The effect of CO2 and salinity on olivine dissolution kinetics at 120 °C
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A B S T R A C T

This paper reports the results of an experimental study on the dissolution kinetics of olivine (Mg1.82Fe0.18SiO4) at operating conditions relevant to the mineral carbonation process for the permanent storage of CO2. In particular, we investigated the effects of CO2 fugacity (fCO2) and of salinity on the kinetics of olivine dissolution, which is assumed to be the rate-limiting step of the overall carbonation process. Dissolution experiments were carried out at 120 °C in a stirred flow-through reactor. Different pH values (between 3 and 8) and solution compositions were investigated by varying fCO2 and by dosing LiOH (for pH control), NaCl, and NaNO3. The specific dissolution rate values, r, were estimated from the experimental data using a population balance equation (PBE) model coupled with a mass balance equation. The logarithms of the obtained r values were regressed with a linear model as a function of pH and compared to the model reported earlier [Hänchen, M., Krevor, S., Mazzotti, M., Lackner, K.S., 2007. Validation of a population balance model for olivine dissolution. Chem. Eng. Sci. 62, 6412–6422] for experiments with neither CO2 nor salts. Our results confirm that, at a given temperature, olivine dissolution kinetics depend on pH only, and that fCO2 and the concentrations of NaCl and NaNO3 affect it through their effect on pH.

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Aqueous mineral carbonation is a technology that is being studied and developed in the framework of the carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) systems [IPCC, 2005]. It aims at binding CO2 into stable carbonates, using metal oxides via a high-pressure and high-temperature ex situ process, which mimics natural rock weathering. For a large scale implementation of this process, the most suitable sources of metal oxides are magnesium silicate minerals, such as olivine and serpentinite, due to their large worldwide availability (e.g. in ophiolite belts) (Goff et al., 2000).

Aqueous mineral carbonation of olivine involves CO2 dissolution in water, the dissolution of the silicate minerals, and the precipitation of Mg-carbonates. In particular, the dissolution of the silicate minerals is considered to be the rate-limiting step of the entire aqueous mineral carbonation process. In the case of the dissolution of forsterite, the magnesium end-member of olivine, the chemical reaction in a CO2-free solution is

\[ \text{Mg}_2\text{SiO}_4(s) + 4\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons 2\text{Mg}^{2+}(aq) + \text{H}_4\text{SiO}_4(aq) + 4\text{OH}^-(aq). \]  (1)

This reaction has been extensively studied at ambient pressure and temperature and its kinetics has been found to depend primarily on pH. Two different mechanisms for olivine dissolution have been postulated at 25 °C, corresponding to a pH-dependence for pH < 8, and to no pH-dependence for higher values (Wogelius and Walther, 1991; Pokrovsky and Schott, 2000; Rosso and Rimstidt, 2000). The first mechanism is governed by the adsorption of one H+ ion onto two olivine cells leading to a preferential release of magnesium over silicon and to the formation of a thin Mg-depleted, and Si-rich (altered) layer. At higher pH values, the dissolution is controlled by the formation of Mg(OH)2 complexes and exhibits a preferential release of silicon into solution, thus creating a Si-depleted and hence Mg-rich surface layer. Recently, we have studied olivine dissolution at temperatures between 90 and 150 °C and at pH values between 2 and 12.5 (tuned using HCl and LiOH), and we have observed the same behavior (Hänchen et al., 2006), and hence we proposed the same mechanism. In particular, the specific dissolution rate, r, depends on pH in the pH range from 2 to 8.5, and it is given by the following equation (that corresponds to a linear dependence of the logarithm of r on pH at a given temperature):

\[ r = a_T^0 A e^{-E_r/RT}, \]  (2)

where r is the specific dissolution rate (mol cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)), T is the temperature (K), R is the gas constant (8.3145 × 10\(^{-3}\) kJ K\(^{-1}\) mol\(^{-1}\)), \(a_T\) is the hydrogen ion activity (dimensionless), and A is a pre-exponential
factor (mol cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)). In the above mentioned study (H\(\text{\ss}\)chen et al., 2006) the parameters \(A\), \(E_a\) (activation energy), and \(n\) (reaction order for H\(^+\)) were estimated by fitting all the experiments to Eq. (2), thus resulting in the following values: \(A = 0.0854\ \text{mol cm}^{-2}\ \text{s}^{-1}\), \(E_a = 52.9\ \text{kJ mol}^{-1}\), and \(n = 0.46\). Moreover, to assess the influence of CO\(_2\) on olivine dissolution, in the same work a few experiments were also carried out at 120 °C under a CO\(_2\) partial pressure (from 15 to 180 bar) and in a pH range between 3 and 6 (adjusted by LiOH addition) (H\(\text{\ss}\)chen et al., 2006). The measured dissolution rates were the same as, or slightly higher than, those without CO\(_2\) up to a pH value of 5, and markedly lower beyond this value. Although earlier studies have reported and justified such dissolution inhibition (Wogelius and Walther, 1991; Pokrovsky and Schott, 2000), others have questioned such a conclusion (Golubev et al., 2005). There is, however, agreement about the importance of the formation of Mg-carbonate complexes on the olivine surface in determining the dissolution behavior. It is worth noting that the pH effect on silicate dissolution can in principle be exploited to control the mineral carbonation process, namely by dissolving silicates at low pH and by precipitating carbonates at high pH, i.e. through a so-called pH-swing process (Park et al., 2004).

