Volume 1 | Number 1 | Jan 2013 | Pages 1–100

Journal of
Materials Chemistry A

Materials for energy and sustainability
www.rsc.org/materialsA

Li⁺
e⁻
Li⁺
e⁻
Li⁺
Li⁺

ROYAL SOCIETY
OF CHEMISTRY

This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the
Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been
accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after
acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading.
Using this free service, authors can make their results available
to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited
article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited
and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the
Information for Authors.

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes
to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's
standard **Terms & Conditions** and the **Ethical guidelines** still
apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held
responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript*
or any consequences arising from the use of any information it
contains.

ARTICLE TYPE

Cs and Sr removal over highly effective adsorbents ETS-1 and ETS-2

Huimin Liu*, Akihiro Yonezawa, Keisuke Kumagai, Makoto Sano, Takanori Miyake*

5 Engelhard titanosilicate-1 (ETS-1) and Engelhard titanosilicate-2 (ETS-2) were prepared. It was the first time their properties were studied and they found their applications in water treatment. The performance of ETS-1 and ETS-2 in Cs and Sr removal was investigated and compared with those of ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5. Characterization revealed successful synthesis of ETS-1 and ETS-2, having layered structures with specific surface areas of about 120 m^2/g and 220 m^2/g, respectively. The compositions of ETS-1 and 10 ETS-2 were analyzed by XRF and TGA, and the theoretical exchange capacities for monovalent cation were calculated to be 6.70 mmol/g and 8.12 mmol/g, respectively, assuming all the alkali metal cations could be exchanged. ETS-1 showed the highest Cs removal performance among the adsorbents studied, whereas ETS-2 was promising in Sr removal. In competitive removal experiment for Cs and Sr, the highest amount of Cs uptake was observed over ETS-1, though ETS-1 did not show specific selectivity to 15 Cs removal.

1 Introduction

Due to the earthquake and the melt-down of the atomic power plants in Fukushima, Japan in March, 2011, the water was 20 contaminated with the radioactive Cs and Sr. These radioactive species were harmful to human beings, and therefore it is urgent to remove them from water [1].

In order to get rid of the radioactive species, several adsorbents have been developed. For the removal of Cs, zeolites (Na-Y, 25 ZSM-5 etc.) [2, 3], prussian blue [4, 5], birnessites [6], and heteropoly acids (HPA) [7] were the most commonly adopted adsorbents. For Sr removal, carbon (including active carbon and carbon nanotubes) [8, 9], calixarene amide ionophores [10], and silica-based materials [11, 12] have been studied. Titanosilicate 30 materials have been one of the main categories in heavy metal removal. Among them, Engelhard titanosilicate-4 (ETS-4), Engelhard titanosilicate-10 (ETS-10) [13, 14], crystalline silicotitanate (CST) [15], AM-2 [16], AM-3 [17] and AM-4 [18] have been widely studied and they have shown high efficiencies 35 in Cs and Sr removal [19, 20, 21, 22].

As titanosilicates also invented by the Engelhard Corporation, however, Engelhard titanosilicate-1 (ETS-1) and Engelhard titanosilicate-2 (ETS-2) have not attracted as much attention of the scientists as ETS-4 and ETS-10. In this work, we synthesized 40 ETS-1 and ETS-2 and for the first time they were employed as adsorbents in Cs and Sr removal. Their physicochemical properties were studied in detail, and their performance was compared with those of Na-Y, ZSM-5 and ETS-4.

2 Experimental

45 **2.1 Reagents**

Sodium silicate (52~57 wt% in water, and the molar ratio of SiO$_2$/Na$_2$O was 2.06~2.31), TiCl$_3$ (20 wt% TiCl$_3$ in 10 wt% HCl solution), NaOH, KOH (the minimum content of KOH is 85 wt%), NaF, KF, CsNO$_3$ and SrCl$_2$·6H$_2$O were obtained from 50 Wako Pure Chemical Industries, Ltd. Na-Y [n(SiO$_2$)/n(Al$_2$O$_3$)=5.5] and Na-ZSM-5 [n(SiO$_2$)/n(Al$_2$O$_3$)=23.0] were supplied from TOSOH Corp.

