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## 1. INTRODUCTION.

Sulfur emissions from coal combustors must be controlled in order to comply with environmental standards. Many processes are available for this purpose, often involving the use of Iimestone as a sorbent.

Two principal types of coal-fired boilers exist in industry. One is the fluidized-bed coal combustor, that operates at relaively low temperature (ca. $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), and has a long residence time ( $>2$ hours). The other is a pulverized coal combustor, that operates at much higher temperatures ( 1200 to $1700^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), with a short residence time ( $<2$ seconds) in the combustion chamber.

In both types, limestone compounds can be used for absorbing $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$. In a first stage, limestone $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ decomposes as it is heated to produce a porous CaO :

$$
\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}(\mathrm{~s}) \rightarrow \mathrm{CaO}(\mathrm{~s})+\mathrm{CO}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})
$$

Sometimes, calcium oxide is also obtained from hydroxide or other salts. In any case, the reaction with $S O 2$ occurs according to following overall reaction:

$$
\mathrm{CaO}(\mathrm{~s})+\mathrm{SO}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+1 / 2 \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \rightarrow \mathrm{CaSO}_{4}(\mathrm{~s})
$$

This last reaction is the object of the present sudy.
The porous $C a O$ is often represented as grains separated by pores (void volune), which can be filled as the grains grow on sulfation. The extent of this pore filling will depend on the grain size, the particle size, and porosity. For large particles, pore plugging occurs, which restricts the sulfate formation to the outer layer of the particle. The best conversion of $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ to $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}$ obtained in an ifdustrial application is approximately $30 \%$ (Staudinger \& Schrofelbauer, 1984).

Many different aspects of this gas-solid reaction have been discussed in the literature. The studies can be categorized into those investigating structural changes, chemical transformations and kinetic parameters
(1) Gas-solid structural models: Structural models have been developed to explain the retardation of the reactions by the $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}$ product layer. They usually assume a simple geometric description for the porous solid. The most common models are cylindrical pore or spherical grain models. They also assume simple Fickian diffusion through the product layer, which cannot model changes in diffusivities. A correct understanding of the models is important as they are used to calculate the kinetic parameters from conversion measurements. A good overview is glven by Ramachandran \& Doraiswamy (1982).
(2) The study of the chemical transformations occurring during the reaction: Calcium sulfate $\left(\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}\right)$ is the stable form of the product under the conditions used. This product, however, is not formed in one step. Low temperature studies (Ferguson \& Rissmann, 1971; Van Houte et al, 1979) have demonstrated that calcium sulfite $\left(\mathrm{CaSO}_{3}\right)$ is formed as an intermediary product. It is then oxidized to the stable sulfate. At high temperature $\left(>750^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, the product layer was found to be composed of calcium sulfate entirely, meaning that the oxidation rate is large enough to not be rate limiting (Marsh \& Ulrichson, 1985.) The assumption of a single sulfate phase in the product layer is therefore justified.
(3) The kinetic parameters themselves and their value to predict reaction rates in real systems (Borgwardt, 1970, 1972, 1986; Haxtman \& Coughlin, 1974, 1976): Many studies have been conducted of the rate of limestone sulfation. However, the conditions (gas or stone composition) differ between studies, and the different structural models used to determine the parameters have
further complicated the comparison of kinetic parameters reported by various investigators. In addition, several authors point out that rate data are hard to reproduce (Hartman \& Coughlin, 1976; Bhatia \& Perlmutter, 1981a). As a result no unambiguous values for the kinetic parameters exist.

The rate of sulfation of a $C a O$ surface is rapid at first, limited by the intrinsic kinetics, but slows down with increasing conversion as a consequence of the increased resistance to diffusion through the product layer. The sulfation rate of porous CaO , such as produced by the decomposition of limestone, is further reduced by diffusion within the pores and by the reduction of pore diameter. In small particles, this reduction occurs in a homogeneous manner throughout the solid until pore filling blocks further reaction. Large particles react faster at the pore mouths, where the product layer builds up faster, thus leading to pore mouth plugging. In both cases, the role of internal porosity is eliminated and the rate is controlled by diffusion through a layer covering the external surface of the particle.

The objectives of this study are to determine the intrinsic kinetics and the product layer diffusion fate by minimizing the resistances to gas-phase pore diffusion, and eliminating complications due to pore filling. This is achieved by the use of nonporous CaO . A wide range of particle sizes are used to change the relative importance of the regimes in which the intrinsic kinetics and product layer diffusion control. The assumption of constant product layer diffusivity can then be tested and the variables that determine this diffusivity independently studied. Information on product layer diffusion can also be obtained from studies of porous particles after the
pore mouths are all plugged and a uniform surface coating is obtained.
This information on diffusion rate and intrinsic reactivity can then be combined with a geometrical model to describe the rate of reaction over the entire range of conversions and is particularly useful in treating the effect of particle stze on conversion history.

