This is the author’s version of an article published in Bioresource Technology

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/75971

Published article:


http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2010.06.079
High purity H₂ by sorption-enhanced chemical looping reforming of waste cooking oil in a packed bed reactor

P. Pimenidou¹, G. Rickett¹, V. Dupont¹*, M. V. Twigg²

¹Energy and Resources Research Institute, SPEME, The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
²Johnson Matthey Plc, Orchard Laboratory, Orchard Road, Royston, SG8 5HE, UK

Corresponding author: V.Dupont@leeds.ac.uk

Paper accepted and published. Full reference:


Abstract

High purity hydrogen (>95%) was produced at 600 °C and 1 atm by steam reforming of waste cooking oil at a molar steam to carbon ratio of 4 using chemical looping, a process that features redox cycles of a Ni catalyst with the in-situ carbonation / calcination of a CO₂-sorbent (dolomite) in a packed bed reactor under alternated feedstreams of fuel-steam and air. The fuel and steam conversion were higher with the sorbent present than without it. Initially, the dolomite carbonation was very efficient (100 %), and 98 % purity hydrogen was produced, but the carbonation decreased to around 56% with a purity of 95% respectively in the following cycles. Reduction of the nickel catalyst occurred alongside steam reforming, water gas shift and carbonation, with H₂ produced continuously under fuel-steam feeds. Catalyst and CO₂-sorbent regeneration was observed, and long periods of autothermal operation within each cycle were demonstrated.
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Introduction

The process of chemical looping has been the focus of growing attention in the past decade as a means of large scale power generation minimising CO$_2$ emissions, by either producing a sequestration-ready CO$_2$ effluent (chemical looping combustion) or decarbonising the fuel (chemical looping reforming). The production of hydrogen of high purity using process intensification measures such as chemical looping is desirable in chemical plants and petroleum refineries, as well as upstream of a fuel cell to alleviate the energy burden placed on gas separation and purification. Suitable feedstocks for steam reforming and steam gasification can be found in many commercial and industrial waste streams of biomass origins. These would typically have significant moisture content, such as the crude glycerol by-product of the transesterification of vegetable oils (Dou et al, 2009), and other 2$^{nd}$/3$^{rd}$ generation biofuels such as biomass pyrolysis oils, or micro algae suspensions. Used vegetable cooking oils exhibit a higher free fatty acid content, viscosity and polarity than the virgin oils, which makes their conversion to the fatty acid methyl esters of the biodiesel blend difficult. In the present study, waste cooking vegetable oil is converted to a nearly pure hydrogen gas separate from the CO$_2$ waste stream, using an advanced steam reforming process. The latter combines the chemical looping of a Ni-based catalyst as oxygen transfer material (OTM) and of a natural CO$_2$ sorbent (dolomite), in a packed bed reactor. It has been shown in a previous publication that the Ni in the catalyst could repeatedly reduce and oxidise during the chemical looping reforming of waste cooking vegetable oil (WCO) in the absence of a CO$_2$ sorbent (Pimenidou et al, in press). The present work focuses on the ability of the CO$_2$ sorbent to repeatedly carbonate while generating a pure H$_2$ gas under the fuel/steam feed, and to regenerate to its calcined oxide form under the air feed during the chemical looping reforming of the same waste oil. The aim of this study was to
carry out a number of cycles with high H₂ purity syngas production while attempting to operate as close to autothermal as possible, that is, with little or any heat being supplied to the reactor.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Materials

The OTM catalyst consisted of 18 wt% NiO supported on Al₂O₃ from Johnson Matthey, originally supplied in pellet form, broken up and sieved to 0.85-2 mm size particles. The CO₂ sorbent was pre-calcined dolomite from the Warmsworth quarry (South Yorkshire, England) broken up and sieved to the same size as the catalyst. 40 g of fresh catalyst, with or without intimate mixing with 40 g of the calcined CO₂ sorbent, were loaded at the centre of the reactor, preceded by 25 mm thick plug of spherical Al₂O₃ beads. The as-received dolomite was fully carbonated and had a composition of 21.3 wt% MgO, 30.7 wt% CaO, 0.3 wt% SiO₂, 0.27 wt% Fe₂O₃, and 0.1 wt% Al₂O₃, and 47.33 wt% CO₂.

The waste cooking vegetable oil (WCO) contained 74.9 wt% C, 12.85 wt% H, 12.15 wt% O and 0.10 wt% N, had a liquid density of 920 kg m⁻³ at 20 °C and a gross calorific value of 39.5 MJ kg⁻¹. Based on its elemental mass formula, its average elemental molar formula was C₁H₂.04O₀.122. Details of the analytical techniques used for the oil characterisation can be found in Pimenidou et al, 2010. The molar formula was equivalent to 3(CH₁.₆₇ + C₁₈H₃₇,O₂.₃₁), where ‘CH₁.₆₇’ represents the portion of non-oxygenated glycerol ‘backbone’ molecule per fatty acid chain, and where the ‘C₁₈’ fatty acid chain is chosen here to reflect on the WCO’s origin as rapeseed oil. The oxygen content of 2.31, larger than the expected 2 of vegetable fatty acid chains, confirmed the increased polarity of the waste oil compared to that of its virgin rapeseed oil source.
2.2 Reactor set-up and experimental procedure

