Minerals Engineering 85 (2016) 55-65

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Minerals Engineering

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/mineng

Copper extraction from chalcopyrite: Comparison of three non-sulfate oxidants, hypochlorous acid, sodium chlorate and potassium nitrate, with ferric sulfate

D.W. Shiers*, D.M. Collinson, N.J. Kelly, H.R. Watling

CSIRO-Chile International Centre of Excellence for Mineral Processing, CSIRO Mineral Resources, PO Box 7229, Karawara, W.A. 6152, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 24 July 2015 Revised 20 October 2015 Accepted 25 October 2015 Available online 30 October 2015

Keywords: Chalcopyrite Hypochlorous acid Chlorate Nitrate

ABSTRACT

Three oxidants, hypochlorous acid, chlorate and nitrate, were assessed for their ability to oxidise chalcopyrite (CuFeS₂). Hypochlorous acid was the most aggressive oxidant trialled, with copper extraction reaching a plateau after 1–5 h. Extraction in this system was complete at room temperature when reagent concentrations of 0.3–0.4 M were supplied. Optimal conditions utilising chlorate as an oxidant measured final extractions of 66–72% after 168 h. Optimal conditions utilising nitrate enabled a final extraction of 92% in systems using milled ore. Gangue dissolution in the presence of each oxidant varied. The system utilising nitrate resulted in comparatively high levels of magnesium and aluminium extraction, 28% and 32%, respectively. The chlorate system, over an identical time period and similar solution pH, had magnesium and aluminium extractions of 7% and 6%. These data, together with those for silicon dissolution, are indicative of incongruent silicate dissolution. Iron extraction data indicated that ferric hydroxy-oxide precipitates formed during leaching in both nitrate and chlorate systems. All systems tested offered improved rates of copper extraction relative to systems utilising ferric sulfate as an oxidant.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The overall limitations of the poor dissolution kinetics of chalcopyrite in ferric sulfate systems (with or without microorganisms – catalysts) drives the search for innovative ways to increase dissolution kinetics using different oxidants, different temperatures, controlled redox leaching, and pre-treatment of concentrates or ores. The purpose of this study is to describe copper extraction at atmospheric pressure in sulfate-free or minimal-sulfate media with selected oxidants other than ferric sulfate. The use of chalcopyrite concentrate for most tests permits comparisons of leaching rates in systems largely free of gangue minerals that might react with test reagents and obscure the targeted results.

The most commonly employed hydrometallurgical process for the oxidation of chalcopyrite and extraction of copper is the sulfuric acid–ferric sulfate system. Reactions (1)–(3) are the generally accepted reactions for the extraction of copper from chalcopyrite via oxidation (oxygen, ferric ions) or acid (H₂SO₄) leaching. It is the system of choice for bioleaching processes at atmospheric pressure, including stirred tank technologies for concentrates (Batty

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: Denis.Shiers@csiro.au (D.W. Shiers). and Rorke, 2006) and heap or dump technologies for low-grade ores (Watling, 2006). However, whether chemical or bio-assisted chemical leaching is undertaken, the oxidation of chalcopyrite is slow and incomplete, even if grains are exposed to solution.

 $CuFeS_2 + 2Fe_2(SO_4)_3 = CuSO_4 + 5FeSO_4 + 2S^0 \tag{1}$

 $CuFeS_2 + O_2 + 2H_2SO_4 = CuSO_4 + FeSO_4 + 2S^0 + 2H_2O \tag{2}$

$$4FeSO_4 + 2H_2SO_4 + O_2 = 2Fe_2(SO_4)_3 + 2H_2O$$
(3)

The slow dissolution kinetics are thought to be consequences of the mineral crystalline structure and changes therein (Klauber, 2003; de Oliveira et al., 2012), or the formation of insoluble secondary reaction products (elemental sulfur, ferric hydroxysulfates or polysulfides) on chalcopyrite surfaces (Klauber, 2008). In summary, from a survey of the literature (Watling, 2013), dissolution rates are:

- proportional to CuFeS₂ surface area, strongly influenced by grain size and possibly influenced by crystal orientation of the surface exposed to the oxidant/lixiviant,
- independent of acid concentration as long as there is sufficient to keep ferric ions in solution,





MINERALS ENGINEERING

- slightly dependent on Fe³⁺ concentrations but inhibited by increased sulfate ion concentrations,
- faster at mid-range oxidation-reduction potential (ORP) than at high ORP,
- enhanced in the presence of iron(II) oxidising *Bacteria* and *Archaea*, and
- strongly dependent on temperature in the range 25–100 °C at atmospheric pressure.

