



Effect of reactor geometry on aqueous ammonia-based carbon dioxide capture in bubble column reactors



Bingtao Zhao^{a,*}, Yaxin Su^b, Yuanchang Peng^a

^a School of Energy and Power Engineering, University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, 516 Jungong Road, Shanghai 200093, China

^b School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Donghua University, 2999 North Renmin Road, Shanghai 201620, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 7 January 2013

Received in revised form 1 May 2013

Accepted 17 June 2013

Available online 9 July 2013

Keywords:

Carbon dioxide

Capture efficiency

Reactor geometry

Liquid height-to-diameter ratio

Aqueous ammonia

Bubble column reactor

ABSTRACT

Capture of carbon dioxide (CO₂) from combustion flue gas by aqueous ammonia has been demonstrated as an effective and promising technology. To examine the effect of reactor geometry on ammonia-based CO₂ capture performance, a series of bubble column reactors with same volume of working liquid but varied geometry (liquid height-to-diameter ratios $H/D = 0.93, 2.04$ and 3.98) were designed to investigate CO₂ capture efficiency with ammonia under different reaction conditions. It is found that reactor geometry characterized by liquid height-to-diameter ratio plays an important role in CO₂ capture efficiency as it is associated with gas holdup time in reactors. CO₂ capture efficiency increases as liquid height-to-diameter ratio increases. Under the same experimental conditions, the maximum CO₂ capture efficiency can increase by up to 7%. Besides, CO₂ capture efficiency has positive correlation with the ammonia concentration and reaction temperature whereas has negative correlation with the CO₂ inlet concentration and flue gas flowrate.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) has been regarded as one of most important greenhouse gases (GHGs) (Georgios and Paul, 2009). Anthropogenic CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel utilization especially from coal combustion make a significant contribution to global CO₂ emission (Pachauri and Reisinger, 2007). Effective capture of CO₂ relates to several factors, e.g., the high concentration (10–20%, v/v) of CO₂ in flue gas, the high flowrate of flue gas, coexisted toxic pollutants such as SO₂, NO_x, HCl and trace metals (Hg, Se, As, etc.). To effectively reduce the post-combustion CO₂ emission, the stable, safe and environmentally acceptable post-combustion CO₂ capture technologies are required besides improving energy efficiency and developing renewable energies (Kannicha and Bouallou, 2007).

Different methods have been intensively investigated for CO₂ capture from combustion flue gas, including chemical or physical adsorption, membranes separation (Mohamed et al., 2008), cryogenics separation (Chris and Hendriks, 1995), etc. Chemical looping combustion (CLC) (Mattisson et al., 2001) and biotechnology (Ho et al., 2011) were also considered as effective ways to reduce CO₂ emission. So far chemical absorption technology seems to be the most suitable technology to reduce CO₂ emission at industrial application level due to its obvious advantages, e.g., high

performance and mature technology (Zhao et al., 2011; Lin and Chen, 2007; Versteeg et al., 1996). The key point of chemical absorption technology lies in the absorbent. Over the past several decades, alcohol amines, including Monoethanolamine (MEA) (Alie et al., 2005; Mamun et al., 2007), diethanolamine (DEA), triethanolamine (TEA) and N-methyldiethanolamine (MDEA) (Aroonwilas and Veawab, 2004; Pacheco et al., 2000), are commonly used as the absorbent. However, they usually suffer the disadvantages of high energy requirement for regeneration, easy oxidization/degradation by SO₂ and O₂ in flue gas and system corrosion (Yan et al., 2006), although they have better technical and economic feasibility than strong alkalines and their salt solutions (e.g., KOH, NaOH and Na₂CO₃). The choice of the cost-effective and high-performance absorbent is still a very open and interesting question. Future research efforts should be directed toward developing better solvents for the removal of CO₂ with high CO₂ loading capacity and low regeneration energy (Wolsky et al., 1994; Resnik et al., 2004). Aqueous ammonia (NH₃·H₂O) was demonstrated to be a very good alternative absorbent (Zhao et al., 2012). Besides the general advantages such as high absorption efficiency, high absorption capacity, low energy requirement for absorbent regeneration and wide distribution of resources (Bai and Yeh, 1997; Yeh and Bai, 1999; Yeh et al., 2005; Niu et al., 2010a, 2010b), aqueous ammonia could simultaneously remove SO₂, NO_x and oxidized mercury. Furthermore, the by-products, amine salts produced during the reaction of ammonia with CO₂, SO₂ and NO_x, can be used as fertilizer for soil improvement. As a promising approach and technology,

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +86 21 55271751; fax: +86 21 55272376.

E-mail addresses: zhaobingtao@usst.edu.cn, zhaobingtao@126.com (B. Zhao).

post-combustion CO₂ capture by aqueous ammonia is receiving increasing attention (Dong et al., 2007; Yeh et al., 2005) and even had pilot scale applications (Kozak et al., 2009; Bollinger et al., 2010).

The understanding of fundamental mechanism of ammonia-based CO₂ capture is critical for its industrial and engineering application. Previously reports particularly focused on NH₃–CO₂ process chemistry and reaction conditions (Zhao et al., 2012). Specifically, the dissolution and absorption of CO₂ into aqueous ammonia is accompanied by a series of complex physicochemical processes which are related to the concentration, temperature, pressure and turbulent conditions (Edwards et al., 1975, 1978; Göppert and Maurer, 1988; Mishima et al., 1989; Bernardis et al., 1989; Kurz et al., 1995; Hassan and Amir, 2005; Pazuki et al., 2006). The major chemical reactions, reaction products and reaction kinetics are listed in Table 1. Actually, CO₂–NH₃–H₂O chemical reaction consists of a series of multi-step and reversible reactions (Brooks and Audrieth, 1946; Hatch and Pigford, 1962; Koutinas et al., 1983; Bai and Yeh, 1997; Yeh and Bai, 1999; Liu et al., 2009). The overall reaction can be simply represented by Eq. (6). According to different analytical methods, it was also demonstrated that NH₄HCO₃ should be the primary reaction product as the forward reaction of CO₂–NH₃–H₂O system is dominant at normal pressure and temperature (Yeh and Bai, 1999). Furthermore, the CO₂–NH₃–H₂O reaction kinetic parameter can be expressed as the form of Arrhenius equation based on the single equation reaction mechanism.