A detailed description of the reactor set up, including a diagram, is given in Pimenidou et al (2010). To summarise, a stainless steel temperature controlled and kaowool insulated reactor of ID 2.05 cm and 26.9 cm length, providing 89 cm$^3$ volume containing the bed materials (40 g of 18wt%NiO/Al$_2$O$_3$ catalyst with or without 40 g calcined dolomite), was fed from the bottom via a co-axial injector with steam in the inner pipe, preheated to 150 °C and near-vapourised WCO in the annular space at 300 °C. When not using the CO$_2$-sorbent, the experiments were carried out both manually diluted with Al$_2$O$_3$ beads ($D_{\text{beads}} \approx 1.5$ mm) to achieve the same reactor bed volume as when using the sorbent, and undiluted, thereby achieving roughly half the bed volume than when using the CO$_2$ sorbent. As the observed reactant conversions were very poor and accompanied by excessive carbon deposition when using the Al$_2$O$_3$ beads dilution, subsequent experiments were carried out without it. Peristaltic pumps maintained the liquid flows of WCO and water at 0.55 and 2.32 cm$^3$ min$^{-1}$ (20 °C) respectively, achieving a molar steam to carbon ratio of 4. The steam to carbon ratio of 4 provided a better operation than 2.5 in the absence of CO$_2$ sorbent (Pimenidou et al, 2010) and thus was chosen for the present study. A gas flow of 600 cm$^3$ min$^{-1}$ (STP) of N$_2$ was employed during the fuel/steam feed and the N$_2$ purge period separating the fuel/steam feed from the air feed, as in the chemical looping experiments without sorbent reported in Pimenidou et al (2010). The air flow rate was also 2000 cm$^3$ min$^{-1}$ (STP) during the air feed. The reactor effluent passed through two condensers and water traps prior to online analysis every 5 seconds of CO, CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ by non-dispersive infra-red absorption, H$_2$ by thermal conductivity detection and O$_2$ via paramagnetic analysis, using Uras 14, Caldos 15 and Magnos 106 ABB analysers respectively. It was shown through off-line GC-FID analysis that there were no other higher hydrocarbons produced in the same set up without sorbent.
(Pimenidou et al, 2010), and therefore the dry gases were also assumed here to contain N₂ molar fractions corresponding to the balance to 1 of the sum of the CO, CO₂, CH₄, H₂ and O₂ measured mol fractions.

The procedure followed to pre-reduce the catalyst to initiate the cycling experiments is described in detail in Pimenidou et al, 2010. In the present work, the reactor temperature was set at 600 °C for all the experiments under both fuel-steam and air feeds. Three thermocouples placed in the middle of the reactor bed, above and below the middle, measured the temperatures at 1 second intervals, allowing the monitoring of the endotherms and exotherms resulting from the reactions during both feeds.

2.3 Reactions and output calculations

The reaction mechanism under each type of feed is outlined in the first two sub-sections, followed by the energetic of the process under the two feeds and a description of the equations used to derive the process outputs. A nomenclature is provided in the appendix.

2.3.1 Reaction mechanism under fuel/steam/N₂ feed (reducing mode):

An oxygenated hydrocarbon fuel with a molar elemental formula of CₙHₘOₖ, reduces the oxidised catalyst via the unmixed combustion reaction henceforth termed ‘UC’ (Dupont et al, 2007), producing CO₂ and H₂O as by-products. While NiO undergoes reduction, significant coking may occur from the thermal decomposition of the fuel and of its pyrolysis products. The maximum reduction rate of NiO is therefore \((2n+0.5m-k)\) mol per mol of \(CₙHₘOₖ\) fuel converted. This emphasises the relative positive contributions of both the C and H fuel-contents to the NiO reduction rate, in contrast to the negative contribution of the O fuel-content. Once Ni is sufficiently reduced, steam reforming of the WCO, henceforth termed ‘SR’ can occur on the catalyst, with CO and H₂ as the products, which is followed by in-situ water gas shift ‘WGS’.
Both the UC and SR/WGS reactions are then followed by the carbonation (‘Carb’) of the calcined sorbent. When using dolomite as the sorbent, this is a chemisorption reaction, where only Ca, and not Mg, acts as the active site for the carbonation.

According to Le Chatelier’s principle, by shifting the equilibria the CO₂-producing reactions UC and WGS to the right, the carbonation of the Ca-based sorbent allows not only the elimination of CO₂ from the gases, promoting UC, but also a decrease in the amount of CO produced, thereby further promoting SR. This results in an increased fuel conversion, a process termed ‘sorption enhancement’. Once SR and WGS are established, a nearly pure H₂ gas evolves, eliminating the need for the downstream high- and low-temperature water gas shift reactors required by a conventional steam reforming process. Thus sorption enhancement represents a process intensification measure. The production of the by-products methane and carbonaceous deposits during this feed would be accompanied by a lower H₂ yield, here defined by the molar ratio of H₂ produced to the theoretical maximum mol of H₂ from the complete SR and WGS reactions.

Assuming complete reactions SR and WGS in the absence of UC, and notwithstanding thermodynamic limitations (mainly due to reverse-WGS), the maximum hydrogen purity can be calculated as:

$$H_2 \text{ max purity} = 100 \times \frac{(n + m/2 - k) + n}{n + n + (n + m/2 - k)} = 74.3\% \text{ for the WCO.}$$

With a carbonation reaction achieving complete removal of CO₂, and ignoring thermodynamic limitations, the maximum H₂ purity becomes 100 %. The maximum production of H₂ obtainable from sorption enhanced steam reforming the WCO, again disregarding thermodynamic limitations, is therefore 2.90 mol H₂/mol of C in the fuel-feed.

2.3.2 Reaction mechanism under air feed (oxidising mode)
Upon switching to air feed, the carbon deposits burn via full or partial oxidation (‘C-Ox’ and ‘C-POx’) depending on the reactor bed temperature, magnitude of the air flow and the oxidation reactions being or not mass transfer limited. The Ni on the catalyst support then consumes oxygen via Ni oxidation to NiO (‘Ni-Ox’).

In the presence of a carbonated sorbent, the higher temperatures reached during the air feed allow the sorbent to regenerate through decarbonation, also called calcination, henceforth termed ‘Calc’.

