

Vietnam Journal of Catalysis and Adsorption Tạp chí xúc tác và hấp phụ Việt Nam

http://chemeng.hust.edu.vn/jca/

Size-controlled synthesis of alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles: effect of stabilizer agent concentration on particle size

Le Nghiem Anh Tuan^{1,2}, Doan Thi Bich Ngoc², Tran Phuoc Tho², Nguyen Hong Nhung³, Bui Duy Du^{1,2*}

¹ Institute of Applied Materials Science, Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology, Ho Chi Minh City, VIETNAM ² Graduate University of Science and Technology, Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology, Hanoi, VIETNAM ³ PetroVietNam Fertilizer and Chemicals Corporation, Ho Chi Minh City, VIETNAM

*Email: vina9802@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 14/02/2021 Accepted: 19/7/2021 Published: 15/10/2021

Keywords:

Alginate-stabilized, Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles, alginate concentration

ABSTRACT

Alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles were fabricated by chemical reduction method using nature polymer alginate as a stabilizing agent. Transmission electron microscopy (TEM), X-ray powder diffraction (XRD), infrared (FT-IR) spectrum, and UV-Vis analysis were used to investigate the morphology, size, structure, and stability of the nanoparticles synthesized. The results suggested that concentration of alginate has an effect on particle size of Cu₂O@Cu. The particle size of Cu₂O@Cu decreased when the alginate concentration increased. The 5% alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles have small sizes (5.5 ± 1.6 nm). The first, the as-preprated products formed Cu₂O@Cu₂O core-shell nanoparticles structure and final, it would be converted to Cu₂O@Cu core-shell nanoparticles structure.

Introduction

In recent efforts, metallic and metallic oxide nanoparticles have emerged as significant and novel antimicrobial, antifungal agents [1,2-5]. Owing to their nano-dimensions (1-100 nm range), copper oxide nanoparticles exhibit fascinating as well as high antimicroorganism compared to their bulk counterparts [3,4]. Among various practical approaches to preparing Cu₂O-Cu nanoparticles, the chemical reduction approach is considered a straightforward, affordable, and scalable technique [6]. Although the preparation of Cu₂O-Cu nanoparticles has advanced significantly, this technique only works at low copper ion concentrations (< 1,000 mg/L). Due to this reason, it hinders large-scale production [2,3,7]. The main challenge of preparation of Cu-based nanoparticles by

the reduction approach is their instability due to aggregation. It is well-known that due to high surface energy, the nanoparticles tend to be aggregated strongly, hence the performance of nanomaterials in particular applications will be affected. To overcome such aggregation, surfactants are often used to improve the colloidal stability of nanoparticles. Among various surfactants, thanks to the strong adhesivity to the metal surface, alginate, a biocompatible, biodegradable, and natural nontoxic polysaccharide, is one of the best candidates for preparation of Cu₂O-Cu nanoparticles [8].

Currently, plant diseases are controlled with the heavy dependence of using rather toxic antibacterial chemicals [9]. The use of chemical bactericides is currently recognized as a danger to human health and the ecosystem, leading to the need of promoting substitutions to mitigate the damage of plant diseases. Recent studies have shown that metal nanoparticles can evolve to become key factors in coping with plant diseases and promoting plant growth [9]. In particular, Cu₂O and Cu nanoparticles showed potential inhibition on various types of bacteria and fungi [3-5]. Huang *et al.* adopted Cu₂O nanoparticles with inhibition of the growth of *Alternaria solani* funguscausing root rot of pepper plant and blight of tomato [10]. The Cu₂O-Cu nanoparticles/alginate expressed high antifungal efficiency (~ 100%) against *Neoscytalidium dimidiatum* causing a brown spot disease on dragon fruit plants, [11] *Xanthomonas oryzae* causing bacterial leaf blight rice, [12] and rice leaf blast disease [13].

Currently, we are interested in alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles prepared by chemical reduction of copper sulfate in alginate solutions using N₂H₄.H₂O as a reducing agent. In the previous study, we reported the effect of copper ion content on particle size of Cu₂O@Cu stabilized by alginate. Herein, we announce the effect of alginate concentration on alginate-stabilized particle size of Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticle and characteristic properties of Cu₂O@Cu nanomaterial by Transmission electron microscopy (TEM), X-ray powder diffraction (XRD), (FT-IR) infrared spectrum, and UV-Vis analysis.

Experimental

Materials

Analytical reagents $CuSO_{4.}5H_2O$ (99.99%), NH_3 (30%), and $N_2H_4.H_2O$ (80%) were obtained from Merck, Germany. Alginate (Mw ~ 51,200 g/mol) was derived from brown seaweed in Khanh Hoa province, Vietnam.

