



Full Length Article

Techno-economic feasibility assessment of CO₂ capture from coal-fired power plants using molecularly imprinted polymer

Dawid P. Hanak*, Vasilije Manovic

Combustion and CCS Centre, Cranfield University, Bedford, Bedfordshire MK43 0AL, UK



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Coal-fired power plant
 Polymer-based sorbents
 Novel CO₂ capture sorbent
 Process modelling
 Process simulation
 Techno-economic analysis

ABSTRACT

Mature CO₂ capture technologies would reduce the net thermal efficiency of the coal-fired power plant by 7–13% points, leading to an electricity cost increase of at least 60%. To minimise the energy-intensity of CO₂ capture, novel technologies and CO₂ capture materials are being developed. This study assessed the techno-economic feasibility of the CO₂ capture system using acrylamide-based molecularly imprinted polymer (MIP) sorbent in a 580 MW_{el} coal-fired power plant retrofit scenario. Under the initial design basis, the net efficiency penalty and the energy penalty of the MIP retrofit scenario were estimated to be 5.3%_{HHV} points and 14.1%, respectively. Furthermore, the cost of CO₂ avoided was estimated to be 29.3 £/tCO₂. Such techno-economic performance was found to be superior to the CO₂ capture system using chemical solvents. The parametric study revealed that the thermodynamic performance of the MIP retrofit scenario is mainly affected by the sorbent capacity, as the net efficiency penalty was found to increase from 4.4 to 8.9%_{HHV} points on reduction of the sorbent capacity from 1 to 0.2 mmol CO₂/g. Moreover, the economic performance was not only found to be affected by sorbent capacity, but primarily on the cyclic performance of the MIP sorbent. It was shown that the cost of CO₂ avoided would increase linearly with increase of the MIP sorbent make-up at a rate of 6.8 £/tCO₂ per 0.1% of sorbent make-up.

1. Introduction

Carbon capture and storage (CCS) is expected to play a pivotal role in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector and is expected to result in a 13% cumulative reduction of CO₂ emission between 2012 and 2050 [1,2]. However, rapid development and demonstration of CCS technologies are required if they are to be deployed after 2020 to meet 2DS objectives [3]. Unfortunately, a first-of-a-kind large-scale demonstration plant retrofitted to the coal-fired power plant was only commissioned in 2014 [4]. A main challenge that keeps CCS from large-scale deployment in the power sector is its considerable capital and operating cost that would affect the cost of electricity.

The post-combustion technologies are claimed to have a large potential for decarbonising the power sector in the short- to mid-term, as they can be both easily retrofitted to the existing power plant fleet and integrated to new greenfield systems [5–8]. Thus far, chemical solvent scrubbing has been perceived as the technology of choice for decarbonisation of coal-fired power plants [5–11]. Yet, retrofit of this technology to coal-fired power plants was shown to impose a net thermal efficiency penalty of 7–13% points [12,13], which is expected

to cause an increase in the cost of electricity by at least 60% [14–18]. Although other CO₂ capture and separation technologies, such as adsorption or membrane separation, have been successfully implemented in other industries, these have thus far not been considered efficient options for coal-fired power plants due to high impurities content and low CO₂ concentration in, and atmospheric pressure of, flue gas [7,8,11]. Yet, the recent progress in development of these technologies indicates that other technologies could result in lower parasitic load on the power plant performance compared to chemical solvent absorption, and thus may bring higher improvements to the economics of CCS.

As opposed to the absorption process, in which CO₂ molecules dissolve in the bulk of the solvent, adsorption of CO₂ takes place at the surface of a solid sorbent. This is typically conducted in a fixed or fluidised bed reactor using zeolites, activated carbon, metal oxides or alumina, as well as new materials, such as functionalised amine-based sorbents, metal-organic frameworks, and polymer-based sorbents [13,19–23]. Compared to chemical solvents, such as monoethanolamine, solid sorbents are neither corrosive nor toxic, and are characterised by the need for lower regeneration energy [20,22,24]. The last quality makes these materials attractive for CO₂ capture from

Abbreviations: CCS, Carbon capture and storage; MEA, Monoethanolamine; MIP, Molecularly imprinted polymer

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: d.p.hanak@cranfield.ac.uk (D.P. Hanak), v.manovic@cranfield.ac.uk (V. Manovic).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.10.107>

Received 28 October 2016; Received in revised form 19 October 2017; Accepted 24 October 2017

0016-2361/ © 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Nomenclature			
<i>Parameters</i>		<i>VOM</i>	Variable operating and maintenance cost (£/MW _{el} h)
<i>AC</i>	Cost of CO ₂ avoided (£/tCO ₂)	\dot{W}_{net}	Net power output (MW _{el})
<i>a</i>	Turbine design parameter (–)	<i>v</i>	Velocity (m/s)
<i>CF</i>	Capacity factor (–)	ρ	Density (kg/m ³)
<i>e_{CO2}</i>	Specific CO ₂ emission (g CO ₂ /kW _{el} h)	η_i	Isentropic efficiency (–)
<i>FC</i>	Fuel cost (£)	η_{th}	Net thermal efficiency (–)
<i>FCF</i>	Fixed charge factor (–)	<i>Superscripts</i>	
<i>FOM</i>	Fixed operating and maintenance cost (£)	0	Parameter at design conditions
<i>LCOE</i>	Levelised cost of electricity (£/MW _{el} h)	<i>Subscripts</i>	
<i>m</i>	Mass flow rate (kg/s)	capture	Corresponds to coal-fired power plant with CO ₂ capture
<i>n</i>	Adiabatic index (–)	in	Stream parameter at inlet to the unit operation
<i>p</i>	Steam pressure (bar)	out	Stream parameter at outlet from the unit operation
<i>Q_{fuel}</i>	Heat input from fuel combustion (MW _{th})	ref	Corresponds to reference coal-fired power plant
<i>SCF</i>	Specific fuel cost (£/MW _{el} h)		
<i>TCR</i>	Total capital requirement (£)		

coal-fired power plants, as they have the potential to reduce the energy-intensity associated with CO₂ capture.

