Pore Size Effect on Methane Adsorption in Mesoporous Silica Materials Studied by Small-Angle Neutron Scattering
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ABSTRACT: Methane adsorption in model mesoporous silica materials with the size range characteristic of shale is studied by small-angle neutron scattering (SANS). Size effect on the temperature-dependent gas adsorption at methane pressure about 100 kPa is investigated by SANS using MCM-41 and SBA-15 as adsorbents. Above the gas–liquid condensation temperature, the thickness of the adsorption layer is found to be roughly constant as a function of the temperature. Moreover, the gas adsorption properties, such as the adsorbed layer thickness and the specific amount of adsorbed gas, have little dependence on the pore size being studied, i.e., pore radius of 16.5 and 34.1 Å, but are mainly affected by the roughness of the pore surfaces. Hence, the surface properties of the pore wall are more dominant than the pore size in determining the methane gas adsorption of pores at the nanometer size range. Not surprisingly, the gas–liquid condensation temperature is observed to be sensitive to pore size and shifts to higher temperature when the pore size is smaller. Below the gas–liquid condensation temperature, even though the majority of gas adsorption experiments/simulations have assumed the density of confined liquid to be the same as the bulk density, the measured methane mass density in our samples is found to be appreciably smaller than the bulk methane density regardless of the pore sizes studied here. The mass density of liquid/solid methane in pores with different sizes shows different temperature dependence below the condensation temperature. With decreasing temperature, the methane density in larger pores (SBA-15) abruptly increases at approximately 65 K and then plateaus. In contrast, the density in smaller pores (MCM-41) monotonically increases with decreasing temperature before reaching a plateau at approximately 30 K.

INTRODUCTION

There has been increasing research on the pore morphology of shale rocks due to the success in extracting hydrocarbons from shale reservoirs.¹–³ Shale gas production has increased from 9.6 billion cubic meter (bcm) in 2001 to 282 bcm in 2015 in the U.S.⁴ and became the largest share of U.S. natural gas production in 2013.⁵ Nevertheless, many fundamental problems related to the storage and transportation of gas in shales are still lacking in understanding. Kerogen is the organic component in the shales that does not dissolve in any solvent, and it imbeds within the inorganic matrix in the rocks. The predominant hydrocarbons in the shale rocks have been found to be stored within the kerogen which has pores with the characteristic length scale between 1 and 100 nm.⁶,⁷ To better estimate the total gas in place (GIP) and the gas transportation properties in the shale rocks, it is necessary to understand the adsorption properties of natural gas, especially methane, in nanopores of different pore sizes and surface properties. For nanometer-sized pores, the pore surface properties can play essential roles of gas adsorption and flow modulator. The total hydrocarbon reserve is the summation of hydrocarbon adsorbed on the pore surface and the free gas in the pore.⁶

Ordered mesoporous silicas have drawn much attention since their discovery in the early 1990s. They have been demonstrated to have outstanding applications in gas storage, separation processes, and heterogeneous catalysis.⁸–¹² These materials have relatively large surface area and uniform pore size. Moreover, the ability to tailor their pore size in a wide range from about 2 nm up to 30 nm,¹³ which covers the characteristic pore size in kerogen and shale rocks, makes them suitable model adsorbents to study shale gas adsorption. Adsorption isotherm measurements for gases such as N₂ and Ar have been widely used to study the mesoporous silica materials such as MCM-41 and SBA-15.¹⁴,¹⁵ As a complementary
technique, X-ray diffraction has been applied to investigate the structure change during gas adsorption for Ar, Kr, and C$_2$F$_6$ on MCM-41 and SBA-15. However, there are few studies on the adsorption mechanism of the most common component in natural gas, methane, on these mesoporous silicas. Methane adsorption behaviors on these model materials with well-controlled pore size and surface chemistry can provide essential information for the petroleum industry with interest in producing natural gas from shales to understand the transportation and storage of methane gas within the nanopores characteristic of the real rocks.