## 2. EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH

### 2.1. Choice of Samples

The four limes used in this study were (i) a combustion generated aerosol with an effective diameter of $0.02 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, (ii) a synthetic lime with an average particle diameter of $0.3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, (iii) single CaO crystals with diameters of 15 to $20 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, and (iv) calcined Iceland Spar with particle sizes of 10 to $15 \mu \mathrm{~m}$. Table 1 sumnarizes their essential features.

The submicron $C a O$ particles were produced by burning char particles containing atomically dispersed calcium. The calcium vaporized, oxidized in the vapor, and condensed to produce CaO aerosol with sizes $<0.02 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ (Graham, 1990). As shown in Figure 1, the grains are very spherical, hence easy to model. However, only low temperature measurements could be performed, due to the formation of calcium silicates (as the sample reacts with the quartz wool substrate) above $700^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Nevertheless, the measurements provided useful information concerning initial rate and activation energy.

The next size range was generated using the citric acid technique, developed by Marcilly et al. (1972). A synthetic line composed of very porous
particles (porosity between 90 and $95 \%$ ), featuring non-porous, spherical granules with average diameter of $0.3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ (see Figure 2), which translates into a surface area of about $5 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{g}$, is formed. The pore size distribution of this synthetic lime is shown in Figure 3 . The porosity is restricted to the macropores between primary particles. Although the aggregates can be as large as $100 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in dianeter the porosity is so large that the effectiveness factor is close to one (0.97), so that the primary particles of $0.3 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in diameter can be used to interpret the kinetic data. The physical structure can be varied within a limited range by modifying the preparation conditions. Table 2 gives an overview of the major structural parameters, and Figure 3 shows the pore size distribution of these samples,

Calcium oxide single crystals were used to investigate the rate of large, nonporous materials. This sample, obtained from Goodfellow Metals, Cambridge, England, is kept in an organic liquid in order to avoid hydration. Before use, it is ground and sieved to particle sizes of 15 to $20 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ (Mess, 1989). The advantage of this sample is that its structure is readily recognizable on SEM pictures (Figure 2), and therefore the formation of a product layer can be followed easily. Hydration, however, is unavoidable, but because of the large size of the grains used, it contaminates only a thin surface layer. Hence, the hydroxide layer will influence the results only at low conversions.

The fourth sample was produced from Iceland Spar, a crystalline $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ found in nature in a very pure form. Particles ranging between 10 and $15 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in size were calcined by ramping the temperature to $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at a rate of
$40^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{min}$ in Helium to yield a porous CaO , with a porosity of 468 , and a surface area of $30 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{g}$ (see SEM picture, Figure 2 and pore size distribution in Figure 4.) Product layer diffusion information was obtained from the conversion rate after the pores had been filled.

### 2.2. Experimental Procedure

The major piece of equipment used is a thermogravimetric analyzer. The thermal, balance, manufactured by Cahr Instruments, is sketched in Figure 5 . It is described in detail by Floess (1985). The balance itself is held under a constant He flow, to avoid contact of the corrosive $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ gas with the delicate electronics. The optimal flow rate through the balance was found to be 200 standard cubic centimeters per minute. A higher rate would create large temperature gradients around the sample pan. A lower rate would yield mass transfer limitations from the gas bulk to the pan surface (see also Floess). The gas used typically consists of $5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}, 3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and a balance of helium. Helium was chosen rather than nitrogen because of the higher diffusivity it provides for $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$. The sample size had to be chosen smaller than 1 mg in order to avoid $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ depletion in the gas stream.

It was found that in some cases the product layer structure was a function of the experimental conditions. For purposes of determining the reaction order, samples were sulfated to a given conversion under standard conditions (typically $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}, 5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$ at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The gas phase concentration could then be changed to examine the effect of concentration on the rate for a given product layer structure. An example of such a series of runs, designated as combination runs, at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and with $5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$, is shown in Figure 6.

As the sample sizes employed in the TGA were too small for purposes of sample characterization, larger amounts of CaO were sulfated in a separate, differential 1 cm diameter packed bed. The gas concentrations and temperatures used duplicated those in the TGA experiments. Surface areas were subsequently measured with nitrogen adsorption, and porosity with mercury intrusion.

Electromicrographic pictures were also made on a regular basis to provide qualitative information on the product layer structure. Approximate quantitative information of crystal sizes were obtained.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1. Effect of Sample Type

The rates observed in the TGA using different types of samples vary widely depending on their physical structure. An overview of this is given in figure 7. The early part of the conversion is controlled by surface reaction, and is proportional to the surface area. When the product layer thickness grows, diffusion through this layer becomes rate limiting. For small particles, this transition occurs at large conversion (needed to obtain the same thickness), while for the largest, almost no surface reaction rate can be measured.