Integration of the vacuum-swing adsorption process (adsorption at 2 bar, regeneration at 0.1 bar) using Zeolite 13X, which is the most popular adsorbent [20], as the post-combustion CO₂ capture plant to an ultra-supercritical coal-fired power plant was found to impose a net thermal efficiency penalty of 10.3% points [25]. This was found to be 0.6% lower than for chemical solvent scrubbing using monoethanolamine (MEA). A similar conclusion can be drawn when analysing performance of the temperature-swing adsorption process using dry sodium carbonate, in which CO₂ was adsorbed at about 55 °C and regenerated at about 140 °C. Namely, the net efficiency penalty of such process on integration to a supercritical coal-fired power plant was found to be 7.1–9.9% points, which was 1.9–4.5% points lower compared to chemical solvent scrubbing using MEA [26]. Furthermore, the use of metal oxides, such as calcium oxide, in high-temperature solid looping temperature cycles is regarded as an emerging CO₂ capture technology suitable for decarbonisation of coal-fired power plants [12,20,27]. In this temperature-swing adsorption process, CO₂ is adsorbed by the sorbent at 600–650 °C and reclaimed through sorbent regeneration at temperatures higher than 900 °C. It has been reported that depending on the operating conditions and the steam conditions in the reference coal-fired power plant, the net efficiency penalty associated with this technology is expected to be between 3 and 8% points [28–35]. Finally, retrofit of the temperature-swing adsorption system using novel materials, such as amine-based sorbent or metal organic frameworks, was shown to impose net efficiency penalties of 10% points and 7% points, respectively [36]. This performance was found to be competitive compared to the advanced chemical solvent scrubbing (Econamine FG+) process, for which the efficiency penalty was estimated to be 11% points.

Although the adsorption processes using solid sorbents were shown to impose lower net efficiency penalties on retrofit to coal-fired power plants, there are several issues that may degrade their performance. Namely, the presence of moisture and impurities, such as NO_x and SO_x, in flue gas can dramatically degrade the capture capacity of zeolites and metal organic frameworks [13,37,38]. Also, calcium-based sorbents are prone to react with SO_x [39,40] and their cyclic performance needs to be improved prior to large-scale deployment [20,40]. Carbonaceous materials are characterised by low sensitivity to moisture and flue gas impurities [19], but their CO₂ adsorption capacity is affected by low CO₂ partial pressure in the flue gas [19,41]. On the other hand, polymer-based materials, such as acrylamide-based molecularly imprinted polymer (MIP) particles, porous aromatic frameworks, hypercrosslinked polymers, and covalent organic polymers, have been shown

to have high selectivity and CO₂ uptake, as well as high hydrothermal stability [22,23,42–44]. The MIP particles, which are polymers with template-shaped cavities within their matrix to enable molecular recognition towards specific target molecule [23,45], were also shown to be insensitive to moisture, SO_x, NO_x and O₂ present in the flue gas [46,47]. As the MIP sorbent was shown to be a suitable material for fixed and fluidised bed systems [23,48], this study is conducted to assess the techno-economic feasibility of a CO₂ capture system using MIP sorbent in a 580 MW_{el} coal-fired power plant retrofit scenario.

2. Model development

2.1. Supercritical coal-fired power plant

The 580 MW_{el} supercritical coal-fired power plant was used in this study as a reference system. The process model of this unit, which has previously been developed in Aspen Plus® [49,50] based on the revised NETL report [51], comprises three sub-models: supercritical boiler, flue gas treatment train (NO_x, SO_x and fly ash), both modelled using the Peng-Robinson-Boston-Mathias equation of state, and steam cycle represented by STEAMNBS steam tables. The boiler heat exchange sections, which include the primary, secondary, and reheat superheaters, as well as the economiser, were modelled using pressure drops and temperature levels set based on the revised NETL report [51]. Both the live (242.3 bar) and reheat steam generated in these sections were assumed to leave the boiler at the temperature of 593.3 °C. Steam turbines were modelled as individual turbine sections, hence the high-, intermediate-, and low-pressure cylinders were further divided into the required steam turbine sections. The condenser was assumed to operate at a fixed pressure of 0.069 bar, which corresponds to a condensation temperature of 38.7 °C. The feedwater heating train comprised five LP feedwater heaters including the deaerator, and three surface HP feedwater heaters. At design conditions, the feedwater heaters were characterised by the terminal temperature difference of 2.78 °C and the minimal temperature difference between subcooled condensate and inlet feedwater of 5.56 °C. The key performance parameters of the model are provided in Table 1. The prediction accuracy of this model was compared with data from a revised NETL report [51] and was shown to closely represent both the process stream data (temperature, pressure, mass flow rate) and the thermodynamic performance (gross power output, net thermal efficiency) of the coal-fired power plant [49,50].

The MIP sorbent needs to be preheated to 80 °C to reclaim CO₂. The configuration investigated in this study assumes that the heat for sorbent regeneration is provided by direct contact with steam extracted

Table 1
Supercritical coal-fired power plant key performance parameters.

Parameter	Value
Gross power output (MW _{el})	580.4
Net power output (MW _{el})	552.7
Net thermal efficiency (% _{HHV})	38.5
Flue gas stream (kg/s)	617.2
CO ₂ content in flue gas (% _{vol})	15.2
Coal consumption rate (kg/s)	53.8
Air consumption rate (kg/s)	526.5
Live steam generation rate (kg/s)	462.3
Excess air ratio (% _{vol})	20.0
Live steam pressure (bar)	242.3
Reheated steam pressure (bar)	45.2
Intermediate-/low-pressure crossover pipe pressure (bar)	9.3
Condenser pressure (bar)	0.069
Live and reheated steam temperature (°C)	593.3
Mechanical efficiency of the rotational machinery (%)	99.0

from the steam cycle. This is because extraction of steam was found to be the most efficient option for providing heat for solvent regeneration in mature chemical solvent scrubbing systems [44]. Moreover, the process configuration based on a dual intermediate/low-pressure crossover pressure system with heat integration [50] is adopted in this study, as it allows reducing the steam pressure and temperature to the values required for MIP sorbent regeneration while reducing the impact of steam extraction on the coal-fired power plant performance (Fig. 1).

