ZnO/SiO2 Composite as Catalyst for the Transformation of
Glycerol to Glycerol Carbonate

Yuni Krisyuningsih Krisnandi
Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Mathematics and Science, Universitas Indonesia, Depok 16424 Indonesia, yuni.krisnandi@sci.ui.ac.id

Reinhard Eckelt
Leibniz Institut für Katalyse, LIKAT, Albert-Einstein-Str. 29 a, 18059 Rostock, Germany

Hanan Atia
Leibniz Institut für Katalyse, LIKAT, Albert-Einstein-Str. 29 a, 18059 Rostock, Germany

Martin Adam
Leibniz Institut für Katalyse, LIKAT, Albert-Einstein-Str. 29 a, 18059 Rostock, Germany

Indah Revita Saragi
Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Mathematics and Science, Universitas Indonesia, Depok 16424 Indonesia

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/science

Recommended Citation
Krisnandi, Yuni Krisyuningsih; Eckelt, Reinhard; Atia, Hanan; Adam, Martin; Saragi, Indah Revita; Martin, Andreas; and Richter, Manfred (2020) "ZnO/SiO2 Composite as Catalyst for the Transformation of Glycerol to Glycerol Carbonate," Makara Journal of Science: Vol. 24 : Iss. 1 , Article 6.
DOI: 10.7454/mss.v24i1.10741
Available at: https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/science/vol24/iss1/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Universitas Indonesia at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Makara Journal of Science by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.
ZnO/SiO2 Composite as Catalyst for the Transformation of Glycerol to Glycerol Carbonate

Cover Page Footnote
Financial support from the Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture of the State Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (Germany) and LIKAT and UI Cluster Research Grant 2015 is gratefully acknowledged.

Authors
Yuni Krisyuningsih Krisnandi, Reinhard Eckelt, Hanan Atia, Martin Adam, Indah Revita Saragi, Andreas Martin, and Manfred Richter

This article is available in Makara Journal of Science: https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/science/vol24/iss1/6
ZnO/SiO$_2$ Composite as Catalyst for the Transformation of Glycerol to Glycerol Carbonate

Yuni Krisyuningsih Krisnandi$^1$, Reinhard Eckelt$^2$, Hanan Atia$^2$, Martin Adam$^2$, Indah Revita Saragi$^1$, Andreas Martin$^2$, and Manfred Richter$^2$

1. Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Mathematics and Science, Universitas Indonesia, Depok 16424 Indonesia
2. Leibniz Institut für Katalyse, LIKAT, Albert-Einstein-Str. 29 a, 18059 Rostock, Germany

*E-mail: yuni.krisnandi@sci.ui.ac.id

Received March 15, 2019 | Accepted December 19, 2019

Abstract

Zinc oxide/porous silica (ZnO/SiO$_2$) composite was used as a catalyst to transform glycerol to glycerol carbonate (GC), a chemical intermediate and monomer for the synthesis of new functionalized polymers. The ZnO/SiO$_2$ catalyst was prepared using the direct precipitation method by mixing zinc sulfate solution with Aerosil 300 silica suspension and adding potassium oxalate solution. Catalytic transformation used glycerol and urea (molar ratio = 1:1) at 140 °C, 40 mbar, and various reaction times (1–6 h). The ZnO catalyst exhibited a high percentage of glycerol conversion of 82.38%; however, the yield of GC and selectivity toward GC were relatively low (i.e., 33.33% and 40.46%, respectively). The presence of silica support (ZnO/(x)SiO$_2$ increased the selectivity toward GC and yield of GC to 74.40% to 77.83% and 57.86% to 64.30%, respectively. Furthermore, although its crystallinity decreased, the reused ZnO/(60)SiO$_2$ catalyst still exhibited a high activity. The scanning transmission electron microscopy image indicated the migration of ZnO on the surface of the composite and the possibility of ZnO-glycolate formation, which were also confirmed by FTIR measurement. Nevertheless, these results showed that ZnO/SiO$_2$ is a promising catalyst for the transformation of glycerol to GC.
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Introduction

For more than a decade, many research groups have attempted to increase the value of crude glycerol (typically containing 85% glycerol, water, and residual ester products) obtained from biodiesel production. Corma et al. [1] reviewed possible reaction routes for the utilization of glycerol as a starting material for various more valuable compounds. Some of the routes are etherification of glycerol to diglycerol and polyglycerols [1–5], oxidation of glycerol to dihydroxyacetone, dehydration of glycerol to acrolein [6,7], and preparation of glycerol carbonate (GC) [8–13].

