Efficient Rhodamine B degradation with molybdenum disulfide nano-flowers as monopersulfide activator under varying precursor solution pH
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ABSTRACT

Molybdenum disulfide (MoS₂) nano-flowers were prepared with different physicochemical properties resulting from varying precursor pH. The degradation rate of Rhodamine B (RhB) via MoS₂-activated monopersulfide (PMS) was investigated under the synergy of light. The results showed that the prepared MoS₂ at pH 1, 2, 3 and 4 were stable 2H-MoS₂ and flowery. The size was evenly distributed between 200 and 500 nm. The degradation rates of RhB by MoS₂ activated PMS were improved from 12.85% to 31.25% comparing with that of PMS alone under 120 min of light. Among them, MoS₂-2 (pH 2) presented the highest activation efficiency. Its specific surface area reached 40.012 m²/g, and the removal rate of RhB was as high as 63.73%. Although MoS₂-1 (pH 1) had the largest specific surface area (69.622 m²/g), the removal of RhB decreased to 58.56% due to its undesirable crystallinity. The main active substances of MoS₂ activated PMS were –OH and SO₄⁻• under the synergy of light.
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1. Introduction

Sulfate radicals (SO₄⁻•) have a relatively wider pH tolerance range (2–10 vs. 2–4), higher redox potential (E₀ 2.5–3.1 V vs. E₀ 1.8–2.7 V), and longer half-life (4 s vs. 0.1 µs) than hydroxyl radicals (–OH). Therefore, persulfate is able to treat refractory organic wastewater [1–3]. The prerequisite is the need to excite the peroxide bond –O–O– breaking with the help of transition metals, electricity, light or heat [4–6] to produce SO₄⁻• and fully exploit its oxidative properties.

Molybdenum disulfide (MoS₂) is a layered transition metal sulfide with a stable semiconductor crystal structure. The nanostructures have unsaturated dangling bonds on the surface to induce electron transfer under light. Therefore, MoS₂ exhibits excellent catalytic degradation of organic matter [7]. Recent studies on MoS₂-catalyzed monopersulfide (PMS) focused on the control of MoS₂ morphology, solution pH, dosing amount, etc. Zhou et al. [8] used bulk MoS₂ to activate PMS and found that neither single MoS₂ nor PMS could achieve the degradation of carbamazepine (CBZ). The kinetic model showed that the degradation of bisphenol A (BPA) via ce-MoS₂/PMS was almost 150 times higher than that of the bulk MoS₂/PMS [9]. Sheng et al. [10] synthesized a composite photocatalyst to activate PMS and found that doping with 20 wt.% MoS₂ resulted in an increase in specific surface area of 62.4 m²/g.
In the exploration of MoS$_2$-catalyzed PMS, the adsorption capacity of the active ingredient determines the rate of radical production [9], and the precursor pH significantly affects the physicochemical properties of MoS$_x$ such as specific surface area, activation sites and crystallinity, thereby affecting the generation of free radicals. However, the activation capacity of MoS$_x$/PMS has not been investigated in depth.

In this study, thin layers of MoS$_2$ with different physicochemical properties were prepared by precisely controlling the pH (1, 2, 3 and 4) of the precursor solution. The effect of precursor pH on the degradation rate of Rhodamine B (RhB) was investigated under the synergy of natural light. Finally, the mechanism of contaminant degradation by MoS$_x$/PMS based on the pH regulation was analyzed.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Reagents

