120-1 HeNe 
laser) via a 50 times magnification objective with 10 mW at the 
sample. Raman scattering was collected and delivered to a Shamrock 
163 spectrograph via a round to line fiber bundle and detected with an 
InDus-416 charge-coupled device detector. All the NMR spectra were 
recorded on a Bruker Advance 400 MHz NMR spectrometer and 
using DMSO-d₆ as the solvent. Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) 
measurements were carried out on a Rigaku MiniFlex X-ray 
diffractometer. The measurements were done in the 2θ range 
using a Cu Kα source. Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) and 
differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) measurements were carried 
on a STA 449 F3 Jupiter (NETZSCH Instrument) unit. The 
measurements were performed in air (20 mL/min) at 35–800 or 80– 
175 °C with a heating rate of 5 or 2.0 °C/min, respectively. The 
 morphology of the samples with a sputtered gold was studied by using 
field-emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM, FEI Verios 460 
scanning electron microscope) operated at 5 kV. N₂ sorption 
isothersms were measured at 77 °K on a Thermo Scientific Surfer. 
Water, methanol, and ethanol sorption experiments were performed 
in an isothermal Setaram Calvert 80 microcalorimeter, connected to 
a home built manometric apparatus. 26 The adsorption enthalpies of 
water, methanol, and ethanol were recorded simultaneously as a function of sorption uptake. 26

2.2. Synthesis of DMOF. DMOF was synthesized using a modification of a reported procedure. 27 Particularly, 0.5 g (1.68 
mmol) of \(\text{Zn}(\text{NO}_3)_2\), 0.28 g (1.68 mmol) of \(\text{H}_2\text{bdc}\), and 0.094 g 
(0.84 mmol) of DABCO were dissolved in 10 mL dimethylforma-
mide (DMF) in a 20 mL Te (0.84 mmol) of DABCO were dissolved in 10 mL dimethylforma-
cidate. Infrared spectra (IR, 4000 
400 cm⁻¹, resol, 0.5 cm⁻¹) 
were recorded on a Varian 660 FTIR spectrometer equipped with a 
GladiATR devise using KBr pellets as the transmission technique. 
Raman spectra were carried out using an Olympus BX51M upright 
microscope with excitation at 632.8 nm (Thorlabs HNL 120-1 HeNe 
laser) via a 50 times magnification objective with 10 mW at the 
sample. Raman scattering was collected and delivered to a Shamrock 
163 spectrograph via a round to line fiber bundle and detected with an 
InDus-416 charge-coupled device detector. All the NMR spectra were 
recorded on a Bruker Advance 400 MHz NMR spectrometer and 
using DMSO-d₆ as the solvent. Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) 
measurements were carried out on a Rigaku MiniFlex X-ray 
diffractometer. The measurements were done in the 2θ range 
using a Cu Kα source. Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) and 
differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) measurements were carried 
on a STA 449 F3 Jupiter (NETZSCH Instrument) unit. The 
measurements were performed in air (20 mL/min) at 35–800 or 80– 
175 °C with a heating rate of 5 or 2.0 °C/min, respectively. The 
 morphology of the samples with a sputtered gold was studied by using 
field-emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM, FEI Verios 460 
scanning electron microscope) operated at 5 kV. N₂ sorption 
isothersms were measured at 77 °K on a Thermo Scientific Surfer. 
Water, methanol, and ethanol sorption experiments were performed 
in an isothermal Setaram Calvert 80 microcalorimeter, connected to 
a home built manometric apparatus. 26 The adsorption enthalpies of 
water, methanol, and ethanol were recorded simultaneously as a function of sorption uptake. 26

2.3. Synthesis of PNIPAM. 0.55 g (4.86 mmol) of NIPAM 
monomer and 0.022 g (0.131 mmol) of radical initiator 2,2-
′azoisobis(2-
methylpropionitrile) (AIBN) were added in a 10 mL reaction tube 
under a nitrogen atmosphere. The mixture was then dissolved in 2 mL 
tetrahydrofuran (THF) and placed in an oil bath at 70 °C overnight. 
Then, the reaction mixture was cooled to room temperature and 
diethyl ether was slowly added in the above reaction mixture. The 
polymer formed as a white precipitate was filtered off and then 
redissolved in THF and reprecipitated with diethyl ether. The above 
process was repeated three times. The purified polymer was then
were activated under vacuum (<10⁻⁴ Torr) at 60 °C for 8 h prior to the following measurements.