Gas adsorption on mesopores begins with the adsorption of gas molecules on the surface before the capillary condensation pressure or temperature. This vapor–liquid condensation is a first-order phase transition. When it takes place, the pores are fully filled with confined fluid. Many studies have shown that the fluid under confinement of nanometer size scale has thermodynamic properties different from the properties of bulk fluids. In particular, Jiang et al. studied the phase transition of n-alkanes from methane to n-butane in carbon nanotubes using gauge-cell Monte Carlo method and found that the critical temperature is decreased, the critical density is increased, and the binodal curve is narrowed. Tan and Piri used perturbed-chain statistical associating fluid theory (PC-SAFT) coupled with the Young–Laplace equation to calculate the confined fluid phase behavior in nanopores and reported that at critical temperature, surface tension and saturated density of confined phases are shifted from those of bulk phases. Gor et al. carried out two different simulation methods and showed that compressibility of confined fluid changes linearly with pore size. So far most of the structural investigations on natural gas adsorbed in confined state were based on theory and simulation. There is an urgent need for experimental verification of the hydrocarbon properties confined in the nanopores under the influences of pore size, surface chemistry, pore structure, etc., so that the understanding of natural gas behaviors in the shale rocks or other porous materials can be advanced.

In this study, two mesoporous silicas, MCM-41 and SBA-15, are chosen in order to study the pore size effect on the gas adsorption process of methane. MCM-41 and SBA-15 have cylindrical mesopores with narrow pore size distributions packed into two-dimensional p6mm hexagonal space group. It is known that increasing the pore size increases the capillary condensation pressure at a given temperature. For the same porous material, increasing the isotherm temperature increases the capillary condensation pressure. Kruk and Jaroniec studied argon adsorption isotherms at 77 K on MCM-41 and SBA-15 with various pore sizes and claimed that below the capillary condensation pressure, the adsorbed film thickness increases with decreasing pore size. But when the pore size is above 4 nm, the film thickness shows little correlation with the pore size. The increase in adsorbed layer thickness with decrease in pore size is also found in N$_2$ adsorption isotherms for MCM-41 with pore diameter from 24.0 to 49.2 Å. Qiao et al. carried on hexane adsorption isotherms on MCM-41 with different size, and they found an almost constant thickness of adsorbed hexane layer before capillary condensation when pore diameter is larger than 24.0 Å. However, these studies relied on the volumetric measurement methods and assumed that the pores have smooth surfaces. The structural information is inferred based on the used models.

It has been shown that the surface of the pores cannot be assumed to be smooth. The change of the surface properties can significantly influence the gas adsorption. Previous studies on MCM-41 and SBA-15 by X-ray diffraction and neutron scattering indicated that their pore walls are diffusive rough interfaces rather than smooth and sharp interfaces. Our previous study showed that due to the rough pore surface of SBA-15, the amount of methane adsorption on the pore surface is more than half of the amount of all liquid methane fully filling the pore volume at the gas–liquid condensation temperature. The surface roughness comes from the morphological defects such as corrugated pore wall and microporosity. Density functional theory (DFT) and grand canonical Monte Carlo (GCMC) simulation were also applied to investigate the surface roughness of MCM-41, and by taking into account the pore wall roughness of MCM-41, the simulated gas adsorption curves have reproduced the experimental Ar adsorption curves. Therefore, it is important to elucidate the pore size effect by taking into consideration the surface roughness of the pore wall to obtain the detailed structure change upon gas adsorption process and separate the pore size and surface roughness impacts in order to elucidate the key factors that determine the total hydrocarbon reserve.

