



## Research article

## Simulation of a sorption-enhanced water gas-shift pilot technology for pure hydrogen production from a waste gasification plant

Barbara Malsegna<sup>a,b</sup>, Alex Sebastiani<sup>b</sup>, João Guilherme da Gama Paz-Dias<sup>b</sup>, Francesco Di Luca<sup>c</sup>, Andrea Di Giuliano<sup>a</sup>, Katia Gallucci<sup>a</sup>, Massimiliano Materazzi<sup>b,\*</sup><sup>a</sup> University of L'Aquila, Department of Industrial and Information Engineering and Economics (DIIIE), Piazzale E. Pontieri 1-loc. Monteluco di Roio, 67100 L'Aquila, Italy<sup>b</sup> University College London, Department of Chemical Engineering, London WC1E7JE, UK<sup>c</sup> ITALFLUID COSMEP srl, Via Vivaldi 4, Montesilvano 65015, Pescara, Italy

## ARTICLE INFO

## Keywords:

Sorption-enhanced water-gas shift  
Hydrotalcite  
Waste gasification  
Renewable hydrogen  
BECCS

## ABSTRACT

This study has analysed and optimised a 5-column sorption enhanced water gas shift (SEWGS) pilot unit, set to operate for the first time in a waste gasification facility for the production of transport-grade hydrogen and CO<sub>2</sub> streams. Full process simulation was undertaken by developing a one-dimensional model of each reactor, with boundary conditions directly informed by real plant operation. From the sensitivity analysis performed, syngas flowrate variations were seen to have a minor but temporary, impact on hydrogen product specifications, while changes to syngas composition were shown to have a longer-lasting effect on system performance. Based on full cycle operation results, the current 5-column SEWGS unit design was concluded to be inadequate for fuel-cell-grade H<sub>2</sub> production, despite obtaining a high H<sub>2</sub> purity of 99.5%, mainly due to its excessive steam consumption. However, the process achieved an exceptionally high CO<sub>2</sub> purity of 99.9%, and 88.6% hydrogen recovery rate, suggesting its potential use in carbon capture and heat-grade hydrogen production applications.

## 1. Introduction

In 2022 the International Energy Agency (IEA) reported that around 80% of global energy is provided by fossil fuels [1]. Reducing and mitigating the associated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions has become a significant climate challenge, requiring the transition to renewable energy systems as the primary objective of most countries' net-zero agenda. Hydrogen represents a promising solution as a clean energy carrier and storage, as well as for its zero end-use emissions [2]. However, natural gas reforming is still the predominant industrial process for generating hydrogen resulting in substantial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions due to the fossil nature of the feedstock [3]. Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) technology integrated into gas reforming is considered the most practical solution to reduce emissions for hydrogen production in the short to mid-term [4]. However, CCS's current cost and efficiency limitations need to be addressed to compete with other emerging technologies in the longer term [5,6]. Carbon capture and reduction (CCR) technology is a possible different route that has gained interest to directly convert CO<sub>2</sub> to value-added products [7]. As to hydrogen production, water electrolysis is being explored and promoted as an alternative; however, the climate

benefits of H<sub>2</sub> from water splitting would only be real if the electricity is supplied solely by renewable energy sources, which are often discontinuous, unpredictable, and geographically constrained [8].

Biomass holds great potential as a renewable feedstock for energy, fuels, and chemical production (e.g., hydrogen), via thermochemical conversion like pyrolysis or gasification [9,10]. Biomass and biowaste offer the advantage of being carbon neutral and, combined with CCS in what is defined as Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS), could further enhance climate performance as a carbon-negative technology [9,11,12].

In the production of hydrogen from biomass, also referred to as biohydrogen, the choice of feedstock is crucial as it significantly influences the performances of the process, in particular the processing and purification steps required. Hydrogen derived from organic or partially organic waste is particularly interesting as it offers a solution to both waste disposal issues and the cost/availability of the feedstock [13]. The IEA emphasizes the significant potential of biohydrogen in reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and highlights the growing interest in producing hydrogen from renewable sources [14–16].

The overall process considered in this work is the production of

\* Corresponding author.


E-mail address: [massimiliano.materazzi.09@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:massimiliano.materazzi.09@ucl.ac.uk) (M. Materazzi).<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuproc.2024.108032>

Received 24 October 2023; Received in revised form 3 January 2024; Accepted 3 January 2024

Available online 11 January 2024

0378-3820/© 2024 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

hydrogen from the gasification of refuse-derived fuel (RDF) generated from biomass-rich (>60% wt.) household waste. The suitability of producing low-carbon hydrogen from the gasification of waste feedstock has already been proven at a pilot and demonstration scale in previous work by Materazzi et al. [17]. Although the hydrogen synthesis process offers numerous environmental benefits, the costs associated with gas cleaning and carbon capture plants might hinder its commercial potential [18]. Compared to more conventional fossil based feedstock, biomass and waste biomass contain much higher quantities of oxygen, which reflect to higher steam and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the syngas (this is especially true in autothermal gasifiers). This factor, together with the varying C:H ratio and potential fluctuations in gas composition due to heterogeneity of waste, make the product syngas quite distinct from other applications, and introduce different challenges in the carbon capture systems. In this respect, one of the main challenges lies in the operational cost of regenerating solvents used in gas separation methods, either physical or chemical based. Furthermore, it should be noted that although CO<sub>2</sub> absorption using liquid solvents is the most mature and commercially available technology for separating CO<sub>2</sub>, the high energy consumption during solvent regeneration and potential solvent degradation could lead to process inefficiencies, solvent loss and toxic byproducts [19,20]. To make the process economically attractive at a low scale, more typical of BECCS, it is essential to reduce capital costs by improving compactness and efficiency. Process Intensification is a chemical engineering concept based on improving the performance of the overall process [21]. In this context, Sorption-Enhanced Water-Gas Shift (SEWGS) emerges as a promising pre-combustion carbon capture technology. SEWGS combines the Water Gas Shift reaction (WGS) (Eq. (1)) with in situ adsorption of CO<sub>2</sub> (Eq. (2)), maximizing hydrogen production from syngas while simultaneously capturing and separating CO<sub>2</sub> in a single-unit operation [21–23]. This intensified process utilizes Pressure Swing Adsorption (PSA), employing solid material for reversible CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption at temperatures ranging from 300 to 500 °C and pressure around 20–40 bar [24].



Compared to conventional processes, SEWGS offers the advantage of reduced process steps and required equipment [24,25]. The benefits of SEWGS have been extensively studied and experimentally demonstrated [24,26–29]. Hydrotalcite-based materials, and in particular potassium-promoted-hydrotalcite (K-HTC), have been the most used in SEWGS processes [30–32], due to their chemical robustness, partial catalytic activity for the WGS reaction, ability to co-capture other acid gas components with CO<sub>2</sub>, fast sorption kinetics, stable cyclic performances, and efficient regeneration through pressure swing [28,33,34]. This enables the SEWGS process to obtain a high carbon capture rate and CO<sub>2</sub> purities in the carbon dioxide effluent stream, making it ideal for CCS applications [35–37]. TNO research groups extensively studied the SEWGS technology in an Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) power plant for H<sub>2</sub> production and in integrated steelwork for H<sub>2</sub> production and simultaneous carbon capture. However, no previous studies have explored the potential of applying SEWGS in a waste gasification plant, and only a few literature papers have focused on the effects of SEWGS operational parameters on hydrogen purity (HP) and hydrogen recovery ratio (HRR) due to the emphasis on carbon capture over hydrogen production [38].

This work aims to assess the suitability of a simplified SEWGS system to generate fuel-cell grade hydrogen (HP > 99.97%) from waste-derived syngas at low pressure (typical of gasification plants), as well as a CO<sub>2</sub> stream suitable for storage (purity >95%). To this end, a numerical simulation was developed to explore the integration possibilities of a novel 5-column pilot scale SEWGS unit into an existing waste gasification plant, and to determine the optimal operating conditions and parameters for the SEWGS pilot unit design. The efficiency of the process

was assessed by analysing the recovery rates of each product, along with the overall steam consumption, which affects the operational costs and the environmental impact of the process. The optimal configuration and design parameters are evaluated, such as the time step duration, rinse configuration (co-current or counter-current) and steam demand for the SEWGS process to achieve the required process specifications. Additionally, variations in syngas feed flowrate and composition during the adsorption step were explored to understand the SEWGS process's sensitivity to common disturbances in bioenergy plants when operated on waste feedstock, which has high variability in density and composition due to its heterogeneous nature. Accomplishing these objectives is deemed important for understanding the operational performance of the low-pressure SEWGS process applied specifically to BECCS for high-purity hydrogen production, which is a novel concept from an industrial and literature standpoint.

## 2. Material and methods

### 2.1. Plant description

This work focused on the integration of SEWGS into an already existing demonstration scale (4.4 MW<sub>th</sub> input) waste gasification plant operated in Swindon UK, originally designed to produce either pure H<sub>2</sub> or bioSNG and CO<sub>2</sub> within the *Hydrogen Greenhouse Gas Removal (GGR) Demonstration project* [39].