As reported for the chemical solvent scrubbing retrofit scenarios [50,52], extraction of steam from the steam cycle results in off-design operation of the low-pressure turbine. This results in the loss of power output not only as a result of reduced low-pressure turbine throughput, but also due to a loss in the inlet pressure to this turbine cylinder. As the condenser pressure is assumed to be fixed at 0.069 bar, pressure gradients across a turbine section are determined using Stodola’s ellipse law presented in Eq. (1) [45–47] to determine the inlet pressure in a back-to-front manner.

$$\frac{\dot{m}_{in}}{\dot{m}_{in}^0} = \frac{P_{in}}{P_{in}^0} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{P_{in}^0 \cdot \rho_{in}^0}{P_{in} \cdot \rho_{in}}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{P_{out}}{P_{in}}\right)^{\frac{n+1}{n}}}}{\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{P_{out}^0}{P_{in}^0}\right)^{\frac{n+1}{n}}}} \quad (1)$$

Importantly, a drop in the steam pressure downstream of the extraction point causes an increase in the steam velocity. As a result, the kinetic energy at the inlet to the low-pressure turbine increases. With further increase in the steam kinetic energy on expansion in the low-pressure turbine stages, the turbine discharge loss is expected to increase compared to the figure under design conditions. This, in turn, would affect the isentropic efficiency of the low-pressure turbine and could cause operational issues, such as vibration of the last stage moving blades [48]. Therefore, the isentropic efficiency is updated using Eq. (2), which is based on the approach used by Salisbury [49] and Knopf [46] assuming that each turbine section reaches its optimal performance at design conditions and comprises 50% reaction blading (a = 0.7071).

$$\frac{\eta_i}{\eta_i^0} \cong 2 \frac{a}{\frac{v_{in}^0}{v_{in}}} \cdot \left[\left(a - \frac{a}{\frac{v_{in}^0}{v_{in}}} \right) + \sqrt{\left(a - \frac{a}{\frac{v_{in}^0}{v_{in}}} \right)^2 + 1 - a^2} \right] \quad (2)$$

2.2. CO₂ capture system using molecularly imprinted polymer sorbent

The process considered in this study utilises MIP sorbent as a CO₂ capture sorbent (Fig. 2), the characteristics of which are listed in Table 2, and comprises two interconnected fluidised beds with assumed pressure drop of 200 mbar. To ensure favourable operating conditions in the adsorber, which is modelled as a conversion reactor, flue gas from the coal-fired power plant is cooled in the direct contact cooler to 40 °C. The flash calculations are performed using the Rachford-Rice equation [53] and the process streams are characterised using the Peng Robinson equation of state.

Conversion of the MIP sorbent in the adsorber is determined using its nominal capacity and the assumed adsorption extent of 70%, which




Fig. 1. Process flow diagram of reference supercritical coal-fired power plant.




Fig. 2. Process flow diagram of the CO₂ capture system using acrylamide-based molecularly imprinted polymer sorbent.

Table 2
Properties of acrylamide-based molecularly imprinted polymer sorbent.¹

Property	Value
Heat of adsorption (kJ/mol CO ₂)	31.2
Sorbent capacity (mmol CO ₂ /g)	0.56
Sorbent heat capacity (kJ/kg K)	0.95–1.53 ²

¹ The properties of acrylamide-based molecularly imprinted polymer material were provided by the CoERCE project partner and are not yet available in the open literature.

² The heat capacity of the MIP sorbent is given by $C_p = 94.437 \times (T - 273.15)^{0.5882}$ within the temperature range of 50–120 °C.

is commonly made for other CO₂ capture systems comprising fluidised beds, such as calcium looping [12,54]. In addition, the amount of the sorbent fed to the adsorber is determined to ensure a CO₂ capture level of 90%. The CO₂-rich sorbent is then heated using air preheated by the lean sorbent leaving the desorber. This aims at reduction of the heat requirements of the process by minimising the amount of waste heat in the CO₂ capture plant. CO₂ is then reclaimed from the preheated CO₂-rich sorbent on its further heating to 80 °C in the desorber, which is also modelled as a conversion reactor with the assumption that the conversion of sorbent is complete. The heat requirement for the sorbent regeneration is met by direct contact of CO₂-rich MIP sorbent and steam extracted from the steam cycle. CO₂ is then separated from water vapour on cooling in the water knock-out tower, which is modelled using the same approach as a direct contact cooler, and sent to the CO₂ compression unit. Part of the condensed water is returned to the steam cycle to balance the amount of steam extracted from the intermediate/low-pressure crossover pipe. The CO₂ compression unit comprises nine intercooled compression stages, each of which was modelled as a polytropic compression stage with a stage efficiency of 78–80% [7,55], and the pressure ratio and polytropic head not exceeding 3 and 3050 m, respectively [56]. It is assumed that the CO₂ delivery pressure of 110 bar [57] is achieved by a CO₂ pump, which is characterised with an isentropic efficiency of 80%.

3. Process performance evaluation

3.1. Considerations

Having linked the coal-fired power plant and the CO₂ capture system using MIP sorbent (MIP retrofit scenario), the thermodynamic performance is evaluated using the system's net power output (\dot{W}_{net}) and net thermal efficiency (η_{th}), which is defined in Eq. (3) as the ratio of the net power output and the heat input from fuel combustion (\dot{Q}_{fuel}). In addition, environmental performance of the MIP retrofit scenario is represented in Eq. (4) as the specific CO₂ emissions (e_{CO_2}), defined as the ratio of CO₂ emission rate (\dot{m}_{CO_2}) and the net power output. This parameter is commonly used to characterise the environmental performance of the fossil fuel power generation systems [58–62].

$$\eta_{th} = \frac{\dot{W}_{net}}{\dot{Q}_{fuel}} \quad (3)$$

$$e_{CO_2} = \frac{\dot{m}_{CO_2}}{\dot{W}_{net}} \quad (4)$$

The economic performance of the proposed system is compared with the reference coal-fired power plant without CO₂ capture using the levelised cost of electricity (LCOE) and the cost of CO₂ avoided (AC) that are calculated according to Eq. (5) and Eq. (6) [32,63,64], respectively.

$$LCOE = \frac{TCR \times FCF + FOM}{\dot{W}_{net} \times CF \times 8760} + VOM + \frac{SFC}{\eta_{th}} \quad (5)$$

$$AC = \frac{LCOE_{capture} - LCOE_{ref}}{e_{CO_2,ref} - e_{CO_2,capture}} \quad (6)$$

These parameters correlate thermodynamic performance indicators, such as net power output, net thermal efficiency (η_{th}), capacity factor (CF) and specific emissions (e_{CO_2}), with economic performance, such as total capital requirement (TCR), variable (VOM) and fixed (FOM) operating and maintenance costs, specific fuel cost (SFC), and the fixed charge factor (FCF), which considers the system's lifetime and project interest rate.

