

# **Remarks on adsorbent surface barrier to adsorbate mass transport**

**As the author passed away while this paper was undergoing peer review, the revisions suggested have been implemented by Timothy C. Golden, Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., Allentown, USA**

# **Shivaji Sircar<sup>1</sup>**

Received: 12 December 2019 / Revised: 6 February 2020 / Accepted: 7 April 2020 / Published online: 9 July 2020 © Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2020

#### **Abstract**

The existence of a skin resistance for adsorbate mass transport at the surface of a pelletized adsorbent particle or at the surface of adsorbent crystals within a particle has been proven by many macroscopic and microscopic experiments. An isothermal and isobaric column dynamic test method may be used to approximately estimate the relative magnitude of the skin resistance.

**Keywords** Surface barrier · Zeolites · Mass transfer · LiLSX

# **1 Introduction**

The potential of existence of a surface barrier (skin resistance) for adsorbate mass transport at the surface of an adsorbent particle is well documented in the literature. The barrier may exist at the surface of (a) a pelletized adsorbent (amorphous or crystalline) particle (with or without a binder), and (b) the individual crystals within an adsorbent particle. Several instances of visible surface barrier of type (a) in pelletized extruded and beaded, abrasion-resistant zeolites have been reported by using scanning electron microscopes (Ogawa et al. [1983;](#page-2-0) Kumar and Sircar [1986;](#page-2-1) Moran et al. [2018\)](#page-2-2). Formation of microscopically invisible surface barriers of type (b) have been reported on various types of zeolite crystals by PFG NMR study (Vasenkov et al. [2001\)](#page-3-0); interference microscopy (Kortunov et al. [2004](#page-2-3)); oscillating microbalance and IR micro imaging (Zhang et al. [2009\)](#page-3-1); thermal frequency response method (Bourdin et al. [1996](#page-2-4)); zero length chromatography (Teixeira et al. [2013\)](#page-2-5): etc. micro imaging technique has also revealed that the surface barriers on the individual crystals of a zeolite can be diferent (micro diversity), even though the shape and size of the crystals

are similar (Saint Remi et al. [2016](#page-2-6)). Such a distribution is known to lead to problems on discriminating the existence of surface barriers by "bulk" techniques, which are applied to assemblages of crystals/particles—rather than to a particular crystal/particle (as a unique property of microimaging). For circumventing this problem, Brandani et al. have introduced the so-called "partial loading technique" (Brandani et al. [1995\)](#page-2-7). This technique makes use of the characteristic diferences in the molecular distribution inside the crystal/particle for difusion and barrier limitation, which are predominantly afected by the mean value (rather than by the distribution) of the surface resistances. Such diferences become, as a matter of course, immediately visible in micro-imaging experiments with the individual crystals/ particles (Chmelik et al. [2009\)](#page-2-8).

Analysis of adsorbate uptake curves measured by various gravimetric methods using a transport model, which incorporates both intra crystalline difusion and surface barrier at the crystal surface, also provide direct quantifcation of surface barriers at the crystal surfaces (Gao et al. [2019](#page-2-9)). Interestingly, the traditionally observed large diference between the difusivity of a gas measured by a macroscopic method (gravimetric or volumetric) and that measured by a microscopic method (NMR pulsed feld gradient) is now explained in terms of the presence of a surface barrier (Ruthven [2012\)](#page-2-10). Thus, the existence of a surface barrier is well proven. Consequently, it is important to know the magnitude

 $\boxtimes$  Shivaji Sircar sircar@aol.com

 $1$  Department of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18105, USA

of the surface barrier resistance (if any) for design of an adsorptive separation process.