2.4. Synthesis of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM Composites. Composites of type DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM were obtained by in situ polymerization of the NIPAM monomer using the activated DMOF. In order to fully introduce the monomer and radical initiator into the channels of DMOF, the 0.1 g activated DMOF was immersed in a THF solution (1 mL) containing the NIPAM monomer and AIBN initiator (4.0 wt % to the monomer NIPAM) under a nitrogen atmosphere for 2 h. Typical weight ratios of NIPAM to DMOF were as follows: DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-1, 0.25; DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-2, 0.60; DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3, 0.90. The excess of THF was completely removed by evaporation under vacuum at room temperature. The resulting white powder was heated in an oil bath at 70 °C overnight to conduct the polymerization, yielding the composites of type DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM, and morphology of the DMOF was retained in all composites. Moreover, the SEM analysis also shows that there is no PNIPAM at the surface of activated DMOF from here forward) are almost the same. It is featured in the activated DMOF. Figure 2 reveals that the size reinsertion, and insertion/deletion of molecules. A DMOF cell of consisting of a random choice from moves like translation, rotation, reinsertion, and insertion/deletion of molecules. A DMOF cell of 300 000 cycles after an initialization run of 150 000 cycles. In order to fully introduce the monomer and radical initiator into the polymerization of the NIPAM monomer using the activated DMOF. PNIPAM composites was washed several times with fresh methanol to remove the surface bulk polymer PNIPAM, then the composites were activated under vacuum (<10⁻⁴ Torr) at 60 °C for 8 h prior to the following measurements.

2.5. GCMC Simulation. The adsorption computations of single-components were performed using the configurational-bias Monte Carlo algorithm in the grand-canonical ensemble. The systems were modeled in full atomistic detail using calibrated classical force fields. Periodic boundary conditions were used to extrapolate the finite system results to macroscopic bulk values. The simulation was run with 300 000 cycles after an initialization run of 150 000 cycles. In each cycle and on each molecule, a Monte Carlo move was attempted consisting of a random choice from moves like translation, rotation, reinsertion, and insertion/deletion of molecules. A DMOF cell of 21.98 × 21.98 × 38.63 Å³ was used using an interaction cutoff of 11.99 Å. The Ewald-summation with a relative precision of 10⁻⁶ was used to model charge interactions. The force field was TraPPE for methanol and ethanol and Tip5pEw for water, respectively. The adsorbate-framework interactions were modeled using the DREIDING force field.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Synthesis and Characterization. The in situ formation of PNIPAM polymer chains within the 1D pores of DMOF is expected to narrow the pore size of DMOF to an appropriate size that enables the adsorption of smaller molecules from water-alcohol mixtures. This approach is summarized in Scheme 1.

In situ polymerization of the NIPAM monomer with different amounts within 1D pores of DMOF was performed at 70 °C using AIBN as the initiator. This led to composites of type DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM with different PNIPAM compositions. Figure 1 shows the PXRD patterns of DMOF, DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-1, 2, and 3. It clearly indicates that the original crystal structure of the as-synthesized DMOF is retained in all the composites. Several main peaks are shifted slightly to lower 2θ values because of the changes in the geometry of the bdc⁻²⁻ ligand, thus leading to an increase in the distance between the two neighboring Zn₂ units. This is a commonly observed feature of the activated DMOF. Figure 2 reveals that the size and morphology of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composite and DMOF crystals (all the DMOFs in this work refers to the activated DMOF from here forward) are almost the same. It confirms that the DMOF crystals were not influenced by the activation and polymerization procedures. Moreover, the SEM analysis also shows that there is no PNIPAM at the surface of the DMOF crystals (see Figure 2c−e).