2.3.3 Energetics under the two feeds

In the described mechanism, the UC, SR and Calc reactions are endothermic, while WGS, Carb, C-Ox, C-POx, and Ni-Ox exothermic. Of the latter, C-Ox and C-POx are more likely to occur on the outer surface of the reactor bed particles, where carbon filaments may form, where they generate a heat that may be easily swept away by the gas flows. In contrast, the Ni-Ox and Carb reactions are highly exothermic reactions which take place deeper within the particles of catalyst and sorbent respectively. Despite the ability of the sorption enhanced chemical looping reforming process to cope with coking fuels by cyclically oxidising the carbon deposits (unlike conventional catalytic steam reforming), it remains desirable to prevent coke deposition from the point of view of both optimising heat transfer and achieving a maximum H₂ yield. Without carbon deposition, the heat transfer would be expected to move deeper in the reactor bed and allow better coupling of the oxidation of nickel with the strongly endothermic calcination (regeneration) of the sorbent.

2.3.4. Calculation of process outputs
While carbonation occurred, the output gas did not contain CO₂, and we shall see in the results section, that CO and CH₄ concentrations were also negligible. With more time on stream, the sorbent began to saturate, corresponding to a CO₂-breakthrough period. Finally, the sorbent reached its maximum sorption capacity for the conditions of the experiment, and a ‘CO₂-steady state’ was established, similarly to the one that occurred in the absence of sorbent (Pimenidou et al, 2010). We are mindful of not calling this regime a full steady-state as transient reactions involving NiO reduction or carbon deposition may still be occurring.

- Fuel conversion fraction during the fuel/steam/N₂ feed:

Direct calculations of the fuel conversion during CO₂ sorption via the carbon balance were not possible due to the inability to measure the carbonation rate ‘\( \dot{n}_{CO₂,carb} \)’ on the solid sorbent at any given time prior to, or during CO₂ breakthrough. However, assuming the expected effect of sorption enhancement, caused by the coupling of UC with Carb, or (SR+WGS) with Carb, a minimum fuel conversion fraction ‘\( X_{WCO,PB} \)’ during carbonation prior to- and during CO₂-breakthrough could be estimated by approximating it to the conversion reached at the CO₂-steady state (post-CO₂ breakthrough):

\[
X_{WCO,PB} \approx X_{WCO,BT} \approx X_{WCO,SS} = \frac{\dot{n}_{WCO,in} - \dot{n}_{WCO,out}}{\dot{n}_{WCO,in}} = \frac{\dot{n}_{N₂,in}(y_{CH₄} + y_{CO} + y_{CO₂})_{SS}}{n \times \dot{n}_{WCO,in}} 
\]

Eq. 1

Where the suffix ‘PB’ stands for ‘prior to CO₂ breakthrough or pre-CO₂ breakthrough’, ‘BT’ means ‘during CO₂-breakthrough’, and ‘SS’ is ‘at CO₂-steady state, post CO₂-breakthrough’. In Eq. 1 and the following equations, the \( \dot{n} \) symbol is used to represent a molar rate, and \( y \), a mol fraction, while the constants \( n, m \) and \( k \) represent the elemental molar composition of the WCO fuel (\( C_nH_mO_k \)).

- Sorbent carbonation rate and total carbonation efficiency during the fuel/steam/N₂ feed:
Using the value of $X_{WCO,PB}$ derived with Eq. 1, as well as the knowledge of the molar production rates of the carbon containing co-products CO and CH$_4$, an estimate of the total molar production rate of CO$_2$ and thus of carbonation rate ($\dot{n}_{CO_2,carb}$) could be obtained via Eq. 2 below:

$$\dot{n}_{CO_2,carb} = nX_{WCO,PB,BT} \dot{n}_{WCO,in} - \left( \frac{\dot{n}_{N_2,in}}{y_{N_2,BT,BT}} \right) \left( y_{CO} + y_{CH_4} + y_{CO_2} \right)_{PB,BT}$$

Eq. 2

In the RHS of Eq. 2, the first, positive term represents the molar rate of carbon converted from the fuel, and the second, negative term, the molar evolution rates of the gaseous carbon-containing products.

Prior to CO$_2$-breakthrough, since none of the carbon containing products were detected, as will be seen in the results section, the negative term in Eq. 2 was negligible, and $\dot{n}_{CO_2,carb}$ was able to simplify to the first positive term only. During CO$_2$-breakthrough, the second negative term was significant and accounted for the simultaneous emergence of CO$_2$, CO and CH$_4$ in the output gas stream.

Equation 3 gives the total carbonation efficiency as the sum of the carbonation efficiencies prior to and after CO$_2$ breakthrough, obtained by integration of the carbonation rates over the characteristic durations of pre-CO$_2$ breakthrough and CO$_2$ breakthrough regimes.

$$\alpha = \alpha_{PB} + \alpha_{BT} = 100 \times \frac{\left( nX_{WCO,PB,BT} \dot{n}_{WCO,in} \times (t_{BT} - t_0) \right) + \int_{t_0}^{t_{SS}} \dot{n}_{CO_2,carb,BT} dt}{n_{CO_2,\max}}$$

Eq.3

In Eq. 3, $t_0$ is defined as the time at breakthrough of H$_2$, taken as evidence of onset of sorption enhanced steam reforming, $t_{BT}$ was the time at breakthrough of CO$_2$, when the sorbent began to reach its capacity, and $t_{SS}$, was the time at reaching CO$_2$ steady state, evidencing the sorbent having reached its maximum capacity.
It was of interest to split the total carbonation efficiency ‘\( \alpha \)’ during fuel and steam feed into its pre-breakthrough (\( \alpha_{PB} \)) and breakthrough contributions (\( \alpha_{BT} \)) because for the former, H\(_2\) purity was close to 100\%, while for the latter, the H\(_2\) purity slowly decreased to the steady state of the non-sorption enhanced process (ca. 70\%). For some applications such as proton exchange membrane fuel cells (PEMFC), which are very sensitive to H\(_2\) purity, maximising the duration of the pre-CO\(_2\) breakthrough period is desirable, whereas for solid oxide fuel cells (SOFC) or molten carbonate fuel cells (MCFC), more tolerant of other syngas compounds, H\(_2\) purity may not be so critical.