The single crystal samples exhibit the slowest rate. Their surface area is very small since they consist of large ( $1.5-20 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ), nonporous grains. Iceland Spar, which most resembles natural lime, exhibits a fast rate up to almost $40 \%$ conversion, at which point it suddenly drops. This corresponds most likely to the pore filling phenomenon described earlier. The sulfation of the submicron CaO particles, because of their high specific surface area, yield an extremely fast rate. The conversion behavior shown in figure 7 was
obtained at $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ because no accurate measurements could be performed at higher temperature (the response time of the TGA, especially when small sample weights are used is 30 seconds at best). The synthetic lime sulfation exhibits a much smoother behavior, than the three other samples. It provides useful information for both inftial rate and product layer diffusion. Conversion measurements obtained at different temperatures with the synthetic lime are shown in Figure 8; Single crystal results in Figure 9.

Inasmuch as the surface area is an important parameter to predict the sulfation behavior, we first discuss how the surface area was observed to change as a result of sulfation.

### 3.2. Surface Evolution During Sulfation

Although extensive work has been done on the reduction of surface area of the lime during calcination (Glasson, 1958; Fischer, 1953; Bardakci, 1979; Hartman \& Traka, 1980; Hartman \& Pata, 1978), the surface area behavior during sulfation is usually assumed to follow the prediction of any of the structural models (grain or pore models.)

Surface area data were obtained with the synthetic lime after sulfation for various periods of time at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The results are shown in Figure 10. In the absence of sintering, a surface area reduction is expected. It can be calculated rather easily using the simple grain model (justified by the granular structure featured by this sample). Following relationship 1 een external specific surface area, $S_{X}$ ' and conversion, $X$, is found

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{X}^{\prime}=\frac{3}{[X(Z-1)+1]^{1 / 3} r_{0}\left[o_{R}(1-X)+\rho_{P} X\right]} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r_{0}$ is the initial grain radius and $Z$ is the molar volume ratio of
product and reagent ( $\mathrm{Z}=2.72$ ). The densities are $\rho_{\mathrm{R}}$ for $\mathrm{CaO}\left(3.32 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}\right)$, and $\rho \mathrm{P}$ for $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}\left(2.96 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{3}\right)$. The result is plotted on Figure 10 , using the rate behavior observed in the TGA to relate time and conversion. The observed surface area is systematically lower than predicted, leading to the conclusion that sintering is occurring.

In order to model the observed behavior, the empirical approach suggested by Ranade \& Harrison (1979) is used:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.S_{X}{ }^{\prime}=S_{x \infty}{ }^{\prime}+(1-X)^{m} *\left(S_{0}^{\prime}-S_{X \infty}\right)^{\prime}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S_{X \infty}$ ' is the final, lowest surface area measured, and $S_{o}{ }^{\prime}$ is the initial surface area. The result is also presented in Figure 10. The best value for m was found to be $m=3$ in all cases, in accordance with the observations of Ranade \& Harrison.

### 3.3. The Surface Kinetic Rate

The initial rate, taken per unit CaO mass, at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and with $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $5 \% O_{2}$, is presented in Figure 11 as a function of the sample surface area, for various samples. From this type of plot, one can determine an average value for the rate per unit surface area $\left(8.4 * 10^{-6} \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{s} \mathrm{m}^{2}\right.$ under these conditions.)

An Arrhenius plot (Figure 12) can be drawn from measurements at different temperatures, performed under $3000 \mathrm{ppm}: \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$. Several series experiments are presented here. Three series were performed with synthetic lime (R1088, R1189, and R489), and one series with submicron ash. The activation energies are reasonably similar with en average value of 18 $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$.

The rate can be expressed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}=2.5 * 10^{-2} \exp (-18(\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}) / \mathrm{RT})\left(\mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{s} \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Figure 12 shows that, even though a bit low, these results compare well with other authors.

The dependence of the rate on the $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ concentration is shown in Figure 13 . The data can be fitted with an order of 0.52 on the $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ partial pressure, in good agreement with the value of 0.57 published by Borgwardt et al (1986) and by Gopalakrishnan et al. (1990).

In the absence of any product layer, the mechanism of sulfation involves chemisorption on the CaO surface (Low et al., 1971; Siriwardane, 1987). While the large range of partial pressures where the low order is observed precludes the use of a Langmuir-Hinshelwood isotherm, other adsorption isotherms (Freundlich), where the heat of adsorption is a function of surface coverage, could explain this phenomenon (Szekely et al., 1976).

### 3.4. Product Layer Diffusion

As soon as the product layer becomes sufficiently thick, diffusional processes become controlling. Comparison of the rates per unit surface area as a function of conversion for the different samples is shown in Figure 14. The rates vary widely because the product layer thickness, at a given conversion, is largest for the larger particles. These data are used to infer product layer diffusivities. Because of the definition of diffusion coefficient as the ratio of diffusion rate and concentration gradient, one must first decide what the diffusing species are.