The presence of the PNIPAM chains in the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites was confirmed by FTIR and micro-Raman spectroscopic analysis. The FTIR spectra of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites show the characteristic peaks of both DMOF and PNIPAM (see Figure S1 in Supporting Information). Specifically, the bands at 1650 and 1380 cm⁻¹ are assigned to the νC=O and νC−O stretching vibrations of the carboxylate groups of the bdc⁻²⁻ ligands whilst the bands at 1055, 820, and 750 cm⁻¹ are assigned to the N−C=N deformation of DABCO.28 Furthermore, the bands at 1650, 1554, and 1380 cm⁻¹ correspond to the νC=O stretching vibration, νC−N stretching vibration, and the methyl bending vibration of amide I, amide II, and methyl group of PNIPAM, respectively.29 Micro-Raman spectroscopy was further used for DMOF, PNIPAM, and DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-2 composite, respectively (see Figure 3). The DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-2 composite was selected here because it has a theoretical median PNIPAM concentration among the three composites. Several main peaks in the range of 860−1800 cm⁻¹ of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-2 composite are assigned to the vibration modes of the bdc⁻²⁻ and DABCO ligands, revealing the presence of DMOF.30 Additionally, the band at about 1450 and 1160 cm⁻¹ in the spectrum of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-2 composite can be ascribed to the C−N−C bending and νC−Nazo stretching vibration of PNIPAM.31 Another broad
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Figure 1. PXRD patterns of the as-synthesized DMOF, DMOF after solvent exchange, activated DMOF, the composites DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-1, 2, and 3 and PNIPAM. These patterns are compared with the simulated PXRD pattern of DMOF using the single-crystal crystallographic data.
The presence of PNIPAM polymer in DMOF is further confirmed by $^1$H NMR studies. Because DMOF is insoluble in DMSO, no peaks from the organic ligands can be detected (see Figure S2 in Supporting Information). The $^1$H NMR spectra of PNIPAM, DMOF ⊙ PNIPAM-1, 2, and 3 composites show the same signals (see Figures 4, S3–S5 in Supporting Information).

Figure 4. $^1$H NMR spectrum of the DMOF ⊙ PNIPAM-2 composite in DMSO-$d_6$ at ambient temperature.

The characteristic signals at around δ = 1.0 and 4.0 ppm correspond to the methyl protons of the isopropyl groups and methyl protons of PNIPAM, respectively. The broad signal in the range δ = 6.5–7.5 ppm is ascribed to the protons of the amide group and also of the PNIPAM chains. Consequently, these results strongly suggest the presence of the PNIPAM polymer within the composites.

The PNIPAM undergoes an endothermic phase transition at a specific temperature which is known as glass transition temperature ($T_g$). This phase transition includes a series of segmental motions and rotations in the surrounding free volume of PNIPAM. Therefore, confining the PNIPAM chains within nanopores may reduce its free motion and rotation, thereby resulting in a change of the $T_g$. The DSC allows the identification of phase transition and the $T_g$ of PNIPAM in DMOF ⊙ PNIPAM composites, and therefore, it can be used to shed light on the confinement of PNIPAM chains within the DMOF’s pores. Figure 5 reveals the endothermic peak of PNIPAM at 135 °C, in agreement with the earlier studies. The DSC curve of DMOF does not show any thermal effect in the temperature range from 80 to 190 °C. The DMOF ⊙ PNIPAM-1, 2, and 3 composites show a phase transition at about 140, 160, and 180 °C, respectively, indicated by the endothermic peak observed in DSC.

Figure 5. DSC heating curves of DMOF, PNIPAM, DMOF ⊙ PNIPAM-1, DMOF ⊙ PNIPAM-2, and DMOF ⊙ PNIPAM-3 composites, respectively.
shift of the $T_g$ to higher values suggests that the PNIPAM chains are confined within the 1D pores of DMOF, thus needing more energy to undergo motion and rotation. This is because the 1D pores of DMOF limit the free volume required by PNIPAM to undergo segmental motion and rotation. Furthermore, the $T_g$ of DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM composites increased by increasing the amount of PNIPAM. This is because the more PNIPAM is confined in the 1D pores of DMOF, the stronger is the intermolecular interactions between DMOF and PNIPAM chains. These interactions are established between the hydrophobic pore walls of DMOF and the alkane chains of PNIPAM. Therefore, a higher transition energy is needed for the composite with higher loading of PNIPAM. Such interactions were proposed earlier for the alkane polymers encapsulated in MOFs.34,35

The loading of PNIPAM in DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-1, 2, and 3 was determined using combined TGA and elemental analysis. Figure 6 shows that after solvent exchange, DMOF has a first weight loss of about 62% below 150 °C which indicates the removal of all the guest CHCl$_3$ molecules. A subsequent weight loss occurs above 300 °C, corresponding to the framework decomposition. Activated DMOF does not contain any solvent molecule (see Figure 6), indicating that the empty 1D pores of DMOF can be used for in situ PNIPAM polymerization.