GC is a chemical intermediate and monomer that could be used to synthesize new functionalized polymers with possible exciting applications. Magniont et al. [14] reported that, by incorporating GC into an alternative binder composed of hydraulic lime and metakaolin, new properties, such as rapid hardening, improved compressive strength, and less shrinkage, are achieved in an innovative pozzolanic matrix. Another example of new GC-derived material is glycerylic cyclocarbonic fatty acid esters, which, by promoting superhydrophilicity, could act as a surfactant and an antimicrobial [15].

Many research groups have reported the transformation of glycerol to GC using various catalysts, sources of carbonyl groups, and reaction conditions [14–17]. Carbonylation of glycerol with ethylene carbonate in supercritical carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) in the presence of zeolites and Amberlyst A26 (OH$^-$ and HCO$_3^-$ forms of ion exchange resins) resulted in a low percentage of glycerol conversion of <25% [14]. The preparation of GC using urea as the carbonyl source and catalyst with Lewis acid sites associated with sulfonate groups of the polystyrene matrix was shown to be a more feasible route [18,19], exhibiting GC molar yields of 61% to 83% based on glycerol. Yoo et al. [16] reported that the use of heterogeneous mesoporous zinc sulfate as a catalyst for the glycerol–urea reaction exhibited a good molar yield of 86%. Aresta et al. [17] investigated the role of catalyst, solvent, and reaction condition in the carboxylation of glycerol to GC using CO$_2$. They also reported the synthesis of GC via a reaction between glycerol and urea [17]. Lipase-catalyzed synthesis of
GC through transesterification of glycerol and dimethyl carbonate was also reported [20]. Climent et al. reported the synthesis of GC by transesterification and carboxylation using urea and hydrotalcite catalysts [21]. Wang et al. [22] reported the use of a series of lanthanum oxides as solid base catalysts for the synthesis of GC from the same starting materials. In summary, heterogeneous catalysts for the synthesis of GC from glycerol and urea (the reaction mechanism is shown in Figure 1) has drawn considerable attention particularly because both starting materials are abundant and inexpensive. In addition, the reaction step could be extended to the fixation of CO₂ because ammonia reacts with CO₂ to produce urea [17]. Therefore, this reaction mechanism has made the transformation of glycerol more attractive.

Zinc compounds, such as ZnSO₄ and Zn-doped ZSM-5, were previously compared with various metallic compounds, including gold-doped ZSM-5, as catalysts in the glycerol–urea reaction [20], whereby the gold catalysts showed superior activity during GC production. In this work, zinc oxide/porous silica (ZnO/SiO₂) composite was proposed to be an inexpensive catalyst to substitute for gold or rare earth composites for the transformation of glycerol to GC. Various solid-state characterization techniques were utilized to obtain comprehensive information about ZnO/(x)SiO₂, such as morphology, phase, and interaction of the composite with the reactants and products during the reaction. The effects of the addition of silica support, reaction time, and variation in reaction conditions on glycerol conversion (X₆GC₆), molar yield (Y₆GC₆), and selectivity toward GC (S₆GC₆) will also be discussed.

**Experimental**

**Materials.** Zinc sulfate, ZnSO₄·7H₂O p.a. (Merck), potassium oxalate (K₂C₃O₄·H₂O) ≥ 99.9% (Sigma-Aldrich), SiO₂ Aerosil 300, glycerol (Acros), urea (Merck), and GC (TCI) were used directly without further purification.

**Catalyst preparation.** ZnO material was prepared using the direct precipitation method. Typically, 5.75 g ZnSO₄ was dissolved in 30 mL distilled water under constant stirring. At the same time, 3.685 g K₂C₃O₄ was dissolved separately in 30 mL distilled water. Then, the potassium oxalate solution was added to the zinc sulfate solution under vigorous stirring for another 30 min. Subsequently, the mixture was left to stand until the white precipitate of ZnC₂O₄ was observed. Finally, the product was filtered, washed with distilled water, dried at 100 °C, and calcined at 400 °C to obtain the white powder of ZnO.