The gasification plant treats approximately 850 kg/h of RDF or waste wood into a two-stage thermochemical process for the conversion of the solid feedstock into clean syngas. The composition of the fed RDF investigated in this work is summarized in Table 1. The two-stage process consists of a steam-oxygen gasifier for syngas generation and a plasma reactor for tar reforming. The stream is then passed into a cleaning section using conventional technologies, e.g., dry filters, a combination of acid and alkaline scrubbers, and ZnO guard beds. In its original configuration, the hydrogen fraction of the clean syngas is increased via a series of catalytic high and low-temperature water gas shift reactors (HTS and LTS). The H<sub>2</sub>-rich stream is polished of CO traces through a methanation step (MTH), followed by a separation stage where CO<sub>2</sub> is chemically adsorbed, separated and made ready for transportation and storage [4]. The hydrogen stream is further purified in a PSA to achieve fuel-cell grade purity levels. This study focuses on a 50 kg/h slipstream of syngas, which is diverted from the plant after the high-temperature WGS to the new SEWGS facility for pure H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> production. A flow diagram of the demonstration plant is reported in Fig. 1, together with the pilot SWGS unit studied in this work.

The feedstock characterization and the syngas composition at different stages of the process (namely, the clean syngas before HTS and the shifted gas after HTS) are reported in Table 1. RDF data are reported for the baseline case, and possible variations are registered during plant operation. This variation would be reflected in gas composition and flowrate ranges, with oscillations typically in the range of +/− 5%. Lower oscillations are instead reported for syngas post-HTS, due to the buffering effect of the water gas shift step, and the higher dilution in steam.

The SEWGS pilot unit under investigation is composed of five reactors (Fig. 2), each with a height of 2.5 m and an internal diameter of 0.23 m. This configuration and number of columns, although sub-optimal, were first selected to assess the potential for a continuous generation of hydrogen and carbon dioxide product stream under PSA operation. The reactor design parameters are also shown in Fig. 2.

### 2.2. Mathematical model description

A dynamic one-dimensional isothermal model for an axially dispersed plug flow SEWGS reactor has been developed. The cylindrical reactor is assumed to be packed with a mixture of catalyst and sorbent particles (adsorbent/catalyst volume ratio of 5): (i) a commercial

**Table 1**  
RDF and Syngas specifications.

| Proximate analysis [wt% dry ash free (DAF)] | Typical Value | Lower Limit | Maximum Limit | Cleaned Syngas     |             | Syngas post-HTS         |               |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------|
|                                             |               |             |               | Composition (mol%) |             | Avg. Composition (mol%) |               |
| Fixed Carbon                                | 8.90          | 5.5         | 10.5          | H <sub>2</sub>     | 34.7 (± 5%) | H <sub>2</sub>          | 29.5 (± 2.5%) |
| Volatile matter                             | 64.7          | 60.2        | 70.5          | CO                 | 42.6 (± 5%) | CO                      | 2.30 (± 2.5%) |
| Ash                                         | 11.8          | 5.0         | 19.5          | CO <sub>2</sub>    | 12.2 (± 5%) | CO <sub>2</sub>         | 20.0 (± 2.5%) |
| Moisture                                    | 14.6          | 6.0         | 16.6          | CH <sub>4</sub>    | 0.1         | CH <sub>4</sub>         | 0.0           |
| Ultimate Analysis [wt% DAF]                 | Typical Value | Lower Limit | Maximum Limit | H <sub>2</sub> O   | 10.1        | H <sub>2</sub> O        | 47.9          |
| Fossil C                                    | 20.51         | 20.0        | 30.0          | N <sub>2</sub>     | 0.30        | N <sub>2</sub>          | 0.30          |
| Biogenic C                                  | 36.23         | 30.0        | 40.0          |                    |             |                         |               |
| H                                           | 6.86          | 4.5         | 7.0           |                    |             |                         |               |
| O                                           | 31.78         | 25.6        | 35.0          |                    |             |                         |               |
| N                                           | 4.1           | 1.5         | 8.5           |                    |             |                         |               |
| S                                           | 0.18          | 0.1         | 0.3           |                    |             |                         |               |
| Cl                                          | 0.34          | 0.1         | 0.4           |                    |             |                         |               |




Fig. 1. Flow diagram for a demonstration plant for H<sub>2</sub> production and newly developed pilot for SEWGS.




Fig. 2. Configuration and design parameter of the SEWGS pilot unit.

**Table 2**  
Reactors governing equation.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |       |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Component mass balance                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |       | Ref.       |
| $\epsilon_t \frac{\partial c_{CO_2}}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial(uc_{CO_2})}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( cD_{ax} \frac{\partial y_{CO_2}}{\partial z} \right) + \rho_{b,cat} r_{WGS} - \rho_{b,ads} \frac{\partial q_{CO_2}}{\partial t}$ | Eq. 3 | [40,47,48] |
| $\epsilon_t \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial uc_i}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( cD_{ax} \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial z} \right) + \rho_{b,cat} r_{WGS} \quad i = H_2, CO, H_2O, N_2$                                        | Eq. 4 |            |
| Overall mass balance                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |       | Ref.       |
| $\epsilon_t \frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial(uc)}{\partial z} + \rho_{b,cat} r_{WGS} - \rho_{b,ads} \frac{\partial q_{CO_2}}{\partial t}$                                                                                                         | Eq. 5 | [47]       |
| Equation of State                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |       |            |
| $pM_{av} = \rho_g RT$                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Eq. 6 |            |
| Momentum balance                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |       | Ref.       |
| $\frac{\partial p}{\partial z} = -K_D u - K_V u^2$                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Eq. 7 | [49]       |
| CO <sub>2</sub> adsorption kinetic                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |       | Ref.       |
| $\frac{\partial q_{CO_2}}{\partial t} = k_{LDF,CO_2} (q_{CO_2}^{eq} - q_{CO_2})$                                                                                                                                                                                 | Eq. 8 | [24,41]:   |

**Table 3**  
Parameters of governing equations.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Parameters of the Momentum balance (Ergun equation)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Ref.       |
| $K_D = \frac{150\mu(1-\epsilon_b)^2}{d_p^2 \epsilon_b^3}; K_V = \frac{1.75(1-\epsilon_b)\rho_g}{d_p \epsilon_b^3}$                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | [49,50]    |
| Axial Dispersion coefficient $D_{ax}$                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Ref.       |
| $D_{ax} = 0.73D_m + \frac{0.5ud_p}{1 + 9.49 \frac{D_m}{ud_p}}$ with: $D_{m,i} = \sum_{i=1}^n D_{m,i} y_i$                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | [21,48]    |
| Modified Langmuir Isotherm                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Ref.       |
| $q_{CO_2}^{eq} = \frac{q_{CO_2}^* K_{CO_2} p_{CO_2}}{1 + K_{CO_2} p_{CO_2}} + \frac{A_{CO_2} V_0}{v_{m,CO_2}}$<br>with<br>$A_{CO_2} = \exp \left( - \left[ \left( \frac{RT}{E_i} \right) \ln \left( \frac{p_{0,i}}{p_i} \right) \right]^{m_i} \right), p_{0,CO_2} = p_{c,CO_2} \left( \frac{T}{T_{c,CO_2}} \right)^2, v_{m,CO_2} = \frac{RT_{c,CO_2}}{8p_{c,CO_2}}$<br>in which:<br>$q_{CO_2}^* = 0.45 \text{ mol} \bullet \text{kg}^{-1}$<br>$E_{CO_2} = 23 \text{ kJ} \bullet \text{mol}^{-1}$<br>$V_0 = 74 \text{ cm}^3 \bullet \text{kg}^{-1}$<br>$K_{CO_2} = 28 \text{ MPa}^{-1}$<br>$m_{CO_2} = 5.2$ | [24,26]    |
| Mass-transfer coefficient                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Ref.       |
| $k_{LDF,CO_2} = \frac{15}{r_p^2} \frac{\epsilon_p D_p}{\epsilon_p + \rho_p RT \left( \frac{\partial q_{CO_2}^{eq}}{\partial p_{CO_2}} \right)}$ in which $D_p = 3.3 \times 10^{-7} \text{ m}^2 \bullet \text{s}^{-2}$                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | [24,48,51] |
| WGS reaction rate expression                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Ref.       |
| $r_{WGS} = k p_{CO} p_{H_2O} \left( 1 - \frac{p_{H_2} p_{CO_2}}{p_{CO} p_{H_2O} K_{eq}} \right)$<br>with:<br>$k = 8.689 \times 10^{-7} \exp \left( -\frac{32.839}{RT} \right)$<br>$K_{eq} = \exp \left( -0.29353Z^3 + 0.63508Z^2 + 4.1778Z + 0.31688 \right)$ with: $Z = \frac{1000}{T} - 1$<br>physical properties of gaseous species were calculated using Aspe Plus V11                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | [52,53]    |

iron-chromium-based material was assumed as the high-temperature WGS catalyst and (ii) K-HTC as the CO<sub>2</sub> sorbent.