### 3.4.1. Theoretical Description of.Solid State Diffusion

The product layer diffusion, is usually described using the gas concen-
tration gradient as driving force, as if gaseous diffusion was occurring through a microporous layer. Borgwardt et al. (1986), however, used the observed high activation energy for diffusion to argue that the sulfur must be diffusing in an ionic form through the solid, nonporous product layer.

## Ionic Diffusion

Ionic diffusion is a complex phenomenon that has been studied extensively (Jost, 1952; Fröger, 1964; Kingery et al, 1976; Shewmon, 1983), in the context of metal oxidation. No mechanistic studies of diffusion through $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}$ were found. The closest information available is the study of C and 0 diffusion through $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ crystals (Kronenberg et al., 1984). The mechanism for solid state diffusion can be viewed as the countercurrent diffusion of ions and defects. The diffusion of ions will either create a potential field (Cabrera \& Mott, 1949), or induce the diffusion of other ions (or defects) in order to maintain a charge balance. As the diffusion rates are coupled, the slowest diffusing species is rate-controlling.

An additional complication arises from the fact that several independent diffusion paths can exist simultaneously. As the diffusion is dependent on the concentration of defects, some regions, where larger amounts of defects are present (dislocations, crystal boundaries), provide a faster diffusion path than the bulk. As a result, the diffusion step must be described as a parallel connection of different resistances. The path that provides fastest diffusion controls the rate.

Concentration Gradient
In order to obtain a value for the solid state diffusivity, using Fick's
first law for diffusion, the gradient in concentratiot of the rate-limitirg species must be known. Since this information is not available, a general. approach is suggested. At, first, only one diffusion peth is considered. A dimensionless concentration, $\gamma, i s$ defined as the molar ratio of the ratelimiting diffusing species to the calcium concentration in the product layer. In order ta visualize its meaning, one can assme that $\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{-1}$ is the rateIimiting diffusing species (Figure 15). In this case, the value of $\gamma$ is the ratio $\left[\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{-} \mathrm{l} /\left[\mathrm{Ca}^{++}\right]\right.$, or $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{Ca}$. A $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{Ca}$, or $\gamma$ gradient must be present.

The value of the parameter $y$ at both ends of the product layer is ifmited by thermodynamic equilibrium. The true value can be different from the equilibrium condition if the surface chemicai reaction is slow compared to the product layer diffusion rate. In what follows, this reaction rate is assuned fast such that only the product layer diffusion is controlling.

At the outer surface, $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}$ is in equilibrium with the gas phase, that contains $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$. We call this equilibrium $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{s}}^{*}$. In the example of sulfate ions diffusing, $\gamma$ is limited by the stolchionetric composition, or unity. At the opposite side of the product layex, the same reasoning applies. The limiting value, defined as $\gamma_{i}^{*}$, is determined by the constraint of thermodynamic equilibrium of $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}$ and CaO . "In the example, $\mathrm{r}_{i}^{*}$ is close to one as well, yet smaller than one.

As the calcium concentration in the product layer is a constant (equal to the molar density, $\rho \mathrm{CaSO}_{4}$ ), the gradient in concentration of the ratelimiting species is equal to the gradient in the dimensionless value $\gamma$ times the value of $P$ CaSO4. The diffusion step can thus be descrioed with Fick's first law as proportional to the gradient of $\gamma$.

## Calculation of the Diffusivity

As the overall reaction rate is the sum of the rates in each diffusion path, the rate of diffusion through the product layer is expressed as follows, with $X$ as the conversion, and the time

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{dX} / \mathrm{dt}=\Sigma\left|D_{s j} \mathrm{~d} \gamma / \mathrm{dr} S_{j}(x)\right| \rho_{\mathrm{P}} / \rho_{R} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $\rho \mathrm{P}$ and $\rho_{R}$ are the molar density of Ca in the product layer and in the solid reagent, respectively (in mol/m3). The surface area for path $j$ at radial position $r$ (coordinate perpendiculax to the surface) per unit volume In the particle is expressed by $S_{j}(r)\left(m^{-1}\right)$ and $D_{s j}\left(m^{2} / s\right)$ is the solid state diffusivity describing the diffusion in path $j$, using the gradient of $\gamma$ as driving force. In reality, the rate-limiting diffusing compound can vary for different paths, and hence the gradient $d \gamma j / d$. However, since the true gradients axe unknown, the use of a single value is a reasonable approximation, that simplifies the mathematical expression. An average value for the diffusivity can be defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{s}=\sum\left\{D_{s j} S_{j} / S\right\} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

assuming that $s_{j} / S$ is independent of $r$.
The rate expression in the diffusion-limited regime becomes thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{dX} / \mathrm{dt}=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{~d} \gamma / \mathrm{dr} \mathrm{~S}(r) \rho \mathrm{p} / \rho_{\mathrm{R}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

with boundary conditions

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\gamma=\gamma_{S}^{\star} & \text { at } r=r_{s} \\
\gamma=\gamma_{1}^{\star} & \text { at } r=r_{i} \tag{8}
\end{array}
$$

