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Abstract

Membrane-based separations are an attractive means to separate hydrogen from gas mixtures in order to use hydrogen in energy-related applications. Zeolite membranes are robust materials that are well suited to be used in harsh conditions, but they are not typically selective for hydrogen. Several studies have shown that highly selective separations of hydrogen are possible using zeolite membranes whose pore mouths have been chemically modified. An important challenge for materials of this kind is to develop methods by which hydrogen selectivity can be retained without significantly reducing the hydrogen flux possible with an unmodified zeolite membrane. Motivated by this, the effect of the pore mouth modification of silicalite was examined using atomic-scale simulations. We developed methods to mimic the chemical vapor deposition of Si and O atoms near the surface of a silicalite crystal, and examined the flux of CH\textsubscript{4} and H\textsubscript{2} through the resulting materials. Under some degrees of surface modification, the CH\textsubscript{4} flux was reduced much more than the H\textsubscript{2} flux. This observation indicates that careful control of surface modifying layers may be a useful means of tailoring the performance of zeolite membranes for H\textsubscript{2} separations.

\textsuperscript{*} Corresponding author. Email: david.sholl@chbe.gatech.edu
1. Separation of hydrogen using pore-modified zeolites

Conventional fuel sources are rapidly being depleted. Hydrogen is one attractive new energy source since once it is produced it can be used with little negative environmental effect. The most practical methods for obtaining large quantities of H\textsubscript{2} use hydrocarbon sources from which H\textsubscript{2} can be produced by steam reforming or by partial oxidation with oxygen. A common characteristic of these methods is that other gases are also produced, so separating H\textsubscript{2} efficiently is important for both economic and environmental reasons.\(^{(1)}\) Inorganic membranes have the potential to play an important role in these separations if membranes with suitable permselectivities and durability can be developed.\(^{(2,3)}\)

As a candidate for membrane-based separation of H\textsubscript{2}, we will consider silicalite, the all-silica analog of ZSM-5 (structure code MFI, space group \textit{Pnma}). This structure has a three-dimensional porous network with typical pore size of \(\sim 5.5\ \text{Å}\).\(^{(4)}\) Among all efforts to fabricate zeolite membranes, methods for making membranes from silicalite are the most fully developed.\(^{(5-8)}\)

A characteristic of silicalite that is common to essentially all zeolites is that its pores are too large to block the adsorption of small gas molecules mixed with H\textsubscript{2}, so a separation cannot be achieved based on simple molecular sieving. Moreover, H\textsubscript{2} adsorption in silicalite is weaker than CO\textsubscript{2} or CH\textsubscript{4}, two typical gases present during H\textsubscript{2} production. Experiments that have been performed with silicalite membranes using gas mixtures including H\textsubscript{2} have not yielded results with selectivities that would be desirable in H\textsubscript{2} separations.\(^{(9-14)}\) The physical phenomena that make silicalite unselective for H\textsubscript{2}
in these mixtures are also present for essentially all zeolites, so the limitations of this material cannot be solved simply by using another zeolite framework.

One avenue that may allow the properties of zeolite membranes to be improved for H₂ separations is to chemically modify the external surfaces of membranes. This strategy has been explored in two experimental studies using silicalite membranes.(15,16) In these experiments, methyl diethoxy silane was attached to the surfaces of ZSM-5 membranes as a modifier with the aim of reducing the width of the pores at the membrane surface. Ideally, this modifying layer could enhance the selectivity of the membrane for H₂ by reducing the effective pore size for molecules entering the membrane but still allow rapid transport of adsorbed molecules through the membrane. In the experiments by Hong et al., the selectivity of the membrane increased from 1.6 to 33 for the H₂/CH₄. Unfortunately, this improvement in selectivity was coupled with a large reduction in net H₂ flux.(15) An interesting question generated from these experiments is whether there is a regime where surface modifications of zeolite membranes can be made to improve the selectivity of the membrane for a small species such as H₂ without a large decrease in the H₂ flux.

