# Oxidative degradation of amines using an open- and closed-batch reactor

Solrun Johanne Vevelstad<sup>a</sup>, Andreas Grimstvedt<sup>b</sup>, Aslak Einbu<sup>b</sup>, Hélène Lepaumier<sup>a</sup>, Nuria Tavera Valero<sup>a</sup>, Hanna Knuutila<sup>b</sup>, Eirik Falck da Silva<sup>b</sup>, and Hallvard Fjøsne Svendsen<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 7491 Trondheim, Norway <sup>b</sup>SINTEF Materials and Chemistry, 7465 Trondheim, Norway

#### TCCS6



### Outline

- Introduction
- Experimental conditions
  - Open batch system
  - Closed batch system
  - Comparison

#### Results

- Open batch system
- Closed batch system
- Comparison
- Summary



### Introduction

- Amine degradation causes problems
  - Solvent loss
  - Corrosion
  - Fouling
  - Foaming
  - Emission of degradation compounds
- Literature describes three different oxidative degradation setups
  - Closed-batch reactor at elevated temperature and oxygen pressure<sup>1</sup>
  - Open-batch reactor at 55 C where the  $CO_2$ -loaded amine solution is sparged with a wet blend of  $CO_2$  and air<sup>2-4</sup>
  - Integrated solvent degradation apparatus (ISDA)<sup>5</sup>
- 1) Lepaumier, H., et al. <u>Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. (</u>2009).**48**: 9068.
- 2) Chi, S., et al. Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. (2002).41: 4178.
- 3) Goff, G.S., *Phd thesis*, in *Chemical Engineering*. 2005, University of Texas: Austin. p. 283.
- 4) Lepaumier, H., et al. Energy Procedia (2011) 4, 1652.
- 5) Closman, F., et al. Energy Procedia (2011) 4, 23.



# **Open batch**

- Open batch glass reactor
- 30 wt% MEA
- Loaded with  $CO_2$  ( $\alpha = 0.4$ )
- 0.35 L/min Air + 7.5 mL/min CO<sub>2</sub>
- 55 C for 3 weeks
- Liquid samples are taken out regularly from the reactor





# **Closed batch**

- Closed batch glass reactor with Sulzer DX packing in SS316
- 30 wt% MEA
- Loaded with  $CO_2$  ( $\alpha = 0.4$ )
- Circulation of gas (air) and liquid
  - Gas flow: 24.6 NL/min
  - Liquid flow: 0.91 L/min
- 50 55 C for 3-4 weeks
- CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> in the gas are logged
- Liquid samples are taken out from the liquid line regularly





### **Oxidative degradation apparatus**

#### **Similarities**

- An amine solution loaded with CO<sub>2</sub>
- Glass apparatus

Differences (closed compared to open)

- Use structured packing instead of bubbling through the sump for mass transfer
- Recirculation of both gas and liquid
- Measure temperature in the sump and in the packing
- Temperature and gas (O<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>) composition are logged
- Higher gas flow through the system



# **Results open batch**





#### **Degradation compounds**



# Degradation compounds – NaOH treatment\*



 2.5 times more formate after NaOH treatment

 Oxalate only after NaOH treatment

Sexton, A.J., Phd thesis: Amine oxidation in CO<sub>2</sub> capture processes, 2008, The University of Texas: Austin. p. 262.



#### **Results closed**







#### **Degradation compounds Ex1**



# Degradation compounds Ex1 and Ex2



# Degradation compounds – NaOH treatment\*

#### Experiment 1



\*Sexton, A.J., *Phd thesis: Amine oxidation in CO2 capture processes*, 2008, The University of Texas: Austin. p. 262.

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

**Experiment 2** 

# Results open versus closed



#### **Amine loss**

	Method		6
Experiment	LC-MS	Titration	
Open (blue)	12.8	13.9	Lation 3
Closed Ex1 (purple)	23.2	23.7	2 - MEA open → MEA closed 1 -
Closed Ex2 (green)	-	12.5	0 0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100



#### **Degradation compounds**

Open:HEF >HEGly > OZD > HEI > BHEOX > HEA > HEPOClosed Ex1:HEF > HEI > BHEOX > OZD > HEA > HEGly > HEPO





# Summary

- Mainly the same degradation compounds discovered in both setups
- The order of the degradation compounds seems to be different
  - Presence of packing in closed setup is likely the reason
- The nitrogen balance still not closed



### Acknowledgement



The work is done under the SOLVit project, performed under the strategic Norwegian research program CLIMIT.

The authors acknowledge the partners in SOLVit: Aker Clean Carbon, Gassnova, EON, Scottish Power and the Research Council of Norway for their support.