Approximate values of the surface barrier resistances for adsorption of pure  $N_2$ ,  $O_2$ , and Ar into small particles of pelletized LiLSX zeolite were recently reported (Wu et al. [2014](#page-3-2), [2015](#page-3-3)). Information on this adsorbate-adsorbent combination is practically useful for design of a PSA process for air separation (Sircar and Myers [2003\)](#page-2-11) The protocol used to estimate the surface barrier resistance consisted of (i) measuring the isothermal–isobaric column break-through data at pressure P and temperature T for a pure adsorbate in the Henry's law region displacing pure non-adsorbing helium at P and T in a column packed with the adsorbent pellets, (ii) estimating an overall, effective mass transfer co-efficient  $(k_e, s^{-1})$  for an adsorbate at P and T using the assumptions that (a) a constant pattern mass transfer zone is formed in the column, and (b) the linear driving force (LDF) model can describe the efective gas to adsorption site mass transfer of the adsorbate, and fnally, (iii) subtracting out the contributions of various other series resistances in the transport path ofered by the external flm, the macropore, the micropore, as well as the resistance equivalence created by the axial dispersion in the packed column (Wu et al. [2014\)](#page-3-2). The following resistances in series model, which is justifed when the adsorbate has a linear adsorption isotherm (Henry's law region), was used (Wu et al. [2014](#page-3-2); Ruthven [1984](#page-2-12)):

$$
\frac{1}{k_{sk}} = \frac{1}{k_e} - \left[ \frac{1}{k_{ax}} + \frac{1}{k_M} + \frac{1}{k_m} + \frac{1}{k_f} \right]
$$
(1)

where  $k_{sk}$ ,  $k_{ax}$ ,  $k_M$ ,  $k_m$  and  $k_f$  are, respectively, the effective mass transfer coefficients  $(s^{-1})$  for the surface skin [type (a), type (b), or combination], the axial dispersion of the adsorbate in the inter-particle gas phase in the packed column, the adsorbent macropores, the adsorbent micropores, and the external gas flm around the particles.

Published models (Ruthven [1984](#page-2-12)) were used for the evaluation of the individual mass transfer coefficients listed inside the parenthesis on the right-hand side of Eq. [1.](#page-1-0) Clearly, the estimation of  $k_{sk}$  depends on the accuracy and reliability of these models (Ackley [2019](#page-2-13)). For example, the possible uncertainty in model estimation of  $k_M$  is discussed elsewhere (Rama Rao and Sircar [2017](#page-2-14)).

A popular correlation for estimation of  $k_{ax}$  is given below (Ruthven [1984\)](#page-2-12).

$$
\frac{1}{k_{ax}} = \frac{D_L K (1 - \epsilon)}{\epsilon V^2}
$$
 (2)

where  $D_L$  (cm<sup>2</sup>/s) is the effective axial dispersion coefficient for the pure adsorbate in the packed column at P and T, The variable K is the dimensionless Henry's law constant for the adsorbate at T, the parameter  $\varepsilon$  (cm<sup>3</sup>/cm<sup>3</sup>) is the inter -particle void fraction in the packed column and V (cm/s) is

the linear velocity of the gas through the external void space in the column. Equation [2](#page-1-1) shows that the effective resistance to adsorbate mass transfer due to axial dispersion  $(1/k_{\alpha}x)$ is directly proportional to  $D<sub>L</sub>$ . In other words, a smaller  $D<sub>L</sub>$ (larger  $k_{ax}$ ) is preferable for an efficient adsorptive separation process design.

## **2** Model estimation of  $D_{\mu}$

A vast body of literature exists on dispersion in packed beds (Delgado [2006](#page-2-15)). A simple empirical model which is frequently-used for practical purposes is given below (Ruthven [1984\)](#page-2-12):