2.2 Synthesis of ETS-1, ETS-2 and ETS-4

ETS-1 was synthesized with the same method as in ref. [23]. That 55 is, 8.08 g sodium silicate (52~57 wt%), 38.1 g TiCl$_3$ (20 wt%), 11.7 g NaOH, 4.91 g KOH (>85 wt%), 2.90 g KF and 20.0 mL water was mixed in a 200 mL flask and stirred at room temperature for half an hour. Then, the mixture was transferred into a teflon-lined autoclave and hydrothermally treated at 125 ^{o}C 60 for 1 day or 3 days. After washing with water until no changes in pH (pH≈9), the product was dried at 70 ^{o}C overnight. The ETS-1 samples obtained were denoted as ETS-1 1d and ETS-1 3d, respectively.

ETS-2 was synthesized as in ref. [23]. The preparation method 65 for ETS-2 was similar with that of ETS-1 except that the potassium containing raw materials were replaced by sodium containing ones. Namely, 14.7 g NaOH and 4.20 g NaF were employed for the preparation of ETS-2 instead of 11.7 g NaOH+4.91 g KOH and 2.90 g KF for ETS-1 preparation. 70 Similarly, ETS-2 samples obtained with different hydrothermal times were denoted as ETS-2 1d and ETS-2 3d, respectively.

15.2 g sodium silicate (52~57 wt%), 38.1 g TiCl$_3$ (20 wt%), 11.7 g NaOH, 1.39 g KF and 56.3 mL water was mixed and stirred at room temperature for half an hour, and then the mixture was 75 hydrothermally treated at 200 ^{o}C for 7 days in a teflon-lined

Fig. 1 XRD patterns of as prepared ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4 and commercial Na-Y, Na-ZSM-5


Fig. 2 TG analysis of water in the adsorbents

Table 1 Composition of ETS-1 and ETS-2 by XRF (calibrated by standard samples)

Sample	Ti (wt %)	Si (wt %)	Na (wt %)	K (wt %)
ETS-1 1d	26.9	13.3	13.7	8.5
ETS-1 3d	29.5	12.1	13.3	7.9
ETS-2 1d	30.6	9.9	21.4	-
ETS-2 3d	27.7	11.5	21.9	-

Table 2 Composition of ETS-1 and ETS-2 by XRF and TG

Sample	TiO_2 (wt %)	SiO_2 (wt %)	Na_2O (wt %)	K_2O (wt %)	Total (wt %)	H_2O (wt %)
ETS-1 1d			85.0			15.0
	44.8	28.5	18.5	10.2	102.0	
ETS-1 3d			85.0			15.0
	49.2	25.9	17.9	9.5	102.5	
ETS-2 1d			85.8			14.2
	51.0	21.2	28.8	-	101.0	
ETS-2 3d			87.6			12.4
	46.2	24.6	29.5	-	100.3	

5.8, 0.050 g portion of the adsorbent was added. The adsorption was carried out at R.T. with different contact times (0.5~24 h). Both the initial $CsNO_3$ solution and the solution after Cs adsorption were attenuated with pre-prepared KCl diluent (0.1 mol/L), and were analyzed by the atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Z-2010, Hitachi). The differences between the initial and final Cs concentrations could be ascribed to the amounts of Cs removed by the adsorbents. For Sr, the solution was analyzed by ICP (ICPS-7510, Shimadzu Corp.) after dilution with water.

3   Results and discussion

3.1 Crystalline structure

The crystalline structures of the as-prepared samples and the commercial Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5 were characterized by XRD, and the results are shown in Fig. 1. Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5 exhibited their typical diffraction peaks [25, 26], and the peaks for the as-prepared ETS-2 and ETS-4 were coincident with those in the references [27, 24]. As for ETS-1, all the peaks mentioned in ref. [23] appeared in the XRD profiles, whereas there was a difference in the relative intensities of the peaks, which may probably be due to the crystal growth anisotropy of different facets. Though the main diffraction peaks for ETS-2 were in the similar positions with those of ETS-1, ETS-1 and ETS-2 were different materials (Fig. 1s and Fig. 2s). ETS-2 was poorly crystallized even after 7 days' hydrothermal time (Fig. 3s). Thus, ETS-1, ETS-2 and ETS-4 were synthesized successfully. Prolonged hydrothermal time affected little on the XRD patterns of the samples.