In this study, we examined the effect of pore modification on H₂ and CH₄ transport through silicalite via molecular simulations. To model modified membranes, a modifying layer was constructed near the surface by adding individual Si and O atoms to an initially crystalline sample. The net flux of H₂ and CH₄ was then calculated for the modified silicalite membrane as well as an unmodified crystal. While Molecular Dynamics (MD) techniques have been developed to simulate transport through the zeolite membranes, most of them are based on the assumption that intracrystalline diffusion
determines the transport rate.(17-19) To describe pore-mouth modified zeolite membranes, however, the increased surface resistance associated with the modifying layer is a key factor. It is therefore vital that we use a calculation method that accounts for the impact of surface resistances during the operation of the membrane. To do this, we applied the Local Equilibrium Flux method (LEFM)(20,21), a method that can calculate surface resistances rapidly from an atomically-detailed model of a membrane material by describing the local fluxes that exist at the gas-membrane interface.

2. Atomically-detailed model of pore mouth modification

To describe gas permeation through a modified zeolite membrane using molecular simulations, the atomic-scale configuration of the modified zeolite structure must be defined. In this section, we describe how a thin layer that mimics amorphous silica was added to the external surfaces of crystalline silicalite. The intention of this procedure was not to precisely model a specific experimental procedure, since detailed structural information about the modifying layers from the limited number of experimental studies that have been performed is not available.

The diffusion of molecules through silicalite crystals is anisotropic because of the anisotropy of silicalite’s pores. Sinusoidal channels go along the crystallographic $x$-orientation, straight channels go along the $y$-orientation, and although no pores exist along the $z$-orientation, net diffusion in the $z$-orientation can occur via diffusion in the $x$ and $y$-orientation.(22,23) Since the $y$-orientation of silicalite provides the fastest intracrystalline diffusion for unmodified membranes(24), modifying layers were created on the surface of 2×2 unit cells in $xz$ plane.
For simplicity in making modified zeolite structures, we modified surface structures by directly adding individual Si and O atoms. First, physically plausible positions are found via geometric criteria. Atoms were inserted only in positions where bond lengths, bond angles and coordination numbers are within physically available ranges. The criteria for each of these quantities was adapted from extensive simulations of amorphous silica zeolites by Mukhopadhyay et al.(25,26) and simulations of internal grain boundaries in silicalite by Newsome and Sholl.(27)

To find positions where the criteria are satisfied, an atom is inserted at a random position near the surface. The inserted atoms are randomly chosen from Si and O with a Si:O ratio of 1:2. Each time an atom is inserted, a list of neighbor atoms is made to calculate bond lengths, bond angles and coordination numbers, with the latter defined as the number of bonds present within a specified range of bond lengths.(25) If all the criteria shown in Table 1 are satisfied for the inserted atom, then this atom is accepted. For example, if an inserted O atom forms bonds with Si atoms with bond lengths between 1.42 and 1.82 Å, Si-O-Si bond angles between 90° and 180°, O-Si-O bond angles between 80° and 140°, has a coordination number between 1 and 3, and has all O-O distances > 2.21 Å, then the insertion of this O atom is accepted. If one (or more) of those criteria is not satisfied, then the trial position is rejected and the inserted atom is move to a nearby position by a random walk. If no acceptable position can be found within 50 steps of the random walk, the atom is removed and a new insertion is begun.

The coordination number criteria for insertion on surface of silicalite are slightly different from those used previously to describe internal grain boundaries.(27) In the latter case, the allowable coordination numbers for Si were 3 to 5. When modifying the
zeolite’s surface, we allowed Si atoms to be inserted with coordination numbers from 1 to 5, to allow both the creation of new atoms on the external surface and bulk-like atoms. The valid coordination numbers for O atoms were defined to be the same as earlier work on grain boundary.(27) Atoms were inserted to randomly chosen positions within ±5 Å from the surface, which was defined as the position of the topmost atoms of the zeolite including any atoms in the modifying layer that have already been deposited.