Thiourea (CH$_3$N,S) was bought from Beilian Fine Chemicals Development Co. Sodium molybdate (Na$_2$MoO$_4$·2H$_2$O) was obtained from Zhiyuan Chemical Reagent Co. Potassium persulfate (KHSO$_4$) was purchased from Macklin reagent Co., Ltd. Rhodamine B (C$_{33}$H$_{34}$CN$_2$O$_{24}$) was obtained from Reagent Research Institute which selected as the major organic pollutant in water. P-benzoquinone (BQ, purity ≥ 99%) was bought from Macklin reagent Co., Ltd. Rhodamine S (C$_{28}$H$_{31}$CN$_2$O$_{7}$S) was bought from Beilian Fine Chemicals Development Co. Sodium molybdate (Na$_2$MoO$_4$·2H$_2$O, purity ≥ 99.5%) and tert-butanol (C$_{4}$H$_{9}$O) of 48 mmol/L rhodamine contaminants. As soon as the desired amount of MoS$_2$ powder and PMS was added into the solution simultaneously with a constant stirring speed of 500 rpm, the timekeeping began. Dark reaction was carried out for 30 min to achieve adsorption-resolution equilibrium between sample and contaminant. The reaction solution was then placed in a dark box with magnetic stirring under light, and 3.5 mL of sample was taken every 20 min after high-speed centrifugation (10,000 rpm). The absorbance of the obtained suspension was measured at 554 nm. The degradation rate (D) of RhB solution was calculated according to the following equation: $D = \frac{A_0 - A}{A_0}$, where $A_0$ and $A$ were the absorbance and concentration of RhB solution at the initial time, while $A_0$ and $A$ were the absorbance and concentration of RhB solution at the reaction time, respectively.

2.2. Synthesis of MoS$_2$ nano-particles

MoS$_2$ nano-particles were fabricated by a hydrothermal method. First, a certain amount of powder mixture of sodium molybdate and thiourea with molar ratio of 1:3 was used as the precursor (0.726 g of sodium molybdate and 0.685 g of thiourea) and dissolved in 35 mL of deionized water, and oxalic acid was added as surfactant. Second, the pH of the precursor solution was adjusted to 1, 2, 3 and 4 in order using concentrated hydrochloric acid. Then the mixed solution was transferred into a stainless 50 mL Teflon-lined autoclave, sealed and kept at 220°C for 24 h. The precipitates were washed three times with deionized water and anhydrous ethanol respectively after precipitates were cooled to room temperature. Finally, the collected black precipitate was dried for 8 h. The resulting samples were labeled as MoS$_2$-1, MoS$_2$-2, MoS$_2$-3 and MoS$_2$-4, respectively.

2.3. Analytical method

The surface morphological details of the bulk MoS$_2$ were scanned by scanning electron microscope (SEM, Hitachi S4800, acceleration voltage 0.1 V–30 kV). The crystal structure was characterized by X-ray diffraction (XRD, X Pertpro, Panalytical, Netherlands, with a maximum power of 3 kW. Copper target as target material, scanning range 5°–90°, scanning speed 12°/min). Surface area (SA) were calculated by N$_2$ adsorption/desorption using an automatic adsorption instrument (ASAP2020HD88, Mike, USA). Using monochromatic Al K$_\alpha$ radiation (1486.6 eV, 12 kV) as the X-ray source, the elemental composition and chemical state of the sample were analyzed by X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS, Thermo Scientific K-Alpha).

UV visible diffuse reflectance spectroscopy (DRS) was measured by a Shimadzu UV-3600 spectrophotometer and different Mo material was used as the reference to analyze the visible light absorption characteristics of samples. The residual RhB concentration was measured using a UV–Vis spectrophotometer (UV3600, SHI-MADZU). The metal leaching of molybdenum was measured by inductively coupled plasma–mass spectrometry (ICP–MS, EXPEC7000, Spotlight Technology Co., China).

2.4. Photocatalytic experiment

For RhB degradation experiments, a 350 W cold light source xenon lamp was used to simulate solar light source for photocatalytic experiments, full spectral range. 15 mg/L of Rhodamine solution was used as the target pollutant. 12 mg of photocatalyst was dispersed in 80 mL of 48 mmol/L rhodamine contaminants. As soon as the desired amount of MoS$_2$ powder and PMS was added into the solution simultaneously with a constant stirring speed of 500 rpm, the timekeeping began. Dark reaction was carried out for 30 min to achieve adsorption-resolution equilibrium between sample and contaminant. The reaction solution was then placed in a dark box with magnetic stirring under light, and 3.5 mL of sample was taken every 20 min after high-speed centrifugation (10,000 rpm). The absorbance of the obtained suspension was measured at 554 nm. The degradation rate (D) of RhB solution was calculated according to the following equation: $D = \frac{(C_0 - C)_\infty}{(A_0 - A)_\infty}$, where $A_0$ and $C_0$ were the absorbance and concentration of RhB solution at the initial time, while $A_0$ and $C_0$ were the absorbance and concentration of RhB solution at the reaction time, respectively.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Characterization