Preparation of alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles with different alginate concentrations

The preparation of alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles was followed our previous report [11, 12]. 4 g CuSO₄.5H₂O was completely dissolved in 30 mL of water. Afterward, 4 mL NH₃ was added into the CuSO₄ solution to produce $[Cu(NH_3)_4]^{2+}$ for preventing gel formation between Cu²⁺ and alginate. Then, the obtained mixture was transferred to sodium alginate solutions, which were prepared by dissolving 8, 10 or 12 g of sodium alginate. in 140 mL₂ decentrane preteres for 2 hours. The mixtures were stirred for 10 min before gentle addition of 8 mL hydrazine (N₂H₄, 8% wt.) to reduce Cu²⁺ to Cu⁺ and Cu⁰. The color of the solution changed from blue to the characteristic reddish-brown color of the alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles. The total volume of the reaction mixtures were adjusted to 200 mL by adding deionized water. The final reaction mixtures have 80 mM Cu content and alginate concentration of 4%, 5% or 6%. The as-prepared products were centrifuged from the solution at 4000 rpm for 15 min and washed with ethanol three times and dried in vacuum drying at 60°C for characterization.

Characterization of alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles

The X-ray diffraction (XRD; D8 Advance Bruker, Germany) measurement was used to study the structure and ingredient of the synthesized materials by applying CuK_{α} (λ = 1.5405 Å) radiation under a constant current and voltage of 30 mA and 40 kV, respectively, and the diffraction angle (2θ) scan range from 10° to 80°. The infrared spectra were measured by using FT-IR spectrometer (FT-IR 8400S, Shimadzu) over the wavenumber range from 4000 to 400 cm⁻¹. UV-visible absorption spectra 0.2 mM solutions of nanomaterials were recorded with a UV-vis spectrophotometer, Jasco V-630, Japan. Transmission electron microscope measurement (TEM; JEM 1010, JEOL, Tokyo, Japan) was used to study the particle size and morphology of the synthesized materials. Nanoparticle sizes were statistically determined from TEM images by using MS Excel 2010 software. All of the data was expressed as mean ± standard error (SE).

Results and discussion

Characterization of alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles





Alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles were synthesized from metal precursor copper sulfate pentahydrate (CuSO4.5H₂O) using hydrazine hydrate (N₂H₄.H₂O) as a reducing agent and brown seaweed alginate as a stabilizing agent. The brown seaweed alginate was identified as the surfactant, which affects the particle size of Cu₂O@Cu nanomaterial. The formation of Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles is easily discernible from the changes in the color of the solution. The color of the mixed solution changed immediately, shifting from a blue to a reddish-brown dispersion, suggesting the production of copper nanoparticles showed in figure 1

The XRD patterns of the brown seaweed alginate and alginate-stabilized $Cu_2O@Cu$ nanoparticles were presented in figure 2.



Figure 2: XRD patterns of the brown seaweed alginate (a) and alginate-stabilized $Cu_2O@Cu$ nanoparticles with different alginate concentrations: 4% (b), 5% (c), 6% (d)

Figure 2a showed that the extracted alginate from the brown seaweed displayed two characteristic peaks at 2θ of 13.5° and 21.5° [14]. There were also peaks at 2θ of 28.2°, 44.0°, 50.1°, and 78.1°, which validated the crystalline form of alginate with organic and inorganic impurities in the brown seaweed. Fig. 2b, 2c, and 2d showed the XRD patterns of alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles samples with various alginate concentrations, namely 4%, 5%, and 6%. The diffraction patterns displayed the distinctive peaks of two phases including crystalline metallic copper (cubic) and Cu₂O (cubic), implying that Cu²⁺ ions were chemically reduced to Cu and Cu⁺. The XRD patterns of Cu₂O showed six peaks at 29.7°, 36.5°, 42.4°, 61.4°, 73.6°, and 77.4° matching properly with (110), (111), (200), (220), (311), and (222) planes of the facecentered cubic (fcc) structure, which is in a good agreement with the Cu₂O powder peaks obtained from of the International Centre of Diffraction Data card (JCPDS file no. 34-1354) [15]. The XRD patterns also display the peaks for Cu at 20 of 43.4° (111), 50.6°

(200), and 74.3° (220). All peaks areattributed to the cubic form of metallic copper [15-17], which is remarkably close to those provided by JCPDS file no. 04-0836 of XRD for Cu. These results are also following research of Badawy et al. and Maximino et al [18,19].

FT-IR spectra of brown seaweed alginate and alginatestabilized $Cu_2O@Cu$ nanoparticles with various alginate concentrations (4%, 5%, and 6% wt) of were shown in figure 3.