In this study, we investigate the methane gas adsorption in mesoporous silica materials with two different pore sizes as a function of the temperature by using small-angle neutron scattering (SANS). Surface roughness is also taken into account to assess its effect on the gas adsorption. The adsorption of deuterated methane is carried out at pressure $\approx$100 kPa (close to isobar condition) on MCM-41 and SBA-15. The previously developed scattering models and methods are used to extract the essential adsorption properties such as the thickness of the adsorption layer, the mass density of CD$_4$ under confinement, and the total gas storage within the pores. It is worth noting that there are only very few isobar gas adsorption studies compared with isotherm adsorption investigations. Especially, most of isobar studies focus on chemisorption rather than physisorption as in the case of methane adsorption in silica materials. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first SANS study of pore size effect on temperature-dependent gas adsorption.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Materials. Synthesis of MCM-41. Mesoporous silica MCM-41 was synthesized following the methodology reported by Ritter et al. The structure-directing agent used was hexadecyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB, Sigma). CTAB (8.8 g) was dissolved in a mixture of 208 mL of distilled water and 96 mL of aqueous NH$_3$ (Sigma-Aldrich) at 35 $^\circ$C. Then 40 mL of tetraethyl orthosilicate (TEOS, Sigma) was slowly added to this clear solution under stirring, and the solution was kept at these conditions for 3 h. Then the gel was aged at room temperature for 24 h in a Teflon bottle. The product was separated by centrifugation, washed with deionized water until the pH value of the washing solution was neutral, and dried in air at room temperature. In order to remove the surfactant occluded in the mesopores, the synthesized material was calcined in static air at 550 $^\circ$C for 4 h.

#### Synthesis of SBA-15. Mesoporous silica SBA-15 was synthesized following the approach reported by Zhao et al. The structure-directing agent and the silicon source used are the commercial triblock copolymer (Pluronic P123, Sigma) and TEOS, respectively. P123 (6 g) was dissolved in 45 mL of
deionized water and 150 mL of 2 M hydrochloric acid at 35 °C, where M represents mol/L, and the solution was stirred vigorously. TEOS (13.8 mL) was then added dropwise to the solution. The synthesis gel was aged for 24 h. The gel was then hydrothermally treated at 80 °C for another 24 h in a Teflon bottle. The precipitated product was centrifuged, washed with deionized water until the pH value of the washing solution became neutral, and dried overnight at 80 °C. The surfactant molecules were removed by annealing the white powder at 550 °C for 4 h.

The final MCM-41 and SBA-15 powder were tested by N2 adsorption isotherm measurement, and the textural properties are summarized in Table 1. The adsorption isotherm for N2 on MCM-41 and SBA-15 under vacuum. CD4 gas was then loaded in aluminum sample cells with 1 mm path length. The degassed samples were first conducted 1.5 h before the SANS experiment. The degassed samples were then conducted at temperatures ranging from 20 to 295 K. The amount of the sample in each cell was maintained the same during the experiments. The CD4 pressure was monitored and maintained at about 100 kPa by the CD4 gas cart at temperature above the lowest temperature of capillary condensation temperature range (Tc,L). The slight change of CD4 pressure at T > Tc,L can be found in Figure S3 in the Supporting Information. At T < Tc,L, the valve connecting the CD4 gas cart and the sample cell was closed to prevent further condensation of gas in the bulk phase.

### SANS DATA ANALYSIS

In previous work,44 we have developed a theoretical model to understand the scattering intensity for the hexagonally packed cylindrical mesopores without or with gas loaded inside. The small-angle scattering intensity I(q) of powder MCM-41 or SBA-15 with CD4 loaded (we refer it as CD4/MCM-41 or CD4/SBA-15 in the remainder of the paper) can be expressed as

\[
\lim_{q_{h,k} \to \infty} I(q_{h,k}) = C \sum_{h,k} \left[ \frac{1}{m_{h,k}} \times \rho_{a,0} R_m^2 \exp \left( -\frac{\sigma_{a,0}^2}{2} \right) \right] ^2
\]

\[
+ \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{2J_1(q_{h,k} R_m)}{q_{h,k} R_m} \exp \left( -\frac{\sigma_{a,0}^2}{2} \right) \left( \frac{\sigma_{a,0}^2}{2} \right)
\]

\[
\left( 2 \delta_{h,k} + q_{h,k}^2 - 2 q_{h,k} q_{l,m} \cos(\delta) R_v \right)
\]

\[
\left( 2 \delta_{h,k} + q_{h,k}^2 - 2 q_{h,k} q_{l,m} \cos(\delta) R_v \right)
\]

\[
- \rho_{a,0}^2 R_m^2 \frac{2J_1(q_{h,k} R_m)}{q_{h,k} R_m} \exp \left( -\frac{\sigma_{a,0}^2}{2} \right)
\]

(1)