Other groups have used a similar modelling approach for sorption-enhanced processes by packed-bed reactors [24,40–44]. The main assumptions used to develop the model are given below:

- The reactor is a tubular, packed-bed reactor, operated dynamically and isothermally.

- The flow pattern can be described by an axially dispersed plug flow model.
- The model is one-dimensional, so the radial gradients of the concentrations, adsorbent loading, fluid velocity, and pressure are not taken into account.
- The mass transfer between gas and solid is sufficiently fast, making interparticle gradients of concentrations and temperature negligible.
- All gaseous components are considered ideal gases.




Fig. 3. Base case operating schedule of SEWGS pilot unit (A: adsorption, R: rinse, PE<sub>d</sub>: pressure equalization depressurization, BD: blow down, P: purge, PE<sub>p</sub>: pressure equalization pressurization, RP: repressurization).

- The WGS reaction is the only one taking place in the reactor.
- An effectiveness factor of unity is assumed for the catalyst particles, i. e., intraparticle diffusion limitations are negligible, in line with similar studies [46–49]
- Sorbent is assumed to exhibit no catalytic properties towards the WGS reaction and carbon dioxide is the only adsorbed species (i.e., water adsorption on the K-HTC sorbent was neglected) [41].
- The Linear Driving Force (LDF) approximation is used to describe the kinetic of carbon dioxide between the gaseous and sorbent phases.
- A modified Langmuir isotherm is used to describe the equilibrium adsorption of carbon dioxide on the sorbent [26].

Based on these assumptions, the governing equations that model each reactor vessel were obtained. Table 2 shows those governing equations, while the related parameters are calculated as summarized in Table 3. The model, and its assumptions on sorbent catalyst therein, was validated through dedicated adsorption tests on a single tube, lab scale apparatus, as reported in Supplementary Material. It is important to emphasise that the value chosen for the maximum sorption capacity is very conservative ( $q_{CO_2}^s = 0.45 \text{ mol} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$ , Table 3) compared to those reported elsewhere [45,46]. This was assumed on the basis that partial deactivation of the sorbent could take place at full regime, upon exposure to trace (undetected) contaminants in a waste gasification plant.

### 2.3. SEWGS cycle process description and modelling approach

The process illustrated in Fig. 2 follows the typical approach of a pressure swing multicomponent system. In particular, the whole SEWGS cycle for CO<sub>2</sub> capture consists of seven distinct steps, performed in sequence by each reactor, as schematized in Fig. 3. The cycle steps include (Fig. 3): adsorption (A), rinse (R), pressure equalization - depressurization (PE<sub>d</sub>), blow down (BD), purge (P), pressure equalization - pressurization (PE<sub>p</sub>), and repressurization (RP). In each step of Fig. 3, details of co-current and counter-current flow pattern are also

shown. The adsorption step (A) is the only stage that generates H<sub>2</sub> product with this configuration, while the counter-current rinse step (R), the blow down step (BD), and the purge step (P) all contribute to the CO<sub>2</sub> product stream. The operating temperature is set to be 350 °C at all steps. The maximum operating pressure of the SEWGS unit is 12 bar ( $p_H$ ) during adsorption and rinse step and the minimum is 1.1 bar ( $p_L$ ) in purge step, with an intermediate pressure of 6 bar ( $p_I$ ) at the end of the pressure equalization steps. Operating pressure was intentionally selected to be relatively low to facilitate plant integration and material selection. This is a novel process choice, as a typical PSA system would work at much higher inlet pressure. As for the stream available in this process, these comprise of a post-HTS clean syngas feed stream, along with high-pressure and low-pressure steam utility streams (HP-STEAM and LP-STEAM, respectively), and a hydrogen repressurization stream (see Fig. 2). The syngas stream is fed at a flowrate of 50 kg/h to the adsorption step and is assumed to be free of contaminants (sulphur, nitrogen-, and chlorine-based compounds, alkali metals, ash, etc.), as the stream has undergone extensive gas cleaning process before entering in the SEWGS section. The steam utility stream consists of pure water vapour at a pressure of 12 bar for the HP-STEAM and 1.1 bar for the LP-STEAM, both fed at 350 °C. The hydrogen repressurization stream is used to bring the last step (RP) column to its original pressure and is assumed to be composed of pure hydrogen gas at 350 °C and 12 bar. The governing equations (Eqs. (3)–(8), Table 2) for modelling a single bed were extended to simulate the SEWGS cyclic process by selecting appropriate initial and boundary conditions [41]. The model considers multicomponent mass balance (Eqs. (3)–(4), Table 2), overall mass balance (Eq. (5), Table 2), Ergun relation for pressure drops (Momentum balance, Eq. (7), Table 2), and nonlinear adsorption equilibrium isotherm (Table 3) coupled with WGS reaction (Table 3), resulting in a system of Partial Differential Equations (PDEs). The variables that can be calculated at each cyclic process step include gas-phase component molar fraction ( $y_{CO_2}$ ,  $y_{CO}$ ,  $y_{H_2}$ ,  $y_{H_2O}$ ,  $y_{N_2}$ ), CO<sub>2</sub> captured by the sorbent (“CO<sub>2</sub> loading”,  $q$ ), gas superficial velocity ( $u$ ) and pressure ( $p$ ). The

Method-of-Line [23,54] is used to solve the PDEs system by initially approximating spatial derivatives with algebraic equations, which are then transformed into a set of Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs), solvable by dedicated numerical methods. Spatial discretization is achieved using a uniform grid and finite difference technique in the axial direction ( $z$ , Table 2). The resulting ODEs system is solved numerically with respect to time ( $t$ , Table 2) using MATLAB “ode15s” solver. Fig. 3 depicts the cycle timing for five parallel reactors, which is controlled by setting the total cycle time and dividing it into steps based on the specified time step duration. A 1/10-time step duration of 90 s is used as the first attempt value.

Simulations were performed using a single bed approach, i.e., following the evolution of all consecutive steps of the SEWGS cycle (as given in Fig. 3), as experienced by one of the five reactors. At the end of each step, the final gas composition expressed as molar fraction, pressure, gas superficial velocity, and (residual) CO<sub>2</sub> loading on the sorbent were saved and used as the initial conditions of the following step in the SEWGS cycle sequence. In the first step, the column was initially purged with pure nitrogen gas at 12 bar and 350 °C.

#### 2.4. Performance analysis

This study aimed to analyse the SEWGS system's operation and determine its viability in generating high purity hydrogen, in order to understand its potential applications, such as the production of fuel-cell-grade hydrogen or CCS-grade carbon dioxide. A parametric analysis was carried out, considering three main operating parameters: time step duration, steam flowrate in the rinse step (R, Fig. 3), and steam flowrate in the purge step (P, Fig. 3). Strict requirements exist for polymeric fuel-cell-grade hydrogen regarding CO and CO<sub>2</sub> levels, which must be below 0.2 μmol/mol and 2 μmol/mol, respectively [55,56]. The time step duration in the SEWGS process can be evaluated during the adsorption step, to ensure that product hydrogen met those requirements. However, certain steps may need longer duration than allowed in the scheduled cyclic process, disrupting the continuity and preventing a continuous flow product, so an optimization exercise is often needed. The steam flowrate in the rinse and purge steps is analysed independently to ensure optimal H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> purities in the respective product stream. The rinse and purge steam flowrates are determined by the rinse-to-carbon (R/C, Eq. (9)) and purge-to-carbon (P/C, Eq. (10)) ratios.

$$R/C = \frac{\int_0^{t_R} F_{Steam,R} dt}{(y_{CO,Feed} + y_{CO_2,Feed}) F_{Feed} t_A} \quad (9)$$

$$P/C = \frac{\int_0^{t_P} F_{Steam,P} dt}{(y_{CO,Feed} + y_{CO_2,Feed}) F_{Feed} t_A} \quad (10)$$

The steam flowrate in these steps influences several efficiency aspects of the SEWGS process, as it impacts the recovery of H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>, as well as the economic and environmental aspects related to energy and emissions for steam generation. To objectively evaluate the parameter influences, key performance indicators (KPIs) were defined for the SEWGS pilot unit (Table 4) on integral base with respect to time: hydrogen recovery ratio (HRR, Eq. (11)), carbon capture ratio (CCR, Eq. (12)), carbon purity (CP, Eq. (14)), and hydrogen purity (HP, Eq. (13)). In Eqs. (11)–(14), the letter  $j$  denotes steps contributing to the hydrogen product stream ( $j = A$ , Eq. (11), Eq. (13)), while  $k$  denotes the steps contributing to the carbon dioxide product stream ( $k = R/BD/P$ , Eq. (12), Eq. (14)). It is important to note that the purities of H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> in their respective product stream were determined on a dry basis.

### 3. Results and discussion


#### 3.1. Adsorption step

The optimal time intervals for the SEWGS model were assessed considering the restrictions on CO and CO<sub>2</sub> content in the hydrogen product stream for transport applications. The amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> and CO leaving the adsorption step were calculated every 30 s (in micromoles of CO<sub>2</sub> or CO per total moles of dry hydrogen product, i.e., μmol/mol), as shown in Fig. 4a-b.