In order to simplify equation (6) further, following definitions are introduced

$$
\begin{align*}
& S=r / r_{0}  \tag{9}\\
& S^{*}=S / S_{0} \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.s_{d}^{*}=1 \int_{\zeta_{i}}^{\zeta_{s} \frac{d \zeta}{s^{*}(\zeta)}}\right\}^{-1} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using these variables, and solving for the boundary conditions, expression (6) can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
d X / d t=\left[D_{S} \rho_{P} S_{0} /\left(\rho_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{r}_{0}\right)\right] \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{d}}^{*}\left(\gamma_{\mathrm{S}}^{*} \cdot \gamma_{\mathrm{i}}^{*}\right) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The densities and initial size parameters are known. However, in order to calculate the solid state diffusivity, $D_{S}$, as a function of the conversion rate, values for $\gamma_{s}^{*}$ and $\gamma_{i}^{*}$ must also be available. In the absence of information concerning these quantities we will solve for $D_{s}{ }^{*}$, defined as the product of the diffusivity, $D_{S}$, and the difference $\gamma_{\mathrm{s}}^{\star}-\gamma_{i}^{*}$.

The value of $S_{d}{ }^{*}$ is to be calculated from (11), with the use of a structural model (grain,...), and is only a function of the conversion. In this study, the overlapping grain model (Lindner \& Simonsson, 1981) was used, and adapted (by allowing the initial grain radius, $r_{0}$, to vary with conversion), such that the external surface would correspond to the predictions of Ranade \& Harrison (equation 2).

### 3.4.2. Lattice Diffusion.

With the present kinetic data for synthetic lime, the product layer thickness at which diffusion becomes dominating can be calculated to be 4.2 nm . Depending on the particle size, this thickness corresponds to a different conversion ( $48 \%$ for rom $0.01 \mu \mathrm{~m} ; 3 \%$ for $\mathrm{r}_{0}=0.2 \mu \mathrm{mi}$ ).

The value of $D_{s}{ }^{*}$ is seen to differ significantly between the synthetic lime and the single crystal results (Figure 16 ). For the synthetic lime, and under $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$, the value is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{s}}{ }^{\star}=0.810^{-10} \exp (-39 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{RT}) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

At $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, this yields $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{s}}{ }^{*}=8.510^{-19} \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{s}$, or $8.510^{-15} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} / \mathrm{s}$.
In order to compare with literature results, the concentration gradient used in these other studies must be known. In the sulfation literature, the diffusivity is measured from the reaction rate, using the gas concentration for the calculation of the gradient. When these diffusivities are corrected for the approach taken here, Figure 17 is obtained. It thus appears that the solid state diffusivities measured with the synthetic lime correspond well with other literature studies. The diffusivities measured with single crystals and Iceland Spar are almost two orders of magnitude higher, however (Figure 16).

Kingery et al. (1976) provides a comprehensive review of the meaning of different solid state diffusivities. They publish data based on the concentration gradient of radioactive tracers. Based on this gradient, lattice, self-diffusion coefficients for simple oxides were found to vary several orders of magnitude, from $10^{-15}$ to $10^{-8} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} / \mathrm{s}$, with activation energies ranging from 30 to $90 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$. These diffusivities can be related to the diffusivity of the vacancies, according to the same authors, by determining the equilibrium concentration of vacancies. Using the data provided, one finds that in KCl , this concentration, at 1073 K , is $9.2 \times 10^{-5}$ mol vacancies/mol. This number must be multiplied with the above diffusivities to obtain a value that can be compared with our $D_{s}{ }^{*}$. The range becones thus $10^{-19}$ to $10^{-12 ~} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} / \mathrm{s}$. Both diffusion coefficient and activation energy fall within the range expected for lattice diffusion.

### 3.4.3. Crystal Boundary Diffusion

This lattice diffusion, however, can only be observed in small particles
(< $1 \mu \mathrm{~m})$. Larger particles exhibit a different, faster diffusion mechanism which is attributed to crystal boundary diffusion. The appearance of the $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}$ crystals on the product layer of the various samples (Figure 18) provide some insights as to the possible reason. The sulfate crystal boundaries in the product layer of the large single crystal can be identified by the raised edges, giving the crystals a dish-shape. The size of these crystals are often larger, but are in the same size range as the crystals found on the synthetic lime ( 0.5 to $1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ), and larger than the dimensions of the primary particle of the synthetic lime.