\(J_1\) is the first-order Bessel function. \(R_m\) is the nominal radius of matrix pore and \(R_v\) is the radius of CD4 vapor core. \(\rho_{a,0}\) and \(\rho_m\) are neutron scattering length densities (SLDs) of the CD4 vapor core, adsorbed CD4, and SiO2 matrix, respectively (see Figure 1 in ref 34). In the temperature and pressure ranges being studied, \(\rho_m\) is small compared with \(\rho_{a,0}\) and therefore \(\rho_m\) is set to be zero. \(\sigma\) is the diffusive parameter characterizing the surface roughness of the mesopore wall. \(m_{h,k}\) is the multiplicity, and C is a constant prefactor related to the length L and number density of the cylindrical mesopores. If the amount of sample inside the neutron beam is the same during scattering measurements, C is independent of the temperature. Equation 1 is derived under the assumption that the interface between the silica matrix and the adsorbed layer is diffusive interface while the interface between the adsorbed layer and vapor core is sharp interface.44

For empty matrix, there is no adsorbed layer and the mesopores are under vacuum and therefore \(R_v\) and \(\rho_{a,0}\) are zero. When mesopores are fully filled with methane liquid or solid, \(R_v\) is zero and \(\rho_{a,0}\) becomes the SLD of confined liquid or solid methane. In both cases, eq 1 reduces to

\[
\lim_{q_{h,k} \to \infty} I(q_{h,k}) = C \sum_{h,k} \left[ \frac{1}{m_{h,k}} \times \rho_{a,0} R_m^2 \exp \left( -\frac{\sigma_{a,0}^2}{2} \right) \right] ^2
\]

(2)
Figure 1. SANS data (open circle) and the corresponding fitting curve (solid line) for (a) MCM-41 and (b) SBA-15. (c) Radial distribution of the volume fraction of the SBA-15 (blue line) and MCM-41 (red line) matrices. Error bars in (a) and (b) represent one standard deviation.

\[ I_M(q) = \int \frac{I(q')}{\sqrt{2\pi\delta(q')^2}} \exp\left[-\frac{(q - q_0)^2}{2\delta(q')^2}\right] dq' \]

where \( I(q') \) is the theoretical intensity calculated through eq 1 with \( q' \) as a dummy variable. The SANS instrument resolution is approximated as a Gaussian function with the standard deviation \( \delta(q') \) and \( q \) dependent parameter \( q_0 \).

The structural information on empty MCM-41 and SBA-15 without loading any gas is first obtained by fitting the SANS data using eq 2. \( \rho_m \) (SLD of silica matrix) is a known parameter determined by separate contrast variation SANS measurements, and the details are described in the Supporting Information. \( \rho_m \) is \((3.66 \pm 0.009) \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^{-2} \) for MCM-41 and \((3.51 \pm 0.008) \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^{-2} \) for SBA-15, where the confidence intervals for uncertainties represent one standard deviation. The fitting parameters in eq 2 are prefactor \( C \), nominal pore radius \( R_m \), and diffusive parameter \( \sigma \). Once the parameters of the solid matrix \( C, R_m, \) and \( \sigma \) are determined, they are fixed as known parameters for gas loading cases. The only fitting parameters in eq 1 for \( \text{CD}_4/\text{MCM}-41 \) and \( \text{CD}_4/\text{SBA}-15 \) are \( \rho_{\text{ads}}, R_v, \) and the background. The details of fitting procedure can be found in the previous work.34

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Properties of Empty MCM-41 and SBA-15. Figure 1a and 1b show the SANS experimental data and the best fits using eq 2 for empty MCM-41 and SBA-15, respectively. The scattering patterns for both cases show clearly the first-order diffraction peak and overlapped second- and third-order peaks. For MCM-41, even the fourth peak can be seen. The peak positions indicate both MCM-41 and SBA-15 have the \( \rho mm \) hexagonal symmetry of the mesopores. The structural fitting parameters for the silica matrices from SANS fitting are listed in Table 2. The nominal pore radius \( R_m \) of SBA-15 is about twice that of \( R_m \) of MCM-41. The normalized surface roughness parameter \( \sigma/R_m \) is larger for SBA-15 likely due to the large microporosity of its pore wall which has been documented in the literature.35,45 Figure 1c shows the volume fraction distribution, \( \varphi_m(r) \), for the empty silica matrix of MCM-41 and SBA-15 calculated by the extracted fitting parameters listed in Table 2. In the center the mesopores are under vacuum, and \( \varphi_m(r) \) is zero. The pore wall is not a sharp interface but a smooth diffuse interface characterized by the diffuse parameter \( \sigma \).

