# Preparation of low-temperature sintered UO<sub>2</sub> nanomaterials by radiolytic reduction of ammonium uranyl tricarbonate



Yongming Wang, Qingde Chen<sup>\*</sup>, Xinghai Shen<sup>\*\*</sup>

Beijing National Laboratory for Molecular Sciences, Fundamental Science on Radiochemistry and Radiation Chemistry Laboratory, College of Chemistry and Molecular Engineering, Peking University, Beijing 100871, PR China

## HIGHLIGHTS

•  $UO_2$  nanoparticles were synthesized by the radiolytic reduction of  $(NH_4)_4UO_2(CO_3)_3$  with high efficiency.

• The as-prepared  $UO_2$  nanoparticles were stable in the irradiated mother solution exposed to air atmosphere.

• UO<sub>2</sub>powders could be sintered at 450–600 °C in vacuum, much lower than that in traditional process.

### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 29 March 2016 Received in revised form 1 July 2016 Accepted 4 July 2016 Available online 7 July 2016

Keywords: UO<sub>2</sub> Nanoparticles Ammonium uranyl tricarbonate (AUC) Nuclear fuels γ-irradiation

# ABSTRACT

 $UO_2$  nanoparticles were successfully obtained from ammonium uranyl tricarbonate with high efficiency by  $\gamma$ -irradiation. More importantly, the as-prepared nanoparticles were stable in the irradiated mother solution exposed to air atmosphere. The purified  $UO_2$  powders could be sintered at 450–600 °C, much lower than the reported values (above 1700 °C) of bulk  $UO_2$ . These advantages made this method promising in the production of  $UO_2$  nuclear fuels.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

In the past half-century, many methods were developed to improve the performance of UO<sub>2</sub>, one of the most important nuclear fuels. However, there are still several intractable problems, especially the sintering temperature as high as 1700 °C or more [1,2]. In the literature, two- and three-step sintering processes at 1100–1500 °C favored the production of high density UO<sub>2</sub> fuel pellets [3,4]. Therefore, it is fascinating to explore novel methods to prepare UO<sub>2</sub> which can be sintered at relatively low temperature.

With the development of nanoscience and nanotechnology, some new techniques were employed to prepare uranium oxide nanoparticles and nanostructures. Wu et al. [5] first prepared nearly monodispersed  $UO_2$  nanocrystals using organic thermal

decomposition method and proposed the application of  $UO_2$  nanocrystals in the fields of nuclear fuel fabrication and catalysis. This inspired an enthusiasm greatly in the preparation of uranium oxide nanoparticles and nanostructures. So far, quasi-spherical  $UO_2$  nanoparticles [5-9], flower-like  $U_3O_8$  nanostructures [10],  $U_3O_8$  nanorods [6,9],  $U_3O_8$  nanotubes [11], and hierarchical uranium oxides nano-/microspheres [10,11] were obtained by thermochemical and electrochemical methods. Furthermore, it was verified that some nano-sized uranium oxide particles exhibited a much better catalytic performance than their bulk materials [6,10,12,13].

Among the numerous methods of preparing nanoparticles, ionizing irradiation (such as  $\gamma$ -irradiation, electron beam irradiation and so on) is powerful, since it can conveniently produce a series of species with tunable redox potentials to reduce metal ions in a wide temperature range [14,15]. In the preparation of uranium-containing nanoparticles, this method also played an important role [16–19]. Roth and coworkers [16] first synthesized UO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles *via* ionizing irradiation. Nenoff et al. [17] also

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: qdchen@pku.edu.cn (Q. Chen), xshen@pku.edu.cn (X. Shen).

obtained UO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles by a similar method, and directly observed their sintering in the range of 500-600 °C, much lower than the reported values of bulk UO2 (above 1700 °C) on a transmission electron microscopy (TEM) with an in situ heating stage. However, the subsequent work of Rath and collaborators [18] indicated that most of the UO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles prepared by radiolytic method could be oxidized in air atmosphere and dissolved in the solution again in a short time (e.g., 8 h). This made it much difficult for the application of radiolytic method in fabricating nuclear fuels. To the best of our knowledge, in the method, almost all UO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles were synthesized from UO<sub>2</sub>(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> in acidic solution. Because bulk UO<sub>2</sub> could be dissolved in HNO<sub>3</sub> slowly but not in ammonia, alkali and carbonate solutions [20-22], it worth exploring in basic condition. In addition, for their existing form of sol in the irradiated mother liquor, the as-prepared UO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles have a large surface area and a high surface energy, which may make them much active in their reaction with oxygen. From this point of view, a suitable aggregation may improve the stability of UO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles.