3.2 Elemental analysis

The contents of Ti, Si and Na (and K) in ETS-1 and ETS-2 were analyzed by XRF and the amounts of water were obtained from TGA. The XRF results are listed in Table 1. It could be seen that there were small differences between the compositions of Ti, Si and Na (and K) with the changing of the hydrothermal time, and the differences might be within the detection errors. Converting the elemental compositions into oxides, namely, TiO_2, SiO_2, Na_2O (and K_2O), the results are in Table 2. As it is not possible to measure the amounts of water by XRF method, the contents of SiO_2, TiO_2, Na_2O and K_2O obtained are on the dry basis. Then,

autoclave. After washing and drying at 70 °C, ETS-4 was obtained [24].

2.3 Characterization of adsorbents

The specific surface areas and pore volumes were calculated based on N_2 adsorption-desorption isotherms measured using Belsorp-mini (BEL JAPAN. INC) after pretreatment at 70 °C for 1 h. Elemental analysis of Na-Y, Na-ZSM-5 zeolites and the other adsorbents was carried out by X-ray fluorescence method (XRF, XRF-1800-HE-CCD-J, Shimadzu Corp.). Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) was carried out using Thermo plus TG 8120 (Rigaku Corp.). The characterization of crystalline phases of the adsorbents was carried out with an X-ray diffractometer (XRD, Rigaku Corp.) at R.T., using Ni filtered Cu Kα radiation and instrumental settings of 40 kV and 20 mA.

2.4 Removal of Cs and Sr

A typical Cs removal procedure is as follows: In a 100 mL Erlenmeyer flask containing 50 mL of $CsNO_3$ solution (the concentration of Cs^+ was 100~1500 ppm), $SrCl_2$ solution (the concentration of Sr^{2+} was 50~750 ppm) or mixed solution of $CsNO_3$ and $SrCl_2$ (Cs^+ 1500 ppm and Sr^{2+} 300 ppm) with pH of

the total amounts of the oxides were summed up for each of the samples, and nearly 100 wt% were obtained.

TGA was employed to analyze the amounts of water in the adsorbents (Fig. 2). The weight losses were mainly appeared in


Fig. 3 N$_2$ adsorption-desorption isotherms of the adsorbents

Table 3 Specific surface areas and pore volumes of as-prepared samples

Sample	Specific surface area (m^2/g)	Pore volume (cm^3/g)
ETS-1 1d	107	0.49
ETS-1 3d	127	0.48
ETS-2 1d	219	0.36
ETS-2 3d	228	0.32
ETS-4	13	0.03
Na-ZSM-5	217	0.21
Na-Y	486	0.35

the range of R.T. to 300 ^{o}C, and the weights were almost stable during 300~500 ^{o}C. As stated previously, the samples were dried
10 at 70 ^{o}C overnight, so the weight losses at temperatures lower than 70 ^{o}C might be due to the adsorption of moisture in air. The weight losses at temperatures higher than 70 ^{o}C were regarded as water existed in the adsorbents. Similar weight losses due to the water in the adsorbents were obtained for ETS-1 and ETS-2. As
15 reported in References [23, 28], titanosilicates were not thermally stable, and they would undergo structural rearrangement even at 200 ^{o}C. For this reason, ETS-1, ETS-2 and ETS-4 were not calcined after drying at 70 ^{o}C in this study.

By knowing the weight percentage of every component in the
20 sample, the molar ratio of the components of ETS-1 and ETS-2 could be calculated. As mentioned before, the small differences between the samples prepared with different hydrothermal time might be due to detection errors. Therefore, the values for ETS-1 1d and ETS-1 3d were averaged to get the possible composition
25 of ETS-1. Similar calculation was made for ETS-2 1d and ETS-2 3d. The molar ratio was n(TiO$_2$): n(SiO$_2$): n(Na$_2$O): n(K$_2$O): n(H$_2$O)=1.3:1:0.65:0.23:2.2 for ETS-1 and n(TiO$_2$): n(SiO$_2$): n(Na$_2$O): n(H$_2$O)=1.6:1:1.3:2.3 for ETS-2. The exchange capacity was estimated by considering all the Na and K could be

30 exchanged, and the values were 6.70 mmol/g and 8.12 mmol/g for ETS-1 and ETS-2, respectively.