ZnO/SiO₂ composite was prepared using a similar method. Prior to the addition of potassium oxalate solution at room temperature, silica suspension (Aerosil 300 with various wt%) was added to the warm ZnSO₄ solution (60 °C) under vigorous stirring for 30 min. The resulting zinc oxide/silica composites were labeled as ZnO/(x)SiO₂, in which x corresponds to the wt% of the loaded SiO₂. For the catalytic tests, the powdered catalysts were pelletized to obtain particle sizes between 315 µm and 710 µm.

**Catalyst characterization.** ZnO and ZnO/(x)SiO₂ catalysts were characterized using nitrogen adsorption BET, ICP-MS, XRD, XRF, XPS, and TEM. Surface areas and pore volumes were determined from the nitrogen adsorption isotherms at −196 °C using an ASAP 2010M characterization unit (Micromeritics). Samples were outgassed at 400 °C for 2 h under vacuum. Then, the surface area was calculated using the BET equation. Elemental analysis was conducted by ICP-OES on an OPTIMA 3000 XL spectrometer (Perkin-Elmer). The required dissolution of solids was achieved using aqua regia solution under a pressure of 8 bar according to standard routines. XRD measurements were conducted using a STADI P (STOE) setup with transmission geometry and a Ge primary monochromator with Cu Kα1 radiation. The XRD patterns were scanned in the 2θ range of 5–60 (step width = 0.58, 100 s/step) and recorded with a position-sensitive detector. The crystallite size of ZnO was determined using the Debye–Scherrer equation. Scanning transmission electron microscopy using high-angle annular dark field (STEM-HAADF) and annular bright field (STEM-ABF) were conducted with an aberration-corrected (in STEM mode, CESCOR, CEOS) microscope (JEM-ARM200F, JEOL) equipped with a 50 mm² Si(Li) detector (JED-2300, JEOL) for EDX analysis. For STEM-HAADF investiga-

![Figure 1. Reaction Mechanism of Heterogeneous Catalysis for Glycerol Carbonate (GC) Synthesis Using Glycerol and Urea as Starting Materials](image-url)
tion, convergence angles of 30–36 mrad and an estimated spot size of 0.14 nm were used. The collection semi-angles were 90–170 mrad. For STEM-ABF investigation, the collection angle was 17 mrad with beam stopper to exclude the primary beam. The samples were prepared on a holey carbon-supported Cu or Ni grid (mesh 300) without any pretreatment.

Catalyst test and analysis. The synthesis of GC was performed following the reaction mechanism shown in Figure 1. Glycerol (typical amount of 46 g, 0.5 mol) was added to a round-bottom flask (100 mL), followed by the desired amount of urea (typical molar ratio of glycerol/urea was 1:1, unless stated in the experiment). The catalyst was added after the glycerol–urea mixture was homogeneous. Note that the amount of the catalyst was varied to keep the amount of ZnO the same for all reactions. The reaction was conducted at 140 °C, approximately 40 mbar, and various reaction times (1–6 h). The produced ammonia was pumped out under reduced pressure. The reaction products were identified and analyzed using a gas chromatograph with flame ionization detector equipped with a Chrompack FFAP 25 m × 0.32 mm × 0.3 µm column. GC from TCI was used as the reference and standard for calibration. Prior to GC measurement, the sample was diluted in distilled water to make a 1% solution.

Results and Discussion

Catalyst characterization. Powdered ZnO catalyst was prepared according to the direct precipitation method based on the metathesis reaction, followed by calcination, as shown in Equations 1 and 2:

\[
2\text{ZnSO}_4\cdot7\text{H}_2\text{O}(s) + K_2\text{C}_2\text{O}_4\cdot\text{H}_2\text{O}(s) \rightarrow 2\text{ZnC}_2\text{O}_4(s) + 2\text{K}^+(aq) + 2\text{SO}_4^{2-}(aq) + 15\text{H}_2\text{O}(l), \tag{1}
\]

\[
\text{ZnC}_2\text{O}_4(s) + \frac{1}{2}\text{O}_2(g) \rightarrow \text{ZnO(s)} + 2\text{CO}_2(g). \tag{2}
\]

The as-prepared zinc oxalate, ZnC₂O₄, after being subjected to calcination at 400°C, was transformed to ZnO as the oxalic anion was decomposed into CO₂. This finding is similar to that reported by Mu et al. [23], in which oxalate from ZnC₂O₄ started to decompose at 320 °C and completely transformed to ZnO at 380 °C. In addition, the SO₄²⁻ anion was removed during filtration and washed with distilled water before calcination.