In the last decade, we tried our best to control the radiolytic syntheses of nanoparticles and nanostructures. Mesoporous BaSO<sub>4</sub> microspheres [23], octahedron Cu<sub>2</sub>O nanocrystals [24], solid and hollow Cu<sub>2</sub>O nanocubes [25], and prismatic PbSO<sub>4</sub> microcrystals [26] were successfully synthesized. In the present work, stable UO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles are prepared by the radiolytic reduction of alkaline  $(NH_4)_4UO_2(CO_3)_3$ , which is a very important material in the production of UO<sub>2</sub> nuclear fuels industry. Then, the sintering properties are further investigated.

## 2. Experimental

 $UO_2(NO_3)_2 \cdot 6H_2O$  (G.R., Chemapol, Prague Czechoslovakia), HCOONH<sub>4</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub>HCO<sub>3</sub>, and Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> were of A.R. grade and were used without further purification. Ultrapure water was used throughout the experiments.

Ammonium uranyl tricarbonate (AUC) crystal was prepared according to Ref. [27].  $UO_2(NO_3)_2 \cdot 6H_2O$  was heated in a muffle furnace at 350 °C for 3 h, then an orange-yellow powder was obtained. The saturated NH<sub>4</sub>HCO<sub>3</sub> solution was added slowly into a flask containing the orange-yellow powder with constant stirring at 60 °C until a yellow and clear solution was formed. When the solution cooled to room temperature, yellow AUC was precipitated from the solution. The result of elemental analysis was identical with the theoretical value. Elemental analysis: calcd (%) for (NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>4</sub> [ $UO_2(CO_3)_3$ ] ( $M_r = 522.21$ ): C 6.90, H 3.09, N 10.73; found (%): C 6.87, H 3.09, N 10.70.

A solution containing 20 mmol L<sup>-1</sup> AUC, 100 mmol L<sup>-1</sup> HCOONH<sub>4</sub>, and 60 mmol L<sup>-1</sup> Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> was prepared, where Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> was used as stabilizer. After bubbling with ultrapure N<sub>2</sub> for 20 min, the solution at room temperature was irradiated in the Gamma Irradiation Facility of Peking University using <sup>60</sup>Co  $\gamma$ -ray source for a fixed time at a special location whose dose rate was determined by a ferrous sulfate dosimeter. The pH values of the solution before and after irradiation, black precipitates were obtained. The deposition efficiency (*E*<sub>d</sub>) and the apparent *G* value (*G*<sub>app</sub>)[28] were calculated as follows:

$$E_d = \frac{c_0 - c_{end}}{c_0} \times 100\% \tag{1}$$

$$G_{app} = 9.647 \times 10^6 \times \frac{c_0 - c_{end}}{D \cdot \rho}$$
(2)

where  $c_0$  and  $c_{end}$  (mol·L<sup>-1</sup>) are the concentrations of uranium in

the mother solution before and after irradiation, *D* (Gy) is the absorbed dose, and  $\rho$  (g·cm<sup>-3</sup>) is the density of solution.

The black precipitates were collected by low-speed centrifugation immediately and thoroughly washed by water, dried in a vacuum oven overnight at room temperature, and then black powders were achieved. The well washed powders were dispersed in water, and were dropped onto a carbon-coated copper grid. After the solvent was evaporated at room temperature, transmission electron microscopy (TEM) images were carried out on a FEI Tacnai G2 T20 microscope operated at 200 kV. Scanning electron spectroscopy (SEM) images were obtained by a FEI nanoSEM 430 scanning electron microscope operated at 10 kV. In addition, after the dispersed sample was deposited on a piece of glass, the powder X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns were recorded on a Rigaku Dmax-2000 diffractometer with Cu K $\alpha$  radiation ( $\lambda = 0.15418$  nm) and the average size of nanoparticles were calculated by Scherrer's formula based on the most strength (111) diffraction peak. DSC was measured on Q600 SDT TGA-DSC-DTA analyzer with temperatureprogramming 10 K/min in N2 atmosphere. The concentration of U(VI) in the solution was analyzed on an Inductively Coupled Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometer (ICP-AES, Leeman, USA). Thermal treatment experiments in vacuum were conducted on a tube furnace for 100 min.