The capital cost of the coal-fired power plant and the key equipment in the CO₂ capture system, such as direct contact cooler and water

Table 3
Key economic model assumptions.

Parameter	Value
Variable cost as a fraction of total capital cost (%) [32,67]	2.0
Fixed cost as a fraction of total capital cost (%) [32,67]	1.0
CO ₂ transport and storage cost (£/tCO ₂) [68]	7.0
Coal price (£/t) [67,69]	1.5
Expected lifetime (years) [32,67]	25
Project interest rate (%) [32,67]	8.78
Capacity factor (%) [32,67]	80
Tax, freight, insurance cost (% of free-on-board supplier cost) [66]	20
Offsites, indirect costs for home office and field expenses (% of labour and material cost including free-on-board supplier cost, freight, delivery, duties and instruments) [66]	30
Contractors fees (% of bare module cost) [66]	4
Project contingency (% of bare module cost) [66]	15
Design contingency (% of bare module cost) [66]	20

knock-out, pumps and fans, adsorber, desorber, heat exchangers and CO₂ compression unit, are determined using the exponential method function [65] with economic data gathered from NETL [51] and Woods [66]. Moreover, fixed and variable operating and maintenance costs are calculated as a fraction of total capital cost, while operating costs associated with fuel consumption, and CO₂ storage, transport and emission are determined based on process simulation outputs using economic data from Table 3.

The techno-economic assessment of the MIP retrofit scenario is first evaluated under the initial design basis using the sorbent characteristics presented in Table 2 and with the assumption that there is no sorbent degradation over multiple cycles; hence no purge is considered in the initial assessment. Moreover, due to lack of information on the MIP sorbent cost, which is, however, widely referred to as being lower compared to other adsorbents for other applications [70], the initial cost of sorbent is assumed to be 100 £/t. This is of the same order of magnitude as synthetic calcium-based sorbents [71]. Nevertheless, considering the uncertainty of the sorbent characteristics, the sensitivity of the key techno-economic performance indicators to variation in the sorbent cyclic performance, adsorption capacity, and specific cost is assessed by varying the MIP sorbent:

- make-up rate between 0 and 1.5%;
- adsorption capacity between 0.2 and 1 mmol CO₂/g;
- specific cost between 50 and 5000 £/t.

3.2. Techno-economic performance evaluation

Retrofit of the CO₂ capture system using MIP sorbent to the 580 MW_{el} coal-fired power plant was found to impose a net efficiency penalty of 5.3%_{HHV} points and to result in an energy penalty of 14.1% (Table 4). In addition, the specific coal consumption was found to increase by 16.4%. Such thermodynamic performance is comparable to the performance of calcium looping with a supercritical CO₂ cycle retrofitted to the same reference coal-fired power plant, which resulted in a net efficiency penalty of 5.8%_{HHV} points and 17.1% increase in the specific coal consumption [35]. Yet, reduction in the net power output in the MIP retrofit scenario can be expected to result in lower revenue from the electricity sales compared to the calcium looping retrofit scenario, which resulted in an increase of the system's net power output by about 45% [35]. Nevertheless, the performance of the MIP retrofit scenario compares favourably with the CO₂ capture systems using chemical solvents, such as MEA or chilled ammonia scrubbing. Retrofits of these systems to the same reference coal-fired power plant resulted in net efficiency penalties of 9.5 and 9% points, and energy penalties of 24.7 and 23.3%, respectively [34,50]. The specific coal consumption increased in these retrofit scenarios by 32.8 and 30.3%, respectively.

Table 4
Summary of techno-economic performance indicators.

Parameter	Reference coal-fired power plant	MIP retrofit scenario
<i>Thermodynamic performance indicators</i>		
Heat input from coal combustion (MW _{th})	1452.6	1452.6
Gross power output (MW _{el})	580.4	545.5
Auxiliary power requirement (MW _{el})	27.7	70.7
Net power output (MW _{el})	552.7	474.8
Gross thermal efficiency (% _{HHV})	40.4	37.6
Net thermal efficiency (% _{HHV})	38.0	32.7
Specific coal consumption (g/kW _{el} h)	350.3	407.7
Specific CO ₂ emission (g/kW _{el} h)	786.8	92.2
Net energy penalty (%)	–	14.1
Net efficiency penalty (% _{HHV} points)	–	5.3
Increase in specific coal consumption (%)	–	16.4
<i>Economic performance indicators</i>		
Specific capital cost (£/kW _{el, gross})	1161.3	1648.1
Levelised cost of electricity (£/MW _{el} h)	36.9	57.5
CO ₂ avoided cost (£/tCO ₂)	–	29.3

Therefore, the MIP retrofit scenario has the potential to significantly reduce the impact of the CO₂ capture system on the performance of coal-fired power plants.

The analysis of the energy requirement of the CO₂ capture system using MIP sorbent revealed that the parasitic load arises primarily from the CO₂ compression unit (Fig. 3). This is because the heat requirement for MIP sorbent regeneration (226.7 MW_{th}) was found to be only 44% of the heat requirement in the amine scrubbing system (513.6 MW_{th}). Such reduction in the heat requirement can be associated with 1.15–3 times lower heat of adsorption of the MIP sorbent compared to the heat of absorption of the MEA solvent within the same operating temperature envelope (40–80 °C) [72]. Moreover, this is reflected in the specific heat requirement of the MIP sorbent (2.0 MJ_{th}/kg CO₂) at a sorbent capacity of 0.56 mmol CO₂/g that was found to be comparable to the specific heat requirement reported for the following solvents: Cansolv (2.33 MJ_{th}/kg CO₂), K₂CO₃ (2–2.5 MJ_{th}/kg CO₂), Econamine FG + (3.12 MJ_{th}/kg CO₂), and MDEA-PZ (2.52 MJ_{th}/kg CO₂) [73]. As a result, the steam extraction accounted only for 33% of the parasitic load in the MIP retrofit scenario (Fig. 3), as opposed to about 60% in the chemical solvent scrubbing retrofit scenarios [34].