The composition of ETS-4 is known as Na$_9$Si$_{12}$Ti$_5$O$_{38}$(OH)·12H$_2$O [29]. In our case, since both Na and K salts were used as raw materials for the synthesis of ETS-4, it


Fig.4 Effect of initial Cs concentration on Cs removal over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5

Adsorption conditions:
40 Initial Cs concentration 100~1500 ppm, solution 50 mL, pH 5.8, contact time 0.5 h, adsorbent 0.050 g

would lead to the partial replacement of Na by K. However, it is expected that both Na and K could be exchanged, and the
45 exchange capacity from the known composition of ETS-4 is about 5.50 mmol/g. As for Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5, their exchange capacities could be calculated according to their n(SiO$_2$)/n(Al$_2$O$_3$) ratios, and they were 3.87 mmol/g and 1.24 mmol/g, respectively.

3.3 Porous properties

50 The N$_2$ adsorption-desorption isotherms of the adsorbents are in Fig. 3 and the calculated specific surface areas and pore volumes are in Table 3. Na-Y [30], Na-ZSM-5 [31] and ETS-4 [20, 32] exhibited their typical isotherms, specific surface areas and pore volumes. ETS-1 and ETS-2 showed the type III of adsorption-
55 desorption isotherms and H$_3$ type hysteresis loops, implying their layered structures. ETS-1 possessed the specific surface area of about 120 m^2/g and pore volume of 0.49 cm^3/g, whereas the specific surface area was 220 m^2/g and pore volume was 0.35 cm^3/g for ETS-2.

60 ### 3.4 Cs removal

The performance of Cs removal over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5 were investigated at R.T. and at different initial Cs concentrations, and the results are demonstrated in Fig. 4. All the samples showed similar performance and more than 90% of
65 Cs was removed when the initial Cs concentration was low (100 ppm). The differences between the samples emerged with the increase of the initial Cs concentration from 500 ppm to 1500 ppm. ETS-1 exhibited the highest ability in Cs removal irrespective of the hydrothermal time (about 2.6 mmol/g). ETS-2,
70 ETS-4 and Na-Y showed similar but somewhat lower performance than that of ETS-1 (in the range of 1.9~2.3 mmol/g) whereas Na-ZSM-5 was the poorest (about 1.4 mmol/g). The similar performance for the samples with different hydrothermal time is to be related to the similar composition of the adsorbents.
75 It has to be noted that due to the higher dilution ratio at higher

initial Cs concentrations, bigger errors would be obtained to the values calculated for Cs removal. That is why the simulated curves were not the same for ETS-1 1d and ETS-1 3d, and also


5 Fig. 5 Effect of contact time on Cs removal over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5
Adsorption conditions:
Initial Cs concentration 1500 ppm, solution 50 mL, pH 5.8, contact time 0.5~24 h, adsorbent 0.050 g

10

Fig. 6 Langmuir plot of Cs removal over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5
Adsorption conditions:
15 Initial Cs concentration 100~1500 ppm, solution 50 mL, pH 5.8, contact time 0.5 h, adsorbent 0.050 g

larger Cs uptake than the capacity was obtained over Na-ZSM-5 when the initial Cs concentration was 1500 ppm.
20 The contact time was varied to check the Cs removal performance of the samples (Fig. 5). It could be seen that all the seven samples reached to an equilibrium in a short time (within 0.5 h), and then the amounts of Cs removal remained constant with the contact time to 24 h.
25 In order to get the maximum amounts of Cs removal (Qmax) over these samples, Langmuir equation, $Ce/Qe=(1/Qmax)*Ce +1/(Qmax*b)$, was employed to simulate the data obtained. Since the hydrothermal time did not influence the properties and the performance of ETS-1 and ETS-2 in Cs removal, the values for
30 1d and 3d were averaged and used for the simulation of ETS-1 and ETS-2. The plots were shown in Fig. 6. All the samples fitted well with the Langmuir adsorption models (except some data with bigger errors). The maximum amounts of Cs removal could

be obtained by calculating the reciprocals of the relevant slopes, 35 and they were 2.50, 2.22, 1.79, 1.87 and 1.25 mmol/g over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5, respectively. The lower exchange capacitis of ETS-1 and ETS-2 than the theoretical values might be resulted from the existence of less easily exchangeable cation [33], though the cations in ETS-4 and ETS-
40 10 were reported to be easily exchanged [20, 34, 35, 36].