The morphological characteristics of MoS$_2$ before and after pH adjustment are shown in Fig. 1a-d. The size of MoS$_2$ distributed in the range of 200–500 nm. The nanosheets were stacked together and showed a flower-like structure. MoS$_2$ was thin and clearly visible at the edges. It could be seen from Fig. 1e and f that the material was composed of 5 and Mo elements with uniform distribution.

XRD was also performed to investigate the crystal phase composition of MoS$_2$ under different pH preparation conditions. As shown in Fig. 2 several typical sharp and narrow diffraction peaks for 2H MoS$_2$ were observable in 13.95°, 33.03°, 39.38° and 58.33° correspond well to the Bragg planes of (002), (100), (103) and (110). The positions of the diffraction peaks were consistent with the standard card match of 2H-MoS$_2$ (JCPDS-PDF: 65-0160). It is worth noting that the intensity of each diffraction peak of MoS$_2$-1 was significantly lower than that of MoS$_2$-2, MoS$_2$-3 and
MoS\(_2\)-4, especially the growth of the (002) crystal plane. The relatively poor crystallization properties and low purity of MoS\(_2\)-1 were indicated. The BET surface area were 69.622, 40.012, 32.104 and 24.097 m\(^2\)/g for MoS\(_2\)-1, MoS\(_2\)-2, MoS\(_2\)-3 and MoS\(_2\)-4 respectively. Unsurprisingly MoS\(_2\)-1 has the largest specific surface area which may be related to the presence of a large number of defects on its surface. This result was verified in the above characterization.

XPS was applied to investigate the surface state changes of precursor MoS\(_2\) at different pH values. The binding energy of all XPS spectra was calibrated by C1s at 284.8 eV. The XPS survey spectrum of MoS\(_2\) further evidenced the presence of Mo, S, C and O elements (Fig. 3a–d), while the presence of O element may be caused by air exposure [11]. Through calculating peak area, the atom ratio of Mo and S was about 1:2. In summary, the above results further confirmed the fact that the tested samples were composed of MoS\(_2\). The XPS Mo 3d core-level spectrum (Fig. 3e–h) could be curve-fitted into three main peak components. First, the peak at 226.3 eV corresponds to S 2s. Second, the main peaks at 229.2 eV and 232.5 eV which are the characteristics of MoS\(_2\) could be attributed to Mo 3d\(_{5/2}\) and Mo 3d\(_{3/2}\), respectively [12]. These two main peaks indicated that most of the Mo existed in the state of Mo(IV). The other peak centered at 235.9 eV was assigned to Mo\(^{6+}\) states [13]. No new phase appears in the XRD pattern, implying no formation of oxides such as MoO\(_3\) [14]. From Fig. 3e–h, by split-peak fitting, it was observed that there were different valence states of Mo present in the materials prepared with different pH precursors. This is mainly because the reactant Mo ions exist in different forms at different pH values, affecting the formation of MoS\(_2\) [15]. Indicating that the pH indeed changed the reduction degree of Mo which might influence the catalytic performance. After adjusting pH, the amount of Mo(VI) reduced from 4-Mo (0.05%) to 1-Mo (5.68%).