Temperature-Dependent Gas Adsorption. Figure 2 shows the SANS data for gas loading matrices for (a) \( \text{CD}_4/MCM-41 \) and (b) \( \text{CD}_4/SBA-15 \) at different temperatures. The relative intensity of the peaks changes significantly with temperature. Separate measurements for empty silica matrices without loading gas at the same temperature range have been conducted, and they confirm that the structures of the matrices are stable and do not change within the temperature range being studied (see Figure S2 in the Supporting Information). Therefore, the intensity changes shown in Figure 2 are solely due to the \( \text{CD}_4 \) gas loaded inside the matrices.

Figure 3a indicates the first-order peak intensity as a function of temperature for both \( \text{CD}_4/MCM-41 \) and \( \text{CD}_4/SBA-15 \). The intensity is normalized to the first-order peak intensity at 295 K for each case and has similar trend for both cases. At high temperature, the first peak intensity increases with decreasing temperature because \( \text{CD}_4 \) molecules are gradually adsorbed into the surface of the pores and form a dense region on the
Table 2. Textural Properties of MCM-41 and SBA-15 Obtained from SANS Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>material</th>
<th>$d_{a,b}$ (Å)</th>
<th>$\rho_{a,b}^{m,\infty}$ (10$^9$ cm$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$R_m^{\infty}$ (Å)</th>
<th>$\sigma^\alpha$ (Å)</th>
<th>$\sigma/R_m$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCM-41</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>3.66 ± 0.009</td>
<td>16.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA-15</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>3.51 ± 0.008</td>
<td>34.0 ± 0.05</td>
<td>7.51 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“The confidence intervals for uncertainties of the fitting parameters represent one standard deviation. $^b$Calculated by $\frac{4d_{m}^{\infty}}{\sqrt{\pi} \rho_{m}^{\infty}}$, where $d_{m}^{\infty}$ is the first-order peak position and fixed as a known parameter during the fitting procedure. Determined by separate contrast variation SANS measurements described in the Supporting Information.”

Figure 2. Temperature-dependent SANS data at pressure $\approx$100 kPa for (a) CD$_4$/MCM-41 and (b) CD$_4$/SBA-15. Error bars represent one standard deviation and are smaller than the symbols.

The region of the surface adsorption is not changed too much with the decreasing temperature even though the amount of gas adsorbed inside this region keeps increasing. If the matrix boundary is set to be $R_m + 2\sigma$, the average adsorbed layer thickness is estimated to be 7 and 9 Å for CD$_4$/MCM-41 and CD$_4$/SBA-15, respectively. The similar layer thickness despite the large difference in the pore size between MCM-41 and SBA-15 indicates that the layer thickness is dominated by the surface properties such as surface roughness and surface chemistry. Since both MCM-41 and SBA-15 matrices are composed of SiO$_2$, the interaction between the pore wall and the CD$_4$ molecules should be similar for both cases. The increase in layer thickness with the decrease of pore size discussed in some literature$^{28-31}$ is not clearly observed in our study.