As the adsorption time increases, more reactants are fed to the column, involving a growing amount of sorbent particles into CO<sub>2</sub> capture. This, in turn, reduces the overall sorption capacity of the bed and increases the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> along the column. As a results, the rate of the forward WGS reaction decreases, causing a decrease in the conversion of CO and a significant rise in the CO impurities content in the hydrogen product. Fig. 5 show a clear advancement of the adsorption front with longer step duration. As the sorbent progressively becomes

**Table 4**  
Description of the KPIs used in this work.

| KPI     | Definition                                                                              | Formula                                                                                                                                                      |        |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| HRR [%] | Ratio of actual H <sub>2</sub> product recovered to maximum obtainable H <sub>2</sub>   | $HRR = \frac{\sum_j \int_0^{t_j} y_{H_2,out,j} F_{out,j} dt}{(y_{H_2,Feed} + y_{CO,Feed}) F_{Feed} t_A} \times 100$                                          | Eq. 11 |
| CCR [%] | Ratio of actual CO <sub>2</sub> product recovered to maximum obtainable CO <sub>2</sub> | $CCR = \frac{\sum_k \int_0^{t_k} y_{CO_2,out,k} F_{out,k} dt}{(y_{CO_2,Feed} + y_{CO,Feed}) F_{Feed} t_A} \times 100$                                        | Eq. 12 |
| HP [%]  | Dry-basis H <sub>2</sub> product purity                                                 | $HP = \frac{\sum_j \int_0^{t_j} y_{H_2,out,j} F_{out,j} dt}{\sum_j \int_0^{t_j} F_{out,j} dt - \sum_j \int_0^{t_j} y_{H_2O,out,j} F_{out,j} dt} \times 100$  | Eq. 13 |
| CP [%]  | Dry-basis CO <sub>2</sub> product purity                                                | $CP = \frac{\sum_k \int_0^{t_k} y_{CO_2,out,k} F_{out,k} dt}{\sum_k \int_0^{t_k} F_{out,k} dt - \sum_k \int_0^{t_k} y_{H_2O,out,k} F_{out,k} dt} \times 100$ | Eq. 14 |



**Fig. 4.** a)  $\text{CO}_2$  content in the outlet hydrogen product stream as a function of adsorption time step, along with the  $2 \mu\text{mol/mol}$  limit required for fuel-cell-grade hydrogen (dashed black line); b) CO content in the outlet hydrogen product stream as a function of adsorption time step, along with the  $0.2 \mu\text{mol/mol}$  limit required for fuel-cell-grade hydrogen (dashed black line).



**Fig. 5.**  $\text{CO}_2$  adsorbed on the sorbent as a function of the column length at various adsorption time step. Total reactor length: 2.5 m.



spent along the column length, the concentration profile of impurities is shifted forward. This shift reduces the available length for  $\text{CO}_2$  adsorption and, therefore, hinders the conversion of CO by the sorption-enhancing effect.

For example, Fig. 4a-b shows that the base case adsorption time (180 s) results in too high levels of  $\text{CO}_2$  and CO impurities. Lowering the adsorption time to 120 s allowed the achievement of the CO specification, but the  $2 \mu\text{mol/mol}$  limit for  $\text{CO}_2$  is only met at 60 s. Consequently, the adsorption time was set to 60 s (corresponding to a 30 s time step duration), resulting in compositions of  $0.705 \mu\text{mol/mol}$  for  $\text{CO}_2$  and

**Table 5**

$\text{CO}_2$  and CO content in the hydrogen product stream resulting from sensitivity analyses simulating variations of feed flowrate and feed  $\text{CO}_2$  content.

| Residual content in $\text{H}_2$ -Product Stream  | Base Case Feed Conditions | 5% Increase in Feed Flowrate | 5% Decrease in Feed Flowrate | 5% Increase in the Molar Fraction of $\text{CO}_2$ at the Feed |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| $\text{CO}_2$ [ $\mu\text{mol/mol}$ ]             | 0.705                     | 1.21                         | 0.375                        | 0.442                                                          |
| $\text{CO}_2$ variation compared to base case [%] | /                         | +72%                         | -47%                         | -37%                                                           |
| CO [ $\mu\text{mol/mol}$ ]                        | 0.0158                    | 0.0280                       | 0.00839                      | 0.00816                                                        |
| CO variation compared to base case [%]            | /                         | +79%                         | -47%                         | -48%                                                           |



**Fig. 6.** a)  $\text{CO}_2$  adsorbed on the sorbent as a function of the column length at the end of the adsorption step at various feed flowrate; b)  $\text{CO}_2$  adsorbed on the sorbent as a function of the column length at the end of the adsorption step with increased  $\text{CO}_2$  content in the feed. Adsorption time of 60 s. Total reactor length: 2.5 m.




Fig. 7. a) Outlet molar flowrate of components in the rinse step as a function of time in the counter-current configuration; b) CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed along the column in the rinse step over time in the counter-current configuration. Rinse time of 60 s.




Fig. 8. a) Outlet molar flowrate of components in the rinse step as functions of time in the co-current configuration; b) CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed as a function of reactor length at several rinse times in the co-current configuration. Rinse time of 60 s. Total reactor length: 2.5 m.

0.0158  $\mu\text{mol/mol}$  for CO in the hydrogen product stream.

Further reducing the time step duration would be sensible in practice, considering the expected increase in these values during continuous operation in case of partial sorbent regeneration. However, decreasing the time step also reduces the available time for rinse and purge steps, imposing higher steam consumption. This significantly impacts the process's economics, efficiency, and environmental burden.

In addition to evaluations of adsorption duration, changes to the feed

properties were evaluated to assess the system's sensitivity to disturbances, which are common in waste fuelled plants. A  $\pm 5\%$  variation was imposed to the syngas flowrate to the column and simulated (Fig. 6a): no significant changes in the column's adsorption profile resulted, with a slight shift forward in the adsorption front for increased flow given the higher overall quantity of CO<sub>2</sub> fed to the reactor (while the reverse occurred for decreased flow). The most significant change occurred in CO<sub>2</sub> content in the hydrogen product, with values of  $+72\%$




Fig. 9. a) HRR and mole fraction of CO<sub>2</sub> in the hydrogen product stream as functions of various rinse steam flowrate in a co-current configuration; b) CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed as a functions of reactor length at several steam flowrate in the co-current configuration. Rinse time of 60 s. Total reactor length: 2.5 m.

for higher feed flowrate, and  $-47\%$  at lower feed flowrate, all having the base case as a reference (Table 5). This is expected, as with increased feed flowrate, the residence time available for  $\text{CO}_2$  to both adsorb on the sorbent and react with steam decreases. Since the partial pressures of all components were not varied, the WGS reaction rate and the adsorption rate of  $\text{CO}_2$  remain relatively the same as in the base case, explaining the minor change observed in the adsorption profile and the increased  $\text{CO}_2$  content at the outlet. The opposite effects occur with decreased flowrate. These conclusions are further supported by the variation in the  $\text{CO}$  content at the product stream with varying flowrate, which is seen to change by a similar degree to that observed with the  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fraction.

A sensitivity analysis was performed also concerning the  $\text{CO}_2$  content in the feed, assuming a  $+5\%$  increase. Interestingly, the results show a significant decrease in  $\text{CO}_2$  ( $-37\%$ ) and  $\text{CO}$  ( $-48\%$ ) content at the outlet compared to the base case (Table 5). However, Fig. 6b reveals a notable increase in adsorbed  $\text{CO}_2$  at the inlet bed portion, possibly due to the higher  $\text{CO}_2$  partial pressure. This leads to enhanced equilibrium adsorption isotherm, resulting in increased adsorption rate. Furthermore, the higher amount of adsorbed  $\text{CO}_2$  results to an increased forward WGS reaction rate, reducing the residual  $\text{CO}$  in the  $\text{H}_2$  product stream.

### 3.2. Rinse step

The adsorption step achieves only a 46.8% of HRR, with the selected counter-current configuration in the base case, significantly compromising the system's efficiency and potentially impacting the  $\text{CO}_2$  product's CP. Ideally, the stream generated in the rinse step should be merged with the hydrogen product. However, based on Fig. 7a, it can be concluded that is not possible, due to the large amount of  $\text{CO}_2$  that would leave the column. At the end of the adsorption step, the  $\text{CO}_2$  content in the gas phase mainly concentrates at the bottom of the column, due to the higher  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration in the syngas feed and the fact that the sorbent at the bottom might be already saturated. Therefore operating with a counter-current configuration in the rinse step, the steam flow will not only directly carry the  $\text{CO}_2$  content in the gas phase to the outlet, but also push the front of adsorbed  $\text{CO}_2$  forward, causing the desorbed  $\text{CO}_2$  to end up in the product stream, as shown Fig. 7b.