The economic assessment (Table 4) revealed that retrofit of the CO₂ capture system using MIP sorbent will result in an increase of the specific capital cost of the entire system by 41.9% (486.8 £/kW_{el, gross}) compared to the specific capital cost of the reference coal-fired power plant. Such an increase in the specific capital cost, along with reduction in the net thermal efficiency, resulted in 55.8% increase in the levelised cost of electricity (LCOE) from 36.9 to 57.5 £/MW_{el}h. This corresponds to the cost of CO₂ avoided (AC) of 29.3 £/tCO₂. Importantly, the key economic indicators for the MIP retrofit scenario fall within the ranges reported previously for coal-fired power plants retrofitted with CO₂ capture systems using chemical solvents (LCOE = 55–60 £/MW_{el}h; AC = 30–75 £/tCO₂ [74–77]) and with calcium looping (LCOE = 25.8–116.7 £/MW_{el}h, AC = 7–87.5 £/tCO₂ [28,32,63,69,78–80]). Therefore, considering lower impact on the thermodynamic performance of the reference coal-fired power plant, the MIP retrofit scenario can be expected to bring higher profit from the electricity sales compared to the chemical solvent scrubbing retrofit scenarios.




Fig. 3. Distribution of the parasitic load in the MIP retrofit scenario.




Fig. 4. Effect of MIP sorbent make-up rate on the key techno-economic performance indicators.

3.3. Parametric study

Further to evaluating performance of the MIP retrofit scenario under the initial design basis, it is important to assess the effects of uncertainty in the sorbent characteristics on the system's performance. As shown in Fig. 4, increasing the amount of fresh MIP sorbent fed to the system did not have an effect on the net efficiency penalty of the retrofitted system. The main reason behind such performance is the low temperature difference between the MIP sorbent purged from (40 °C), and the fresh MIP sorbent fed to (25 °C), the system that results in a very small increase (0.025%) of the steam requirement in the desorber.

Nevertheless, increasing the MIP sorbent make-up rate was found to deteriorate the economic performance of the retrofitted system. Namely, the cost of CO₂ avoided would increase linearly with increasing MIP sorbent make-up at a rate of 6.8 £/tCO₂ per 0.1% of sorbent make-up¹ (Fig. 4). This implies that the CO₂ avoided cost would increase to 36.1 £/tCO₂ and 63.4 £/tCO₂ for MIP sorbent make-up rates of 0.1% and 0.5%, respectively, which is comparable to the figures reported for coal-fired power plant retrofits with CO₂ capture systems using chemical solvents [74–77] and calcium looping [28,32,63,69,78–80] (Fig. 5a). Thus for higher values of MIP sorbent make up rate, the MIP retrofit scenario would become less economically

favoured over mature CO₂ capture technologies.

Conversely to the make-up rate, the adsorption capacity of the MIP sorbent has a significant effect on both thermodynamic and economic performance of the MIP retrofit scenario. Fig. 6 shows that the net efficiency penalty could be reduced to 4.4%_{HHV} points, if the sorbent capacity increased to 1 mmol CO₂/g. Interestingly, such sorbent capacity corresponds to the theoretical lime conversion in the calcium looping process of 5.6%, which is slightly below the residual value of the limestone sorbent (7–12%) [81]. On the other hand, for a sorbent capacity of 0.2 mmol CO₂/g, the net efficiency penalty increases sharply to 8.9%_{HHV} points, which is comparable to the figures reported for other CO₂ capture technologies (Fig. 5b). This is due to the higher amount of sorbent that needs to be circulated in the system to achieve the desired CO₂ capture level of 90%, and thus increased heat requirement associated with the sensible heat of the sorbent entering the desorber. Importantly, the contribution of the sensible heat to the total heat requirement for MIP sorbent regeneration was found to reduce from 87% to 67% on increase of the sorbent capacity from 0.2 to 1 mmol CO₂/g. Nevertheless, increase in the net efficiency penalty for lower sorbent capacities was found to bring a subsequent increase in the cost of CO₂ avoided, which was estimated to be 50 £/tCO₂ for a sorbent capacity of 0.2 mmol CO₂/g and sorbent cost of 100 £/t. Upon increasing the sorbent capacity to 1 mmol CO₂/g, the cost of CO₂ avoided was found to reduce only by 3.7 £/tCO₂ compared to the value estimated under the initial design basis. Importantly, the economic performance of the MIP retrofit scenario was found to be linearly dependent upon the specific cost of the MIP sorbent. The cost of CO₂ avoided was found to be only marginally affected if the MIP sorbent cost is below 500 £/t, as its variation is not higher than 5% with respect to the values estimated using the initial sorbent cost of 100 £/t (Fig. 6). However, if the MIP sorbent cost increases to 5000 £/t, the cost of CO₂ avoided would increase by 40–65%, from 29.3 to 42–69.3 £/tCO₂, depending on the sorbent capacity. For this reason, the MIP sorbent needs to be further tested in order to quantify its cyclic performance, adsorption capacity under different operating conditions and sorbent cost. Moreover, the potential correlation between sorbent cost and adsorption capacity needs to be assessed.

4. Conclusions

This study assessed the techno-economic feasibility of the CO₂ capture system using MIP sorbent in a 580 MW_{e1} supercritical coal-fired

¹ The percent of MIP material make-up is defined as the mass flow rate ratio of the MIP material make-up and the MIP material directed from the desorber to the adsorber.




Fig. 5. Comparison of a) economic and b) thermo-dynamic performance of MIP retrofit scenario with calcium looping and chemical solvent scrubbing retrofits.