Once an atom is inserted as described above, a quenching procedure was used to relax the atomic positions. In this procedure, the potential energy, $U_{ij}$, of Si and O atoms was defined using the BKS (van Beest-Kramer-van Santen) interatomic potential for silica.(28-30) This potential, with the additional Lennard-Jones 24-6 terms suggested by Guissani and Guillot(31) for amorphous silica, has the form

$$U_{ij} = \frac{q_i q_j}{r_{ij}} + A_{ij} \exp(b_{ij} r_{ij}) - \frac{C_{ij}}{r_{ij}^6} + 4\varepsilon_{ij}[\left(\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r_{ij}}\right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r_{ij}}\right)^6] \quad (1)$$

Here, the subscripts $i$ and $j$ refer to Si and O atoms, $q$ is the charge of an atom, $A$, $b$, $c$ are parameters and $r$ is an interatomic distance. The parameters for the BKS potential are shown in Table 2.(28,29,31) The electrostatic interactions were handled using the Wolf method with an $\alpha$ value of 0.345 Å⁻¹.(32) The potential cutoff was 12 Å.

During our MD simulations using this potential, temperature was controlled using the Nosé-Hoover thermostat and the equations of motion were integrated with the Verlet leapfrog algorithm with 0.905 fs time step. A temperature quench was performed by removing kinetic energy at the rate of $7.3 \times 10^{15}$ K/s from 200 K until the kinetic energy vanishes. The structure that results from this procedure defines a local minimum on the potential energy surface. For computational efficiency, only the inserted atom and its
neighbors were relaxed. We typically inserted multiple atoms before MD was used to relax the positions of these atoms.

The procedure defined above leaves a small number of highly undercoordinated atoms near the upper boundary of the modifying layer. The final stage of defining a modified layer was to examine the atomic density \( d \) in the layer in slices 1 Å thick normal to the zeolite’s initial surface. The atom density in these slices abruptly drops from a roughly constant value inside the layer to zero outside the layer. In the region where this density drop occurs, we removed any Si atoms with coordination numbers of 1 or 2.

Figure 1 shows side views of modified silicalite with different degrees of modification. Although insertion attempts were made for positions within ±5 Å of the zeolite’s surface, the great majority of inserted atoms lie on top of the surface rather than inside the zeolite pores. Figure 2 shows top views of unmodified and modified silicalite. After modification, the size of pores was reduced. It is reasonable to expect that this may reduce the flux of molecules into the pores when the crystal is used as a membrane.

One way to characterize the modifying layers in our simulated structures is to calculate the free volume in the layers available for diffusion of adsorbed molecules. Free volumes were measured by inserting spherical probes into the region of interest. To measure the available free volume accessible by CH\(_4\) (H\(_2\)), a spherical probe of radius 1.9 Å (1.445 Å) was used. The radius of Si and O atoms were assigned as the van der Waals radii of \( r_{Si}=2.10 \) Å and \( r_O=1.52 \) Å. The position for a probe sphere was considered as the part of the free volume if no overlaps existed between the probe sphere and the Si and O atoms, and the free volume was defined by the fraction of feasible locations for probe spheres after > 10\(^8\) of trial insertions.
We calculated the ratio of free volume per total volume in a region 2 Å thick in the $y$-direction located 1.5–3.5 Å above the initial surface of the crystalline silicalite. Figure 3 shows the free volume of six modified silicalite membranes as a function of the two dimensional density of atoms in the modifying layers, $d$. Each membrane is numbered as 1 to 6. Since the probe sphere used for H$_2$ is smaller than for CH$_4$, the free volume is higher for H$_2$ in all cases. The free volume for each probe decreases steadily as more material is added to the modifying layer. For the membrane with the most Si and O atoms in the modifying layer, membrane 6, the free volume ratio for the CH$_4$ probe is reduced to 0.008, which is big reduction when comparing to 0.086 in crystalline silicalite. In addition, the difference in free volume between crystalline silicalite and the modifying layer for this membrane for the H$_2$ probe is less severe; these values reduced from 0.19 to 0.035, which differ by a factor of 5.