Figure 2 shows the XRD patterns of ZnO/(x wt%)SiO₂. The ZnO particles have a wurtzite structure (hexagonal phase, space group P6₃.mc), which is similar to the pattern reported for nanosized ZnO powder [24]. All of the diffraction peaks were attributed to the hexagonal-phase ZnO, as reported in the JCPDS card (No. 36-1451; a = 0.3249 nm, c = 0.5206 nm) [25]. The results indicate that the products consisted of pure phases and that the ZnSO₄ phase did not appear. Diffraction peaks related to the impurities were not observed in the XRD pattern, confirming the high purity of the synthesized product. The SiO₂ of Aerosil 300 only exhibited a broad pattern of the amorphous phase of silica, as reported by Guerfi et al. [26]. The intensity of ZnO peaks first decreased with the increase in the amount of silica support, i.e., from 30% to 50%, and then slightly increased at 60% SiO₂. The crystallite sizes of ZnO and ZnO/(x)SiO₂ catalysts, which were determined using the Scherrer equation, were in the range of 10–14 nm.
Physicochemical analysis of the catalyst. Table 1 shows the physicochemical properties of the as-prepared ZnO and ZnO/(x)SiO\(_2\) catalysts. The ICP elemental analysis shown in Table 1 indicates the decrease in Zn concentration and increase in Si concentration in the composite. The actual content of ZnO in the ZnO/(x)SiO\(_2\) composites did not significantly differ from the intended amount. However, the amount of SiO\(_2\) support in each composite was always lower than expected, which could be attributed to the loss of some of the SiO\(_2\) support during preparation as Aerosil 300 consists of particularly fine particles. Accordingly, the specific surface area of ZnO/(x)SiO\(_2\) increased with the increase in the amount of SiO\(_2\) support. Furthermore, the adsorption–desorption isotherms of ZnO and ZnO/(x)SiO\(_2\) composites (Figure 3) show the increase in porosity of the materials after the addition of Aerosil 300 to the system. This trend was expected when ZnO was dispersed in the finely powdered Aerosil 300. Well-dispersed ZnO in the SiO\(_2\) system was also observed through STEM (see Figure 4).

STEM measurement. Figure 4 shows the electron microscopy investigation of the fresh ZnO/(60)SiO\(_2\) catalyst. Notably, the ZnO particles (dark image) comprised two groups of different particle sizes, i.e., small crystals in the range of 5–10 nm (Figure 4b) and large crystals in the range of 20–50 nm (Figure 4c). The composite structure was visible in the STEM-ABF image (Figure 4d). The image contrast in the STEM-HAADF, EDX analysis (Figure 5), and XRD (Figure 2) revealed the crystals to be ZnO. SiO\(_2\) exhibited an amorphous gel structure and was homogeneously distributed in the sample. Furthermore, no predominant attachment of silica to the ZnO crystals was detected. Figure 5 shows the EDX analysis of both fresh and used catalysts.

Table 1. Physicochemical Properties of the As-prepared ZnO and ZnO/(x)SiO\(_2\) Catalysts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst name</th>
<th>SBET [m(^2)/g]</th>
<th>Average pore diameter [nm]</th>
<th>Pore volume [cm(^3)/g]</th>
<th>Weight percent (ICP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZnO</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZnO/(70)SiO(_2)</td>
<td>154.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZnO/(60)SiO(_2)</td>
<td>128.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZnO/(50)SiO(_2)</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZnO/(30)SiO(_2)</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZnO/(60)SiO(_2) after the reaction</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Adsorption–desorption Isotherms of the ZnO/(x)SiO\(_2\) Composites
spectra were recorded from an area with no carbon film to exclude the resulting C signal. Figure 5a shows the STEM-HAADF image of the ZnO crystals of the fresh catalyst. The corresponding EDX spectra are marked as 1 and 2. The Cu and Ni signals arose from the TEM grids. Zn and O signals indicated a ZnO composition. In Figure 5b, a dark-field image of the used catalyst is shown. The corresponding spectrum 3 was taken from a ZnO crystal, whereas spectrum 4 was taken from the smaller morphologies shown in Figure 4b. Spectrum 4 shows a distinct carbon peak in comparison with spectrum 3 and the fresh sample (1 + 2). This distinct carbon peak might be the remainder of Zn (glycerol) after electron beam damage.