Interestingly, by changing to co-current rinse configuration, the  $\text{CO}_2$  content exiting the column become negligible (Fig. 8a). In co-current mode, steam is introduced at the concentrated  $\text{CO}_2$  region (reactor bottom), pushing upward both  $\text{CO}_2$  already in gaseous phase and newly desorbed  $\text{CO}_2$ , towards sorbent layers with lower  $\text{CO}_2$  loading at the end of adsorption phase; this resulted in a transient adsorption front, peaking along the column (Fig. 8b). This effectively prevents contamination of the hydrogen product stream, making unspent bed layers working as an

additional purification guard.

The impact of steam flowrate in a co-current rinse configuration on system performance was assessed by a sensitivity analysis: the steam flowrate was increased in the rinse step by 50% increments ( $R/C = 1.68, 2.24, 2.8$ ) compared to the base case ( $R/C = 1.12$ ) and analysing its effects on HRR and  $\text{CO}_2$  content in the hydrogen product (combining adsorption and rinse steps). Fig. 9 shows the results of this sensitivity analysis. At the base case (1.12  $R/C$  ratio), the co-current rinse improves the HRR up to 77.6% (vs. 46.8 of the counter-current rinse), with a  $\text{CO}_2$  content in  $\text{H}_2$  product of  $0.8 \mu\text{mol/mol}$  (Fig. 9). Higher steam flowrates lead to further HRR improvements, eventually plateauing at  $R/C$  ratios exceeding 2.24. However, the outlet  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fraction increases more than linearly with the  $R/C$  ratio, resulting in a significant shift forward with respect to the column length of the adsorption front, calculated at the end of the rinse step (Fig. 9b). Consequently, at an  $R/C$  ratio of 2.80, the  $\text{CO}_2$  content in the hydrogen product exceeds the specified limit, making it impractical to incorporate the rinse effluent stream into the hydrogen product.

Therefore, a co-current configuration with a  $R/C$  ratio of 2.24 resulted as the optimal arrangement for the rinse step, which allows for a HRR of 97.7%, while maintaining the  $\text{CO}_2$  mole fraction in the hydrogen product at  $1.2 \mu\text{mol/mol}$ , below its limit for PEM fuel cell applications. Choosing a higher steam flow would not be advisable since it would result in  $\text{CO}_2$  content approaching or exceeding that limit, without any significant gain in HRR that would justify the increased steam consumption costs. A lower value, for example  $R/C$  of 1.68 was also acceptable, given the relatively high HRR of 92.7% and the lower  $\text{CO}_2$  contamination in the hydrogen product ( $0.9 \mu\text{mol/mol}$ ), along with the reduced steam consumption costs. However, it is common practice in SEWGS and related processes to aim for a hydrogen recovery rate higher than 95% to enhance efficiency, economic returns, and achieve high  $\text{CO}_2$  purity for carbon capture and storage applications [25,57,58].

### 3.3. Purge step

The effect of steam flowrate on  $\text{CO}_2$  removal and sorbent regeneration was studied during the purge step, by a sensitivity analysis that involved increments of steam flowrate by 100% relative to the base case ( $P/C = 1$ ). The impact on sorbent regeneration resulted low, becoming negligible for  $P/C$  ratio of 3 or higher (Fig. 10a). The main effect of steam flow is in rinsing out the gas phase  $\text{CO}_2$ , as shown in Fig. 10b. However, the efficiency of gaseous  $\text{CO}_2$  removal gradually decreases with higher flowrates because the lower partial pressure of  $\text{CO}_2$  along the column leads to increased desorption, resulting in more  $\text{CO}_2$  in the gas phase.

The purge step's inefficiency is even more evident when evaluating






Fig. 10. a)  $\text{CO}_2$  adsorbed as a function of reactor length at several steam flowrates; b) Gas phase  $\text{CO}_2$  content as a function of reactor length at several steam flowrates. Purge time of 60 s. Total reactor length: 2.5 m.



**Fig. 11.** a) CCR and CP in the CO<sub>2</sub> product stream as a functions of different steam flowrates. Purge time of 60 s; b) CCR and CP in the CO<sub>2</sub> product stream as a function of different purge time step, P/C ratio of 2.

**Table 6**

Design parameters adopted for the fully cycle simulation.

|                                                      | A  | R  | PE <sub>d</sub> | BD | R   | PE <sub>p</sub> | RP | R/C ratio        | 2.24 |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|----|-----------------|----|-----|-----------------|----|------------------|------|
| Step duration [s] ( <i>t</i> <sub>step</sub> - 30 s) | 60 | 60 | 30              | 30 | 420 | 30              | 30 | <b>P/C ratio</b> | 2    |

**Table 7**

Results for the full cycle operation of the SEWGS pilot process.

|         | Dry Hydrogen Product        |         |        | Dry Carbon Dioxide Product |        |
|---------|-----------------------------|---------|--------|----------------------------|--------|
|         | y <sub>CO2</sub> [μmol/mol] | HRR [%] | HP [%] | CCR [%]                    | CP [%] |
| Cycle 1 | 1.25                        | 97.6    | 99.9   | 95.2                       | 99.9   |
| Cycle 2 | 5.90                        | 88.5    | 99.5   | 97.2                       | 99.9   |
| Cycle 3 | 7.00                        | 88.5    | 99.5   | 97.4                       | 99.9   |
| Cycle 4 | 7.24                        | 88.5    | 99.5   | 97.5                       | 99.9   |
| Cycle 5 | 7.40                        | 88.5    | 99.5   | 97.4                       | 99.9   |
| Cycle 6 | 7.40                        | 88.5    | 99.5   | 97.4                       | 99.9   |

the CCRs and CPs, as shown in Fig. 11a. There is a minor increase in CCR with higher steam flow, but it becomes even more negligible above a P/

of 95% or higher is required, which is only achieved at a purge step duration of 420 s. This presents challenges as it hinders continuous hydrogen production by a five-columns-stack and significantly increases steam consumption, necessitating an overall P/C ratio of 14. This would have a substantial impact on the process economics and environment on a full-scale pilot plant. However, for the only sake of pilot plant operation, this is shown to be the only viable option to meet the required product specifications.

### 3.4. Fully cycle operation

Simulations for the full cyclic operation of the process were performed by the single bed approach, to evaluate long-term performance. The formulations for HRR and CCR had to be modified, to account for the H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> gases present in the column and the CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed on the sorbent after each cycle, as given by Eq. (15) and Eq. (16), respectively.

$$HRR_{tot} = \frac{\sum_j \int_0^{t_j} y_{H_2, out, j} F_{out, j} dt}{\left( y_{H_2, Feed} + y_{CO_2, Feed} \right) F_{Feed} t_A + \int_0^L \frac{dN_{H_2, 0}}{dz} dz} \times 100 \quad (15)$$

$$CCR_{tot} = \frac{\sum_k \int_0^{t_k} y_{CO_2, out, k} F_{out, k} dt}{\left( y_{CO_2, Feed} + y_{CO_2, Feed} \right) F_{Feed} t_A + \int_0^L \frac{dN_{CO_2, 0}}{dz} dz + \int_0^L q_{CO_2} A_c \rho_{b, ads} (1 - \varepsilon_b) dz} \times 100 \quad (16)$$

C ratio of 2. The overall CCR obtained remains low in all examined cases (<50%), indicating that approximately half of the fed CO<sub>2</sub> remains adsorbed even after the purge step. This suggests that the sorbent could become saturated after a few cycles, making the purge step impractical, despite always achieving high CPs suitable for CCS applications (impurities in recovered CO<sub>2</sub> always <0.001%). The effect of purge step duration on CCR and CP was evaluated at a P/C ratio of 2 over different time intervals (Fig. 11b): increasing the purge time improves sorbent regeneration. However, to ensure optimal sorbent cyclic working capacity and minimize impurities content in the hydrogen product, a CCR

Based on the previous analyses, the optimal configuration for the SEWGS process includes co-current rinse operation, with the stream generated during this step directly incorporated into hydrogen product stream. Table 6 summarise the design parameters adopted for the simulations. Six full cycles were simulated in series, the results of which are given in Table 7. It should be noted that only the first cycle works with fresh sorbent at full capacity.

Table 7 shows that after an initial drop in performance on HRR from Cycle 1, a constant value of 88.5% is obtained from Cycle 2 to Cycle 6.




Fig. 12. CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed as a function of reactor length at the end of the adsorption step for the various full cycle simulations.

The decreasing in HRR value is caused by the residual CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed on the sorbent, which reduces the CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption rate, hence lowering the sorption-enhancing effect on WGS. The CO<sub>2</sub> content in the hydrogen product undergoes a gradual increase with each cycle run with a coupled decrease of HP, also resulting from the lower CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption rate along the column. This trend with cycles makes the hydrogen product go outside the fuel-cell-grade specifications required, from Cycle 2 and beyond, meaning that the process will have to be modified to meet this target, either by incorporating an additional hydrogen purification step or altering the operating conditions set. Regarding the CO<sub>2</sub> product, a slight improvement was obtained for CCR, which is associated with the greater amount of CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed on the sorbent following Cycle 1, as shown in Fig. 12, that results in an increased desorption rate at the blow down and purge steps. Moreover, from the convergence in the CCR achieved and in the CO<sub>2</sub> obtained in the hydrogen product after multiple cycle runs, we can conclude that steady state is reached and full sorbent saturation is avoided in the process, as can also be deduced from the

relatively constant adsorption profile displayed in Fig. 12. As for the purity of the CO<sub>2</sub> product, the fluctuations are negligible over multiple cycles. However, extremely high CPs are still generated from the process, which exceed the CCS-grade specifications required.