Figure 3: FT-IR spectra of the brown seaweed alginate (a) and alginate-stabilized $Cu_2O@Cu$ nanoparticles with different alginate concentrations: 4% (b), 5% (c), 6% (d)

Figure 3a showed the stretches corresponding to mannuronic acid, OH, and CH₂ functional groups at 831 cm⁻¹, 3472 cm⁻¹, and 2926 cm⁻¹, respectively. Two strong absorptions were observed at 1610 cm⁻¹ and 1415 cm⁻¹ which were attributed to the asymmetric and symmetric stretching vibrations of carboxylate groups (O-C-O) [16]. The band at 1122 cm⁻¹ was assigned to C-O stretching of pyranose. The comparison between FT-IR spectra of alginate (figure 3a) and alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles (figure 3b, 3c, 3d) showed a blueshift of the absorption peak from 3462 cm⁻¹ to 3430 cm⁻¹ and decrease in intensity of the absorption at 2926 cm⁻¹ due to the interaction of Cu⁰ with -OH groups [17]. When stabilization occurred, the band corresponding to -C-Ostretching showed bathochromic shift from 1128 cm⁻¹ to 1109 cm⁻¹ [19]. Furthermore, the characteristic bands in the range of 618-637 cm⁻¹ were ascribed to the vibrational mode of Cu-O in the Cu₂O phase [16,17], thereby confirming the formation of Cu₂O nanoparticles.

The UV-Vis absorption spectra of the alginate- Cu^{2+} complex and alginate-stabilized $Cu_2O@Cu$ nanoparticles were presented in fig. 4. In the UV-Vis spectra of nanomaterials, the presence of absorption band in the range of 550-600 nm belonging to metallic Cu nanoparticles and the absence of absorption band in the range of 300-500 nm corresponding to Cu_2O nanoparticles reveal the formation of $Cu_2O@Cu$ core-

https://doi.org/10.51316/jca.2021.098

shell nanoparticles [16]. The absorption peak at 234 nm is assigned to alginate- Cu^{2+} complex.





The formation of the Cu shell could be explained as follows. As N₂H₄ was added into the system, in which the molar ratio of CuSO₄/N₂H₄ ~ 4/1, the Cu²⁺ ions were firstly reduced to Cu⁺ ions, and the Cu₂O@Cu₂O nanoparticles could be formed [20,21]. When the addition of N₂H₄ was kept continuing, Cu₂O nanoparticles were formed initially, and subsequently, Cu₂O were reduced further by hydrazine to transform to copper hierarchical nanostructures, which can be described by the following reaction: $2Cu_2O + N_2H_4 \rightarrow 4Cu + N_2\uparrow + 2H_2O$ [20,22]. Thus, the Cu₂O@Cu₂O core-shell nanoparticles would be converted to

Cu₂O@Cu core-shell nanoparticles stabilized by alginate. The obtained results are similar to those of our previous study [12].

Effect of alginate concentration on the size of Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles

TEM images and particle size distribution of alginatestabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles obtained from experiments with alginate concentration from 4% - 6% are shown in figure 5. The results obviously showed that Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticle size decreased when concentration of the alginate stabilizer increased. In particular, the Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticle size was 8.7 ± 1.8 nm with alginate concentration of 4%, decreased to 5.5 ± 1.6 nm with alginate concentration of 5% and to 3.7 ± 1.7 nm with alginate concentration of 6%. The Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles are spherical, relatively uniform and distributed in a narrow range. It is known that surfactants or polymers cause decrease in particle size due to the spatial effect. They prevent particles from coming together to agglomerate into larger particles [13]. However, when the glue solution achieves the necessary flexibility, the surfactant polymer content cannot be too high because solutions with a large viscosity are difficult to apply. Therefore, the solution with 6% wt of alginate is too concentrated and difficult to use.



Figure 5: TEM images and particle size distributions of alginate-stabilized Cu₂O@Cu nanoparticles with different alginate concentration: 4% (A, a), 5% (B, b), 6% (C, c)

Conclusion

The alginate concentration affects the particle size of alginate-stabilized $Cu_2O@Cu$ nanoparticles. The particle size is in the range of 3.7-8.7 nm corresponding to alginate concentration of 4-6% and decreased when the alginate concentration increased. The alginate-stabilized $Cu_2O@Cu$ nanoparticles had a mixture crystal structure of Cu_2O and metallic Cu. The $Cu_2O@Cu_2O$ core-shell structure would be converted to $Cu_2O@Cu$ core-shell structure. With small particle size, the alginate-stabilized $Cu_2O@Cu$ nanoparticle solution can be used as a fungicide to replace toxic agrochemicals and potentially applied to the development of sustainable agricultural production.

Acknowledgments.

This research was funded by the Program of Science and Technology for the Sustainable Development of the Mekong Delta Region under grant number KHCN-TNB.ĐT/14-19/C38.