The carbonation efficiency values were calculated for each performed cycle to assess the sorbent performance over repeated sorption enhanced chemical looping reforming cycles of the waste cooking oil.

- Steam conversion fraction during the fuel/steam/N\(_2\) feed:

In the steam reforming coupled with water gas shift, the production of hydrogen is the result of the contributions of the fuel-hydrogen and of the steam-hydrogen. Generally, for a ‘\( C_nH_mO_k \)’ oxygenated fuel reacting with (2\( n-k \)) H\(_2\)O via SR/WGS, the maximum production of H\(_2\) is ((2\( n-k \))+0.5\( m \)), indicating clearly that in conditions of maximum H\(_2\) production, the steam contribution fraction is (2\( n-k \))/(2\( n-k \)+0.5\( m \)) and that of the fuel, 0.5\( m/(2n-k+0.5m) \). For the C\(_1\)H\(_{2.04}\)O\(_{0.122}\) waste cooking oil, the steam contribution can therefore account for 64.9\% of the H\(_2\) produced through SR/WGS, while that of the fuel is only 35.1\%. Therefore steam conversions, which are rarely reported in the literature on steam reforming, have a great effect on the material efficiency of the process. Factors limiting the steam conversion are not only equilibrium limitations, which the presence of the CO\(_2\)-sorbent intend to overcome, but also the catalyst’s activity in both the steam reforming and the water gas shift reactions.
Using the fuel conversion fraction from Eq. 2 and an elemental balance on hydrogen, a minimum value for the steam conversion fraction can be estimated using Eq. 4 below:

\[ X_{H,O,PB} \approx X_{H,O,BT} \approx X_{H,O,SS} = \frac{1}{2n_{H,O,in}} \left( \frac{n_{N_2,in}}{y_{N_2,SS}} \left( 4y_{CH_4} + 2y_{H_2} \right)_{SS} - m\left( n_{WCO,in}X_{WCO,SS} \right) \right) \]  

Eq. 4

The first, positive term in the RHS of Eq. 4 represents the formation of the hydrogen containing products and the second, negative term accounts for the known contribution of the fuel to the hydrogen products, leaving only the contribution of water to the same.

- Selectivity of the carbon-containing products in the gas phase during the fuel-steam feed:

These were defined as:

\[ Sel_{CH_4,CO} (\%) = 100 \times \frac{y_{CH_4,CO}}{y_{CH_4} + y_{CO} + y_{CO_2}} \]  

Eq. 5

- NiO molar reduction rate and extent of NiO reduction during fuel-steam feed:

From an elemental balance of oxygen, it is possible to also estimate a constant rate of NiO reduction during carbonation, and thus establish whether reduction of the catalyst (UC) may have been concurrent with steam reforming (SR) and carbonation (Carb). This is expressed in Eq. 6:

\[ \dot{n}_{NiO,Ni,\text{PB}} = \dot{n}_{\text{out,\text{dry,}\text{PB}}} \left( y_{CO} + 2y_{CO_2} \right)_{\text{PB}} + 2\dot{n}_{CO_2,\text{carb}} - \left( \dot{n}_{H_{2}O,in}X_{H_{2}O,\text{PB}} \right) - k\left( n_{WCO,in}X_{WCO,\text{PB}} \right) \]  

Eq. 6

Where the values of \( X_{WCO,\text{PB}} \), \( \dot{n}_{CO_2,\text{carb}} \), and \( X_{H_{2}O,\text{PB}} \) were pre-determined by Eqs. 1, 2 and 4.

In the RHS of Eq. 6, the first, positive term represents the molar rate of O leaving the reactor as gaseous products (no \( O_2 \) is produced under these reducing conditions), the second positive term is the molar rate of O creating the carbonate, and the last two negative terms represent the molar rate of O converted from water and fuel respectively.
However, in the pre-breakthrough regime, where $H_2$ was the only dry gas product detected, Eq. 6 was able to simplify to Eq. 7 below:

$$n_{NiO\rightarrow Ni,PB} = \dot{n}_{WCO,in} X_{WCO,SS} \left(2n + 0.5m - k\right) - y_{H_2,SS} \left(1 - y_{H_2,SS}\right) \dot{n}_{N_2,in} \quad \text{Eq. 7}$$

The equation above reflected that the NiO reduction rate prior to CO$_2$ breakthrough, i.e. when $H_2$ was the only gas product, was equal to the maximum rate of reduction arising from fuel conversion ($\dot{n}_{WCO,in} X_{WCO,SS} \left(2n + 0.5m - k\right)$) through the unmixed combustion reaction, minus the molar rate of hydrogen evolving from the process. This is because one mol of $H_2$ could potentially have reduced an additional mol of NiO to Ni by forming water. It has to be stressed that Eq. 7 is not expected to provide an accurate value of the reduction rate of NiO at any given time prior to CO$_2$ breakthrough, but is a time-averaged estimate, as any transient effect that the rate may have undergone, e.g. early peak followed by drop, would not be accounted for. The purpose of this equation was to merely help assess whether the NiO reduction via unmixed combustion was more likely to have occurred prior to, or concurrently to steam reforming, its fuel-consuming competitor, where the latter situation may be preferable due to allowing $H_2$ production earlier in the process.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Process outputs during WCO/steam/N$_2$ feed

3.1.1 Steam reforming outputs and energetics
H₂ and CO₂ mol fractions measured during the WCO/steam/N₂ feeds for 6 cycles conducted in the presence of the CO₂-sorbent dolomite are shown in Fig. 1(a), with Fig. 1(b) showing the electrical power input to the reformer in % of the maximum. There was a long period in Fig. 1b where the power input to the reformer was automatically cut off, corresponding to a visible lack of CO₂ in the products in Fig. 1a, as the heat produced in the reactor from the carbonation reaction caused the temperature to exceed the set point of 600 °C. In the case of the first cycle, this period lasted 700 seconds. This illustrated the increased energy efficiency of the sorption enhanced chemical looping reforming process over that of the conventional steam reforming process.