3. Gas permeation through surface-modified membranes

3.1 The Local Equilibrium Flux Method

Molecules pass through a zeolite membrane in three steps. Molecules must adsorb to the crystal’s external surface, then they diffuse through the crystal’s pores and finally molecules desorb from the downstream surface of the zeolite. In most models for molecular transport through zeolite, surface effects are assumed to be far smaller than intracrystalline resistances. In this case, the steady-state flux of a single species permeating through a membrane can be calculated from (17,24,33)

$$J_{ideal} = \frac{1}{L} \int_{c_{permeate}}^{c_{feed}} D_t(c')dc'$$

(2)
Here, $c_{\text{feed}}$ ($c_{\text{permeate}}$) is the adsorbed concentration at the feed (permeate) side of the membrane, $L$ is the membrane thickness, and $D_t$ is the transport diffusion coefficient of the adsorbed species. This diffusion coefficient, which is dependent on the concentration of the adsorbing species, can be calculated using equilibrium molecular dynamics.(24,33,34) In the absence of surface resistances, the concentration of the adsorbates is defined by the equilibrium adsorption isotherm via the gas phase pressure on the feed and permeate side, $P_{\text{feed}}$ and $P_{\text{perm}}$, respectively.

In the case of surface modified zeolites, surface resistances are key factors in the performance of the material. One widely used simulation technique to measure flux in the presence of surface resistances is Dual Control Volume Grand Canonical Molecular Dynamics (DCV GCMD). This is a conceptually simple method in which the net flux, $J$, of molecules passing through a membrane is directly computed under nonequilibrium conditions. Unfortunately, this method is very computationally intensive and can only be applied to crystals much smaller than those relevant to current experiments.(20,27,35) The Local Equilibrium Flux Method (LEFM) offers a way to estimate surface resistances without directly observing $J$.(20) The LEFM has been compared to DCV GCMD simulations of gas permeation through unmodified silicalite membranes by Newsome and Sholl.(20,21) Although the LEFM is not exact, it was shown to accurately estimate the size of surface resistances in a way that can be used to examine much wider ranges of operating conditions than is possible using DCV GCMD. Importantly for our purposes, the surface resistances associated with unmodified $\gamma$-oriented silicalite membranes were shown to be small for all conditions we examine below. The LEFM has also been applied to estimate the role of surface resistances in carbon nanotube membranes.(36) In carbon
nanotube membranes, surface resistances may be more important than for unmodified zeolites because of the extremely low resistance to mass transport that exists inside the membrane’s pores. (37-39)

The aim of the LEFM is to characterize the net membrane flux in terms of the local fluxes that exist under equilibrium conditions. If \( j_+ \) is the one way flux from left to right (right to left) at any plane through the membrane, the net flux \( J \) is \( J = j_+ - j_- \). If the system is at equilibrium, then \( j_{eq} = j_+ = j_- \) and \( J = 0 \). The equilibrium flux, \( j_{eq} \) can be measured by counting molecules crossing an interface using equilibrium MD simulations. The LEFM assumes the net steady state flux can be estimated by the difference of the one way equilibrium fluxes at different effective pressures. (20) The total feed side flux is

\[
J_{feed} \cong j_{eq}(P_{feed}) - j_{eq}(P_{ads}) \quad \text{(3)}
\]

Here, \( P_{feed} \) is the actual gas phase pressure outside the membrane, while \( P_{ads} \) is an effective pressure in the membrane boundary layer. By writing \( P_{ads} = P_{feed} - \delta P \), we can rewrite Eq. (3) as

\[
J_{feed} \cong j_{eq}(P_{feed}) - j_{eq}(P_{feed} - \delta P) = \delta P \left( \frac{dj_{eq}}{dP} \right)_{P_{feed}} \quad \text{(4)}
\]