3.2. Photocatalytic activity

Fig. 4a is a graph showing the performance of MoS\(_2\) photocatalyst on RhB degradation under different pH conditions of precursor fluids preparation. The removal rate of RhB by single PMS was low, only 32.87% after 120 min of operation. However, the degradation was significantly improved after the addition of MoS\(_2\). 64.02% removal of RhB was achieved by MoS\(_2\)-2/PMS system. The removal rates were 55.42% and 45.72% for MoS\(_2\)-3/PMS and MoS\(_2\)-4/PMS, respectively. MoS\(_2\)-2, MoS\(_2\)-3 and MoS\(_2\)-4 were flower-like, and insignificant difference existed in crystallinity (Fig. 2). The different removal efficiency may be due to the difference in specific surface area. On the one hand, a larger specific surface area means that the Mo was more fully exposed and had more edge active sites per unit volume, which in turn led to a higher efficiency of electron transfer [16] and a significantly enhanced activation effect. On the other hand, the larger specific surface area also provided sufficient active sites [17]. However, for MoS\(_2\)-1, the removal rate of RhB was only 58.56%. Obviously, the maximum specific surface area of MoS\(_2\) did not produce
the best activation effect because the Mo-O bond in MoO$_4^{2-}$ was weak and easily replaced by S$_2^-$; MoO$_2$ was then easily dehydrated under the condition of strong acid (pH 1) to produce polymolybdate, which inhibited the formation of MoS$_2$ and led to its undesirable crystallinity [18] (Fig. 2).

3.3. Radical scavenging experiments

To clarify the types of active free radicals, CH$_3$O, TBA and BQ were used as radical quenchers (Fig. 4b). At specified intervals, a 3.5 mL of samples was filtered through a 0.45 µm PTFE syringe filter before analysis. Previous studies showed that CH$_3$O can quench both SO$_4^{•−}$ and –OH, while TBA can quench more quickly with –OH [19]. After the addition of methanol and tert-butanol, the degradation rates of RhB was 28.26% and 43.58% lower compared to the control, respectively. The 15.32% difference may be resulted from the SO$_4^{•−}$ involved in the degradation. In summary, in the MoS$_2$/PMS activation system, –OH and SO$_4^{•−}$ were involved as the main ROS.

3.4. Cycle performance test

As shown in Fig. 5, under the full-spectrum xenon lamp irradiation, it was found that the degradation rate of rhodamine under light conditions was decreasing rapidly with a trend of about 3% after three cycles of experiments. A possible explain to this drawback could be that recycled MoS$_2$ surfaces clogged with contaminant molecules. In addition, the presence of losses during the recycling of collected materials could also lead to a decrease in the degradation rate of contaminants. Besides, it has been shown that PMS has little ability to reduce Mo species in the highly oxidized state [20].

3.5. Dissolution of MoS$_2$ nanosheets

It has been found that MoS$_2$ nanosheets are susceptible to oxidation under environmental conditions resulting in the release of soluble molybdenum species, which may cause secondary contamination [21]. The Mo ion release from MoS$_2$ nanosheets prepared with different pH precursors was evaluated in deionized water. For dissolution experiments, different MoS$_2$ nanosheets at 10 mg/L were prepared in deionized water. Samples were collected at 12, 24, 48 and 72 h. At each sampling time, the collected suspensions were centrifuged (30 mL, 5 min) to separate the MoS$_2$ nanosheets and the dissolved Mo ions. Then filtered through a 0.45 um pore size membrane for further solid-liquid separation. As shown in Fig. 6, after 72 h exposure under natural conditions, the metal leaching rates of Mo were 0.56 mg/L (MoS$_2$-1), 0.70 mg/L (MoS$_2$-2), 0.64 mg/L (MoS$_2$-3), 0.09 mg/L (MoS$_2$-4), respectively. It indicates that the dissolved amount is relatively low and not enough to cause secondary pollution to the environment. However, MoS$_2$-2 has a higher dissolution than the rest of different pH, which is more favorable for its participation in the activation of PMS to degrade the pollutants. This is consistent with the above experimental results.