The H₂ % purity, defined here as the % dry mol fraction ratio of H₂ to the sum of the H₂, CO, CO₂ and CH₄, i.e. the H₂ mol % corrected for 0 N₂, is plotted with time on stream for the six cycles in Fig. 2, focusing mainly on the pre-CO₂ breakthrough period. Figures 1a and 2 indicated that all the cycles exhibited a period of time where the only significant gas species in the reactor products was hydrogen, these corresponded to purities above 90\% between 800 and 1400 s for all the cycles, and 97% purity reached for cycles 1 and 6 for more than 700 s. Therefore, as expected from sorption enhancement, during this period the effect of the sorbent was to, not only fully chemisorb CO₂, but also to cause nearly complete conversion of CO and CH₄, virtually eliminating them from the syngas. The following section assesses the efficiency of the process via the fuel and steam conversion fractions, selectivity of the carbon containing products, and H₂ purity in post CO₂-breakthrough conditions (steady state ‘SS’), listed in Table 1. Note that the H₂ purity listed in table 1 are the minimum values reached in Fig. 2 after the plateaus of high purity
of pre-CO$_2$ breakthrough. These outputs are compared to the corresponding process for the same conditions in the absence of CO$_2$ sorbent in the reactor (results of the study published in Pimenidou et al, 2010). We have shown in Pimenidou et al (2010), that when operating with a mass of 80 g of the NiO-Al$_2$O$_3$ catalyst at the same feed flows as the present work, WCO conversion fractions of average 0.9 and steam conversion fractions of 0.27 were recorded over 6 cycles. This contrasted with the results when using only 40 g of catalyst with the same feed rates, which only achieved WCO and steam conversion fractions of 0.2 and 0.06 respectively, also averaged over 6 cycles. Unfortunately the size of the reactor meant that more than 80 g of bed material could not be accommodated in the reactor. Therefore the present conditions of 40 g catalyst with 40 g calcined dolomite using the same feed rates were not expected to yield WCO and steam fractions exceeding 0.20 and 0.06 by significant amounts. Surprisingly, a comparison of the two conditions ‘40 g of catalyst’ vs. ‘40 g catalyst + 40 g dolomite’ in Table 1 shows that the WCO and steam conversion fractions post-CO$_2$ breakthrough were significantly larger in the presence of the sorbent for the 6 cycles than without the sorbent, with average values of 0.31 and 0.12 respectively. This may have been caused by the catalytic cracking activity of dolomite, and its resistance to coking, as previously observed by Simell and Son-Bredenberg (1990), Myren et al (2002), Devi et al (2005) and Srinakruang et al (2006). The first cycle with the sorbent exhibited the highest reactant conversions, with WCO and steam conversion fractions of 0.46 and 0.19. From the 2$^{nd}$ cycle, the process outputs lowered to nearer the average and, notwithstanding a dip during the 5$^{th}$ cycle, remained around the average for the remainder of the
cycles. The highest conversions observed in the first cycle were accompanied by a mid-reactor temperature lower than the average by 15 °C, reflecting the endothermicity of SR in post-CO₂ breakthrough conditions. The lower temperature in turn affected the selectivity of the carbon containing products, with higher CH₄ and lower CO. As the cycles settled into a less performant fuel conversion, the heat demand in the reactor decreased accordingly and the mid reactor temperature remained close to the set temperature of 600 °C.

The H₂ purity during CO₂-steady state (post-CO₂ breakthrough) was, with an average of 70.7 %, close to the theoretical maximum in absence of carbonation of 74.3% and notwithstanding thermodynamic limitations quoted in section 2.3.1. A more realistic comparison can be made by using thermodynamic equilibrium calculations following the methodology outlined in Pimenidou et al (2010), and previously applied to the reactor without sorbent, using the mid-reactor temperature as input and assuming the typical rapeseed oil composition used in Pimenidou et al (2010). This new calculation yielded H₂ purities between 69.4 % and 70.2%, with an average of 70.0% over the 6 cycles, in very good agreement with the measurements. The selectivity to CO, CO₂ and CH₄ products with time-on-stream in post-CO₂ breakthrough conditions is listed in Table 1. The high selectivity to CO₂ between 78% and 89% indicated there must have been good conditions for sorption enhancement of the chemical looping reforming during the preceding carbonation period. The values predicted by the equilibrium calculations were Sel_{CO, eq}=21-25%, Sel_{CO₂, eq}=70%, Sel_{CH₄, eq}=5-8%, which would have been less propitious for CO₂ sorption. This calculated equilibrium selectivity was however reproduced quite closely by the experiments without CO₂ sorbent in the reactor, as can be seen in Table 1.
3.1.2 Carbonation efficiency

Using the mass of calcined dolomite present in the reactor (40 g) and the known mass fraction of CaO in the fully carbonated sorbent (0.307), the maximum molar capacity for CO₂ capture \( n_{CO, max} \) was calculated to be 0.417 mol. The characteristic times \( t_0, t_{BT} \) and \( t_{SS} \) are indicated in Fig.1 for the first cycle, representative of all the cycles. Table 2 lists the values of \( (t_{BT} - t_0), (t_{SS} - t_{BT}) \), i.e. the durations prior to- and during CO₂-breakthrough, and their carbonation efficiencies \( \alpha_{PB}, \alpha_{BT} \), with the total \( \alpha \), for the six cycles carried out with the sorbent in the reactor using Eq. 3. Given the error-propagating nature of the calculation of the total carbonation efficiency \( \alpha \) via Eq. 3, it was remarkable that the obtained value for the first cycle, at 101%, was so near 100%. It was also expected from previous dolomite carbonation studies (Pimenidou et al, 2009), that the first cycle be able to fully carbonate the sorbent, as was the case here. The values in table 3 indicate that \( \alpha \) decreased sharply in the second cycle, but more or less stabilised for the remainder of the cycles to an average of 55.9 % over cycles from 2 to 6. Decreases of carbonation efficiency upon repeated cycling were expected for calcined dolomite, which, as all un-pretreated natural CaO-based sorbents, would have exhibited poor chemical stability due to sintering (Harrison, 2008).