Therefore, we can calculate the net flux on the feed side if we measure the local equilibrium flux at various pressures. In the case of interest to us where the surface resistance from a modifying layer appears only on the feed side, the intracrystalline flux can be calculated from

\[
J_{intra} = \frac{1}{L} \int_{c_{perm}}^{c_{ads}} D_i(c') dc' \quad \text{(5)}
\]
In this case, $c_{ads}$ is the adsorbate concentration that corresponds to the effective pressure $P_{ads}$. At steady state, the feed flux and intracrystalline flux obtained from Eqs. (4) and (5) must be the same. The net flux can be calculated by adjusting $P_{ads}$ iteratively.

It is often convenient to describe net mass transfer through a membrane in terms of resistances associated with the different processes involved. Using this approach, the resistances to transport due to the feed side, intracrystalline region, and permeate side can be defined as $R_{ads}$, $R_{intra}$, and $R_{des}$.(35) If surface resistances on both the feed and the permeate side are negligible, then $R_{ads}$ and $R_{des}$ may be disregarded. The net flux associated with this idealized situation is related to $R_{intra}$ by

$$J_{ideal} = \frac{\Delta c}{R_{intra}} \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta c$ is the concentration change in adsorbed concentration from feed to permeate side. The flux in this expression is the same as the flux defined in Eq. (2). For the surface-modified membranes, we want to consider the situation where $R_{des}$ is negligible but $R_{ads}$ is not. The net flux through the membrane can then be expressed in terms of resistances to mass transport as

$$J = \frac{\Delta c}{R_{ads} + R_{intra}} \quad (7)$$

In this expression, the flux is the net flux defined iteratively using Eqs. (4) and (5). From Eqs. (6) and (7), it is convenient to define the ratio of adsorption resistance to the intracrystalline resistance by

$$\frac{R_{ads}}{R_{intra}} = J_{ideal} \cdot \frac{1}{J} \quad (8)$$
3.2 Equilibrium Simulations of CH₄ and H₂ in Surface-Modified Silicalite

In our calculation CH₄ and H₂ molecules were treated as rigid spherical molecules and only dispersive interactions were considered to describe the potential energy surface. A Lennard-Jones (LJ) pair-wise potential was used to calculate adsorbate-adsorbate interaction and adsorbate-zeolite interaction;

\[ U_{ij} = 4\varepsilon_{ij}[\left(\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r_{ij}}\right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r_{ij}}\right)^6] \]  

(9)

We used interaction parameters for CH₄ and H₂ from the literature.(40) These parameters are shown in Table 3. In many calculations for the adsorption in homogeneous zeolites, only the framework O atoms in the zeolite are considered to calculate the host-guest potential energy since Si atoms are shielded from the guest molecules.(40,41) In our calculations, however, we also considered the effect of the Si atoms on the total potential because Si atoms near the external surface can be exposed to the guest molecules. Interactions between Si atoms and guest molecules were described by a purely repulsive LJ-12 potential, that is, the first term of the Eq. (9). The parameters for this potential were chosen as \( \varepsilon_{\text{Si-Guest}} = 200 \text{ K} \), \( \sigma = 1.5 \text{ Å} \) to create a repulsive force near the Si atoms but not to affect adsorption in a homogeneous silicalite.

Two assumptions were made in performing our calculations. First, the structure of the zeolite was assumed to be rigid. This assumption leads to a great reduction in the computational effort, since the potential energy surface defined by the zeolite can be pretabulated.(40,41) It is possible that local vibrations in the modifying layer could play a larger role in the transport of highly hindered molecules than in transport of the same molecules inside the zeolite pores. Inclusion of these vibrational degrees of freedom
would be a useful topic to pursue in future extensions of this work. Second, the interactions of guest molecules with undercoordinated zeolite atoms on the surface of the membrane were treated with the same interaction potentials as fully coordinated zeolite atoms in the bulk material. In reality, it is likely that these undercoordinated atoms are terminated with hydroxyl or similar species. By neglecting any differences in interaction potentials that might arise from these effects, our calculations are consistent with previous calculations for unmodified zeolite surfaces.