Table 8: summarizes a comparative investigation between the results obtained in this work and those from other SEWGS and related processes from literature: the system simulated in this work achieved a superior separation of H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>, obtaining a considerably high purity for both products (Table 8, HP = 99.5%, CP = 99.9%), even surpassing the HP reached by Zhu et al. (2018) [57] through an elevated-temperature pressure swing adsorption (ET-PSA) process, in contrast with the low HRR (89.0%, Table 8). However, the high purity always comes at the cost of recovery: when fixing the bed number, this phenomenon is commonly observed with operating parameters including adsorption pressure, adsorption time, feed flowrate, purge rate, purge-to-feed ratio, cycle time and adsorbent loading ratio in layered bed [46].

Despite the lower HRR, the CP obtained was still extremely high, particularly compared with other SEWGS processes that recovered a considerably higher percentage of hydrogen (Table 8). This is due to the lower hydrogen-to-carbon ratio present in waste syngas feed compared to that obtained in syngas streams generated from coal and natural gas feedstocks [25,41,59]. These observations may suggest that biomass-rich feedstocks could allow for higher HPs (at the cost of having a lower HRR), without compromising the purity of the CO<sub>2</sub> product. Consequently, SEWGS offers greater opportunity to BECCS and low-carbon hydrogen production, compared to other solutions.

Another important point to consider is the large steam consumption (Table 8, R/C and P/C ratios) in the current pilot, compared to literature. This is related to several aspects that must be considered:

- the lower-than-average number of pressure equalization steps in the investigated pilot process, which increases the steam demand in the rinse step [24,60]. It has been demonstrated that increasing the number of equalization steps enabled the rinse steam to be reduced without significantly changing the purge steam, as it reduced the H<sub>2</sub> remaining inside the bed before the blow down step [46,61];

Table 8

Comparison of the results obtained in this work with those achieved by SEWGS and related process from literature, as well as contrasting between the different configurations of each process.

|                                      | This work                                                                                                  | Reijers et al. (2011)<br>[59]                                                      | Boon et al. (2015)<br>[24]                                                                                          | Najmi et al. (2016)<br>[41]                                                                                    | Wright et al. (2009)<br>[25]                                                                          | Zhu et al.<br>(2018) [57]                               |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Process                              | SEWGS<br>5-column<br>7-steps<br>(co-current<br>rinse)                                                      | SEWGS<br>6-column<br>8-steps<br>(counter-current<br>rinse)                         | SEWGS<br>9-column<br>11-steps<br>(co-current rinse)                                                                 | SEWGS<br>8-column<br>11-steps<br>(counter-current rinse)                                                       | SEWGS<br>11-steps<br>(counter-current rinse)                                                          | ET-PSA<br>8-column<br>13-steps<br>(co-current<br>rinse) |
| HP [%]                               | 99.5                                                                                                       | 93.2 <sup>a</sup>                                                                  | 76.8 <sup>a</sup>                                                                                                   | 81.1                                                                                                           | 46.5                                                                                                  | 97.7                                                    |
| HRR [%]                              | 88.5                                                                                                       | 99 <sup>a</sup>                                                                    | 95 <sup>a</sup>                                                                                                     | –                                                                                                              | 99                                                                                                    | 98                                                      |
| CP [%]                               | 99.9                                                                                                       | 98.0                                                                               | 99.0                                                                                                                | 99.3                                                                                                           | 99.9                                                                                                  | –                                                       |
| CCR [%]                              | 97.4                                                                                                       | 90                                                                                 | 95                                                                                                                  | 95                                                                                                             | 91                                                                                                    | –                                                       |
| R/C ratio                            | 2.24                                                                                                       | 0.55                                                                               | 0.03                                                                                                                | 0.4                                                                                                            | 0.89                                                                                                  | 0.56                                                    |
| P/C ratio                            | 14                                                                                                         | 1.3                                                                                | 0.08                                                                                                                | 1.5                                                                                                            | 1.33                                                                                                  | 1.0                                                     |
| t <sub>step</sub> Duration [s]       | 30                                                                                                         | –                                                                                  | 38                                                                                                                  | 44                                                                                                             | –                                                                                                     | 60                                                      |
| Adsorption t <sub>step</sub> [s]     | 60                                                                                                         | –                                                                                  | 156                                                                                                                 | 174                                                                                                            | –                                                                                                     | 90                                                      |
| Purge t <sub>step</sub> [s]          | 420                                                                                                        | –                                                                                  | 156                                                                                                                 | 87                                                                                                             | –                                                                                                     | 240                                                     |
| Set of Pressure Equalization<br>Step | 1                                                                                                          | 1                                                                                  | 3                                                                                                                   | 3                                                                                                              | 3                                                                                                     | 4                                                       |
| Operating Pressure Range<br>[bar]    | 12–1.1                                                                                                     | 23.6–2.0                                                                           | 24.0–1.1                                                                                                            | 27.0–1.0                                                                                                       | 28.0–1.1                                                                                              | 30.4–1.2                                                |
| Operating Temperature [°C]           | 350                                                                                                        | 400                                                                                | 400                                                                                                                 | 400                                                                                                            | 400                                                                                                   | 400                                                     |
| Feed Composition                     | 29.5% H <sub>2</sub><br>2.3% CO<br>20.0% CO <sub>2</sub><br>47.9% H <sub>2</sub> O<br>0.30% N <sub>2</sub> | 32.6% H <sub>2</sub> O<br>34.6% H <sub>2</sub><br>4.7% CO<br>23.8% CO <sub>2</sub> | 0.8% Ar<br>27.6% H <sub>2</sub> O<br>3.6% H <sub>2</sub><br>7.1% CO<br>54.4% CO <sub>2</sub><br>6.5% N <sub>2</sub> | 3.46% CO <sub>2</sub><br>22.06% H <sub>2</sub><br>49.33% CO<br>18.17% H <sub>2</sub> O<br>6.98% N <sub>2</sub> | 2.6% CO<br>15.2% H <sub>2</sub> O<br>11.7% CO <sub>2</sub><br>32.2% H <sub>2</sub><br>38.2% Inert gas | 40% H <sub>2</sub><br>1% CO<br>30% CO <sub>2</sub>      |

<sup>a</sup> Hydrogen product results were obtained from Zhu et al. (2018) [57].

- the adsorption step duration is well below that adopted in any other process (Adsorption  $t_{\text{step}}$ : 60 s, Table 8). Recall that this step duration was reduced to ensure optimal HP and minimal impurities content in the hydrogen product, in contrast, the P/C ratio and purge step duration had to be increased considerably to enhance sorbent regeneration for high-purity hydrogen to be obtained (Table 8);
- the operating pressure range and operating temperature used in the current process are lower than in the literature (Table 8, operating pressure range [bar]: 12–1.1, operating temperature [°C]: 350), which limit the cyclic working capacity of the sorbent and may contribute to higher steam requirement.

From this study, it seems that a 5-column SEWGS may not be a viable method of producing fuel-cell-grade hydrogen without the incorporation of an additional hydrogen purification step or a multi-train configuration, particularly considering the extreme steam demands required to do so. However, the same system is effective in producing hydrogen for heating applications, which requires lower hydrogen purity of 98% and could accommodate higher quantities of other impurities, such as methane, sulphur, etc. [56].

#### 4. Conclusions

The increasing concern with climate change is leading a global transition towards renewable and low-carbon energies, in which BECCS is expected to play a crucial role in offsetting GHG emissions. Recently, with the emerging investment in hydrogen production and CCS technologies, SEWGS has gained increasing attention as an intensification process for simultaneous carbon capture and hydrogen generation, aiming to reduce capital costs and energy demands. This study has analysed and optimised a 5-column SEWGS pilot unit, set to operate for the first time in a waste gasification facility. From the sensitivity analysis performed, syngas flowrate variations were seen to have an instantaneous, but temporary, impact on hydrogen product specifications, while changes to syngas composition were deduced to have a longer-lasting effect on performance. Based on full cycle operation results, the current SEWGS unit design was concluded to be inadequate for fuel-cell-grade  $H_2$  production, despite obtaining a high HP of 99.5%, mainly due to its excessive steam consumption. Nevertheless, compared with literature results, the process achieved an exceptionally high CP of 99.9%, despite the relatively low 88.6% HRR obtained. This indicated that the incorporation of SEWGS in BECCS may allow for higher purity hydrogen products to be obtained, whilst meeting CCS product specifications, in contrast with using fossil-based feedstocks, although mostly for heating applications. Overall, this study has contributed towards a deeper understanding of SEWGS as a pre-combustion carbon capture technology for BECCS and a high-purity hydrogen production method, both of which are increasingly important topics, with still limited available research.