Fig. 6. Effect of MIP sorbent capacity and sorbent cost on the key techno-economic performance indicators.

power plant retrofit scenario. Under the initial design basis, the net efficiency penalty and the energy penalty of the MIP retrofit scenario were estimated to be 5.3%_{HHV} points and 14.1%, respectively. Such thermodynamic performance was found to be superior to CO₂ capture systems using chemical solvents, such as MEA or chilled ammonia, retrofitted to the same reference coal-fired power plant. The specific heat requirement of the MIP sorbent (2.0 MJ_{th}/kg CO₂ at a sorbent capacity of 0.56 mmol CO₂/g) was found to be comparable to advanced CO₂ capture materials. Furthermore, the cost of CO₂ avoided for the MIP retrofit scenario was estimated to be 29.3 £/tCO₂, and fell within the lower end of the range reported for coal-fired power plants retrofitted with CO₂ capture systems using chemical solvents. To account for the uncertainty in the MIP sorbent characteristics, a parametric study was conducted. It was found that the thermodynamic performance of the MIP retrofit scenario is mainly affected by the sorbent capacity, as the net efficiency penalty was found to increase from 4.4 to 8.9%_{HHV} points on reduction of the sorbent capacity from 1 to 0.2 mmol CO₂/g. Moreover, the economic performance was shown to be not only dependent upon sorbent capacity, but primarily on the cyclic performance of the MIP sorbent. This study revealed that the cost of CO₂ avoided would increase linearly with increasing MIP sorbent make-up at a rate

of 6.8 £/tCO₂ per 0.1% of sorbent make-up. To reduce the uncertainty associated with this material, the MIP sorbent needs to be further tested in order to quantify its cyclic performance, adsorption capacity under different operating conditions and sorbent cost. Moreover, the potential correlation between sorbent cost and adsorption capacity needs to be assessed.

Acknowledgements

This publication is based on research conducted within the “Combined energy recovery & CO₂ removal” project funded by UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC reference: EP/N508615/1). The authors would like to thank Sayed Ali Nabavi for providing the characteristics of the acrylamide-based molecularly imprinted polymer sorbent. The authors would also acknowledge the support they received from Cambridge Engineering Analysis & Design Ltd.

References

- [1] IEA. Carbon capture and storage: the solution for deep emissions reductions. Paris, France: IEA Publications; 2015.
- [2] IEA. Energy technology perspectives 2015. Paris, France: IEA Publications; 2015.
- [3] IEA. Energy technology perspectives 2010: scenarios & strategies to 2050. Paris, France: IEA Publications; 2010.
- [4] Stéphane K. Start-up of world's first commercial post-combustion coal fired CCS project: contribution of Shell Cansolv to Saskpower Boundary Dam ICCS project. Energy Procedia 2014;63:6106–10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.11.642>.
- [5] Rackley SA. Carbon capture and storage. Burlington, USA: Elsevier; 2010.
- [6] Oexmann J, Kather A, Linnenberg S, Liebenthal U. Post-combustion CO₂ capture: chemical absorption processes in coal-fired steam power plants. Greenhouse Gases Sci Technol 2012;2:80–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ghg.1273>.
- [7] Pfaff I, Oexmann J, Kather A. Optimised integration of post-combustion CO₂ capture process in greenfield power plants. Energy 2010;35:4030–41. doi:j.e-nergy.2010.06.004.
- [8] Strube R, Manfrida G. CO₂ capture in coal-fired power plants – impact on plant performance. Int J Greenhouse Gas Control 2011;5:710–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2011.01.008>.
- [9] Mac Dowell N, Florin N, Buchard A, Hallett J, Galindo A, Jackson G, et al. An overview of CO₂ capture technologies. Energy Environ Sci 2010;3:1645. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c004106h>.
- [10] Blamey J, Anthony EJ, Wang J, Fennell PS. The calcium looping cycle for large-scale CO₂ capture. Prog Energy Combust Sci 2010;36:260–79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pecc.2009.10.001>.
- [11] Oexmann J, Hensel C, Kather A. Post-combustion CO₂ capture from coal-fired power plants: preliminary evaluation of an integrated chemical absorption process with piperazine-promoted potassium carbonate. Int J Greenhouse Gas Control