The existence of the rough surface regions in the studied mesoporous materials changes the gas adsorption properties compared to materials with only smooth pore surfaces. Thus, this brings a challenge when studying the pore size effect on gas adsorption using the volumetric isotherm adsorption in model porous materials where the surfaces were usually assumed to be smooth without any roughness. $^{28,32}$ For example, for N$_2$ adsorption on MCM-41, Qiao et al.$^{29}$ reported that the layer thickness at the relative pressure of 0.2 increases from $\approx$5 Å to $\approx$6 Å if mesopore diameter decreases from 49.2 to 30.4 Å by assuming a smooth surface in the materials. This layer thickness difference is much smaller than the thickness of the surface regions in both cases studied here. If considering the pore outer boundary as $R = R_m + 2\sigma$ and the thickness of pore wall roughness region as $2\sigma$, the thickness of the rough surfaces for MCM-41 and SBA-15 is 5.6 and 15.0 Å, respectively, in our samples. According to our analysis, for SBA-15 (nominal diameter $D_m = 68$ Å) and MCM-41 ($D_m = 32$ Å), the thickness detected in previous study is actually within the surface roughness region. Therefore, even if there is some difference of adsorption layer thickness due to the pore size variation, it is a secondary effect because of the existence of the roughness region of the pore wall. The region of the rough surface extends from $R_m - 2\sigma$ to $R_m + 2\sigma$ (Figure 1c). The total roughness region is at 11 Å < $r$ < 22 Å and at 19 Å < $r$ < 49 Å in the mesopores of MCM-41 and SBA-15, respectively. This is actually quite wide. If the pore outer boundary is at $R = R_m + 2\sigma$, the adsorbed methane layer with thickness $\approx$7 Å covers 15 Å < $r$ < 22 Å in the mesopores of MCM-41, and that with thickness $\approx$9 Å covers 40 Å < $r$ < 49 Å in the mesopores of SBA-15 (Figure 3b). Therefore, for both MCM-41 and SBA-15, the adsorbed layer of methane does not fully cover the surface roughness region before the capillary condensation happens.

When $T < T_c$, we can determine the average density of liquid and solid CD$_4$ confined in the mesopores. Since liquid or solid fills the entire pores, we fix $R_c$ to be zero during the fitting process when $T < T_c$. It should be noticed that in these fittings, there is only one fitting parameter, that is, the scattering length.

pore surface. The intensity drops dramatically for both cases when the gas–liquid condensation happens and CD$_4$ vapor condenses into liquid and fills the entire mesopores. Our results clearly indicate that the condensation temperature ($T_c$) is higher for MCM-41 which has smaller pores than SBA-15. Below $T_c$, the intensity increases again if further decreasing the temperature because the density of liquid CD$_4$ confined in the pores increases and eventually CD$_4$ becomes solid.

The structural parameters of CD$_4$/MCM-41 and CD$_4$/SBA-15 are extracted by fitting the SANS data in Figure 2 using eq 1. The first peak intensity calculated from the extracted parameters giving the best fits is plotted together with the experimental peak intensity in Figure 3a. Figure 3a indicates that our model can reproduce the change of SANS data with the temperature very well. Figure 3b shows the vapor core radius $R_v$ as a function of temperature. $R_v$ decreases slightly with decreasing temperature when $T > T_c$ but roughly maintains as a constant value for both CD$_4$/MCM-41 and CD$_4$/SBA-15. The relative constant value of $R_v$ above $T_c$ for both cases indicates
density of the liquid/solid methane, $\rho_{CD_4}$, in the mesopores (see eq 2). The mass density of confined $CD_4$ can be calculated from the extracted $\rho_{CD_4}$ through the following equation:

$$\rho_{CD_4} = \frac{\rho_{CD_4, mass}}{M_w} \times N_A b, \quad \rho_{CD_4, mass}$$

is the mass density of $CD_4$, $M_w$ is the molecular weight of $CD_4$ (= 20 g/mol), $b$ is the total bound coherent scattering length of one $CD_4$ molecule (= $3.33 \times 10^{-4}$ Å), and $N_A$ is Avogadro’s constant. The mass density of $CD_4$ under confinement of both MCM-41 and SBA-15 extracted from SANS results together with bulk $CD_4$ density at the corresponding temperature at 100 kPa are plotted in Figure 3c. Bulk density of deuterated methane is simply obtained from

$$\rho_{CD_4,mass} = \frac{\rho_{CH_4, mass}}{M_w,CH_4} \times \frac{M_w,CD_4}{M_w,CH_4},$$