Fig. 7 Effect of initial Sr concentration on Sr removal over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5
Adsorption conditions:
45 Initial Sr concentration 50~750 ppm, solution 50 mL, pH 5.8, contact time 0.5 h, adsorbent 0.050 g


Fig. 8 Effect of contact time on Sr removal over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5
50 Adsorption conditions:
Initial Sr concentration 300 ppm, solution 50 mL, pH 5.8, contact time 0.5~24 h, adsorbent 0.050 g

There might be two factors that related to the performance of the 55 adsorbents in Cs removal. One is the exchange capacities of the samples [37], and the other one is the size differences between the cations in their structures and in the solution [16]. As discussed in section 3.2, the nominal exchange capacity was in the order of ETS-2 (8.12 mmol/g) > ETS-1 (6.70 mmol/g) > ETS-
60 4 (5.50 mmol/g) > Na-Y (3.87 mmol/g) > Na-ZSM-5 (1.24 mmol/g). For the comparison of ETS-1 and ETS-4 in Cs removal (both Na and K existed), only the exchange capacity mattered, which lead to the amount of Cs removal in the order of ETS-1>ETS-4. For the comparison of ETS-2, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5
65 (with only Na), also the exchange capacity was the only factor, and then the amounts of Cs uptake was in the trend of ETS-2>Na-

Y>Na-ZSM-5. Whereas for ETS-2 and ETS-4, both of the two factors would exert their own effects. It has been reported that the smaller the size differences between the cations in the adsorbent and in the solution, the kinetically easier the exchange process occurred [20]. Compared with Na^+ (0.102 nm), the size of K^+


Fig. 9 Langmuir plot of Sr removal over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Ns-ZSM-5
Adsorption conditions:
Initial Sr concentration 50~750 ppm, solution 50 mL, pH 5.8, contact time 0.5 h, adsorbent 0.050 g

Table 4 Cs and Sr competitive removal over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4 and Na-ZSM-5

	Exchange capacity (mmol/g)	Cs uptake (mmol/g)	D_{Cs}	Sr uptake (mmol/g)	D_{Sr}	D_{Cs}/D_{Sr}
ETS-1 1d	6.70	1.83	0.22	0.60	0.22	1.0
ETS-1 3d	6.70	1.65	0.20	0.36	0.14	1.4
ETS-2 1d	8.12	0.61	0.07	1.29	0.77	0.1
ETS-2 3d	8.12	0.38	0.04	1.18	0.67	0.1
ETS-4	5.50	1.53	0.17	0.12	0.04	4.8
Na-ZSM-5	1.24	1.31	0.15	0.02	0.005	29.3
Na-Y	3.87	0.84	0.08	0.67	0.24	0.4

Adsorption conditions:
Initial Cs 1400 ± 100 ppm, initial Sr 280 ± 20 ppm, solution 50 mL, pH 5.8, contact time 0.5 h, adsorbent 0.050 g

(0.138 nm) is closer to that of Cs^+ (0.167 nm). In this aspect, the cations in ETS-4 were more easily to be exchanged with Cs^+ than those in ETS-2. However, ETS-2 possessed higher exchange capacity than ETS-4. Then, the mixed effects of both of the two factors resulted in their similar performance in Cs removal.

3.5 Sr removal

The exchange properties of ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5 were further investigated in Sr removal. Their performance at different initial Sr concentrations is in Figs. 7 and 8. They displayed different exchange performance even at low initial Sr concentration (50 ppm), and the difference became more obvious with the increase in the initial Sr concentration (Fig.7). In addition, varying the contact time from 0.5 h to 24 h affected little on the amounts of Sr uptake over these adsorbents studied (Fig. 8). The maximum amounts of Sr removal over the samples were also simulated by the Langmuir plots, and the results are in Fig. 9. All the data fitted the Langmuir plots well, and the calculated maximum Sr exchange amounts were 1.52, 1.82, 0.44, 1.09 and 0.35 mmol/g over ETS-1, ETS-2, ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-

ZSM-5, respectively. Then, the order of Sr removal was ETS-2 > ETS-1 > Na-Y > ETS-4 ≈ Na-ZSM-5.