In addition to the process chemistry, it has been demonstrated that ammonia-based CO₂ capture performance was strongly affected by reaction conditions and reactor configurations (Cheng et al., 2006; Versteeg et al., 1996; Alie et al., 2005; Mamun et al., 2007; Aroonwilas and Veawab, 2004; Pacheco et al., 2000). Bubble column reactors (BCR), as one of important compact multiphase reactors with high heat and mass transfer rates and low operation and maintenance costs (Kantarci et al., 2005), has been widely used in a variety of chemical and biochemical gas–liquid reaction systems (Shah et al., 1982; Deckwer and Schumpe, 1993). During the past decades, fundamental researches in bubble column reactors have increased considerably (Kantarci et al., 2005). In spite of the relatively simple geometry, complex multiphase hydrodynamics, transport characteristics and reaction processes make bubble column reactors difficult to achieve accurate and reliable design. Factors including parameters of gas and liquid physicochemical properties, parameters of operating conditions and parameters of geometry and configuration influence the performance of BCR significantly. Bai and Yeh (1997) and Yeh and Bai (1999) investigated

the ammonia-based CO₂ capture in a bubble column reactor. Their results indicated that the maximum CO₂ capture efficiency by aqueous ammonia absorbent was as high as 95% and the CO₂ loading capacity approached to 1.20 g CO₂/g NH₃. Although the CO₂ capture performance in a BCR has been preliminarily examined, the relationship between structural or geometrical parameters of BCR and CO₂ capture performance by aqueous ammonia has not yet been reported.

In the present work, a series of BCRs with same volume of working liquid but varied geometry were designed to examine its effect on CO₂ capture efficiency based on aqueous ammonia method. As the liquid volume in reactor keeps constant, the height of the liquid is inversely proportional to the square of inner diameter of reactor (also diameter of liquid). To characterize the BCR geometry with fixed solvent volume, an important design and structural parameter liquid height-to-diameter ratio (H/D) was used since it is associated with both the reactor shape and gas holdup time (retention time) (Wu et al., 2001). The unsteady and maximum CO₂ capture efficiencies were compared and evaluated under varied reaction conditions, including the ammonia concentration, CO₂ inlet concentration, flue gas flowrate and reaction temperature.

2. Experiment and method

2.1. Experimental setup and conditions

The schematic diagram of the experimental system is illustrated in Fig. 1. Simulated flue gas consisted of varied concentration of CO₂ balanced with N₂ was aerated into the bubble column reactor. The bubble column reactors with bubble size of 1.5 mm were designed with varied geometry (characterized with $H/D=0.93$, 2.04 and 3.98), as shown in Fig. 2. In this test, 200 ml (work volume) aqueous ammonia with varied concentrations was used as solvent contained in reactors. They could be diluted by ammonium hydroxide solutions (analytical reagent, 28%, w/w) to obtain desired ammonia concentrations. Gas flow was adjusted with a gas rotameter. The reaction temperatures were controlled by a constant temperature water bath. Gas washing bottle with sulfuric acid solution and gas dryer were used to prevent the volatilized ammonia and water vapor from entering into the simulated flue gas after reaction, respectively. Finally, CO₂ concentration was measured using the online infrared CO₂ analyzer (GXH-3010E1).

In the experiments, the reaction (operating) parameters including ammonia concentration, CO₂ inlet concentration, total flue gas flowrate and reaction temperature were systematically varied to

Table 1
Process chemistry of NH₃–CO₂ reaction.

Item	Specification	References
Reaction mechanism	Substages: $2\text{NH}_3 + \text{CO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{NH}_2\text{COONH}_4$ (1) $\text{NH}_2\text{COONH}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{NH}_4\text{HCO}_3 + \text{NH}_3$ (2) $\text{NH}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{NH}_4\text{OH}$ (3) $\text{NH}_4\text{HCO}_3 + \text{NH}_4\text{OH} \rightleftharpoons (\text{NH}_4)_2\text{CO}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ (4) $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{CO}_3 + \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons 2\text{NH}_4\text{HCO}_3$ (5) Overall: $\text{NH}_3 + \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{NH}_4\text{HCO}_3$ (6)	Brooks and Audrieth (1946), Hatch and Pigford (1962), Koutinas et al. (1983), Bai and Yeh (1997), Yeh and Bai (1999), Liu et al. (2009)
Reaction products	Early stage: NH_2COO^- Last stage: HCO_3^- Primary product: NH_4HCO_3	Holmes II et al. (1998), Mani (2006), Meng et al. (2005), Zhang et al. (2008), Lin (2008), Park et al. (2008), Zhao et al. (2011)
Reaction kinetics	$\ln K = \ln A - \frac{E_a}{RT}$ (7) where $\ln A = 9.4867 - 25.6278$, $E_a = 26.730 - 48.529$ kJ/mol ($T = 0 - 50^\circ\text{C}$)	Andrew (1954), Pinsen et al. (1956), Hsu (2003), Diao et al. (2004), Rivera-Tinoco and Bouallou (2010)

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8092108>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8092108>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)