The depolymerization of PNIPAM polymer occurs above 350 °C, a temperature higher than the decomposition temperature of DMOF. Therefore, it is not possible to separate the depolymerization of PNIPAM from the decomposition of DMOF based on TGA. Nevertheless, because the TGA curves of all composite materials are very similar below 300 °C, the different residual weight percentage of composites corresponds to the different loadings of PNIPAM in the composites. Consequently, one can conclude that a higher loading of PNIPAM in composites leads to a lower residual weight percentage in the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM composites. The elemental analysis was used as a complementary method to TGA to quantify the PNIPAM loading. The PNIPAM loading equals to 3.1, 12.8, and 15.0 wt %, respectively, for the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-1, 2, and 3 composites (see Table S1 in Supporting Information). These results indicate that the loading of PNIPAM can be controlled by adjusting the weight ratio of monomer NIPAM to host DMOF before the polymerization reaction.

Nitrogen sorption studies were performed to determine the porosity of all materials and to further confirm the confinement of PNIPAM within DMOF’s pores (see Figure 7). In agreement with earlier studies, DMOF has very high Brunauer–Emmett–Teller (BET) and Langmuir surface areas of 1780 and 2090 m$^2$/g, respectively. In sharp contrast, the N$_2$ uptake is almost negligible for the PNIPAM polymer (less than 5 cm$^3$/g at STP), confirming that it is a nonporous material. For the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM composites (Figure 7), a decreasing of N$_2$ uptake can be observed with increasing the loading of PNIPAM. The corresponding BET and Langmuir surface areas of DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-1, 2, and 3 are 660/760, 340/390, and 160/180 m$^2$/g, respectively. Nonlocal density functional theory (NLDFT) was used to calculate the pore size distributions (see Figure 8). Interestingly, with increasing the loading of PNIPAM, the pores with widths in the range of 7.5–8.6 Å (DMOF pores) gradually diminish whereas pores with widths in the range of 10–13 Å (PNIPAM chains) slightly increase.
5.0–6.6 Å (DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composite pores) emerge and gradually boost. The decreasing of the pore size of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites confirms the confinement of PNIPAM chains within the pores of DMOF.

### 3.2. Adsorption Studies.

Taking into account the successful synthesis of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites with different PNIPAM loadings, further studies aimed at verifying the potential of these materials for size-driven adsorptive separations. Water–alcohol adsorptive separations were considered as model studies given the pore size of these composites as well as the presence of amide groups along PNIPAM chains suitable for adsorbing polar molecules.

Figure 9 shows the single sorption isotherms of DMOF for water, methanol, and ethanol at 30 °C. Note that DMOF is a material with high hydrophobicity because of the presence of hydrophobic bdc[^2−] and DABCO ligands. Therefore, the interaction between DMOF and hydrophilic molecules is expected to be very weak. Such behaviour is revealed by the water adsorption isotherm of DMOF which is of type III, with a low water uptake of 1.5 mmol/g at water adsorption isotherm of DMOF which is of type III, with a low water uptake of 1.5 mmol/g at 30 °C (see Figure S6 in Supporting Information).45 Additionally, the water uptake of DMOF at 30 °C reaches 16 and 7.7 mmol/g at P/P₀ = 0.98 and 0.5, respectively (see Figure 10). This phenomenon reveals that the adsorption uptake of methanol and ethanol rises sharply and gradually boost. The decreasing of the pore size of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites is much different than that of DMOF for which no initial plateau exists in the pressure range of 0 < P/P₀ < 0.5 (see Figure 10). This phenomenon reveals that the adsorption uptake of methanol and ethanol at 30 °C, respectively. Solid and open symbols refer to adsorption and desorption, respectively.