With regards to the pre-CO₂ breakthrough carbonation efficiency \( \alpha_{PB} \), it exhibited the same trend as \( \alpha \), with a maximum obtained in the initial cycle (74 %) followed by a sharp decline and stabilisation at around 42 % to the exception of cycle 5. In the observed absence of carbon containing products during pre-CO₂ breakthrough, there were two main parameters that contributed to the value of the pre-CO₂ breakthrough carbonation efficiency \( \alpha_{PB} \) : the WCO fractional conversion \( X_{WCO} \), which determined the rate of CO₂ production and thus controlled that of carbonation, and the pre-CO₂ breakthrough duration \( (t_{BT} - t_0) \), over which the rate of
carbonation was integrated. Table 2 indicates that the low value of $\alpha_{PB}$ obtained in cycle 5 
(17.3%) was not due to ($t_{BT} - t_0$), which itself was of similar duration as cycles 3 and 4, but to the 
lower fraction of fuel conversion (0.23), the lowest of the 6 cycles. This suggests not a limitation 
of the carbonation process but a momentary abnormality in the activity of reactions UC, SR and 
WGS. Accordingly, this low pre-CO$_2$ breakthrough carbonation efficiency was later 
compensated by a longer CO$_2$-breakthrough period, yielding a total efficiency close to those of 
the post-initial cycles. It is difficult to find a reason for the lower WCO conversion obtained at 

cycle 5, as the experiments without sorbent did not exhibit this anomalous dip in conversion, and 
the cyclic experiments were carried out without interruption. 

Sustaining the relatively high level of carbonation for six cycles is a strong indicator that 
regeneration of the sorbent must have occurred to a significant extent via the exotherms 
generated during the air feed steps introduced between each WCO/steam/N$_2$ feeds, which will be 
verified qualitatively in the ‘air feed’ section of the results. 

3.1.3 NiO reduction 

Table 3 lists the 

pre-CO$_2$ breakthrough values of the NiO reduction rate $\dot{n}_{NiO \rightarrow Ni, PB}$ per cycle 
using Eq. 7, derived from the elemental balance of oxygen, alongside the fuel conversion 
fraction. One would expect the two parameters to follow the same trend since the H$_2$ mol fraction 
reached at CO$_2$-steady state, $y_{H2,SS}$, varied little over the six cycles, and the remaining terms in 
Eq. 7 were input values that remained constant for all the cycles. Nevertheless, the term 

$y_{H2,SS} \left( \frac{1}{1 - y_{H2,SS}} \right)$ in Eq. 7 exacerbated the small variations in $y_{H2,SS}$ and was responsible for the 
slight divergence between them. Using Eq. 7, and integrating the estimated NiO reduction rate 
during pre-CO$_2$ breakthrough until 100% of the NiO was reduced, yielding the number of Ni
moles produced ($\Delta n_{Ni}$), a ‘time to final reduction’ ($t_{FR}$) could be obtained, where $t_{FR} = \frac{\Delta n_{Ni}}{\dot{n}_{NiO \rightarrow Ni}}$.

For all the cycles, $t_{FR}$ was found to be either well within the pre-breakthrough period (cycles 2, 5 and 6) or to coincide with breakthrough (cycles 3 and 4). Recall that the first cycle started from a H$_2$-reduced catalyst and thus Eq. 7 would only apply to the following cycles. On this basis, the processes of steam reforming, carbonation and reduction of NiO to Ni would appear to have occurred alongside one another. It is noteworthy that when comparing the contributions of the two fuel consuming reactions (reduction of NiO via UC) and SR (steam reforming) to the total fuel conversion, the steam reforming was dominant across the cycles 2-6. This is illustrated in Table 3 by the % ratio ‘$R_{red}$’ of the estimated NiO reduction rate per cycle in pre-breakthrough to the maximum possible reduction rate for the same cycle via UC, defined by Eq. 8 below:

$$R_{red} = 100 \times \frac{\dot{n}_{NiO \rightarrow Ni,PB}}{\dot{n}_{WCO,in} X_{WCO,SS} (2n + 0.5m - k)}$$