There have been numerous studies aimed at overcoming the slow dissolution kinetics, the vast majority employing chalcopyrite concentrate regardless of the intended material to be treated in the final process. The present study was focused on the use of alternative oxidants for the dissolution of chalcopyrite in mildly acidic conditions at atmospheric pressure. Background information for the study was obtained during the preparation of two substantive reviews of chalcopyrite oxidative dissolution (Watling, 2013, 2014). Noting that the passivation of chalcopyrite has commonly been attributed to three 'sulfur-containing' compounds (elemental sulfur, ferric hydroxysulfates or polysulfides), non-sulfate oxidising systems were chosen for the study. Rationalising that an alternative oxidant would need to be readily available commercially, the three oxidants selected for study were:

- (i) nitrate-based; sodium nitrate (NaNO₃) is a mineral product of Chile;
- (ii) chlorate-based; NaClO₃ is used extensively in the paper industry for making chlorine dioxide; and
- (iii) hypochlorous acid-based (HClO), readily prepared by acidifying household bleach with HCl.

The selected alternative oxidants all have higher reduction potentials than ferric ion (Table 1). The literature pertaining to the use of each of these oxidants tested was reviewed recently (Watling, 2013, 2014). In brief, the benefits of using sodium nitrate were recognised more than 130 years ago (Stetefeldt, 1883) and a variety of processes have been proposed since then for application to *in situ*, dump and heap leaching as well as pressure leaching of copper sulfides, mainly using sulfuric acid (e.g., Sokić et al., 2009, 2010; Vračar et al., 2003). These authors provided comprehensive accounts of the chemistry of the systems tested. For CuFeS₂, the reactions (4)–(7) with various stoichiometries were thought to occur (Sokić et al., 2010, 2014).

$$3CuFeS_{2} + 4NaNO_{3} + 8H_{2}SO_{4} \rightarrow 3CuSO_{4} + 3FeSO_{4}$$
$$+ 2Na_{2}SO_{4} + 6S^{0} + 4NO + 8H_{2}O \qquad (4)$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Cures}_{2} + 4\text{NaNO}_{3} + 4\text{H}_{2}\text{SO}_{4} \rightarrow \text{CusO}_{4} + \text{PeSO}_{4} + 2\text{Na}_{2}\text{SO}_{4} \\ + 2\text{S}^{0} + 4\text{NO}_{2} + 4\text{H}_{2}\text{O} \end{array} \tag{5}$$

$$6CuFeS_2 + 10NaNO_3 + 20H_2SO_4 \ \rightarrow \ 6CuSO_4 + 3Fe_2(SO_4)_3$$

$$+5Na_2SO_4 + 12S^0 + 10NO + 20H_2O$$
(6)

$$\begin{split} & 2 CuFeS_2 + 10 NaNO_3 + 10 H_2 SO_4 \ \rightarrow \ 2 CuSO_4 + Fe_2(SO_4)_3 \\ & + 5 Na_2 SO_4 + 4S^0 + 10 NO_2 + 10 H_2 O \end{split} \label{eq:eq:expansion} \tag{7}$$

The strong oxidising power of NaClO₃ has been exploited mainly in the uranium industry (Edwards and Oliver, 2000) but was proposed as one of several possible oxidants for use in the production of other metals. Both the NaClO₃–H₂SO₄ and NaClO₃–HCl systems have been applied to the dissolution of CuFeS₂ (Kariuki et al., 2009; Xian et al., 2012). In the context of the present study on CuFeS₂ dissolution, Kariuki et al. (2009) studied CuFeS₂ leaching in sealed vessels in a sulfuric acid solution. They mixed chalcopyrite concentrate with up to NaClO₃ and then added H₂SO₄ (solution composition 0.9 M NaClO₃, 0.1 M H₂SO₄; pH ~0.7). The results showed that CuFeS₂ oxidation (reaction (8)) increased with

Table 1

Selected oxidants tested on chalcopyrite, half reactions and standard reduction potentials (Lide, 2008).