#### 3. Results and discussion

Fig. 1 exhibits the effect of the absorbed dose on the deposition efficiency of uranium and the apparent *G* value at a fixed dose rates of 160 Gy min<sup>-1</sup>. With an increase in the absorbed dose, the deposition efficiency increases obviously, while the apparent *G* value decreases due to the decrease of uranium concentration. At an absorbed dose of 150 kGy, the deposition efficiency reaches 99.7%. Furthermore, *via* fixing the absorbed dose at 150 kGy and altering dose rate in the range of 20–267 Gy min<sup>-1</sup>, it was found that the deposition efficiency was not affected significantly. Therefore, the absorbed dose of 150 kGy and the dose rate of 160 Gy min<sup>-1</sup> were applied in the following investigation.

Fig. 2A shows the SEM image of the as-prepared precipitate, it can be seen that the precipitate consists of quasi-spherical nanoparticles with a diameter of 50–200 nm. The corresponding TEM image (Fig. 2B) shows that the margin of the particles is quite coarse. So we speculate that they are composed of some smaller nanoparticles. In the related XRD pattern (curve a, Fig. 3), besides a broad peak at *ca.* 20° coming from the scattering of glass, four broaden (111), (200), (220) and (311) diffraction peaks



Fig. 1. Effect of absorbed dose on the deposition efficiency of uranium and the apparent G values. Dose rate: 160 Gy min<sup>-1</sup>.



Fig. 2. SEM (A, C and D) and TEM (B) images of the products before (A and B) and after (C and D) thermal treatment in vacuum. Thermal treatment temperature: (C) 450 °C, (D) 600 °C.

corresponding to cubic phase  $UO_2$  (JCPDS file No. 41-1422) are observed. This indicates the formation of cubic phase  $UO_2$ . Moreover, based on the (111) diffraction peak, the average size is estimated to be about 5 nm by using Scherrer's formula, confirming our speculation based on the TEM image.

In our experiment, when the aqueous solution was irradiated by  $\gamma$ -rays, the water molecules absorbed most of the irradiation energy and generated many reactive species, such as hydrated electrons ( $e_{aq}^{-}$ ),  $\cdot$ H and  $\cdot$ OH and so on (Eq. (3))[29].

$$H_2O \xrightarrow{\text{irradiated}} e_{aq}^-, \quad H, \quad OH, H_2, H_2O_2, H_3O^+ \dots$$
(3)

. . . .



Fig. 3. XRD patterns of the products before (a) and after (b–d) thermal treatment in vacuum. Thermal treatment temperature: (a) as-prepared, (b) 400 °C, (c) 450 °C, (d) 600 °C.

Then the oxidative  $\cdot$ OH and the reductive  $\cdot$ H were eliminated by HCOO<sup>-</sup> with the rate constants of 3.2  $\times$  10<sup>9</sup> and 2.1  $\times$  10<sup>8</sup> L mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, respectively (Eq. (4))[29].

$$HCOO^{-} + OH(\cdot H) \rightarrow CO_{2}^{-} + H_{2}O(H_{2})$$
(4)

The reducing species, e.g.,  $e_{aq}^-$  and possible  $\cdot CO_2^-$ , reduced the precursors  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$  ions to U(IV) ions. Whereafter,  $U(OH)_4$  was generated in the basic aqueous solution, which was transformed to  $UO_2$  via dehydration (Eq. (5)).

$$UO_{2}(CO_{3})_{3}^{4-} \xrightarrow{e_{aq}^{-}} U(IV) \xrightarrow{OH^{-}} U(OH)_{4} \xrightarrow{-H_{2}O} UO_{2}(s)$$
(5)

It may be the low solubility of U(OH)<sub>4</sub> (pK<sub>sp</sub> = 52) [21] that leads to its quick precipitation, the formation of nanoparticles and the follow-up aggregates. Besides, part of nanoparticles exists in the form of sol. The sol could be destroyed by salts (*i.e.*, Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> and HCOONH<sub>4</sub>), favoring the aggregation of nanoparticles.