To calculate the intracrystalline flux of CH$_4$ and H$_2$ in Eq. (5), we need the transport diffusivity, $D_t$, and adsorption isotherms in bulk silicalite. For CH$_4$, we used previously calculated data. The values for H$_2$ were calculated using EMD (Equilibrium Molecular Dynamics) and GCMC (Grand Canonical Monte Carlo) simulation. For all the simulations the cutoff distance for the interactions was set to 13 Å. For GCMC simulation to measure the adsorption isotherm, we used $2 \times 10^7$ Monte Carlo moves for equilibration, followed by $1 \times 10^7$ Monte Carlo moves for data collection. In our MD calculations, systems were initialized with $1.5 \times 10^5$ steps of canonical Monte Carlo moves and equilibrated by MD. Trajectories were measured for 10 ns with 1 fs time step with 30 trajectories.

The local equilibrium flux $j_{eq}$ in Eq. (4) was measured with various pressures using EMD (Equilibrium Molecular Dynamics) with an Andersen thermostat. The length of the gas region was 40 Å in the $y$-direction. Like previous MD simulations, the system was initialized by canonical Monte Carlo moves and equilibrated by MD. Approximately 42 to 160 molecules were located in the total system, and simulations were performed for 20 ns. From the forward and backward movement of molecules along
the $y$ direction, the local flux was calculated across various planes oriented perpendicular to the crystallographic $y$-orientation of the zeolite. The minimum local flux observed from this collection of planes was used for our LEFM calculations since this is the relevant flux for determining the net flux on the feed side. This minimum flux was observed to occur in the region of the modifying layer above the initial surface of crystalline silicalite that was characterized in terms of free volume in Fig. 3.

### 3.3 Results

Using the methods described above, we examined the single-component flux of CH$_4$ and H$_2$ through silicalite membranes with various degrees of surface modification. We will discuss our results using the numbering system assigned to our simulated membranes in Fig. 4. Figure 4 shows the net flux of CH$_4$ calculated with the LEFM as a function of membrane length, $L$, with $P_{\text{feed}} = 10$ bar and $P_{\text{perm}} = 0.3$ bar. It can be seen from Eq. (7) that if the surface resistance is negligible, then a plot of log $J$ versus log $L$ is linear. This situation accurately describes the results in Fig. 4 for membranes 1-3. This supports our earlier statement that the surface resistances of the unmodified membrane could be neglected in our description of the permeate side of the membrane. For larger degrees of modification, the curves in Fig. 4 deviate strongly from linearity, indicating that the surface resistance becomes an important effect. These results are consistent with the free volume results shown in Fig. 3. For membranes 4 and 5, the calculated fluxes are not very different, and the free volume accessible to CH$_4$ in these two membranes is similar. For membrane 6, CH$_4$ could no longer permeate through the membrane, so the surface modification had completely blocked the pores to CH$_4$ molecules.
Figure 5 shows results similar to those in Fig. 4 for the permeation of H$_2$ with $P_{\text{feed}} = 10$ bar and $P_{\text{perm}} = 0.3$ bar. For surface modifications for membranes 1-5, the H$_2$ flux is negligibly affected by the modifying layer. For membrane 6 the H$_2$ flux was significantly reduced by the modifying layer. For a membrane with $L = 1 \mu m$ under these conditions, the H$_2$ flux was reduced by 72% compared to the unmodified silicalite membrane. Crucially, however, CH$_4$ was completely blocked by this modifying layer.