The ionic radius of Sr^{2+} (0.118 nm) is smaller than those of Cs^+ (0.167 nm) and K^+ (0.138 nm), and a little larger than that of Na^+ (0.102 nm). Therefore, the Na^+ and K^+ in the structures of the adsorbents could be exchanged more easily with the Sr^{2+} in the solution than with Cs^+. If so, the exchange capacity is the only factor that matters. However, compared with the trend for exchange capacity, ETS-2 (8.12 mmol/g) > ETS-1 (6.70 mmol/g) > ETS-4 (5.50 mmol/g) > Na-Y (3.87 mmol/g) > Na-ZSM-5 (1.24 mmol/g), ETS-4 showed somewhat lower performance in Sr removal.

There have been several studies on the removal of Sr over ETS-4 [19, 20], and Na-ETS-4 was reported to be effective in Sr removal, which was totally different from our case. Probably the preparation method, raw materials employed and hydrothermal conditions would affect the exchange properties of ETS-4.

3.6 Competitive removal of Cs and Sr

In order to selectively remove Cs or Sr, competitive removal experiment was carried out and the results are in Table 4. It could be seen that for ETS-1, D_{Cs}/D_{Sr} of about 1.0 was obtained, indicating no special selectivities to Cs or Sr. To the contrary, for ETS-2 and Na-Y, D_{Cs}/D_{Sr} were about 0.10 and 0.35, respectively, which implied that ETS-2 and Na-Y could selectively remove Sr instead of Cs. On the other hand, the values of D_{Cs}/D_{Sr} were much higher than 1.0 over ETS-4 and Na-ZSM-5, and this means that these two samples could selectively remove Cs. In spite of the high selectivity to Cs over ETS-4 and Na-ZSM-5, the amounts of Cs removal were lower than that of ETS-1 (1.65-1.83 mmol/g). That is to say, no matter with or without the existence of Sr, ETS-1 proved itself as a better adsorbent than ETS-4 and Na-ZSM-5 in Cs removal. In addition, ETS-2 was a promising adsorbent in Sr uptake.

4 Conclusions

Layered ETS-1 and ETS-2 were synthesized successfully. The specific surface areas and the theoretical exchange capacities for ETS-1 and ETS-2 were about 120 and 220 m^2/g, and 6.70 and 8.12 mmol/g, respectively. Both ETS-1 and ETS-2 exhibited better performance in the removal of Cs and Sr, compared with ETS-4, Na-Y and Na-ZSM-5. ETS-1 was effective in Cs removal whereas ETS-2 showed more promising property in Sr uptake.

Acknowledgement

Notes and references

* *Department of Chemical, Energy, and Environmental Engineering, and High Technology Research Center, Kansai University, 3-3-35 Yamate, Suita, Osaka 564-8680, Japan. Corresponding author: Huimin Liu, email: liuhuimin08@tsinghua.org.cn; Corresponding author: Takanori Miyake, E-mail: tmiyake@kansai-u.ac.jp, Fax/Tel: 81-6-6368-0918,*

† Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: [details of any supplementary information available should be included here]. See DOI: 10.1039/b000000x/
1   H. S. Martland, J. Am. Med. Assn., 1925, 85, 1769-1776.
2   B. R. Cherry, M. Nyman and T. M. Alam, J. Solid State Chem., 2004, 177, 2079-2093.

3   P. K. Sinha, P. K. Panicker, R. V. Amalraj and V. Krishnasamy, Waste Manage., 1995, 15(2), 149-157.

4   J. Moon, E. Lee and H. Kim, Korean J. Chem. Eng., 2004, 21(5), 1026-1031.

5   C. Thammawong, P. Opaprakasit, P. Tangboriboonrat and P. Sreearunothai, J. Nanopart. Res., 2013, 15, 1689-1698.

6   A. Dyer, M. Pillinger, R. Harjula and S. Amin, J. Mater. Chem., 2000, 10, 1867-1874.

7   Y. Park, W. S. Shin and S. Choi, Chem. Eng. J., 2013, 220, 204-213.

8   C. Chen, J. Hu, D. Shao, J. Li and X. Wang, J. Hazard. Mater., 2009 164, 923-928.

9   S. Chegrouche, A. Mellah and M. Barkat, Desalination, 2009, 235, 306-318.

10   A. Casnati, S. Barboso, H. Rouquette, M. Schwing-Weill, F. Arnaud-Neu, J. Dozol and R. Ungaro, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2001, 123, 12182-12190.