Using these observations, it is postulated that the sulfate crystals formed on small particles quickly grow to a size that is larger than the initial CaO grains. They thus "swallow" the original grain, blocking off all easy access to the unreacted oxide. Figure 19 illustrates this qualitative description. When larger particles are employed, however, the sulfate crystals remain smaller than the underlying oxide. The boundaries between these crystals are highly disordered, and provide paths for faster diffusion. The dish-shape indicates that more material is deposited along these boundaries. Mess (1989) described the recarbonation of CaO single crystals in a similar way as limited by crystal boundary diffusion.

Evidence supporting the crystal boundary diffusion mechanism, is presented in Figure 20. It was obtained by measuring the sulfation rate of Iceland Spar at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, using combination runs. A first sulfation was accomplished at various temperatures for different amounts of time, chosen such that the product layer would have the same thickness (3 and 11 minutes at 700 and $900^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, respectively). This first step created a product layer, upon which further sulfation was performed at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The rate was slower when the
preparation temperature was higher. Simultaneously, Figure 21 shows that for similar sulfation times, the sulfate crystal size increases with increasing temperature. This is evidence that the sulfation rate increases when the particle size decreases, in accordance with the proposed mechanism.

Crystal boundary diffusivity can be described as

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{c b}=\ell / A \quad D^{\prime} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $2 / A$ represents the crystal boundary length per unit area. This quantity is inversely proportional to the crystal diameter, $d$. The parameter $D^{\prime}$ represents the grain boundary diffusivity. Its dimensions are $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ (or $\left.\mathrm{cm}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right)$. It can be considered to be the diffusivity through the disordered crystal boundary times the crystal boundary thickness. As this last quantity is unknown but issumed constant, we use $D^{\prime}$ as a dummy parameter that incorporates all unknown constants. Doing so, we can expect

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{\prime}=D_{c b} d \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

to be a constant during conversion, in opposition to the value of $D_{c b}$, that decreases almost an order of magnitude at early time, as shown in Figure 16. The inaccuracy in the crystal size measurements on SEM pictures results in considerable scatter in the value of $D^{\prime}$ (Figure 22). However, it eliminated the change in diffusivity with time, observed in Figure 16.

Using expression (15), it was possible to obtain a value, shown in Arrhenius form in Figure 23.

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{\prime}=1.410^{-16} \exp (-28 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{RT})\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}\right) \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The activarion energy for crystal boundary diffusion is typically much lower than for lattice diffusion (Kingery et al., 1976), in accordance with what is observed here.

### 3.4. C Diffusing Species

Even though it was not possible to obtain information on the rate-limiting species, use was made of "a combination run to test whether the $\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}$ was formed on top of the product layer, or at the solid-solid interface. If the sulfate is formed at the interface, the sulfur species must diffuse through the product layer, probably in its sulfate form, as this ion is covalently bound and thus unlikely to decompose. If the product is formed on top of the layer, both $\mathrm{Ca}^{++}$and $\mathrm{O}^{--}$are diffusing out, towards the gas phase.

Calcium sulfate does not react with $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, as the sulfate is more stable than the carbonate. However, if CaO is present on the outer surface, $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ can react and a weight increase can be registered on the TGA recorder. Hence, in the first step of the combination run, the sample was sulfated to the point where product layer diffusion is rate-limiting. At that point, the sulfur containing gas is replaced by $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, and the weight is recorded. The synthetic lime exhibited formation of carbonate, as testified in Figure 24 by the weight loss due to its decomposition, when $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ is replaced by an inert gas (He). The larger, single crystals for which grain boundary diffusion is ratecontrolling, showed no measurable reaction with $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ when subjected to a similar exposure history, indicating the absence of CaO on the outer surface. For this material, the sulfur species is diffusing via the crystal boundaries towards the interface to react with CaO .

These observations are consistent with the expectation that where lattice diffusion occurs, the smallest species will diffuse orders of magnitude faster than the larger ones. In the crystal boundaries, where the concentration of defects is much larger, the larger $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ " -units diffuse much easier.
3.4.4. Dependence on $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ partial pressure

The dependence of the rate on the $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ concentration in this regime was determined as well. The order of 0.6 , measured at low conversion, decreased to 0.25 at high conversion with synthetic limes, and to 0.2 with single crystals and Iceland Spar. An explanation for this phenomenon is probably to be found in the dependence of the thermodynamic equilibrium, $\gamma_{s}^{*}$, on the partial pressure.

Theories of this sort exist and have been investigated in other circumstances (Fröger, 1964). No further investigation on this subject was performed in this work.

### 3.5. Use of the Regime Map

The purpose of the above discussion was to provide arguments for the existence, and for the conditions needed for the various regimes. The most important parameters found to determine what regime is controlling are the grain size and the conversion. Hence, the map shown in Figure 25 is proposed. It is applicable at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}$. When temperature and gas concentrations change, the kinetic parameters change and the curves will move accordingly.

The boundary between kinetic and solid state diffusion controlled regimes is obtained by assuming a structural model (overlapping spherical grains in this case), and calculating the conversion at which the product layer reaches the critical thickness as a function of grain size.