where $\rho_{CD_4, mass}$ and $\rho_{CH_4, mass}$ are the mass density of $CD_4$ and $CH_4$, and $M_w,CD_4 = 20$ g/mol and $M_w,CH_4 = 16$ g/mol are molecular weight of $CD_4$ and $CH_4$, respectively. The bulk density of $CD_4$ using the literature results of $CH_4$ is appreciably higher than the density of the $CD_4$ confined in the nanometer-sized pores studied here. If we assume the bulk density as the confined methane density, the calculated scattering intensity is much higher than the measured intensity which can definitely be distinguished by the instrument. Notice that the accuracy of the obtained methane density in MCM-41 and SAB-15 critically depends on the accuracy of the SLD of the matrix. In the Supporting Information, we show that the matrix SLD can be accurately determined by the contrast variation experiments. Therefore, we ensure that the confined methane density in the nanopores in the temperature and pressure conditions studied here is lower than the bulk density even though the difference is not large. Our results are consistent with the calculation from perturbed-chain statistical associating fluid theory (PC-SAFT) coupled with Young–Laplace equation done by Tan and Piri. They showed that $CO_2$ and $n$-pentane densities in confined MCM-41 with radius of 22.0 and 22.9 Å, respectively, are smaller than the corresponding bulk density. It is an interesting finding that density of confined liquid is slightly smaller than density of bulk liquid. For the commonly used volumetric (Sievert’s method) gas adsorption apparatus, the total specific pore volume is obtained by assuming that the condensed gas inside the pores has the molar volume and density of the bulk liquid at the same operational temperature. According to our result, this traditional approach will lead to slight under-estimation of total pore volume of porous materials. Even though our observation was made for the methane in MCM-41 and SBA15, it is still a reasonable speculation that this finding may be generally true for liquid confined in small nanometer-sized pores. Hence, for the liquid phase hydrocarbons in shale rock, about 9% difference of liquid density could be possible. Future works need to be performed to experimentally verify this. In addition, our results seem to indicate that the liquid methane density is smaller in smaller pore as the density in $CD_4$/MCM-41 is smaller than that in $CD_4$/SBA-15. But as the

Figure 3. (a) First-order peak intensity of experimental (solid) and fitting (open) data, (b) vapor core radius ($R_v$), (c) $CD_4$ mass density, and (d) absolute adsorption per volume for SBA-15 (blue square) and MCM-41 (red circle) as a function of temperature. The lines are only guides to the eye, and error bars represent one standard deviation. $CD_4$ pressure is maintained $\approx 100$ kPa.
pore size is so small, it is likely that the surface structure may also play a role here. The detailed reasons still need some future studies.

Figure 3c indicates that in both CD$_4$/MCM-41 and CD$_4$/SBA-15 cases, the density of confined methane increases with the decreasing temperature when $T < T_c$. We notice that the trend of the density change with temperature is different in these two cases. For CD$_4$/SBA-15, the density has a sharp transition at $T \approx 65$ K, below which the density maintains roughly as a constant. A methane liquid–solid transition may take place at this temperature. In contrast, for CD$_4$/MCM-41, the methane density increases continuously with decreasing temperature and eventually reaches a plateau at $T < 30$ K. The mechanism behind these different trends is not clear yet even though it may be related to the pore size effect. Future simulations or theoretical works may help to clarify this phenomenon. Also, we need to be careful to generalize the density difference observed in MCM-41 and SBA-15 to the pure pore size effect. The solid density of methane in small pores depends on many factors, such as the pore size and the surface structure. Especially, due to the finite size, the nucleation growth of solid methane is restricted. Even the diffusion of the methane in pores may play a role as well. Unlike the liquid methane, the diffusion of the solid methane may be very slow. This may make it very slow for a system to reach the equilibrium. A future study is needed to understand the factors affecting the solid methane formation in small pores.

For $T > T_c$, our previous work$^{36}$ showed that the vapor core radius $R_v$ (and therefore the thickness of adsorbed layer) and the density of adsorbed CD$_4$ before the gas–liquid condensation are sometimes coupled together and their absolute values depend on the density profile of solid matrix being used. Therefore, a more reliable parameter is excess adsorption rather than $R_v$ and adsorbed gas density. The specific absolute adsorption $M_{\text{ads}}$, i.e. the absolute adsorption per volume of a single pore, is calculated by