3.6. Possible activation mechanism

The results suggested that PMS generated more ROS under the co-excitation of light and MoS$_2$ (Fig. 4b). The activation mechanism can be divided into two parts (Fig. 7). First, the UV-vis diffuse absorption spectra indicated that four MoS$_2$ species showed strong visible light absorption properties. This was related to their narrow band gap width (1.3–1.9 eV). Under ultraviolet (UV) irradiation, the O-O bond in PMS broke and converted PMS to SO$_4^{•−}$ and –OH [22]. Zhou et al. [23] showed by DFT simulations that the reaction between PMS and BPR could take place spontaneously and a large amount of charge would accumulate on the surface of PMS, and the increase in the bond length of O-O bond implies a breakage tendency which indicates that PMS will undergo strong electron transfer with BPR. In addition, under the excitation of visible light, MoS$_2$ generated photogenerated electrons that reacted with HSO$_5^−$ to form SO$_4^{•−}$ [24]. Next, Mo(IV) produced by the dissociation of MoS$_2$ underwent electron transfer with HSO$_5^−$ to produce Mo(V) and SO$_4^{•−}$. Following that, Mo(V) continued to undergo electron transfer with HSO$_5^−$ to produce Mo(VI) and SO$_4^{•−}$ [Eqs. (1)–(6)]. Finally, the reduction of Mo(VI) to Mo(IV) by PMS is slow [8]. In the MoS$_2$/PMS system, Mo underwent a complete redox process with continuous production of SO$_4^{•−}$ [25]. Different precursor pH created the varying specific surface area, crystallinity and number of active sites of MoS$_2$, resulting in different activation performance and degradation ability of PMS.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{HSO}_5^− + \text{hv} &\rightarrow \text{SO}_4^{•−} + \text{OH}^- \\
\text{MoS}_2 + \text{hv} &\rightarrow \text{e}^- + \text{h}^+ \\
\text{e}^- + \text{HSO}_5^− &\rightarrow \text{SO}_4^{•−} + \text{OH}^- \\
\text{Mo(IV)} + \text{HSO}_5^− &\rightarrow \text{Mo(IV)} + \text{SO}_4^{•−} + \text{OH}^- \\
\text{Mo(IV)} + \text{HSO}_5^− &\rightarrow \text{Mo(IV)} + \text{SO}_4^{•−} + \text{OH}^-
\end{align*}
\]
Fig. 3. XPS survey spectra of MoS$_2$ in different pH precursors (a–d), Mo 3d core-level spectra of MoS$_2$ (e–h).
Mo VI $\rightarrow$ Mo IV + $\cdot$OH + SO$_4$$^-$$^-$

4. Conclusion

MoS$_2$ with different physicochemical properties were prepared by controlling the pH of precursor solution. The results showed that the MoS$_2$ prepared at different pH values were flower-like. The specific surface areas were MoS$_2$-1 (pH 1) > MoS$_2$-2 (pH 2) > MoS$_2$-3 (pH 3) > MoS$_2$-4 (pH 4). Meanwhile, the light absorption ability was MoS$_2$-1 > MoS$_2$-2 > MoS$_2$-3 > MoS$_2$-4. The removal rates of RhB were 58.56%, 64.02%, 55.42% and 45.72% for MoS$_2$-1/PMS, MoS$_2$-2/PMS, MoS$_2$-3/PMS and MoS$_2$-4/PMS, respectively, which were 12.85% to 31.25% higher than that of PMS alone. The ROS types mainly included $\cdot$OH and SO$_4$$^-$$^-$. Under the irradiation of natural light for 120 min, the highest performance was found for MoS$_2$-2/PMS due to its desirable crystallinity, specific surface area and excellent dissolution rate. The results indicate that the regulation of precursor solution pH is an effective way to enhance the degradation ability of MoS$_2$/PMS.

Fig. 4. Influence of different MoS$_2$ on the degradation of RhB (a) and photocatalytic degradation effect of MoS$_2$/PMS system under different scavengers (b). Experiment conditions: [RhB]$_0$ = 15 mg/L; [MoS$_2$] = 0.125 g/L; [PMS] = 0.15 g/L; under 350 W xenon lamp light.

Fig. 5. Stability test for MoS$_2$ after 4 circles. Experiment conditions: [RhB]$_0$ = 15 mg/L; [MoS$_2$] = 0.125 g/L; [PMS] = 0.15 g/L; under 350 W xenon lamp light.

Fig. 6. Dissolution of MoS$_2$ nanosheets in different pH in water solution. Experiment conditions: [MoS$_2$] = 0.01 g/L; under natural light conditions.
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