The boundary between the two solid state diffusion regimes, however, is not as easy to determine. The reason is that it depends on the crystal sizes in the product layer, for which no unambiguous size prediction can be made.

Nevertheless, a few points of reference can be used. When the grain size is smaller than the smallest crystal size observed, the crystal cannot stand on its own and will incorporate the grains, thus eliminating all high diffusion paths. The smallest crystal size ever observed was about $0.1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in diameter. However, these small crystals grow fast until they reach an asymptotic value. The parameter needed here is time rather than conversion; qualitatively, using the observed time-conversion particle size relationship, the lower dashed curve in the regime map, Figure 25 can be drawn.

The higher end of this boundary is even more qualitative. We know that the synthetic limes, whose grain size lie between 0.2 and $0.4 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ e:hibits lattice diffusion exclusively, and at the other hand, that small (1-2 $\mu \mathrm{m}$ ) Iceland Spar samples provided large diffusivities, indicative of crystal boundary diffusion. Thus, the upper dashed line, rising similarly as the lower line must be drawn in between these extremes.

As a grain sulfates, it moves on an horizontal line in the regime map. The submicron ash ( $\mathrm{d}=0.015 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ), with the highest surface area of all samples investigated, will be in the kinetic regime until over $50 \%$ conversion. The synthetic lime (0.2.0.4 $\mu \mathrm{m}$ ) still allows us to measure a kinetic regime, but will rapidly be controlled by lattice diffusion. All grains largei than $1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ will only react according to the crystal boundary diffusion mechanism.

Porous materials that exhibit pore filling, as most natural limes, behave differently before and after pore filling. As long as the internal grains (whose size can be determined from the internal specific sulface area) can react independently, they can be regarded as independent particles. The kinetic and subsequent lattice diffusion mechanism will dominate. This is why most authors observed the slower, lattice diffusion rate. When pore filling
occurs, however, the individual grains cease to exist as independent units, and the particle size becomes important. Soon, crystal boundary diffusion takes over the sulfation process.

At that point, only the external surface is available for reaction, such that the overall rate is dramatically reduced. The time needed for further conversion depends on the sulfate crystal size in the product layer. Figure 26 presents the time needed to react from $40 \%$ (when pore filling occurs) to 60\%, assuming lattice diffusion at the one hand, and crystal boundary diffusion, with various crystal sizes, at the other hand. It is expected that very small particles, less than $1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ in diameter, will exhibit lattice diffusion only, and thus react slower than larger particles that can reach the crystal boundary diffusion regime. When still larger particles are used, the crystals have time to grow, which results in a reduction in the diffusivity. For particles larger than $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ diameter, an optimal size, where time for full sulfation is shortest, is therefore predicted.

## 5. Conclusion

The object of this work is to provide a mechanistic understanding of the lime sulfation process.

Although the chemical $\left(\mathrm{CaSO}_{4}\right)$ and physical (solid crystals) composition of the product layer is known, the traditional description of the product layer diffusion mechanism assumes a homogeneous product layer, and a driving force proportional to the gas concentration of $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ (as if gaseous diffusion were occurring). Such a model is unable to describe diffusivity changes during the sulfation process, or large differences in diffusivity among different
samples. The model suggested in this work allows for the more realistic case of ionic diffusion through the product layer. The product layer structure was found to, in some cases, produce high diffusivity paths that affect the conversion behavior.

Model stones were designed in order to provide kinetic information. Measurements of the surface area with sulfation time indicated that a sintering process occurred, thus explaining the faster decrease in rate than predicted by the traditional structural models.

Three rate-controlling regimes were postulated (Figure 23.) At early conversion, the rate is controlled by the kinetic, or surface reaction rate. When conversion increases, the transition depends on the particle size. product layer diffusion becomes important. If the grain size is smaller than $1 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, lattice diffusion takes over. This occurs when the sulfate crystals become so large that they 'swallow' the original grain. If the original grain is large enough the sulfate crystals in the product layer cannot surround the CaO , and the crystal boundaries provide fast diffusion paths for further reaction.

The rate dependence on $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ partial pressure was also examined. In the early stage, an order of 0.52 was found, and in the product layer diffusion regime, the order decreased to 0.2 (for crystal boundary diffusion) or 0.25 (for bulk diffusion).
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TABIGEI

| Synthetic |
| :--- |
| Lime |

$100-150 \mu \mathrm{~m}$
$5 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{g}$
$90-95 \mathrm{~g}$
0.2
0.97
Table 2. Description of Synthetic Lime Samples