- 2008;2:539–52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2008.04.002>.
- [12] Hanak DP, Anthony EJ, Manovic V. A review of developments in pilot plant testing and modelling of calcium looping process for CO₂ capture from power generation systems. *Energy Environ Sci* 2015;8:2199–249. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C5EE01228G>.
- [13] Boot-Handford ME, Abanades JC, Anthony EJ, Blunt MJ, Brandani S, Mac Dowell N, et al. Carbon capture and storage update. *Energy Environ Sci* 2014;7:130–89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C3EE42350F>.
- [14] Bhowan AS, Freeman BC. Analysis and status of post-combustion carbon dioxide capture technologies. *Environ Sci Technol* 2011;45:8624–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es104291d>.
- [15] Khesghi HS, Thomann H, Bhore NA, Hirsch RB, Parker ME, Teletzke GF. Perspectives on CCS cost and economics. *SPE Econ Manag* 2012;4:24–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2118/139716-PA>.
- [16] Renner M. Carbon prices and CCS investment: a comparative study between the European Union and China. *Energy Policy* 2014;75:327–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.09.026>.
- [17] CSIRO. Assessing post-combustion capture for coal-fired power stations in Asia-Pacific partnership countries. EP116217. Newcastle, NW, USA: CSIRO Advanced Coal Technology; 2012.
- [18] Hanak DP, Biliyok C, Yeung H, Bialecki R. Heat integration and energy analysis for a supercritical high-ash coal-fired power plant integrated with a post-combustion carbon capture process. *Fuel* 2014;134:126–39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2014.05.036>.
- [19] Kenarsari SD, Yang D, Jiang G, Zhang S, Wang J, Russell AG, et al. Review of recent advances in carbon dioxide separation and capture. *RSC Adv* 2013;3:22739–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C3RA43965H>.
- [20] D'Alessandro DM, Smit B, Long JR. Carbon dioxide capture: prospects for new materials. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2010;49:6058–82.
- [21] Leung DYC, Caramanna G, Maroto-Valer MM. An overview of current status of carbon dioxide capture and storage technologies. *Renewable Sustainable Energy Rev* 2014;39:426–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.093>.
- [22] Nabavi SA, Vladislavjević GT, Wicaksono A, Georgiadou S, Manović V. Production of molecularly imprinted polymer particles with amide-decorated cavities for CO₂ capture using membrane emulsification/suspension polymerisation. *Colloids Surf., A* 2017;521:231–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2016.05.033>.
- [23] Nabavi SA, Vladislavjević GT, Eguague EM, Li B, Georgiadou S, Manović V. Production of spherical mesoporous molecularly imprinted polymer particles containing tunable amine decorated nanocavities with CO₂ molecule recognition properties. *Chem Eng J* 2016;306:214–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2016.07.054>.
- [24] McDonald TM, Lee WR, Mason JA, Wiers BM, Hong CS, Long JR. Capture of carbon dioxide from air and flue gas in the alkylamine-appended metal-organic framework mmen-Mg 2(dobpdc). *J Am Chem Soc* 2012;134:7056–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ja300034j>.
- [25] Riboldi L, Bolland O. Evaluating pressure swing adsorption as a CO₂ separation technique in coal-fired power plants. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2015;39:1–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.02.001>.
- [26] Nelson TO, Green DA, Box P, Gupta RP, Henningsen G, Turk BS. Carbon dioxide capture from flue gas using dry regenerable sorbents. Durham, NC, USA: RTI International; 2009.
- [27] Abanades JC, Arias B, Lyngfelt A, Mattisson T, Wiley DE, Li H, et al. Emerging CO₂ capture systems. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2015;40:126–66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.04.018>.
- [28] Romeo LM, Abanades JC, Escosa JM, Paño J, Giménez A, Sánchez-Biezma A, et al. Oxyfuel carbonation/calcination cycle for low cost CO₂ capture in existing power plants. *Energy Convers Manag* 2008;49:2809–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2008.03.022>.
- [29] Martínez I, Murillo R, Grasa G, Carlos Abanades J. Integration of a Ca looping system for CO₂ capture in existing power plants. *AIChE J* 2011;57:2599–607. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aic.12461>.
- [30] Abanades JC, Anthony EJ, Wang J, Oakey JE. Fluidized bed combustion systems integrating CO₂ capture with CaO. *Environ Sci Technol* 2005;39:2861–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es0496221>.
- [31] Vorrias I, Atsonios K, Nikolopoulos A, Nikolopoulos N, Grammelis P, Kakaras E. Calcium looping for CO₂ capture from a lignite fired power plant. *Fuel* 2013;113:826–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2012.12.087>.
- [32] Yang Y, Zhai R, Duan L, Kavosh M, Patchigolla K, Oakey J. Integration and evaluation of a power plant with a CaO-based CO₂ capture system. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2010;4:603–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2010.01.004>.
- [33] Ströhle J, Lasheras A, Galloy A, Eppele B. Simulation of the carbonate looping process for post-combustion CO₂ capture from a coal-fired power plant. *Chem Eng Technol* 2009;32:435–42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ceat.200800569>.
- [34] Hanak DP, Biliyok C, Anthony EJ, Manovic V. Modelling and comparison of calcium looping and chemical solvent scrubbing retrofits for CO₂ capture from coal-fired power plant. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2015;42:226–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.08.003>.
- [35] Hanak DP, Manovic V. Calcium looping with supercritical CO₂ cycle for decarbonation of coal-fired power plant. *Energy* 2016;102:343–53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.02.079>.
- [36] Glier JC, Rubin ES. Assessment of solid sorbents as a competitive post-combustion CO₂ capture technology. *Energy Procedia* 2013;37:65–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2013.05.086>.
- [37] Sumida K, Rogow DL, Mason JA, McDonald TM, Bloch ED, Herm ZR, et al. Carbon dioxide capture in metal-organic frameworks. *Chem Rev* 2012;112:724–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/cr2003272>.
- [38] Li G, Xiao P, Webley P, Zhang J, Singh R, Marshall M. Capture of CO₂ from high humidity flue gas by vacuum swing adsorption with zeolite 13X. *Adsorption* 2008;14:415–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10450-007-9100-y>.
- [39] Stanmore BR, Gilot P. Review—calcination and carbonation of limestone during thermal cycling for CO₂ sequestration. *Fuel Process Technol* 2005;86:1707–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fuproc.2005.01.023>.
- [40] Dean CC, Blamey J, Florin NH, Al-Jeboori MJ, Fennell PS. The calcium looping cycle for CO₂ capture from power generation, cement manufacture and hydrogen production. *Chem Eng Res Des* 2011;89:836–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2010.10.013>.
- [41] Wang J, Huang L, Yang R, Zhang Z, Wu J, Gao Y, et al. Recent advances in solid sorbents for CO₂ capture and new development trends. *Energy Environ Sci* 2014;7:3478–518. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C4EE01647E>.
- [42] Ben T, Pei C, Zhang D, Xu J, Deng F, Jing X, et al. Gas storage in porous aromatic frameworks (PAFs). *Energy Environ Sci* 2011;4:3991–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c1ee01222c>.
- [43] Martin CF, Stöckel E, Clowes R, Adams DJ, Cooper AI, Pis JJ, et al. Hypercrosslinked organic polymer networks as potential adsorbents for pre-combustion CO₂ capture. *J Mater Chem* 2011;21:5475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c0jm03534c>.
- [44] Xiang Z, Zhou X, Zhou C, Zhong S, He X, Qin C, et al. Covalent-organic polymers for carbon dioxide capture. *J Mater Chem* 2012;22:22663. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c2jm35446b>.
- [45] Chen L, Xu S, Li J. Recent advances in molecular imprinting technology: current status, challenges and highlighted applications. *Chem Soc Rev* 2011;40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c0cs00084a>.
- [46] Zhao Y, Shen Y, Bai L, Hao R, Dong L. Synthesis and CO₂ adsorption properties of molecularly imprinted adsorbents. *Environ Sci Technol* 2012;46:1789–95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es203580b>.
- [47] Zhao Y, Shen Y, Ma G, Hao R. Adsorption separation of carbon dioxide from flue gas by a molecularly imprinted adsorbent. *Environ Sci Technol* 2014;48:1601–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es403871w>.
- [48] Nabavi SA, Vladislavjević GT, Zhu Y, Manović V. Synthesis of size-tunable CO₂-philic imprinted polymeric particles (MIPs) for low-pressure CO₂ capture using oil-in-oil suspension polymerization. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017;51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b03259>.
- [49] Hanak DP, Biliyok C, Manovic V. Rate-based model development, validation and analysis of chilled ammonia process as an alternative CO₂ capture technology for coal-fired power plants. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2015;34:52–62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2014.12.013>.
- [50] Hanak DP, Biliyok C, Manovic V. Efficiency improvements for the coal-fired power plant retrofit with CO₂ capture plant using chilled ammonia process. *Appl Energy* 2015;151:258–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.04.059>.
- [51] Black J. Cost and performance baseline for fossil energy plants volume 1: Bituminous coal and natural gas to electricity. Pittsburgh, PA, USA: National Energy Technology Laboratory; 2013.
- [52] Hanak DP, Biliyok C, Manovic V. Evaluation and modeling of part-load performance of coal-fired power plant with postcombustion CO₂ capture. *Energy Fuels* 2015;29:3833–44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.energyfuels.5b00591>.
- [53] Rachford HH, Rice JD. Procedure for use of electrical digital computers in calculating flash vaporization hydrocarbon equilibrium. *J Pet Technol* 1952;4:327–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2118/952327-G>.
- [54] Berstad D, Anantharaman R, Jordal K. Post-combustion CO₂ capture from a natural gas combined cycle by CaO/CaCO₃ looping. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2012;11:25–33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.07.021>.
- [55] Posch S, Haider M. Optimization of CO₂ compression and purification units (CO₂CPU) for CCS power plants. *Fuel* 2012;101:254–63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2011.07.039>.
- [56] Sanpasertparnich T, Idem R, Bolea I, de Montigny D, Tontiwachwuthikul P. Integration of post-combustion capture and storage into a pulverized coal-fired power plant. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2010;4:499–510.
- [57] Metz B, Davidson O, de Coninck H, Loos M, Meyer L. IPCC special report on carbon dioxide capture and storage. Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press; 2005.
- [58] IEA. CO₂ emissions from fuel combustion highlights. Paris, France: IEA Publications; 2016.
- [59] Hanak DP, Manovic V. Calcium looping combustion for high-efficiency low-emission power generation. *J Clean Prod* 2017;161:245–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.05.080>.
- [60] Committee on Climate Change. Meeting carbon budgets – progress in reducing the UK's emissions London, UK 2015.
- [61] Miller BG. Clean coal engineering technology. Boston, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann; 2011.
- [62] IEA. Power generation from coal. Ongoing developments and outlook. Paris, France: IEA Publications; 2011.
- [63] Abanades JC, Grasa G, Alonso M, Rodríguez N, Anthony EJ, Romeo LM. Cost structure of a postcombustion CO₂ capture system using CaO. *Environ Sci Technol* 2007;41:5523–7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es070099a>.
- [64] Zhao M, Minett AI, Harris AT. A review of techno-economic models for the retrofitting of conventional pulverised-coal power plants for post-combustion capture (PCC) of CO₂. *Energy Environ Sci* 2013;6:25–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c2ee22890d>.
- [65] Perry RH, Green DW, Maloney JO. Perry's chemical engineers' handbook. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill; 2007.
- [66] Woods DR. Rules of thumb in engineering practice. Weinheim, Germany: Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA; 2007.