Figure 4. STEM Images of the Fresh ZnO/(60)SiO₂ Catalyst. (a) Dark-field Image of the Two Particle Sizes, (b) Bright-field Image of ZnO Crystals of 5–10 nm, (c) Dark-field Image of ZnO Crystals of 20–50 nm, and (d) Bright-field Image of ZnO Crystals and Silica

Figure 5. STEM-HAADF Images of (a) Fresh and (b) Used ZnO/(60)SiO₂ Catalysts and (c) the Corresponding EDX Analysis

Figure 6. Chromatogram of Products from the Reaction between Glycerol and Urea Using ZnO/(40)SiO₂ Catalyst. Reaction Conditions: Glycerol/Urea Molar Ratio = 1:1, P = 30 mbar, T = 140 °C, t = 6 h
ZnO was observed to be active during the reaction. Figure 7 shows the results. \(X_{\text{Glycerol}}\) was high (82.38%), but \(S_{\text{GC}}\) and \(Y_{\text{GC}}\) were low (40.46% and 33.33%, respectively). By contrast, when ZnO/(x)SiO2 catalysts were used, not only \(X_{\text{Glycerol}}\) but also \(S_{\text{GC}}\) and \(Y_{\text{GC}}\) increased with the increase in the amount of silica support. This finding indicates that the presence of silica support enhanced the activity of the ZnO catalyst, which can be attributed to a better distribution of the active ZnO sites in ZnO/(x)SiO2, such as in ZnO/(60)SiO2. Thus, the interaction between ZnO catalyst with glycerol and urea was augmented resulting in increased yield and selectivity.

Meanwhile, Hammond et al. [27] reported that the deposition of Zn, Ga, and Au onto ZSM-5 by precipitation resulted in the enhancement of GC yield, with the degree of promotion following the order: Au > Ga > Zn. The Zn-doped ZSM-5 exhibited a lower yield (<25%) than all ZnO/(x)SiO2 composites in our experiment. ZSM-5 is zeolite with MFI structure, which has well-ordered pores and channels [28] and some levels of activity [29]. By contrast, Aerosil 300 has an amorphous structure, as indicated by its XRD pattern; thus, its interaction with the glycerol–urea mixture was insignificant. The characterization results showed that ZnO/(60)SiO2 had the highest crystallinity and the largest surface area; its \(S_{\text{GC}}\) and \(Y_{\text{GC}}\) were also slightly higher. Therefore, ZnO/(60)SiO2 was used for further experiments and was the focus of discussion in this paper.

**Variation of reaction time.** To obtain the optimum reaction time, four different experiments using ZnO/(60)SiO2 catalyst were conducted for 1, 2, 4, and 6 h. In general, a longer reaction time results in a higher glycerol conversion and yield, as shown in Figure 8. By contrast, the percentage of selectivity toward GC (\(S_{\text{GC}}\)) increased when the reaction time was extended from 1 h to 2 h. When the reaction time was longer than 2 h, the percentage of glycerol conversion (\(X_{\text{Glycerol}}\)) and the percentage of selectivity toward GC (\(S_{\text{GC}}\)) were in the range of 45.8% to 45.80% and 69.67% to 77.83%, respectively. However, the percentage of GC yield (\(Y_{\text{GC}}\)) steadily increased and reached its highest value of 64.30% after 6 h. Although reactions with longer reaction times were not conducted, it could be expected that \(S_{\text{GC}}\) will not increase significantly. In addition, given that the reaction was performed in batches, unwanted side products, such as thick charcoal, could form when the reaction time was longer than 6 h. A similar phenomenon was observed in the dimerization reaction of glycerol in the presence of Cs-loaded zeolite catalysts [3].