Interestingly, the water adsorption behavior of DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites is much different than that of DMOF for which no initial plateau exists in the pressure range of 0 < P/P₀ < 0.5 (see Figure 10). The fact that the water adsorption increased by increasing the loading of PNIPAM in composites can be attributed to the increasing number of polar amide groups of PNIPAM in composites, favoring the water adsorption via hydrogen bonding. The water uptake of DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 has increased considerably (ca. 27%) as compared with that of DMOF (1.5 mmol/g at P/P₀ = 0.98 and 30 °C). This is because DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 has the highest loading of amide groups among the three composites synthesized, thus leading to a significant decrease in the hydrophobicity of DMOF. The measured water adsorption enthalpies further confirm that the hydrophobicity of DMOF decreased with the increasing of PNIPAM loading in composites. The water adsorption enthalpies equal to −88, −127, −148, and −159 kJ/mol, for the initial water uptakes of DMOF, DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-1, 2, and 3, respectively. It shows that the initial adsorption enthalpies are very high for the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM composites. A high initial water adsorption enthalpy is also observed for other hydrophilic MOFs, for example, MIL-101Cr-NH₂ (∼170 kJ/mol), MIL-100 (Fe) (∼100 kJ/mol), H₂N-Uio-66 (∼105 kJ/mol), and NH₂-MIL-125 (∼95 kJ/mol). These values indicate that the water adsorption occurs first at the hydrophilic sites, such as the amide groups of the polymer, and then water clusters are formed around the adsorbed water molecules. At higher water uptakes, all enthalpies decreased to about −43.6 kJ/mol, which is the enthalpy of evaporation of water (see Figure S6 in Supporting Information). Additionally, the water adsorption enthalpy of DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 is the highest among DMOF and the other two composites in the entire pressure range. The results confirm that the interaction between water molecules and adsorbent materials increased by increasing the number of exposed amide groups in DMOF. Therefore, even though the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite has the smallest surface area, because of the highest loading of amide groups from PNIPAM, it leads to the strongest affinity for water molecules and highest water uptake among the composites.

![Figure 9. Water adsorption isotherms of DMOF, DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-1, DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-2, and DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composites at 30 °C, respectively.](image-url)
DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 composite was further selected to study its adsorption behavior for methanol and ethanol at 30 °C. This is because it displays the highest water uptake and the smallest pore size distribution among the three composites, which may lead to selective adsorption of the smaller water and methanol molecules over ethanol. As expected, the ethanol uptake of the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 composite is less than 1.1 mmol/g, which is much lower than that of DMOF under the same conditions (30 °C and P/P₀ = 0.98; see Figure 11). It is worth noting that the pore size distribution of DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 (5−6.1 Å, see Figure 8) already indicates that the ethanol molecules may not be adsorbed because of their larger kinetic diameter (4.5 Å). Moreover, the smaller surface area of DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 also contributes to the low ethanol adsorption uptake. The methanol adsorption isotherm of DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 is different than that of DMOF, showing a methanol adsorption isotherm without the initial plateau (below P/P₀ = 0.1). This is because the amide groups of confined PNIPAM show affinity for methanol molecules through hydrogen bonding, similar to water adsorption. The measured methanol adsorption enthalpies for DMOF and DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 composites at initial uptakes are −45 and −62 kJ/mol, respectively (see Figure S7 in Supporting Information). This confirms that the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 composite interacts strongly with methanol molecules as compared with pristine DMOF. The methanol uptake of DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 is 4.3 mmol/g (30 °C and P/P₀ = 0.98), much lower than that observed for DMOF, even though its pore size is large enough for selective methanol adsorption (the kinetic diameter of methanol is 3.6 Å). However, this is expected because the surface area of DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 is much lower than that of DMOF. The occurrence of the hysteresis loop confirms the presence of hydrogen bonding between the adsorbed molecules and the amide groups of the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 composite.