Oxidant	Half reaction	Standard reduction potential (<i>E</i> ⁰) (V)
Ferric ion	$Fe^{3+} + e^{-} \leftrightarrows Fe^{2+}$	0.771
Nitrate	$NO_3^- + 4H^+ + 3e^- \rightarrow NO + 2H_2O$	0.957
Chlorate	$\begin{array}{c} ClO_3^- + 6H^+ + 5e^- \rightarrow 3H_2O + 0.5Cl_2 \\ ClO_3^- + 6H^+ + 6e^- \rightarrow 3H_2O + Cl^- \end{array}$	1.470 1.451
Hypochlorous acid	$\begin{array}{l} HClO+H^++e^-\rightarrow 0.5Cl_2+H_2O\\ HClO+H^++2e^-\rightarrow Cl^-+H_2O \end{array}$	1.611 1.482

© 2015 CSIRO. All Rights Reserved.

increased temperature in the range 45–100 °C. Assuming a stoichiometric reaction, the end result would be a solution containing 0.9 M Cl[−], sufficient to contribute to enhanced Cu extraction through the stabilisation of iron and copper complex ions but at a higher pH than the conditions of Carneiro and Leão (2007).

$$6CuFeS_2 + 17NaClO_3 + 3H_2SO_4$$

$$\rightarrow 3Fe_2(SO_4)_3 + 6CuSO_4 + 17NaCl + 3H_2O$$
(8)

The presence of NaClO₃ was also reported to enhance the dissolution of CuFeS₂ in HCl solutions (Xian et al., 2012). At 45 °C, copper extractions after 5 h in solutions of 0.5 M and 1 M NaClO₃ in 1 M HCl were 45% and 65%, respectively (Xian et al., 2012). The leaching rate accelerated with increased HCl concentration up to 1.5 M. In addition to chlorate ion, the reaction products ferric chloride and gaseous Cl₂ (detected by odour during leaching; reaction (9)) could also have oxidised CuFeS₂, but the stoichiometry of the reaction products indicated that the gaseous Cl₂ was more likely to have been volatilised. Surface area (grain size) was an important parameter in the study by Xian et al. (2012).

$$NaClO_3 + 6HCl \rightarrow 3Cl_2 + NaCl + 3H_2O$$
(9)

The application of aqueous hypochlorous acid to the oxidative dissolution of CuFeS₂ and other sulfide minerals is part of a reaction continuum from acid to alkaline conditions. Potential processes at low temperature and atmospheric pressure utilising hypochlorite anion in alkaline solutions (e.g., Garlapalli et al., 2010), hypochlorous acid in mildly acidic solutions (e.g., Ikiz et al., 2006) and aqueous chlorine in acidic solutions (e.g., Park et al., 2009) have been described. CuFeS₂ and other copper sulfides are amenable to one or more of these treatments. The advantages of using mildly acidic solutions are the extremely strong oxidative capacity, the selectivity towards sulfide minerals over gangue minerals and the minor extent of gangue mineral acid consumption. The hypochlorous acid leach, conducted at pH 4-6, beyond the stability zone of Fe^{3+} , follows reactions (10) and/or (11). At the slightly more acidic pH where hypochlorous acid decomposes to Cl₂, the leach loses selectivity, causing iron to be solubilised as well as the copper (reaction (12)). Gaseous reagent loss is a disadvantage of the hypochlorous acid system, requiring the use of closed reactors.

$$2CuFeS_2 + 11HOCI \rightarrow 2Cu^{2+} + Fe_2O_3 + 2SO_4^{2-} + 2S + 11CI^- + 11H^+$$
(10)

$$2CuFeS_{2} + 17HOCI + 2H_{2}O \rightarrow 2Cu^{2+} + Fe_{2}O_{3} + 4SO_{4}^{-} + 21H^{+} + 17CI$$
(11)
$$2CuFeS_{2} + 17CI_{2} + 16H_{2}O \rightarrow 2CuCI_{2} + 2FeCI_{2} + 4H_{2}SO_{4} + 24HCI$$

$$ures_2 + 17Cl_2 + 10H_2O \rightarrow 2CuCl_2 + 2reCl_3 + 4H_2SO_4 + 24HCl$$
(12)

Given that ferric ions in acidic solutions are the most commonly applied system for sulfide dissolution, comparative data pertaining to ferric ion as oxidant were also obtained using the experimental apparatus and conditions. Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/232898

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/232898

Daneshyari.com