| Sample ID | ratio | $\frac{\text { cicric acid }}{\mathrm{Ca}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2}}$ | Calcination Tempersture ( ${ }^{9} \mathrm{C}$ ) | Calcination Time (hours) | BET Surface Area $\left(\mathrm{n}^{2} / g\right)$ | Pore Volume ( $\mathrm{cm}^{3} / \mathrm{g}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R |  | 1:1 | 1100 | 3 | 5.5 | 4.2 |
| Ri088 |  | 1:1 | 1000 | 4 | 6.3 | 4.4 |
| R289 |  | 1:1 | 1000 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 4.8 |
| R489 |  | 1:1 | 1100 | 6 | 4.0 | 4.6 |
| R1189 |  | 1:1 | 1100 | 3 | 4.9 | 5.2 |
| L |  | 1:1 | 1100 | 8 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| $\underline{1088}$ |  | 1:1 | 1000 | 8 | 5.3 | 3.5 |
| D |  | $2: 1$ | 1100 | 3 | 5.6 | 2.9 |
| D1088 |  | $2: 1$ | 1000 | 4 | 5.4 | 2.5 |
| (aggre | te si | $z e=50-150$ |  |  |  |  |



Figure 1. TEM picture of Submicron Ash


Figure 2. Microscopic Aspect of the Various CaO Samples Used:
(a): Synthetic Line: (b) Single CaO Crystals; (c): Calcined Iceland Spar


Figure 3. Pore Size Distribution of Synchetic Limes, Using Different Preparations: $R$ and $L$ have equimolar amounts of $C_{a}$ and Citric Acid; $R$ is Calcined at $1000^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 hours; $L$ for 8 hours. D is calcined for 3 hours, but has twice the amount of Citric Acid (see Table 2). Particle Size 50 $250 \mu \mathrm{~m}$.


Figure 4. Pore Size Distribution of Iceland Spar, Calcined in a Helium Atwosphere, with Heating Rate of $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{min}$. Particle Size $10-15 \mu \mathrm{~m}$.


Figure 5. Sketch of the Thermogravimetric Analyzer


Figure 6. Example of Combination Run: Change of $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ concentration on Synthetic Lime, at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$


Figure 7. Conversion Behavior of Different Samples (3000ppm $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$ )


Figure 8. Conversion Behavior of Synthetic Lime, under $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$ (Sample R489)


Figure 9. Conversion Behavior of Single Crystals, under $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$


Figure 10. Surface Area Evolution During Sulfation, for three Synthetic Limes, Compared with the Simple Grain Model Predictions, and the Model of Ranade \& Harrison (1979)


Figure 11. Dependence of the Initial Rate on the Surface Area. C stands for Single Crystals; the other labels designate Synthetic Limes (see Table 2)


Figure 12. Arrhenius Plot for the Initial Rate, Comparing Results of Submicron Ash and Synthetic Limes with Literature ( $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2} ; 5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$ )


Figure 13. Order of Initial Rate on $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ Partial Pressure, at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and with $5 \& \mathrm{O}_{2}$


Figure 14. Rate per Unit Surface Area for Different Samples


Figure 15. Illustration of the Definition of $\gamma$


Figure 16. Solid State DIffusivity Behmior with time of the Synthetic Limes, the Iceland Spar and Single Crystals


Figure 17. Arrhenius Plot for Lattice Diffusion ( $D_{s}{ }^{*}$ ): Comparison with Literature Results


Figure 18. SEM Pictures of Sulfated Limes (after 40 minutes at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ):
(a): Synthetic Lime; (b): Single Crystal; (c): Iceland Spar


Figure 19. Illustration of the Sulfation of Synthetic Lime



Figure 21. Calcium Sulfate Crystal Size Dependence on Temperature and Time, for Iceland Spar. The Larger Sizes at High Temperature Explain the Results of Figure 20.


Figure 22. Product of Diffusivity and Product Layer Thickness as a Function of Time and Temperature


Figure 23. Arrhenius plot for Crystal Boundary Diffusion, using two different Samples, under $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $58 \mathrm{O}_{2}$


Figure 24. TGA Results of Combination Experiments at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with Synthetic Lime: After Sulfation under $3000 \mathrm{ppm} \mathrm{SO}_{2}$ and $58 \mathrm{O}_{2}$ in $\mathrm{He}, 1 \mathrm{~atm} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ is introduced.


Conversion
Figure 25. Regime Map Under the Standard Conditions: 3000ppm $\mathrm{SO}_{2}, 5 \% \mathrm{O}_{2}$ at $800^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$


Figure 26. Time needed to increase the conversion from 40 to $60 \%$, in the case of pure lattice diffusion (solid line) or pure crystal boundary diffusion (dashed line). In this last case, the time also depends on the crystal size in the product layer (between brackets). These, sulfate, crystals are expected to be small for small particles and to get the time to grow larger for larger particles. The expected behavior (diamonds) therefore corresponds to crystal boundary diffusion with small grains when the particles are small, and shifts to the diffusion behavior with larger crystals when the particles are larger. When the particles are smaller than $1 \mu m$, lattice diffusion is expected.