Eq. 8

where this maximum reduction rate is reached in the absence of steam reforming. The results in Table 3 indicate that, since $R_{red}$ remained between 10 and 20 % for all the relevant cycles (2-6), most of the fuel conversion would have resulted from steam reforming. This was shown to be also the case in the study without sorbent. A possible uncertainty about the % reduction state of the bed in the initial stages of the fuel feed may arise from the fact that there was an initial time $t_0$ between the start of the mixture feed and the first detection of H$_2$ by the online thermal conductivity analyser. One could interpret $t_0$ as representing two periods, a first non-reactive (long) period accounting for all the feeds to transport through the piping, reactor and analysers, and possibly, a shorter reactive second period where all or a significant amount of the WCO could have converted via solely the NiO reduction via the unmixed combustion (UC) reaction. Its CO$_2$ product would have been captured by the sorbent, and its co-product H$_2$O would have
condensed in the water trap, resulting in no dry gas products being detected, in this aspect making it indistinct from a non-reactive period. The 40 g of the catalyst, corresponding to $9.64 \times 10^{-2}$ mol of Ni, would have fully reduced in only 63 s if a full conversion of the WCO had occurred via UC. In the absence of an accurate way of monitoring the onset of build up of water condensate, it was not possible to differentiate between non-reactive and potentially reactive periods ‘pre-$t_0$’ due to the presence of the sorbent. To circumvent this uncertainty, we use the outputs of the experiments carried out without the sorbent to assess whether an initial reactive ‘reducing-only’ period was likely to have occurred. In the absence of sorbent, if the reduction reaction UC had initially occurred on its own, CO$_2$ would have been detected in significant concentrations well before H$_2$. For instance, this was observed in a previous study using methane as the fuel (Dupont et al, 2008). A fuel conversion would then be derived from the rate of evolution of CO$_2$. In addition, the hydrogen elemental balance would also yield a significant negative steam conversion, as water would have been produced by UC, (rather than consumed by SR and WGS). Further, a peak in the NiO reduction rate would result from the elemental O balance. All of these were observed in Dupont et al (2008) when using methane as the fuel in chemical looping reforming conditions. However, it was clear from observing the outputs of the experiments with 40 g of catalyst without sorbent, that none of these manifestations had occurred with the present experiments with the WCO fuel. This is shown in Figs. 3a-b, which display the dry syngas mol fractions and the water conversion fraction for cycle 4 without sorbent, as a representative of typical ‘no-sorbent’ cycle behaviour. Figure 3a shows a CO$_2$ profile that started slightly earlier than the H$_2$ profile but not in significant amount, which then translated into a steam conversion fraction that exhibited a very small initial negative dip due to UC, immediately followed by a much more significant rise in positive values caused by SR and WGS (Fig. 3b).
Thus in the presence of the sorbent, a reducing-only initial period would most likely have been briefly present but with expected very small activity even if sorption enhanced by Carb, and the reduction of the NiO would have been gradual, occurring alongside the steam reforming and carbonation reactions. This then further reinforced the assumptions made earlier to derive Eq. 7 and the integration of the NiO reduction rate from time $t_0$ and not before. This finding is significant, as, had the reducing reaction occurred prior to the steam reforming/water gas shift reactions, the production of pure hydrogen would have been delayed. Upon up-scaling of the process, this would cause exaggerated intermittency in the production of H$_2$. The combination of the WCO fuel with the sorption enhanced chemical looping reforming process using this Ni-Al$_2$O$_3$ catalyst was therefore a beneficial one, as the Ni catalyst did not seem to require full reduction nor full fuel conversion prior to becoming active in hydrogen production by steam reforming and water gas shift.

3.2 Process outputs during air feed

During the air feed, four main reactions were susceptible to occur: the two carbon oxidation reactions (C-Ox and C-POx), the nickel oxidation reaction (Ni-Ox) and the calcination of the sorbent (Calc). Both C-Ox and Calc would have generated CO$_2$, while the three reactions C-Ox, C-POx and Ni-Ox consumed oxygen, therefore the carbon and oxygen elemental balances were not sufficient to determine the three unknown rates of Ni oxidation, carbon oxidation, and sorbent calcination. Thus a qualitative discussion is carried out in the following section. Figure 4(a) plots the rates of evolution of CO$_2$ and CO with time-on-stream during the air feed of the first cycle, juxtaposed with the mid-reactor and top-reactor temperatures curves. As soon as the temperatures exceeded the set temperature of 600 °C, the power to the reactor’s heating coil was automatically cut-off, and this corresponded to a period of time of ca. 400 s. This period ended
with O₂ concentration in the products recovering from a low mol fraction to ca. 21% of the air feed (not shown). A period of flushing of the products from the previous feeds was observed for the initial 200 s, as was observed and discussed in the experiments carried out without the sorbent (Pimenidou et al, 2010). This was identified thanks to the matching profiles of CH₄ and H₂ (peaks not shown), which could only have formed during the WCO/steam/N₂ feed. Some CO and CO₂ also evolved during this flushing period. Between 300 and 500 s, CO₂ increased as a result of carbon oxidation, followed by a CO increase when the lack of oxygen hampered complete oxidation. We have shown in the study without sorbent and using the O elemental balance, that at this stage, Ni oxidation also occurred, and began its trend to dominate the consumption of oxygen. The exothermicity of these simultaneous oxidation reactions contributed to a rise in the reactor bed temperatures from 600 to above 800 °C (Fig. 4a).

It was expected that when the bed temperatures exceed 750 °C, de-carbonation would occur, but it is possible that larger solid temperature gradients deep in the bed material would allow for a more significant de-carbonation to take place. These solid temperature gradients would not have been accurately reflected by the thermocouple temperatures, which would have been closer to bulk gas reactor temperatures. This would explain how, when multiplying the peak rate of CO₂ evolution (4×10⁻⁴ mol/s) under air feed, by the assumed duration of the de-carbonation (the 300 s indicated in Fig. 4a by temperature exceeding 750 °C), only 29% of the CO₂ capacity of the sorbent was accounted for. In contrast, as seen previously in Table 2, the next carbonation cycle under fuel feed allowed for 46% of the capacity to be reached. This suggested a significantly longer de-carbonation period than that indicated by the duration for which thermocouple temperatures exceeded 750 °C, and would support higher solid temperatures at the seat of the
oxidation reactions able to better couple with the endothermic decarbonation (calcination) reaction.