#### Nomenclature

##### Abbreviations

|        |                                                |
|--------|------------------------------------------------|
| A      | adsorption step in SEWGS cycle                 |
| BECCS  | bioenergy with carbon capture and storage      |
| BD     | blow down step in SEWGS cycle                  |
| bioSNG | bio synthetic natural gas                      |
| CP     | carbon purity                                  |
| CCR    | carbon capture ratio                           |
| CCS    | carbon capture and storage                     |
| DMEA   | dimethylethanolamine                           |
| ET-PSA | elevated temperature pressure swing adsorption |
| GHG    | greenhouse gas emission                        |
| HP     | hydrogen purity                                |
| HRR    | hydrogen recovery rate                         |

|                 |                                                            |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| HTS             | high temperature shift                                     |
| IEA             | international energy agency                                |
| IGCC            | integrated gasification combined cycle                     |
| K-HTC           | potassium-promoted hydrotalcite                            |
| LDF             | linear driving force                                       |
| LTS             | low temperature shift                                      |
| MEA             | monoethanolamine                                           |
| MTH             | methanation step                                           |
| ODEs            | ordinary differential equations                            |
| P               | purge step in SEWGS cycle                                  |
| P/C             | purge to carbon ratio                                      |
| PDEs            | partial differential equations                             |
| PE <sub>d</sub> | pressure equalization depressurization step in SEWGS cycle |
| PE <sub>p</sub> | pressure equalization pressurization step in SEWGS cycle   |
| PSA             | pressure swing adsorption                                  |
| R               | rinse step in SEWGS cycle                                  |
| R/C             | rinse to carbon ratio                                      |
| RP              | repressurization step in SEWGS cycle                       |
| RDF             | refuse derived fuel                                        |
| SEWGS           | sorption-enhanced water-gas shift                          |
| WGS             | water-gas shift                                            |

##### Symbols

|           |                                                                          |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| A         | nanopore-sorbate interaction parameter, –                                |
| $A_c$     | column cross-sectional area, $m^2$                                       |
| $c$       | molar concentration, $mol\ m^{-3}$                                       |
| $d_p$     | particle diameter, m                                                     |
| $d_r$     | reactor internal diameter, m                                             |
| $D_{ax}$  | axial mass dispersion coefficient, $m^2\ s$                              |
| $D_m$     | molecular diffusivity of the gas mixture, $m^2\ s$                       |
| $D_{m,i}$ | molecular diffusivity of the gas component i, $m^2\ s$                   |
| $D_p$     | intraparticle diffusion coefficient, $m^2\ s$                            |
| $E$       | nanopore-sorbate interaction energy, $J\ mol^{-1}$                       |
| $F$       | molar flow rate, $mol\ s^{-1}$                                           |
| $K$       | surface-sorbate interaction parameter, $Pa^{-1}$                         |
| $K_{eq}$  | equilibrium constant for the WGS reaction                                |
| $K_D$     | Ergun equation coefficient, $N\ s\ m^{-4}$                               |
| $K_V$     | Ergun equation coefficient, $N\ s^2\ m^5$                                |
| $k$       | rate constant for the WGS reaction, $mol\ g_{cat}^{-1}\ h^{-1}\ Pa^{-2}$ |
| $k_{LDF}$ | linear driving force intraparticle mass transfer coefficient, $s^{-1}$   |
| $L$       | reactor length, m                                                        |
| $M_{av}$  | average molar mass of gas mixtures, $kg\ mol^{-1}$                       |
| $m$       | pore-size distribution parameter, –                                      |
| $N_i$     | mole number of chemical species i, mol                                   |
| $p$       | pressure, Pa                                                             |
| $p_i$     | partial pressure of species i, Pa                                        |
| $p_c$     | critical pressure, Pa                                                    |
| $p_H$     | high pressure in cycle simulation, Pa                                    |
| $p_I$     | intermediate pressure in cycle simulation, Pa                            |
| $p_L$     | low pressure in cycle simulation, Pa                                     |
| $p_0$     | saturation pressure, Pa                                                  |
| $q$       | solid phase adsorption capacity, $mol_{CO_2}\ kg_{ad}^{-1}$              |
| $q^{eq}$  | equilibrium solid phase concentration, $mol\ kg^{-1}$                    |
| $q^s$     | maximum concentration adsorbed, $mol\ kg^{-1}$                           |
| $R$       | universal gas constant, $J\ mol^{-1}\ K^{-1}$                            |
| $r_{wgs}$ | water-gas shift reaction rate, $mol\ g_{cat}^{-1}\ h^{-1}$               |
| $T$       | temperature, K                                                           |
| $t$       | time, s                                                                  |
| $T_c$     | critical temperature, K                                                  |
| $u$       | superficial gas velocity, $m\ s^{-1}$                                    |
| $v_m$     | molar volume, $cm^3\ mol^{-1}$                                           |
| $V_0$     | limiting nanopore volume per mass of sorbent, $cm^3\ kg^{-1}$            |
| $y_i$     | gas phase mole fraction of species i, –                                  |
| $z$       | column axial coordinate, m                                               |

## Greek

|                 |                                               |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| $\varepsilon_b$ | bed void fraction, –                          |
| $\varepsilon_p$ | adsorbent porosity, –                         |
| $\varepsilon_t$ | total bed porosity, –                         |
| $\rho_{b,ads}$  | bulk density of adsorbent, kg m <sup>-3</sup> |
| $\rho_{b,cat}$  | bulk density of catalyst, kg m <sup>-3</sup>  |
| $\rho_p$        | particle density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>          |
| $\rho_g$        | gas-phase density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>         |
| $\mu$           | viscosity of the fluid, Pa s                  |

## Subscribes

|     |                                                    |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 0   | initial                                            |
| i   | generic chemical species                           |
| j   | step contributing to hydrogen product stream       |
| k   | step contributing to carbon dioxide product stream |
| out | outlet                                             |
| tot | total                                              |

## CRediT authorship contribution statement

**Barbara Malsegna:** Data curation, Investigation, Visualization, Writing – original draft. **Alex Sebastiani:** Data curation, Investigation, Validation. **João Guilherme da Gama Paz-Dias:** Formal analysis, Methodology, Validation. **Francesco Di Luca:** Data curation, Formal analysis, Supervision, Project administration, Resources. **Andrea Di Giuliano:** Formal analysis, Data curation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. **Katia Gallucci:** Data curation, Formal analysis, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. **Massimiliano Materazzi:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Barbara Malsegna reports financial support was provided by MUR (Italian Ministry of University and Research).

## Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by MUR (Italian Ministry of University and Research) [PON 2014-2020 – CUP E19J21012860001 – DOT13LHQ8Y-2].

The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of Andy Cornell and Richard Taylor from Advanced Biofuel Solutions (ABSL) for providing access to Swindon plant data and for the insightful discussion throughout the project.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuproc.2024.108032>.