References

 T. Jay, G. C. Ratiram, V. G. Nilesh, R. R. Alok, Y. Sachin, D. J. Harjeet, J. Exp. Nanosci. 11(11) (2016) 884-900.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17458080.2016.1177216

- K. Giannousi, G. Sarafidis, S. Mourdikoudis, A. Pantazaki, C. Dendrinou-Samara, Inorg. Chem. 53(18) (2014) 9657-9666. https://doi.org/10.1021/ic501143z
- K. P. Ajay, G. C. Ratiram, B. C. Prashant, Y. Sachin, M. Aniruddha, N. S. Vaishali, R. R. Alok, D. J. Harjeet, Mater. Sci. Eng. C 99 (2019) 783-793. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msec.2019.02.010
- B. D. Du, D. V. Phu, L. A. Quoc, N. Q. Hien, J. Nanopart. (2017) Article ID 7056864, 1. https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/7056864
- Regmi, J. Bhandari, S. Bhattarai, S. K. Gautam, J. Nep. Chem. Soc. 40 (2019) 5-10. https://doi.org/10.3126/jncs.v40i0.27271
- Eivazihollagh, M. Norgren, C. Dahlström, H. Edlund, Nanomater. 8 (2018) 238 (11pp). https://10.3390/nano8040238
- N. Gu, J. Gao, H. Li, Y. Wu, Y. Ma, K. Wang., Appl. Clay Sci. 79 (2016) 132-133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2016.05.017
- 8. S. Pandey, J. Ramontja, Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 93

(2016) 712-723. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2016.09.033

 R. G. Chikte, K. M. Paknikar, Jyutika M. Rajwade, J. Sharma, Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 103(11) (2019) 4605.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-019-09740-z

- S. Huang, L. Wang, L. Liu, Y.Hou, and L. Li, Agron. Sustain. Dev. 35(2) (2015) 369–400. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-014-0274-x
- D. Du, D. T. B. Ngoc, N. D. Thang, L. N. A. Tuan, B. D. Thach, N. Q. Hien, Vietnam J. Chem. 57(3) (2019) 318. https://doi.org/10.1002/vjch.201900022
- T. B. Ngoc, B. D. Du, L. N. A. Tuan, B. D. Thach, T. P. Tho, D. V. Phu, Adv. Nat. Sci.: Nanosci. Nanotechnol., 2021, 12, 013001. https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/2043-6262/abebd6/meta
- T. B. Ngoc, B. D. Du, L. N. A. Tuan, B. D. Thach, C. T. Kien, D. V. Phu, N. Q. Hien, Indian J. Agric. Res. 54(6) (2020) 802-806. https://10.18805/IJARe.A-582
- R. A. Khajouei, J. Keramat, N.R Hamdami, A.-V. Ursu, C. Delattre, C. Laroche, C. Gardarin, D. Lecerf, J. Desbrières, G. Djelveh, P. Michaud, Inter. J. Biol. Macromol. 118 (2018) 1073-1081. https://10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2018.06.154
- S. S. Sawant, A. D. Bhagwat, C. M. Mahajan, J. Nano Elec. Phys. 8(1), (2016) 01035 (5pp). https://10.21272/jnep.8(1).01036
- H. Khanehzaei, M. B. Ahmad, K. Shameli, Z. Ajdari., Int. J. Electrochem. Sci. 9 (2014) 8189-8198. http://www.electrochemsci.org/papers/vol9/91208 189.pdf
- J. Diaz-Visurraga, C. Daza, C. Pozo, A. Becerra, C. V. Plessing, A. Garcia, Int. J. Nanomedicine 7 (2012) 3597-3612. https://10.2147/IJN.S32648

18. S. M. Badawy, R. A. El-Khashab, A. A. Nayl, Bull.

- Chem. React. Eng. Catal. 10(2) (2015) 169-174. https://doi.org/10.9767/bcrec.10.2.7984.169-174
- N. J. Maximino, M. P. Alvarez, R. S. Avila, C. A. Orta, E. J. Regalado, J. Nanomater. (2018) Article ID 9512768 1.

https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/9512768

 L. Yang, S. P. Li, Y. J. Wang, L. L. Wang, X. C. Bao, R. Q. Yang, Trans. Nonferrous Met. Soc. China. 25 (2015) 3643-3650. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1003-6326(15)64005-5

- 21. M. Behera, G. Giri, Mater. Sci.-Poland 32(4) (2014) 702-708. https://doi.org/10.2478/s13536-014-0255-4
- 22. V. Andal, G. Buvaneswari, Eng. Sci. Technol. Int. J. 20 (2017) 340-344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jestch.2016.09.003