The GCMC molecular simulations were used to further shed light on the adsorption behavior of DMOF and DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM composites. Figure 12 shows the simulated adsorption behaviors of both DMOF and DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 for water, methanol and ethanol, respectively. In the limit of low pressure, the fugacity equals pressure because the fugacity coefficient is unity. Therefore, we used the adsorption uptake as a function of fugacity to simulate the adsorption behavior. Figure 12a shows that the simulated water isotherm of DMOF resembles type III adsorption behavior which is consistent with the experimental result, thus confirming the highly hydrophobic surface of DMOF. The simulated methanol and ethanol isotherms show an adsorption behavior of type V, also in good agreement with the experimental results. It indicates that the hydrophobic DMOF has weak affinity for both methanol and ethanol in the initial pressure range and the alcohol uptake increased by
increasing the pressure, revealing a capillary condensation phenomenon. Figure 12b displays the possible adsorption surface for DMOF which is detected by rolling a probe molecule of helium over the inner surface of DMOF. It reveals that the probe helium atom can be adsorbed around bdc²⁻ ligands on the ab plane whilst the space around DABCO ligands along c direction is empty because the helium atom would overlap with DABCO ligands. This indicates that the adsorbate molecules, including water, methanol, and ethanol in this study, are first adsorbed around bdc²⁻ ligands on the ab plane of DMOF.

In order to simplify the complex interactions between the confined PNIPAM and DMOF, artificial atomic centers were used to mimic the confined polymer PNIPAM chains to block certain areas of the channel from being accessible to adsorbate molecules. The size and shape of the blocked volume is influenced by the size of the artificial atomic centers. The interaction parameter of these centers is made so small as to have no attractive nor repulsive interaction with the adsorbates (ε/KB = 1). As compared to DMOF, the simulated adsorption uptake of the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM composite for methanol, ethanol, and water decreased drastically from 17.5, 9.7, and 3.5 to 5.8, 2.0, and 0.7 mmol/g, respectively (see Figure 12c). It reveals that the volume of 1D pores of DMOF decreased significantly because of the confined artificial atomic centers, resulting in a reduced space for water, methanol, and ethanol adsorption. Figure 12d confirms that the possible adsorption surface of the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM composite changed as compared to that of DMOF, in which the probe helium atom can only be present at the top-left part of the 1D pores and on the surface around the confined artificial atomic centers. In order to confirm that the confined PNIPAM decreases the hydrophobicity of DMOF, we gradually increased the pressure range.30 The ideal adsorbed solution theory (IAST) simulation results indicate that the adsorption space of DMOF can be decreased by incorporating artificial atomic centers in its 1D pores, thus resulting in decreased adsorption uptakes for water, methanol, and ethanol. Increasing the affinity of artificial atomic centers for water, methanol, and ethanol can decrease the hydrophobicity of the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM composite, thus increasing the adsorption uptakes in the initial pressure range and narrowing the initial plateaus of the adsorption isotherms. These results are in agreement with the experimental adsorption properties of the DMOF and DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 composite. However, the simulated adsorption properties of the DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM composite do not exactly match the observed experimental adsorption behavior. This means that simulated data do not show a preferential adsorption for water over ethanol. This is likely because of the simplified artificial atomic centers which are still different than the actual complex PNIPAM chains.

3.3. Separation and Regeneration Studies. Based on the adsorption studies discussed above, one may conclude that both the DMOF and DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 composite are promising candidates for water–ethanol and methanol–ethanol separation processed because both materials have very different adsorption behaviors for water, methanol, and ethanol. However, the pristine DMOF cannot be directly used in water–alcohol separation applications because of its weak stability in the presence of water. The PXRD patterns of DMOF (Figure S11) indicate clearly that the structure of DMOF is completely changed after water adsorption, in agreement with earlier studies.37,38 By sharp contrast, DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 retains its crystallinity after water adsorption (see Figure S11 in Supporting Information). This is likely due to the fact that the confined PNIPAM chains facilitate water adsorption on their amide groups, thereby preventing the decomposition of DMOF. Moreover, both DMOF and DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 retain their structures after methanol and ethanol adsorption, confirming their structure stability in the presence of alcohol molecules (see Figure S12 in Supporting Information). The stability of DMOF in methanol and ethanol adsorption probably is likely because of the preferential occupancy of these molecules within the 1D channels of DMOF without affecting the overall structural topology.38 DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 has increased stability also because of the amide groups of confined PNIPAM which provide preferential adsorption sites for methanol and ethanol molecules, thus preventing structural changes.