11   A. Zhang, E. Kuraoka and M. Kumagai, Sep. Purif. Technol., 2006, 50, 35-44.

12   Y. Song, H. Ou, W. Bian, Y. Zhang, J. Pan, Y. Liu and W. Huang, Inorg. Organomet. Polym., 2013, 23, 1325-1334.

13   Y. D. Noh and S. Komarneni, Environ. Sci. Technol., 2011, 45, 6954–6960.

14   L. D. Barreira, P. F. Lito, B. M. Antunes, M. Otero, Z. Lin, J. Rocha, E. Pereira, A. C. Duarte and C. M. Silva, Chem. Eng. J., 2009, 155, 728-735.

15   S. Chitra, R. Sudha, S. Kalavathi, A. G. S. Mani, S. V. S. Rao and P. K. Sinha, J. Radioanal. Nucl. Chem., 2013, 295, 607-613.

16   N. Dobelin and T. Armbruster, Micropor. Mesopor. Mat., 2007, 99, 279-287.

17   Y. Koudsi and A. Dyer, J. Radioanal. Nucl. Ch., 2001, 247, 209-219.

18   L. Al-Attar, A. Dyer, Airi Paajanen and R. Harjula, J. Mater. Chem., 2003, 13, 2969-2974.

19   Y. D. Noh, S. Komarneni and K. J. D. Mackenzie, Sep. Purif. Technol., 2012, 95, 222-226.

20   C. C. Pavel and K. Popa, Chem. Eng. J., 2014, 245, 288-294.

21   K. Popa and C. C. Pavel, Desalination, 2012, 293, 78-86.

22   C. C. Pavel, B. Zibrowius, E. Löffler and W. Schmidt, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys., 2007, 9, 3440-3446.

23   S. M. Kuznicki, US pat., 5011591, 1991.

24   S. Nair, H. Jeong, A. Chandrasekaran and C. M. Braunbarth, Chem. Mater., 2001, 13, 4247-4254.

25   M. Asadollahi, D. Bastani and H. Kazemian, Sep. Purif. Technol., 2010, 76, 120-125.

26   G. L. Woolery, G. H. Kuehl, H. C. Timken, A. W. Chester and J. C. Vartuli, 1997, 19, 288-296.

27   S. Rezaei, A. Tavana, J. A. Sawada, L. Wu, A. S. M. Junaid and S. M. Kuznicki, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 2012, 51, 12430-12434.

28   M. Naderi and M. W. Anderson, Zeolites, 1996, 17, 437-443.

29   G. Cruciani, P. De Luca, A. Nastro and P. Pattison, Micropor. Mesopor. Mat., 1998, 21, 143-153.

30   T. Kawai and K. Tsutsumi, Adsorption, 1998, 4, 225-231.

31   Y. Li, L. Ma, H. Liu and D. He, Appl. Catal. A:Gen., 2014, 469, 45-51.

32   N. Sudheesh and R. S. Shukla, Appl. Catal. A:Gen., 2014, 473, 116-124.

33   V. Valtchev, J. –L. Paillaud, S. Mintova and H. Kessler, Micropor. Mesopor. Mat., 1999, 32, 287-296.

34   C. C. Pavel, K. Popa, N. Bilba, A. Cecal, D. Cozma and A. Pui, J. Radioanal. Nucl. Ch., 2003, 2, 243-248.

35   C. C. Pavel, M. Walter and K. Popa, J. Mater. Chem., 2008, 18, 3342-3346.

36   C. C. Pavel, M. Walter, P. Pomi, D. Bouexiere and K. Popa, J. Mater. Chem., 2011, 21, 3831-3837.

37   Y. Watanabe, H. Yamada, J. Tanaka, Y. Komatsu and Y. Moriyoshi, Sep. Sci. Technol., 2004, 39 (9), 2091-2104.

Journal of Materials Chemistry A Accepted Manuscript