Inorganic salts such as NaCl, NaHCO\(_3\), and KHC\(_2\)O\(_3\) have been used in different works to enhance the carbonation of silicates (Geerlings et al., 2002; O’Connor et al., 2005; McKelvey et al., 2005). However, in a thorough study of forsterite CO\(_2\)-free dissolution at 25 °C in a pH range from 1 to 4, it has been shown that the dissolution rate was not affected by the presence of the inorganic salts KNO\(_3\), Mg(NO\(_3\))\(_2\), Na\(_2\)SO\(_4\), and MgSO\(_4\) at an ionic strength of up to 12 mol kg\(^{-1}\) (Olsen, 2007). Nevertheless, specific studies regarding the dissolution kinetics of Mg-silicates at high CO\(_2\) fugacity, salinity, and temperature, the operating conditions typically reported for the mineral carbonation process (O’Connor et al., 2005), are still missing. Hence, the effects of CO\(_2\) and salinity on olivine dissolution kinetics are not clear enough, both qualitatively and quantitatively, at the conditions of interest for mineral carbonation. Thus, with this work we aimed at achieving a deeper understanding of these effects on olivine dissolution kinetics in order to be able to optimize the mineral carbonation process. Olivine dissolution was studied at 120 °C in a H\(_2\)O–CO\(_2\)–LiOH–NaCl/NaNO\(_3\) system, for different values of CO\(_2\) fugacity (in the range 0.4–123 bar), of pH (2–8), and of salinity (salt concentration up to 2.5 mol kg\(^{-1}\)). For each experiment, the values of \(r\) were estimated by fitting the experimental data (olivine concentration vs. time) with a population balance equation (PBE) model coupled with a mass balance equation (H\(\text{\ss}\)chen et al., 2007). Finally, the obtained values of \(r\) were regressed using the model reported in Eq. (2).

2. Materials and methods

The dissolution kinetics of natural San Carlos gem-quality olivine grains (Mg\(_{1.82}\)Fe\(_{0.18}\)SiO\(_4\)), with a particle size between 90 and 180 \(\mu\)m and a specific surface of 797 ± 55 cm\(^2\) g\(^{-1}\), was studied in a LiOH–CO\(_2\) aqueous system. Selected experiments were also carried out in NaCl/NaNO\(_3\)–LiOH–CO\(_2\) aqueous solutions. Small amounts of LiOH were added to the solution in order to achieve pH values higher than 4 in the presence of CO\(_2\). This hydroxide was chosen since Li\(^+\) concentrations of the solution could be accurately monitored online, as described below. A flow-through high-pressure high-temperature titanium reactor, as described in H\(\text{\ss}\)chen et al. (2006), was used for all experiments. All runs were performed at a temperature of 120 °C, with a liquid volume of 170 ml and a gas headspace of 130 ml. Carbon dioxide 99.999% vol.-purity (PanGas, Werk Dagmersellen, Switzerland), fed directly from a gas cylinder. Such a solution, consisting of ultrapure water only or of ultrapure water with electrolytes, i.e. LiOH, NaCl, and NaNO\(_3\), was introduced into the reactor at a constant flow rate of either 2 or 5 ml min\(^{-1}\), after being pre-heated up to 90 °C with a heat exchanger, in order to minimize the temperature drop at the entrance of the reactor. A second HPLC pump was used to withdraw liquid at exactly the same flow rate as the inlet pump, in order to maintain a constant liquid level in the reactor. Before passing through the second pump, the outlet stream was cooled down to ambient temperature by a copper-tubular heat exchanger, then its flow rate was measured with a flow meter and finally it was depressurized to ambient pressure by using a hydraulic disconnection. For each experiment, the reactor was initially filled with a known amount of olivine, closed, and flushed with CO\(_2\) to purge O\(_2\) from it. Then a known amount of solution was pumped into the vessel and heated up to 120 °C. Once the system stabilized, the reactor was pressurized and kept at these conditions for the entire run. The Mg\(^{2+}\) and Li\(^+\) concentrations in the outlet solution were measured online by means of an ion chromatograph (CS12A column, Dionex). Solution samples were taken with a fraction collector at regular intervals and their silicon concentration was measured with a spectrophotometer using the Molybdate Blue method (Grasshoff and Anderson, 1999; ICRM, 2001). The standards for the Mg\(^{2+}\) and Si\(^{4+}\) measurements were prepared with the feed solution to take into account the effects of salinity on the analysis. In order to estimate the pH, the geochemical software package EQ3/6 v8.0 (Wolery and Jarek, 2003) was used to model the composition of the solution, assuming that the time scale for achieving equilibrium was smaller than the residence time (30–90 min). A database employing Pitzer equations to estimate the activity coefficients of the aqueous species at high ionic strengths was used. Based on the measured temperature and pressure, the CO\(_2\) fugacity was calculated by using a noniterative procedure developed by Spycher et al. (2003), based on the Redlich–Kwong equation of state for the CO\(_2\)–H\(_2\)O mixture. The value of f\(_{CO_2}\), together with the temperature and Mg\(^{2+}\) and Si\(^{4+}\) concentrations was used to calculate the actual pH value using EQ3/6.