The ratios of adsorption resistance to intracrystalline resistances for CH$_4$ and H$_2$ are shown for a variety of operating conditions for membrane 4 in Fig. 6. Figure 6 includes results with $P_{\text{feed}} = 1, 10,$ and 20 bar. In this figure, circles are the results for membranes with a transmembrane pressure drop equal to the feed pressure, while crosses are for membranes where the pressure drop is only 1% of the feed pressure. For a given feed pressure, these two pressure drops span the full range of possible pressure drops. $R_{\text{ads}}/R_{\text{intra}}$ is large when $L$ is small because $R_{\text{intra}}$ is inversely proportional to $L$ (see Eqs. (2) and (6)), while $R_{\text{ads}}$ is only weakly dependent on $L$. The most important observation from Fig. 6 is that for a broad range of operating conditions the surface resistance due to the modifying layer is much larger for CH$_4$ than for H$_2$. The magnitude of the surface resistance is more sensitive to the operating conditions for CH$_4$ than for H$_2$. While this is in part simply due to the much larger resistances that exist for CH$_4$, this sensitivity also stems from the fact that the range of pressures included in Fig. 6 spans a larger range of adsorbate concentrations for CH$_4$ than for H$_2$ because of the stronger adsorption of CH$_4$.

Figure 7 summarizes the ideal selectivity, that is, the ratio of single-component fluxes, of the membranes we have considered as the density of the modifying layer is increased. For membranes 1-3, the ideal selectivity is essentially that of the unmodified
membrane, which significantly favors permeation of CH$_4$ under all operating conditions. As the thickness and density of the modifying layer increases, the ideal selectivity increases somewhat for membranes 4 and 5. In this range, the membrane is only selective for H$_2$ if the membrane thickness is less than 500 nm. Fabricating zeolite membranes with this thickness is currently a challenge.(45,46) For membrane 6, however, the ideal selectivity becomes infinity because CH$_4$ is excluded from the membrane. This modifying layer is selective for H$_2$ because of a simple molecular sieving mechanism. When both species can permeate through the membrane, the selectivity of the membrane when exposed to a mixed gas feed can differ from the ideal selectivity.(47) This complication does not arise, however, if one species is excluded by molecular sieving.

Figure 8 shows the selectivity and H$_2$ flux for membranes 4-6 when $P_{feed} = 20$ bar and $P_{perm} = 0$ bar. For the unmodified membrane, the ideal selectivity is smaller than 1 because CH$_4$ is more favored by this membrane. For membrane 4 ideal selectivity decreases to 1 at L = 270 nm. The ideal selectivity of the membranes increased when degree of modification increased. For membrane 5, the ideal selectivity decreases to 1 at L = 400nm. While the ideal selectivity of membranes 4 and 5 are larger than that of the unmodified membranes, we can observe that the H$_2$ flux with those membranes is decreased slightly from the flux of the unmodified membranes. For these two modified membranes, the reduction of CH$_4$ flux is far more significant than the H$_2$ flux. That is, the modified pore mouths can effectively block CH$_4$ only while they still allow transport of most H$_2$ molecules. The most useful membrane, however, would be one in which CH$_4$ was completely excluded from the membrane, such as membrane 6. With this membrane, the ideal selectivity is infinity. H$_2$ can still diffuse through this membrane with 72 % of
the flux through unmodified membrane when L=1000 nm. It is likely that membranes with thicker modifying layer could also exclude H₂ molecules. To date, however, we have not performed simulation for membranes with modifying layers thicker than the one already obtained.

