#### **SGC**2019 May 13<sup>rd</sup> - 17<sup>th</sup>

# $N^\circ 122 \ / \ OC \ / \ PC$ TOPIC(s) : Clean reactions / Waste valorization

Direct CO2 capture from air - What is the best sorbent?

# AUTHORS

Nazila MASOUD / WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY, BORNSE WEILANDEN 9, WAGENINGEN Guillermo BORDANABA FLORIT / WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY, BORNSE WEILANDEN 9, WAGENINGEN Tomas VAN HAASTERECHT / WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY, BORNSE WEILANDEN 9, WAGENINGEN Harry BITTER / WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY, BORNSE WEILANDEN 9, WAGENINGEN Corresponding author : Harry BITTER / harry.bitter@wur.nl

# PURPOSE OF THE ABSTRACT

The Paris climate agreement pledged to keep global temperature increase below 2°C compared to pre-industrial times. To fulfil that promise, roughly 800 bn tonnes of CO2 must be removed from air by 2100.1 Hence, development of CO2 capture technologies is of prime importance. A first step is to develop suitable sorbents that are able to capture CO2 efficiently, to release it with little energy input, and to sustain its performance for a long time. Carbon supported potassium carbonate is a promising candidate for this, although its performance is still not ideal. It has been reported that supported K2CO3 can match the energy efficiency of the commercially applied liquid phase amines for CO2 capture from flue gas.2 Notably, amines are expensive, corrosive, and have toxicity issues. K2CO3 reversibly reacts with CO2 in the presence of water, in an endothermic reaction at room temperature to produce potassium bicarbonate. The enthalpy of the reverse reaction is only 38 kJ/mol, and full decomposition of the bicarbonate product could be achieved below 150 °C. Hence, the K2CO3 is a green sorbent for CO2 capture from air.

Here we studied the use of K2CO3 as solid sorbent for the capture of CO2 from air. The use of a solid sorbent (instead of e.g., the liquid amines) is beneficial for practical reasons. To make efficient use of K2CO3 it must be dispersed on a support. Carbon based supports were chosen because of their high hydrothermal stability. However the carbons have different structural and chemical properties like different surface area, porosity and surface functionalities. These properties can be tuned, upon production of carbon as support for any specific application.3 However the relation between the carbon properties and their performance, after K2CO3 deposition, is currently unknown.

Here we focused on three different commercial carbon supports: CA1, SX ultra, and Ketjen Black. These carbons are different in their porosity and surface functionalities. CA1 and SX ultra are mainly microporous while Ketjen black is mesoporous. CA1 has polar surface functions with point of zero charge of 2 while SX ultra and Ketjen Black show more apolar surface properties with point of zero charge of 7. Figure 1 shows evolution of H2O, CO and CO2 from CA1 support upon heat treatment up to 800°C indicating presence of acidic groups while such groups are not present on SX ultra and Ketjen Black supports. Figure 2 shows a breakthrough curve of CO2 using K2CO3 supported on these supports. Only Ketjen Black induced fast sorption kinetics and displayed a high CO2 uptake capacity of the sorbent. Hence, the support affected the performance of K2CO3 via different mechanisms. These will be discussed in more detail in conference contribution.

# **FIGURES**





# FIGURE 1

Functional groups evolved from different supports upon heat treatment.

Different supports (50 mg) were heated (10°C/min) under flow of He (20 mL/min). Evolved gases were detected by online mass spectrometer.

#### FIGURE 2

CO2 breakthrough curves during capture from air. The air passed down-flow through different sorbents (16 wt% K2CO3 on CA1 and 10 wt% K2CO3 on SX ultra and Ketjen Black, 50 mg), at 60°C, air flow 50 mL/min, water content: 3 wt% (vapor generated at 25°C).

# **KEYWORDS**

CO2 capture from air | solid sorbent | carbon supports | potassium carbonate

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] N. Mac Dowell, P.S. Fennell, N. Shah, G.C. Maitland, Nature Climate Change 2017, 7 (4), 243.

[2] N.N.H. Meis, A.M. Frey, J.H. Bitter, K.P. de Jong, Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research 2013, 52 (36), 12812.

[3] B. Donoeva, N. Masoud, P.E. de Jongh, ACS Catalysis 2017, 7 (7), 4581.