- [67] Hanak DP, Manovic V. Economic feasibility of calcium looping under uncertainty. *Appl Energy* 2017;208:691–702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.09.078>.
- [68] Romano MC, Martínez I, Murillo R, Arstad B, Blom R, Ozcan DC, et al. Process simulation of Ca-looping processes: review and guidelines. *Energy Procedia* 2013;37:142–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.11.239>.
- [69] Mantripragada HC, Rubin ES. Calcium looping cycle for CO₂ capture – performance, cost and feasibility analysis. *Energy Procedia* 2013;63:2199–206.
- [70] Whitcombe MJ, Chianella I, Larcombe L, Piletsky SA, Noble J, Porter R, et al. The rational development of molecularly imprinted polymer-based sensors for protein detection. *Chem Soc Rev* 2011;40:1547–71. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/c0cs00049c>.
- [71] Lisbona P, Martínez A, Lara Y, Romeo LM. Integration of carbonate CO₂ capture cycle and coal-fired power plants. a comparative study for different sorbents. *Energy Fuels* 2010;24:728–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ef900740p>.
- [72] Kim I, Svendsen HF. Heat of absorption of carbon dioxide (CO₂) in mono-ethanolamine (MEA) and 2-(aminoethyl)ethanolamine (AEEA) solutions. *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2007;46:5803–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ie0616489>.
- [73] Goto K, Yogo K, Higashii T. A review of efficiency penalty in a coal-fired power plant with post-combustion CO₂ capture. *Appl Energy* 2013;111:710–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.05.020>.
- [74] ZEP. The costs of CO₂ capture, transport and storage. *European Technology Platform for Zero Emission Fossil Fuel Power Plants*. 2011.
- [75] Versteeg P, Rubin ES. A technical and economic assessment of ammonia-based post-combustion CO₂ capture at coal-fired power plants. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2011;5:1596–605. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2011.09.006>.
- [76] Mac Dowell N, Shah N. The multi-period optimisation of an amine-based CO₂ capture process integrated with a super-critical coal-fired power station for flexible operation. *Comput Chem Eng* 2015;74:169–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2015.01.006>.
- [77] Rubin ES, Davison JE, Herzog HJ. The cost of CO₂ capture and storage. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2015;40:378–400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2015.05.018>.
- [78] Romano MC, Spinelli M, Campanari S, Consonni S, Cinti G, Marchi M, et al. The calcium looping process for low CO₂ emission cement and power. *Energy Procedia* 2013;37:7091–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2013.06.645>.
- [79] Hanak DP, Biliyok C, Manovic V. Calcium looping with inherent energy storage for decarbonisation of coal-fired power plant. *Energy Environ Sci* 2016;9:971–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/C5EE02950C>.
- [80] Cormos C-C. Economic evaluations of coal-based combustion and gasification power plants with post-combustion CO₂ capture using calcium looping cycle. *Energy* 2014;78:665–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2014.10.054>.
- [81] Alonso M, Rodríguez N, González B, Grasa G, Murillo R, Abanades JC. Carbon dioxide capture from combustion flue gases with a calcium oxide chemical loop. Experimental results and process development. *Int J Greenhouse Gas Control* 2010;4:167–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2009.10.004>.