**Variation of catalyst types and conditions.** Figure 9 summarizes the results of the experiments using various catalyst types and conditions. When the glycerol–urea mixture was subjected to reaction conditions without catalyst (labeled as the blank experiment), glycerol conversion still occurred (\(X_{\text{Glycerol}} = 64.80\%\)) but with a low \(Y_{\text{GC}}\) and \(S_{\text{GC}}\) (16.16% and 24.93%, respectively). The presence of Aerosil 300 silica in the reaction mixture caused the decrease in glycerol conversion (51.06%) but a slight increase in \(Y_{\text{GC}}\) and \(S_{\text{GC}}\) (23.58% and 44.23%, respectively). This is evidence that Aerosil 300 has a low activity toward the reaction of the glycerol–urea mixture to produce GC.

Glycerol conversion increased by 10% (from 82.61% to 92.26%) when the amount of ZnO/(60)SiO2 catalyst was doubled. However, \(Y_{\text{GC}}\) and \(S_{\text{GC}}\) decreased by nearly half (from 64.30% to 45.56% and from 77.83% to 49.39%, respectively).

---

**Figure 7. Results of the Reaction of Glycerol with Urea in the Presence of ZnO/(60)SiO2 Catalyst as a Function of SiO2 Content. Reaction Conditions: Glycerol/Urea Molar Ratio = 1:1, \(P = 30\) mbar, \(T = 140^\circ\text{C}\), \(t = 6\) h**

**Figure 8. Results of the Reaction between Glycerol and Urea in the Presence of ZnO/(60)SiO2 as a Function of Reaction Time. Reaction Conditions: Glycerol/Urea Molar Ratio = 1:1, \(P = 30\) mbar, \(T = 140^\circ\text{C}\)**
respectively). This finding could be attributed to excess catalyst causing further reactions to produce unwanted side products. The best catalytic performance was observed when the ratio of urea/glycerol was changed to 1.2 and the amount of the ZnO/(60)SiO2 catalyst was maintained at 1.8 wt%, where $X_{GC}$, $Y_{GC}$, and $S_{GC}$ reached more than 90%. This finding indicates the completion of the reaction in terms of glycerol concentration.

The effects of pressure and the use of nitrogen gas to remove the produced ammonia (NH3) were also investigated. It is expected that nitrogen purging would induce ammonia removal and result in higher $S_{GC}$ [30]. However, as shown in Figure 8, the conversion was lower than expected during the reaction without nitrogen purging. Furthermore, $Y_{GC}$ and $S_{GC}$ were similarly reduced, which could be attributed to product removal because of additional nitrogen purging. This result indicated that N2 purging was unnecessary when the reaction was conducted at low pressure with continuous vacuum pumping. Reuse of the ZnO/(60)SiO2 catalyst for several cycles was also investigated. Notably, the catalyst was still active, and the conversion was similar to those obtained in the reaction with fresh ZnO/(60)SiO2 catalyst. In addition, the yield and selectivity toward GC were slightly higher. The characterization of the used catalyst showed

![Figure 9. Comparison of Glycerol Conversion ($X_{Glycerol}$), Yield ($Y_{GC}$), and Selectivity Toward GC ($S_{GC}$) Obtained from Various Reaction Conditions](image)

![Figure 10. XRD Patterns of ZnO/(60)SiO2](image)
that the Zn and Si contents were unchanged (as determined by ICP-MS, shown in Table 1). However, the XRD pattern of the used ZnO/(60)SiO₂ catalyst had lower peak intensities than the fresh catalyst, although the peaks of ZnO were still present (Figure 10). This finding indicates that the ZnO crystals had lost most of its crystallinity during the reaction of GC and exhibited more defects in the structure that could provide more active sites to the used ZnO/(60)SiO₂ catalyst. Figure 11 shows the STEM images of the used catalyst. Notably, ZnO was leaching from the composite (Figure 11c). However, overall, the morphology of the used ZnO/(60)SiO₂ catalyst was still similar to that of the fresh catalyst.

**Conclusion**

Heterogeneous catalytic reaction of the transformation of glycerol to GC using ZnO/(x)SiO₂ composite and urea as catalysts was successfully conducted. The selectivity toward GC and yield of GC were improved in the presence of porous SiO₂ as support, which was higher than those obtained using only ZnO catalyst. The higher the SiO₂ Aerosil content is, the better the values of glycerol conversion, GC yield, and selectivity toward GC.
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