Considering the WCO/steam/N$_2$ and air feeds as the two main reactive cycle conditions, and ignoring the potential reactivity of the N$_2$ purge, such as carbonaceous deposits playing a role in the reduction of NiO (Dupont et al, 2008), the advantages of the sorption enhanced chemical looping reforming process were demonstrated over a restricted number of cycles. These included production of high purity H$_2$, improved fuel and steam conversion, and autothermality for extended periods of time, as well as the ability to cope with partial fuel conversion without deleterious effects of carbon deposits, due to integration of the oxygen transfer catalyst and sorbent regeneration steps within the process. Thus on one hand, these features make the process very promising, and this, coupled with the fact that the chosen fuel, waste cooking oil, will remain in plentiful supply for the foreseeable future, would justify further research and development. On the other hand, the results revealed complex reaction mechanisms at work, where individual steps were difficult to isolate and quantify with the current set up and methods. For a better understanding of all the significant reactions in the process and of their interactions, fundamental studies with increased analytical capabilities in monitoring the extent of the OTM’s redox states and sorbent’s usage with time on stream appear necessary. In addition, although the process was shown to operate without obvious deterioration for six cycles, tests designed to establish the life expectancy of the OTM and sorbent in the conditions of sorption enhanced chemical looping reforming in packed bed configuration, and the extent to which their chemical reactivity influences the process would be desirable.

4. Conclusion
The chemical looping reforming of waste cooking vegetable oil on a Ni-Al$_2$O$_3$ catalyst in the presence of dolomite for in-situ CO$_2$ sorption has been shown to operate for six cycles at 600 °C at a steam to carbon ratio of 4 without obvious deterioration in fuel and steam conversion, H$_2$ purity and carbon products selectivity. Better fuel and steam conversions than in the absence of sorbent, carbonation efficiencies that stabilised around 56% of the ideal value for the following 5 cycles, and evidence of regeneration of both the catalyst and the sorbent under the two types of feeds were found.

**Appendix: Nomenclature**

\( \alpha \)
- Carbonation efficiency (%)

**BT**
- Suffix relevant to the CO$_2$-breakthrough regime (carbonation with sorbent saturation)

Calc
- Decarbonation (calcination) reaction (CaCO$_3$ → CaO+CO$_2$)

Carb
- Reaction of carbonation of the solid sorbent (CaO+CO$_2$ → CaCO$_3$)

C-Ox
- Complete carbon oxidation reaction (C+O$_2$ → CO$_2$)

C-POx
- Partial carbon oxidation reaction (C+0.5O$_2$ → CO)

H$_2$ % pur
- Hydrogen purity (%) calculated by $100\times(y_{H_2}/(y_{H_2}+y_{CO}+y_{CO_2}+y_{CH_4}))$

Ni-Ox
- Nickel oxidation reaction (Ni+0.5O$_2$ → NiO)

\( \dot{n} \)
- Molar rate (mol s$^{-1}$)

\( n, m, k \)
- Elemental amounts of C, H and O in the fuel (mol)
OTM  Oxygen transfer material

PB    Suffix relevant to the pre-CO₂ breakthrough regime (during carbonation)

Sel   Selectivity to a specific product (%)

SS    Suffix relevant to CO₂-steady state or post-CO₂ breakthrough conditions.

SR    Steam reforming reaction (CₙHₘOₖ reacting with steam producing CO and H₂)

t    Characteristic time (s)

Tmid  Mid reactor bed temperature (°C)

UC    Unmixed combustion reaction (reduction of NiO by CₙHₘOₖ, producing Ni, CO₂, and H₂O)

WCO   Waste cooking vegetable oil

WGS   Water gas shift reaction (CO+H₂O ↔ CO₂+H₂)

X     Fractional conversion

y     Gas mol fraction
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Table 1 Process outputs at steady state (post-CO$_2$ breakthrough) for 6 cycles without (left) and with (right) the CO$_2$ sorbent present (40 g of catalyst, S:C ratio of 4, set reactor temperature of 600 °C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Without sorbent</th>
<th>With 40 g of calcined dolomite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$X_{WCO}$</td>
<td>$X_{H_2O}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Durations of CO$_2$ pre-breakthrough and breakthrough periods, pre-breakthrough rate of carbonation, carbonation efficiencies prior to- and during CO$_2$ breakthrough, and total carbonation efficiency for each cycle during the chemical looping reforming of WCO at S:C of 4 with sorbent and the set reactor temperature of 600 °C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>$t_0$</th>
<th>$t_{BT} - t_0$ (s)</th>
<th>$t_{SS} - t_{BT}$ (s)</th>
<th>$n_{CO_2,carb,FB}$ (mol s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\alpha_{PB}$ (%)</th>
<th>$\alpha_{BT}$ (%)</th>
<th>$\alpha$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>2.42×10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1.59×10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1.61×10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1.70×10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1.22×10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1.42×10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Estimate of NiO reduction rate in pre-CO$_2$ breakthrough conditions and % ratio of NiO reduction rate to maximum reduction rate achievable by fuel conversion

$$R_{\text{red}} = 100 \times \frac{\dot{n}_{\text{NiO-Ni, PB}}}{\dot{n}_{\text{WCO,in}} X_{\text{WCO,SS}} (2n + 0.5m - k)}$$

for cycles 2-6 and same conditions as Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>$\dot{n}_{\text{NiO-Ni, PB}}$ (mol s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>% $R_{\text{red}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.66 $\times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84$\times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.01$\times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.61$\times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.41$\times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1(a) Dry mol % of H₂ (upper curves group) and CO₂ (lower curves group) for each cycle (C1-6) measured online every 5 s during the WCO/steam/N₂ feed with 40 g of catalyst and 40 g of calcined dolomite, using a S:C of 4 at a set reactor temperature of 600 °C. (b) Electrical power input to the reactor for the first cycle (% of maximum).
Fig. 2  H$_2$ % purity for cycles C1-6 in same experimental conditions as Fig. 1. End values near 70% after high plateau (post CO$_2$-breakthrough) correspond to tabulated values in Table 1.

Fig. 3 (a) Dry syngas mol fractions and (b) estimated water conversion fraction for cycle 4 without sorbent, 40 g catalyst, S:C=4, T$_{set}$=600 °C, same flows as in Fig. 1.
Fig. 4 (a) Rates of CO$_2$ and CO evolution for the air feed of the first cycle with sorbent (bottom curves) and mid- and top-reactor temperature-time curves (top). (b) Percent electrical power input to the heater during air feed of first cycle.