4. Conclusion

Our results indicate that it is possible, at least in principle, to make modifications to zeolites such as silicalite to make membranes that can selectively transport H₂ from H₂/CH₄ mixtures without a catastrophic drop in the membrane’s H₂ flux. These membranes take advantage of a situation where increased surface resistances for CH₄ transport make it possible to separate CH₄ from H₂ with high selectivity. The general concept of making a local modification in the surface structure of a zeolite membrane may be useful in other separations in addition to the H₂/CH₄ separation we have considered here. Although our simulations give some insight into the feasibility of this approach, several practical issues exist that would need to be carefully understood in order to use this idea experimentally. If the density of the modifying layer is too high, the porous layers could become completely blocked, stopping permeation of both H₂ and CH₄. It is not clear what level of control in the surface modification would be necessary to create layers that block CH₄ without blocking all molecular transport. Another complication in real zeolite membranes is that net transport through polycrystalline films involves contributions from both zeolitic and non-zeolitic pores. High quality zeolite membranes are assumed to be dominated by transport through zeolitic pores, but non-zeolitic pores are always present and are typically thought to reduce separation
selectivity.\textsuperscript{(48,49)} It is conceivable that efforts to modify zeolite surfaces could also block or reduce access to non-zeolitic pores, although our simulations provide no direct information on this possibility. The simulation methods we have introduced here may be of use in understanding what impact modifying layers could have on non-zeolitic pores in polycrystalline films.
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Figures

**Figure 1:** Side views of (a) unmodified silicalite and (b)-(c) surface modified silicalite with various degree of modification. As modification proceeds, the thickness of modifying layer increases.

**Figure 2:** Top views of (a) unmodified silicalite and (b) surface modified silicalite
Figure 3: Free volume calculated in a 2 Å slice in the modifying layer on the modified silicalite membranes used in our calculations, shown as a function of the two dimensional density of atoms in the modifying layers, \( d \). Dashed lines indicate the free volume of unmodified silicalite.
Figure 4: Net flux of CH$_4$ through surface modified silicalite. In every case, $P_{\text{feed}}=10$ bar and $P_{\text{perm}}=0.3$ bar.
Figure 5: Net flux of H₂ through surface modified silicalite. In every case, \( P_{\text{feed}} = 10 \text{ bar} \) and \( P_{\text{perm}} = 0.3 \text{ bar} \).
Figure 6: Surface resistance ratios as a function of membrane length, \( L \), for surface-modified membrane 4. Results are shown for three values of \( P_{\text{feed}} \) and two values of \( P_{\text{perm}} \). Open symbols represent CH\(_4\) data, while closed symbols show H\(_2\) data.
Figure 7: Ideal selectivity of H$_2$ relative to CH$_4$ as a function of the two dimensional density of the modifying layers. Results are shown for two values of $P_{\text{feed}}$ and three membrane thicknesses. In every case, $P_{\text{perm}}$ was assumed to be a vacuum. Selectivity is infinity at membrane 6 since CH$_4$ is blocked.
**Figure 8**: Ideal selectivity (filled symbols) and \( \text{H}_2 \) flux (open symbols) with an unmodified membrane and three modified membranes with various atom densities. Solid lines represent selectivity and dashed lines show flux.
### Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si-O bond length [Å]</td>
<td>1.62 ± 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-O length [Å]</td>
<td>&gt;2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si-Si length [Å]</td>
<td>&gt;2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si-O-Si bond angle [deg]</td>
<td>135 ± 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Si-O bond angle [deg]</td>
<td>110 ± 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination number of O</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination number of Si</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**: Criteria for inserting atoms as defined in text (25, 26).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O-O</th>
<th>Si-O</th>
<th>Si-Si</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A [eV]</td>
<td>1388.7730</td>
<td>18003.7572</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B [Å⁻¹]</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.87318</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C [eV Å⁶]</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>133.5381</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε [kJ/mol]</td>
<td>0.04613</td>
<td>1.0834</td>
<td>1.2768E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ [Å]</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**: Parameters for the BKS potential (28, 29, 31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CH₄ - O</th>
<th>H₂ - O</th>
<th>CH₄ - CH₄</th>
<th>H₂ - H₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ε [K]</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>51.233</td>
<td>147.9</td>
<td>34.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ [Å]</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3**: Parameters for LJ potential (40)
References