<span id="page-1-2"></span>
$$
D_L = \gamma_1 D_m + \gamma_2 V d_p; \quad \frac{1}{P_e} = \left[ \gamma_2 + \frac{\gamma_1 D_m}{V d_p} \right]
$$
(3)

where  $D_m$  (cm<sup>2</sup>/s) is the molecular diffusivity of a pure adsorbate gas at P and T, and  $d_p$  (cm) is the diameter of the particle in the packed column. The dimensionless group  $P_e$ [  $= P_e$  [=  $V d_p / D_l$ ] is the Peclet number. The variables  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are empirical constants. It is generally accepted that  $\gamma_1$  is equal to 0.7 (Ruthven [1984](#page-2-12)). On the other hand, Langer et al. [\(1978\)](#page-2-16) correlated experimental data from various authors to observe that the limiting value of  $P_e (= P_e^{\infty})$  when V is very large, is approximately (a) equal to 2 when  $d_p > 0.3$  cm and (b) proportional to  $d_p$  ( $P_e^{\infty} = 6.67 d_p$ ) in the region where 0  $\leq d_n \leq 0.3$  cm. It then follows from Eq. [3](#page-1-2) that  $\gamma_2 = 0.5$  when  $d_p$  > 0.3 cm and  $\gamma_2 = 0.15/d_p$  when  $0 \le d_p \le 0.3$  cm. Thus:

<span id="page-1-3"></span><span id="page-1-0"></span>
$$
D_L = 0.7D_m + 0.5V d_p \text{ for } d_p > 0.3 \text{ cm}
$$
 (4)

<span id="page-1-4"></span>
$$
D_L = 0.7D_m + 0.15V \text{ for } d_p \le 0.3 \text{ cm}
$$
 (5)

Equations [2](#page-1-1) and [4](#page-1-3) indicate that  $D_L$  increases and  $k_{ax}$ decreases with increasing  $d_p$  when  $d_p \geq 0.3$  cm, while Eqs. [2](#page-1-1) and [5](#page-1-4) indicate that both  $D_l$ and  $k_{ax}$  are independent of  $d_p$  when  $d_p < 0.3$  cm.

<span id="page-1-1"></span>No clear physical explanation can be found for the observed linear dependence of  $P_e^{\infty}$  on  $d_p$  when  $d_p \le 0.3$  cm. In particular, the consequential lack of dependence of  $D_L$ on  $d_p$  is strange and awkward. Agglomeration (cluster formation) of small particles, aggravated channeling, gas maldistribution in column, etc. have been cited as possible reasons (Langer et al. [1978;](#page-2-16) Ruthven [1984](#page-2-12)). These effects depend on the nature and compactness of the packing in the column, particle size and shape distribution, vessel design, etc. which may be difficult to reproduce in experiments and nearly impossible to model reliably. Thus, estimation of  $D_L$  or  $k_{ax}$  using Eqs. [2](#page-1-1) and [5](#page-1-4) may be uncertain.

# **3 Sample calculation of**  $k_{av}$

It was reported earlier that the efective skin resistance  $(1/k<sub>sk</sub>)$  for adsorption of pure O<sub>2</sub> in the Henry's law region into small zeolite particles of LiLSX ( $d_p = 0.0525$  cm) at  $P = 2.0$  atm and  $T = 303.1$  K was  $\sim 62\%$  of the overall resistance  $(1/k<sub>e</sub>)$  for mass transport (Table I, Wu et al. [2014](#page-3-2)). The details of the column size and the experimental conditions can be found elsewhere (Wu et al. [2014\)](#page-3-2). Equation [4](#page-1-3) was chosen over Eq. [5](#page-1-4) to estimate  $D<sub>L</sub>$  even though  $d<sub>p</sub>$  was less than 0.3 cm, for the reasons given earlier. An additional support for selection of Eq. [4](#page-1-3) was provided by Edwards and Richardson ([1968](#page-2-17)) who reported the following empirical expression to describe experimentally measured values of  $D_L$  for particles diameters  $(d_p)$  ranging between 0.0377 and 0.60 cm and Reynolds number (Re) ranging between 0.008 and 50:

$$
D_L = 0.73D_m + \frac{0.5V d_p}{1 + 9.7D_m/V d_p} \tag{6}
$$

The relative values of  $D<sub>L</sub>$  for axial dispersion of  $O<sub>2</sub>$  in He calculated by Eqs. [4](#page-1-3) and [6](#page-2-18) were comparable in magnitude, being respectively,  $\sim 0.41$  and 0.28 cm<sup>2</sup>/s under the relevant conditions (P=2.0 atm, T=303.1 K,  $d_p = 0.0525$  cm, V = 6.0 cm/s,  $Re \sim 1.5$ ). On the other hand, the corresponding value of  $D_L$  estimated by Eq. [5](#page-1-4) was  $\sim 1.16$  cm<sup>2</sup>/s which was  $\sim$  2.8 times larger than that estimated by Eq. [4](#page-1-3).

Nonetheless, it can be shown that the skin resistance would still be  $\sim$  35% of the overall resistance if Eq. [5](#page-1-4) was chosen for estimation of  $D<sub>L</sub>$ . Thus, the skin resistance for this system was not negligible as suggested by Moran et al. [2018\)](#page-2-2) even when Eq. [5](#page-1-4) was used for the estimation of  $D<sub>L</sub>$ . It was also suggested by the same authors that a large skin resistance should be visible in a SEM picture. That, of course depends on how thick the type (a) skin is. A high skin resistance can be exhibited by a very thin skin depending on the imperviousness of the skin. A type (b) skin, on the other hand, cannot be seen by a microscope.

#### **4 Summary**

The existence of a skin resistance for adsorbate mass transport at the surface of a pelletized adsorbent particle or at the surface of the adsorbent crystals within a particle has been proven by many macroscopic and microscopic experiments. An isobaric–isothermal column dynamic test method may be used for approximate estimation of the magnitude of the skin resistance for transport of a pure gas into an adsorbent particle in the Henry's law region. A protocol for data analysis is described. The skin resistance is extracted from the experimentally measured over-all transport resistance by subtracting out the contributions of other resistances in the path of transport, which are estimated using standard models published in the literature. Thus, the goodness of these individual models may be important.

It is reconfrmed that a substantial skin resistance exists for adsorption of  $O_2$  into small particles of LiLSX zeolite even when extreme models for estimation of the coefficient of axial dispersion of  $O<sub>2</sub>$  in packed columns are used.