3. Modeling

Following H\(\text{\ss}\)chen et al. (2007), the dissolution of olivine was modeled by a 1-D population balance equation model, assuming constant particle shape. This equation together with a flow-through reactor model allows the description of the temporal evolution of olivine particles. The governing equations are given by

\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial L} = 0, \quad (3)
\]

\[
V \frac{\partial c}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = - \frac{dm}{dt}, \quad (4)
\]

where \(f\) is the unscaled particle size distribution number density (m\(^{-1}\)); \(D\) is the dissolution rate (m s\(^{-1}\)); \(m\) is the total mass of particles (moles of olivine); \(V\) is the volume of the suspension (m\(^3\)); \(Q\) is the flow rate through the reactor (m\(^3\) s\(^{-1}\)); \(c\) is the concentration of olivine in solution (mol m\(^{-3}\)), and \(L\) is the characteristic length of a particle (m).

The model consisting of Eqs. (3) and (4) must be solved numerically for a given initial mass of olivine and a given initial particle size distribution, thus yielding the time evolution of the olivine concentration \(c\) in solution. To this aim, we used a combination of the method of characteristics and of the method of moments.
Table 1
Olivine dissolution at 120 °C: operating conditions and experimental results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>f\textsubscript{CO\textsubscript{2}} (bar)</th>
<th>Li\textsuperscript{+} (mol kg\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Salt (mol kg\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>Q (ml min\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>V (ml)</th>
<th>m\textsubscript{0} (mg)</th>
<th>Duration (h)</th>
<th>r (mol cm\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1}) \times 10\textsuperscript{10}</th>
<th>Exp. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>168.4</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.054</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0168</td>
<td>0.0168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>116.47</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>173.78</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>158.37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>203.54</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>130.87</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols indicate type of salt, * NaCl and ** NaNO\textsubscript{3}.

(Hänchen et al., 2007) (note, however, that in that work, due to a typo, in Eq. (23) there is a factor \( r \) before the integral that should not be there). By fitting such evolution to the experimental concentrations of Mg\textsuperscript{2+} (\( c_{\text{Mg}} \)) and Si\textsuperscript{4+} (\( c_{\text{Si}} \)), expressed as olivine equivalents (\( c \)), that in a perfect stoichiometric dissolution process, is given by

\[
c = c_{\text{Si}} = \frac{c_{\text{Mg}}}{1.82},
\]

(5)

the value of the dissolution rate \( D \) corresponding to the chosen operating conditions (pH, CO\textsubscript{2} fugacity, salinity) was estimated. Following the procedure explained earlier (Hänchen et al., 2007) a value of the specific dissolution rate \( r \) was calculated from the fitted value of \( D \) using information about the initial particle size distribution and the BET surface area of the initial particles.

4. Results and discussion

Specific data regarding olivine dissolution experiments carried out at 120 °C are reported in Table 1. In particular, for each experiment, the applied operating conditions, i.e. CO\textsubscript{2} fugacity (\( f\textsubscript{CO\textsubscript{2}} \)), LiOH (\( \text{LiOH} (\text{Li}^+ \) and salt (either NaCl or NaNO\textsubscript{3}) concentrations, flow rate (\( Q \)), suspension volume (\( V \)), initial olivine mass (\( m_0 \)), and duration of the experiment are listed, together with the resulting specific dissolution rate (\( r \)), and the calculated pH. Two sets of experiments are shown:

- Experiments 27–37 (reported also in Hänchen et al., 2006), carried out with neither CO\textsubscript{2} nor salt, in which the pH was set by adding HCl or LiOH.
Experiments 54–135, performed under a CO₂ atmosphere with or without salt addition, all of which were unpublished data, except for experiments 54–68 already reported by Hānchen et al. (2006).