$$M_{\text{ads}} = \int_0^\infty \rho_{\text{CD}_4,\text{gas}}(r)2\pi r dr/CS,$$

where $\rho_{\text{CD}_4,\text{gas}}(r)$ is the gas accessible volume fraction and $CS = \int_0^\infty q_{\text{CD}_4}(r)2\pi r dr$ is the cross section of a mesopore. $M_{\text{ads}}$ versus temperature is plotted in Figure 3d. This adsorption is an indication of the statistically averaged adsorption behavior of all mesopores. Since adsorption is an exothermic reaction, decreasing temperature should increase the amount of gas adsorption as shown in Figure 3d. Interestingly, at $T > T_c$, $M_{\text{ads}}$ is larger for SBA-15 than MCM-41. The larger adsorption amount in the larger pore (SBA-15) found here is different from that predicted from previous grand canonical Monte Carlo (GCMC) simulation and molecular dynamics (MD) simulation. Mosher et al. carried out GCMC simulation on isotherms of methane adsorption in noninterconnected, graphic slit pores with pore size ranging from 4 to 90 Å and found that the smaller pore adsorbs more methane at 298 K and at pressure smaller than 18 000 kPa. Similarly, Zhu and Zhao$^{38}$ did MD simulation on methane isotherm adsorption in carbon nanotubes (CNTs) with diameter from 9 to 32 Å and found that when CNT has diameter larger than 20 Å, smaller CNT has higher methane adsorption below 30 000 kPa. It should be noticed that Figure 3d plots the specific absolute adsorption $M_{\text{ads}}$ of CD$_4$ within “a single mesopore”.

CONCLUSIONS

Temperature-dependent methane gas adsorption in mesoporous silica materials with different pore sizes is studied by small-angle neutron scattering technique. As far as we know, this is the first neutron scattering study of the pore size influence on the temperature-dependent gas adsorption process (close to isobar condition with the methane pressure $\approx100$ kPa). Despite the large pore size difference between MCM-41 (nominal pore radius $R_m$ of 16.5 Å) and SBA-15 ($R_m$ of 34.1 Å), the average adsorption layer thickness at the temperature above the gas–liquid condensation temperature ($T > T_c$) is found to be similar in both samples. The adsorbed layer thickness in the materials is governed mainly by the surface roughness of the pore wall determined by many factors such as the surface defects and surface undulation. The existence of the surface roughness region also indicates that we have to be cautious when understanding the volumetric or gravimetric gas isotherm adsorption curves using the models based on smooth pore surfaces. Not surprisingly, the gas–liquid condensation takes place at a higher temperature for MCM-41 with smaller pores.
than for SBA-15 as the smaller pores tend to condense gas molecules at higher temperatures.

The mass density of methane confined in both MCM-41 and SBA-15 for $T < T_c$ is determined in a wide range of temperatures. The density in confined space is found to be appreciably smaller than the corresponding bulk methane density at similar conditions. With decreasing temperature, the density increases and there is a sharp increase of the methane density in SBA-15 at $T \approx 65$ K, which is likely due to the liquid–solid transition. The methane density becomes almost constant after the temperature is below 65 K. However, this sharp transition of the methane density is not observed in MCM-41 which has a much smaller pore size. Instead, we see a sharp transition of the methane density is not observed in MCM-41 and the density at similar conditions. With decreasing temperature, the density becomes almost a constant value. The difference in liquid density behavior in MCM-41 and SBA-15 is very likely induced by the different pore sizes. The exact mechanisms need to be further investigated in the future.

In most of the porosity measurements using the popular Sieverts method, one of the fundamental assumptions is that when the gas–liquid condensation happens, the liquid density confined in porous materials is the same as the bulk liquid density. However, our experimental results indicate that in nanometer-sized pores, the confined density can be different from the bulk density by an appreciable amount. Therefore, the traditional method may slightly underestimate the available pore volume in a porous material even though the difference is not too big based on our results.

The total adsorption within a single mesopore is determined as a function of temperature. It confirms our previous work that surface roughness plays an important role in the amount of surface adsorption prior to the capillary condensation. Therefore, the surface properties of the pores such as surface roughness and the surface chemistry, rather than the pore size, should be the most essential parameters to determine the total adsorption within the pores in materials with large surface roughness.
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