#### **References**

- <span id="page-2-13"></span>Ackley, M.D.: Medical oxygen concentrator: a review of progress in air separation technology. Adsorption **213**, 235–245 (2019)
- <span id="page-2-4"></span>Bourdin, V., Grenier, Ph, Meunier, F., Sun, L.M.: Thermal frequency response method for the study of mass transfer kinetics in adsorbents. AIChE J. **42**, 700 (1996)
- <span id="page-2-7"></span>Brandani, S., Hufton, J., Ruthven, D.: Self-difusion of propane and propylene in 5A and 13X zeolite crystals studied by the tracer ZLC method. Zeolites **15**(7), 624 (1995)
- <span id="page-2-18"></span><span id="page-2-8"></span>Chmelik, C., Heinke, L., Kortunov, P., Li, J., Olson, D., Tzoulaki, D., Weitkamp, J., Kärger, J.: Ensemble measurement of difusion: novel beauty and evidence. ChemPhysChem **10**, 2623 (2009)
- <span id="page-2-15"></span>Delgado, J.M.P.Q.: A critical review of dispersion in packed bed. Heat Mass Transfer **42**, 229 (2006)
- <span id="page-2-17"></span>Edwards, M.F., Richardson, J.F.: Gas dispersion in packed beds. Chem. Eng. Sci. **23**, 109 (1968)
- <span id="page-2-9"></span>Gao, M., Li, H., Yang, M., Gao, S., Wu, P., Tian, P., Xu, S., Ye, M., Liu, Z.: Direct quantifcation of surface barriers for mass transport in nano-porous crystalline materials. Commun. Chem. **2**, 43 (2019)
- <span id="page-2-3"></span>Kortunov, P., Vasenkov, S., Chemlik, C., Karger, J., Ruthven, D.M., Wloch, J.: Infuence of defects on the external crystal surface on molecular uptake into MFI type zeolite. Chem. Mater. **18**, 3552– 3558 (2004)
- <span id="page-2-1"></span>Kumar, R., Sircar, S.: Skin resistance for adsorbate mass transfer into extruded adsorbent pellets. Chem. Eng. Sci. **41**, 2215 (1986)
- <span id="page-2-16"></span>Langer, G., Roethe, A., Roethe, K.P., Gelbin, D.: Heat and mass transfer in packed beds—III. Axial mass dispersion. Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer **21**, 751 (1978)
- <span id="page-2-2"></span>Moran, A., Patel, M., Talu, O.: Axial dispersion efects with small diameter adsorbent particles. Adsorption **24**, 333 (2018)
- <span id="page-2-0"></span>Ogawa, M., Tetsuo, M., Goto, K., Sugai, H., Takahashi, M.: Abrasionresistant granular zeolite and process for preparation thereof. U.S. Patent 4,420,419 (1983)
- <span id="page-2-14"></span>Rama Rao, V., Sircar, S.: Comments on the reliability of model simulation of a rapid pressure swing adsorption process for high purity product. I & EC Res. **56**, 8991 (2017)
- <span id="page-2-12"></span>Ruthven, D.M.: Principles of Adsorption and Adsorption Processes. Wiley, New York (1984)
- <span id="page-2-10"></span>Ruthven, D.M.: Difusion in type A zeolites: new insights from old data. Microporous Mesoporous Mater. **162**, 69 (2012)
- <span id="page-2-6"></span>Saint Remi, J.C., Lauerer, A., Chmelik, C., Vandendael, I., Terryn, H., Baron, G.V., Denaver, J.F., Karger, J.: The role of crystal diversity in understanding mass transfer in nano-porous materials. Nat. Mater. **15**, 401 (2016)
- <span id="page-2-11"></span>Sircar, S., Myers, A.L.: In: Aurbach, S.M., Carrado, K.A., Dutta, P.K. (eds.) Gas Separation by Zeolites, Chap. 22 in Handbook of Zeolite, Catalysts, and Microporous Materials, pp. 1063–1105. Marcell Dekker, New York (2003)
- <span id="page-2-5"></span>Teixeira, A.R., Chang, C.C., Coogan, T., Kendall, R., Fan, W., Dauenhauer, P.J.: Dominance of surface barriers in molecular transport through silicalite—1. J. Phys. Chem. C **117**, 25545 (2013)
- <span id="page-3-0"></span>Vasenkov, S., Bohlmann, W., Galvosas, P., Geier, O., Liu, H., Karger, K.: PFG NMR study of difusion in MFI type zeolites: evidence of the existence of intracrystalline transport barriers. J. Phys. Chem. B **105**, 5922–5927 (2001)
- <span id="page-3-2"></span>Wu, C.-W., Kothare, M.V., Sircar, S.: Column dynamic study of mass transfer of pure  $N_2$  and  $O_2$  into small particles of pelletized LiLSX zeolite. I & EC Res. **53**, 17806 (2014)
- <span id="page-3-3"></span>Wu, C.W., Kothare, M.V., Sircar, S.: Equilibrium isotherm and mass transfer coefficient for adsorption of pure argon on small particles of pelletized lithium exchanged low silica zeolite. I & EC Res. **54**, 2385 (2015)
- <span id="page-3-1"></span>Zhang, L., Chmelik, C., van Laak, A.N.C., Karger, J., de Jongh, P.E., de Jong, K.P.: Direct assessment of molecular transport in mordenite: dominance of surface resistances. Chem. Commun. (2009). [https](https://doi.org/10.1039/B914391B) [://doi.org/10.1039/B914391B](https://doi.org/10.1039/B914391B)

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.