As an example, in Fig. 1 Exp. no. 92 (at pH = 3.44, corresponding to fast dissolution) is analyzed in more detail. In particular, the measured Mg²⁺ and Si⁴⁺ concentrations, expressed in olivine equivalents according to Eq. (5), are plotted over time, together with their arithmetic average. These experimental data are compared with the simulation results, obtained by solving Eqs. (3) and (4), numerically. The specific dissolution rate \( r \), reported in the figure legend, was obtained by least-squared minimization of the residuals between the experimental data and the model results. In this case, the agreement is rather satisfactory, as in all the other experiments. In Fig. 1, the Mg²⁺ and Si⁴⁺ concentrations vary in time according to the dissolution dynamics, but remain always in their stoichiometric ratio. This was not always the case, as illustrated in Fig. 2, where the time evolution of the ratio of the two concentrations is plotted in the case of the Exp. nos. 36, 60, and 119. The behavior observed in this figure is indeed general, thus indicating that after an initial transient phase, the Mg²⁺ to Si⁴⁺ concentration ratio stabilized to its stoichiometric value. For modeling and regression purposes and to reduce the variability, the arithmetic average of the two concentrations expressed in olivine equivalents was used (Eq. (5)).

For all the experiments reported in Table 1, the logarithm of the value of \( r \), estimated using the method described in Section 2, is plotted as a function of the calculated pH value in Fig. 3. In this figure, we plot also the values obtained in eight experiments without CO₂, where HCl was used to acidify the solution, that were reported and analyzed in our previous work (Hānchen et al., 2007). Experiments carried out with and without CO₂, with and without salt addition, can be distinguished by the different symbols.

The main conclusion that can be drawn by analyzing these results is that the change in the dissolution rate could be accounted for by the change in solution pH only. Varying the CO₂ fugacity, or the LiOH or HCl concentration, or the salinity, produced a change in the pH value, which in turn led to a change in \( r \), but there was no evidence of a direct and independent effect of these parameters on the dissolution rate. Therefore, all experimental data in Fig. 3 were
regressed using a single equation, namely the following linearized form of Eq. (2):

$$\log r = -n\mathrm{pH} + B$$

(6)

with $r$ in mol cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, $\mathrm{pH} = -\log a_{H^+}$, $n = 0.523 \pm 0.047$, and $B = -7.59 \pm 0.24$, defined as the logarithm of $Ae^{-E_a/RT}$, based on a 95% confidence interval (this corresponds to $A = 0.264$ mol cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ in Eq. (2)) with a regression coefficient $R^2 = 0.91$. The corresponding straight line is plotted as a solid line in the same figure, where it can be compared with the same regression determined earlier (dash-dotted line) and based on a much smaller set of CO2-free dissolution experiments, where $n = 0.46 \pm 0.03$, $B = -8.05 \pm 0.13$, and $R^2 = 0.98$ (Hâchen et al., 2006, 2007). It is worth noting that although the regression coefficient was higher in the earlier work because the regression was based on a smaller number of more homogeneous data (neither CO2 nor salt present), the value of the reaction order $n$ obtained in this study was closer to the theoretical value of 0.5. The two regression lines were anyhow in good agreement, considering also the experimental variability. The only noticeable difference was a slight dissolution enhancement at low pH values in the new regression. As to the effect of CO2, which was considered to be detrimental at pH values larger than 5 in our earlier work (Hâchen et al., 2006), we believe that the large amount of consistent experimental evidence reported in this work demonstrates that such an effect was an artifact. We presume the inconsistency of the earlier measurements (Hâchen et al., 2006) was due to the very small amount of dissolved olivine on which the estimated values of the dissolution rate were based.

5. Conclusion

The conclusion of this comprehensive experimental work is simple but rather significant. The specific dissolution rate of olivine at a given temperature in the pH range between 2 and 8 depends on pH only. The effects of CO2 fugacity, LiOH, HCl, salt concentrations, and combinations thereof are important inasmuch as they affect the pH, but not directly and independently. There is no inhibition effect of the presence of CO2 on olivine dissolution at pH higher than 5 as previously reported, which is important because these are the conditions where carbonate precipitation is favored. Our investigation was carried out at 120 °C, but we would argue that our conclusions are general and could be applied to any temperature in the range between 25 and 150 °C, where several studies by our group and others have shown that the dissolution mechanism is the same. We believe that this is an important finding towards the design and optimization of an effective mineral carbonation process.
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