The ideal adsorbed solution theory (IAST) simulation method was used to evaluate the potential of the DMOF ⊃

Figure 13. Adsorption selectivity calculated with the IAST method for equimolar binary mixtures of (a) methanol–ethanol and (b) ethanol–water for DMOF ⊃ PNIPAM-3 at 30 °C.
PNIPAM-3 composite for equimolar water–ethanol and methanol–ethanol separations. As seen in Figure 13, the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite shows a selective adsorption for methanol and water over ethanol. The selectivity of methanol–ethanol and water–ethanol increased from 3.5 to 17.3 and 2.1 to 3.3 with the increasing of pressure, respectively. An increased adsorption selectivity can be obtained for both methanol–ethanol and water–ethanol equimolar mixtures, mainly because the methanol and water uptake of the DMOF \[\text{DMOF} = \text{Cu}_2(\text{tpt})_2(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_2(\text{BF}_4)_2\] has a unique molecular length-to-diameter ratio as well as a high hydrophobicity of these frameworks.

Figure 14. (a) Water adsorption isotherms for the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite at 30, 40, 50, and 60 °C, respectively. (b) Methanol adsorption isotherms for the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite at 30, 40, 50, and 60 °C, respectively.

It is observed that the initial plateau of the methanol adsorption isotherm is gradually extended by increasing the temperature. Such behavior confirms that the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite becomes hydrophobic at higher temperatures, thus the weak interactions between the composite and methanol lead to lower methanol uptake in the initial pressure range. This is also because of the intermolecular hydrogen bonds which are gradually replaced by intramolecular hydrogen bonds, similar to composite’s water adsorption. However, different than the water uptake, which decreases significantly by increasing the temperature, the methanol uptake of DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 decreased only little. This can be explained by the fact that methanol molecules tend to accumulate within the pores of the composite through capillary condensation by increasing the methanol pressure.

The hydrophobic feature of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite above 60 °C inspired us to regenerate it by desorbing the adsorbed water and methanol molecules at this temperature. Therefore, the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite is regenerated at 60 °C and three consecutive adsorption–regeneration cycles for both water and methanol have been obtained (see Figures S13 and S14 in Supporting Information). The adsorption uptake of each cycle is similar to each other; however, a small difference in isotherms can be observed, probably because of the movement of PNIPAM chains within 1D pores of DMOF after each cycle. Notably, this regeneration temperature of the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite is lower than that of some other porous adsorbents used in similar applications, such as DMOF itself (70–80 °C for desorbing methanol and ethanol)\(^{16}\), Linda Type 4A molecular sieves (200–300 °C for desorbing water)\(^{16}\), UiO-66 and H\(_2\)N-MIL-125 (120 °C for desorbing water)\(^{57}\), and CNT@MIL-68 (Al) (100 °C for desorbing phenol)\(^{58}\). Such a lower regeneration energy makes the DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM-3 composite a more suitable adsorbent for the water–alcohol adsorptive separations.

4. CONCLUSIONS

MOFs-based composites of type DMOF ⊂ PNIPAM were synthesized using in situ polymerization of NIPAM monomers within the 1D pores of DMOF. As compared to pristine DMOF, the pore size of composites narrowed due to the fact that PNIPAM chains were blocking partially the 1D pores of DMOF. Consequently, the composites’ hydrophobicity decreased because the amide groups of the confined PNIPAM have adsorptive affinity for water and alcohols. Additionally,
the pore size and hydrophobicity of DMOF \( \supset \) PNIPAM composites can be controlled by adjusting the loading of PNIPAM in the composites. For DMOF \( \supset \) PNIPAM-3, which has the highest loading of PNIPAM, an increased water adsorption uptake and an increased water stability are observed as compared to the pristine DMOF. Both the experimental results and GCMC simulations of DMOF \( \supset \) PNIPAM-3 for water and alcohol adsorption reveal that it can adsorb selectively water and methanol over ethanol. The DMOF \( \supset \) PNIPAM-3 composite shows a selectivity as high as 17.3 and 3.3 in equimolar methanol–ethanol and water–ethanol mixtures, as indicated by IAST simulations. The regeneration and desorption studies on DMOF \( \supset \) PNIPAM-3 show that the adsorbed water and methanol molecules can be removed at 60 °C. At this temperature, the confined PNIPAM chains undergo a transition between hydrophilic and hydrophobic phases in response to the temperature change. This work provided a rational strategy for the design of a water-stable MOF-based composite with adjustable pore sizes and tunable adsorption for water, methanol and ethanol.
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