Fig. 4 is the DSC spectrum of the as-prepared UO<sub>2</sub> powders. As seen, there is a weak peak at ca. 440 °C, which may correspond to the melting of some UO2 nanoparticles. With respect to the appearance of the broad peak, it may suggest the existence of a few impurities (such as U(IV) hydroxide). Thus, three thermal treatment experiments in vacuum were performed at 400, 450, and 600 °C, respectively. The XRD analyses of the heat-treated products (curves b, c and d, Fig. 3) indicate that they are all cubic phase UO<sub>2</sub> (JCPDS file no. 41-1422). Besides, the XRD pattern of the product treated at 400 °C (curve c, Fig. 3) does not change obviously as compared with that of the product directly synthesized by  $\gamma$ -rays (curve a, Fig. 3). Moreover, the average size of nanoparticles is estimated to be 5 nm, close to that before thermal treatment. When the heat-treatment temperature increases to 450 °C, the diffraction peaks become sharp, and there appear (222), (400), (331), and (420) diffraction peaks corresponding to cubic phase UO<sub>2</sub> (curve c, Fig. 3), and the average size of nanoparticles increases to ca. 13 nm. As the heattreatment temperature increases to 600 °C, the peaks in the XRD spectrum of the product (curve d, Fig. 3) are further sharpened, and the average size of nanoparticles increases to ca. 35 nm. This rep-

studies, CrystEngComm 13 (2011) 2878–2889, http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/ c0ce00666a.

- [11] L. Wang, R. Zhao, C.Z. Wang, L.Y. Yuan, Z.J. Gu, C.L. Xiao, S.A. Wang, X.W. Wang, Y.L. Zhao, Z.F. Chai, W.Q. Shi, Template-free synthesis and mechanistic study of porous three-dimensional hierarchical uranium-containing and uranium oxide microspheres, Chem. -Eur. J. 20 (2014) 12655–12662, http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1002/chem.201403724.
- [12] G.J. Hutchings, C.S. Heneghan, I.D. Hudson, S.H. Taylor, Uranium-oxide-based catalysts for the destruction of volatile chloro-organic compounds, Nature 384 (1996) 341–343, http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/384341a0.
- [13] H. Madhavaram, H. Idriss, Evidence of furan formation from ethanol over β-UO<sub>3</sub>, J. Catal. 184 (1999) 553–556, http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jcat.1999.2453.
- [14] J. Belloni, Nucleation, growth and properties of nanoclusters studied by radiation chemistry - application to catalysis, Catal. Today 113 (2006) 141–156, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2005.11.082.
- [15] Q.D. Chen, X.H. Shen, H.C. Gao, Radiolytic syntheses of nanoparticles in supramolecular assemblies, Adv. Colloid Interface Sci. 159 (2010) 32–44, http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cis.2010.05.002.
- [16] O. Roth, H. Hasselberg, M. Jonsson, Radiation chemical synthesis and characterization of UO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles, J. Nucl. Mater 383 (2009) 231–236, http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2008.09.026.
- [17] T.M. Nenoff, B.W. Jacobs, D.B. Robinson, P.P. Provencio, J. Huang, S. Ferreira, D.J. Hanson, Synthesis and low temperature in situ sintering of uranium oxide nanoparticles, Chem. Mater 23 (2011) 5185–5190, http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ cm2020669.
- [19] T.M. Nenoff, S.R. Ferriera, J. Huang, D.J. Hanson, Formation of uranium based

nanoparticles via  $\gamma\text{-irradiation},$  J. Nucl. Mater 442 (2013) 162–167, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2013.08.027.

na4ous

/rriera1(Jourm-con44.5(H.0233 on9,-413.3r(n334.4((