## References

- [1] IEA, World Energy Outlook 2022. [www.iea.org/t&e/](http://www.iea.org/t&e/), 2022.
- [2] M. Materazzi, S. Chari, A. Sebastiani, S. Bajwa, Waste-to-hydrogen: challenges and opportunities in the UK scenario, *Detritus*. 23 (2023) 65–75, <https://doi.org/10.31025/2611-4135/2023.18274>.
- [3] S. Masoudi Soltani, A. Lahiri, H. Bahzad, P. Clough, M. Gorbounov, Y. Yan, Sorption-enhanced steam methane reforming for combined CO<sub>2</sub> Capture and hydrogen production: a state-of-the-art review, *carbon capture*, *For. Sci. Technol.* 1 (2021) 100003, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccst.2021.100003>.
- [4] G. Amaya-Santos, S. Chari, A. Sebastiani, F. Grimaldi, P. Lettieri, M. Materazzi, Biohydrogen: a life cycle assessment and comparison with alternative low-carbon production routes in UK, *J. Clean. Prod.* 319 (2021) 128886, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128886>.
- [5] A. Ajanovic, M. Sayer, R. Haas, The economics and the environmental benignity of different colors of hydrogen, *Int. J. Hydrog. Energy* 47 (2022) 24136–24154, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.02.094>.
- [6] E.S. Rubin, H. Mantripragada, A. Marks, P. Versteeg, J. Kitchin, The outlook for improved carbon capture technology, *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* 38 (2012) 630–671, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecs.2012.03.003>.
- [7] L.C. Wirner, F. Kosaka, T. Sasayama, Y. Liu, A. Urakawa, K. Kuramoto, Combined capture and reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> to methanol using a dual-bed packed reactor, *Chem. Eng. J.* 470 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2023.144227>.
- [8] P. Balcombe, J. Speirs, E. Johnson, J. Martin, N. Brandon, A. Hawkes, The carbon credentials of hydrogen gas networks and supply chains, *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.* 91 (2018) 1077–1088, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.04.089>.
- [9] M. Shahbaz, A. AlNouss, I. Ghia, G. McKay, H. Mackey, S. Elkhailifa, T. Al-Ansari, A comprehensive review of biomass based thermochemical conversion technologies integrated with CO<sub>2</sub> capture and utilisation within BECCS networks, *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* 173 (2021) 105734, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2021.105734>.
- [10] K. Gallucci, A. Di Giuliano, S. Rapagnà, Steam O<sub>2</sub>-enriched air gasification of lignite and solid recovered fuel in fluidized bed, *Fuel*. 303 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2021.121271>.
- [11] BECCS: The Carbon Capture Technology the UK is Relying on to Reach Net Zero. <https://theconversation.com/beccs-the-carbon-capture-technology-the-uk-is-relying-on-to-reach-net-zero-182176>, 2022 (accessed October 25, 2022).
- [12] C. Gough, S. Garcia-Freites, C. Jones, S. Mander, B. Moore, C. Pereira, M. Röder, N. Vaughan, A. Welfle, Global Sustainability challenges to the use of BECCS as a keystone technology in pursuit of 1.5°C, *Glob. Sustain.* 1 (2018) 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2018.3>.
- [13] M. Materazzi, P.U. Foscolo, The role of waste and renewable gas to decarbonize the energy sector, in: *Substitute Natural Gas from Waste: Technical Assessment and Industrial Applications of Biochemical and Thermochemical Processes*, Elsevier, 2019, pp. 1–19, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815554-7.00001-5>.
- [14] C. Acar, I. Dincer, Comparative assessment of hydrogen production methods from renewable and non-renewable sources, *Int. J. Hydrog. Energy* 39 (2014) 1–12, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2013.10.060>.
- [15] H. Tian, J. Li, M. Yan, Y.W. Tong, C.H. Wang, X. Wang, Organic waste to biohydrogen: a critical review from technological development and environmental impact analysis perspective, *Appl. Energy* 256 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113961>.
- [16] Technology Roadmap - Hydrogen and Fuel Cells – Analysis - IEA, IEA, 2015. <https://www.iea.org/reports/technology-roadmap-hydrogen-and-fuel-cells> (accessed October 10, 2023).
- [17] M. Materazzi, R. Taylor, M. Cairns-Terry, Production of biohydrogen from gasification of waste fuels: pilot plant results and deployment prospects, *Waste Manag.* 94 (2019) 95–106, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2019.05.038>.
- [18] S. Budinis, S. Krevor, N. Mac Dowell, N. Brandon, A. Hawkes, An assessment of CCS costs, barriers and potential, *Energy, Strat. Rev.* 22 (2018) 61–81, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2018.08.003>.
- [19] V.S. Sikarwar, C. Pfeifer, F. Ronsse, M. Pohorelý, E. Meers, A.K. Kaviti, M. Jeremiáš, Progress in in-situ CO<sub>2</sub>-sorption for enhanced hydrogen production, *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* 91 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecs.2022.101008>.
- [20] N. Zecca, P.D. Cobden, L. Lücking, G. Manzolini, SEWGS Integration in a Direct Reduction Process for CO<sub>2</sub> Mitigation. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4493859>, 2023.
- [21] A.E. Rodrigues, L.M. Madeira, Y.-J. Wu, R. Faria, Sorption Enhanced Reaction Processes, 01, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1142/Q0103>.
- [22] S. Karagöz, Huanhao Chen, M. Cao, T. Tsotsis Theodore, I. Manousiouthakis Vasilios, Multiscale Model Based Design of an Energy-Intensified Novel Adsorptive Reactor Process for the Water Gas Shift Reaction, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.16608>.
- [23] S. Decker, J. Tian, T.J. Stadler, J.-H. Knoop, P. Pfeifer, Numerical Simulation Approach for a Dynamically Operated Sorption-Enhanced Water-Gas Shift Reactor, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.3390/pr10061160>.
- [24] J. Boon, P.D. Cobden, H.A.J. van Dijk, M. van Sint Annaland, High-temperature pressure swing adsorption cycle design for sorption-enhanced water-gas shift, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 122 (2015) 219–231, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2014.09.034>.
- [25] A. Wright, V. White, J. Hufton, E. van Selow, P. Hinderink, Reduction in the cost of pre-combustion CO<sub>2</sub> capture through advancements in sorption-enhanced water-gas-shift, *Energy Procedia* 1 (2009) 707–714, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2009.01.093>.
- [26] J. Boon, P.D. Cobden, H.A.J. van Dijk, C. Hoogland, E.R. van Selow, M. van Sint Annaland, Isotherm model for high-temperature, high-pressure adsorption of CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O on K-promoted hydrotalcite, *Chem. Eng. J.* 248 (2014) 406–414, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2014.03.056>.
- [27] H.A.J. van Dijk, S. Walspurger, P.D. Cobden, D. Jansen, R.W. van den Brink, F. G. de Vos, Performance of water-gas shift catalysts under sorption-enhanced water-gas shift conditions, in: *Energy Procedia*, Elsevier, 2009, pp. 639–646, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2009.01.084>.
- [28] H.A.J. van Dijk, S. Walspurger, P.D. Cobden, R.W. van den Brink, F.G. de Vos, Testing of hydrotalcite-based sorbents for CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S capture for use in sorption

- enhanced water gas shift, *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*. 5 (2011) 505–511, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2010.04.011>.
- [29] G. Manzolini, A. Giuffrida, P.D. Cobden, H.A.J. van Dijk, F. Ruggeri, F. Consonni, Techno-economic assessment of SEWGS technology when applied to integrated steel-plant for CO<sub>2</sub> emission mitigation, *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*. 94 (2020) 102935, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2019.102935>.
- [30] E.R. Van Selow, P.D. Cobden, A.D. Wright, R.W. Van Den Brink, D. Jansen, Improved sorbent for the sorption-enhanced water-gas shift process, in: *Energy Procedia*, Elsevier, 2011, pp. 1090–1095, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2011.01.159>.
- [31] E.L.G. Oliveira, C.A. Grande, A.E. Rodrigues, CO<sub>2</sub> sorption on hydrotalcite and alkali-modified (K and Cs) hydrotalcites at high temperatures, *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 62 (2008) 137–147, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2008.01.011>.
- [32] H. Xu, Y. Hu, Z. Cheng, Z. Zhou, Production of high-purity H<sub>2</sub> through sorption-enhanced water gas shift over a combination of two intermediate-temperature CO<sub>2</sub> sorbents, *Int. J. Hydrog. Energy* 48 (2023) 25185–25196, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.02.108>.
- [33] L.K.G. Bhatta, S. Subramanyam, M.D. Chengala, S. Olivera, K. Venkatesh, Progress in hydrotalcite like compounds and metal-based oxides for CO<sub>2</sub> capture: a review, *J. Clean. Prod.* 103 (2015) 171–196, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.12.059>.
- [34] K. Coenen, F. Gallucci, G. Pio, P. Cobden, E. van Dijk, E. Hensen, M. van Sint Annaland, On the influence of steam on the CO<sub>2</sub> chemisorption capacity of a hydrotalcite-based adsorbent for SEWGS applications, *Chem. Eng. J.* 314 (2017) 554–569, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2016.12.013>.
- [35] M.H. Halabi, M.H.J.M. De Croon, J. Van Der Schaaf, P.D. Cobden, J.C. Schouten, High capacity potassium-promoted hydrotalcite for CO<sub>2</sub> capture in H<sub>2</sub> production, *Int. J. Hydrog. Energy* 37 (2012) 4516–4525, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2011.12.003>.
- [36] Y. Hu, H. Cui, Z. Cheng, Z. Zhou, Sorption-enhanced water gas shift reaction by in situ CO<sub>2</sub> capture on an alkali metal salt-promoted MgO-CaCO<sub>3</sub> sorbent, *Chem. Eng. J.* 377 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2018.08.209>.
- [37] Y. Hu, Z. Cheng, Z. Zhou, High-purity H<sub>2</sub> production by sorption-enhanced water gas shift on a K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>-promoted Cu/MgO-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> bifunctional material, *Sustain. Energy Fuel* 5 (2021) 3340–3350, <https://doi.org/10.1039/d1se00400j>.
- [38] W.L. Theo, J.S. Lim, H. Hashim, A.A. Mustafa, W.S. Ho, Review of pre-combustion capture and ionic liquid in carbon capture and storage, *Appl. Energy* 183 (2016) 1633–1663, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.09.103>.
- [39] M. Materazzi, A. Cornell, P. Cozens, *Hydrogen GGR Demonstration Project Project Report*, Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, 2021, pp. 1–34.
- [40] H.T.J. Reijers, J. Boon, G.D. Elzinga, P.D. Cobden, W.G. Haije, R.W. Van Den Brink, Modeling study of the sorption-enhanced reaction process for CO<sub>2</sub> capture. I. Model development and validation, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 48 (2009) 6966–6974, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie801319q>.
- [41] B. Najmi, O. Bolland, K.E. Colombo, A systematic approach to the modeling and simulation of a Sorption Enhanced Water Gas Shift (SEWGS) process for CO<sub>2</sub> capture, *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 157 (2016) 80–92, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2015.11.013>.
- [42] A. Di Giuliano, K. Gallucci, F. Giancaterino, C. Courson, P.U. Foscolo, Multicycle sorption enhanced steam methane reforming with different sorbent regeneration conditions: experimental and modelling study, *Chem. Eng. J.* 377 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2018.09.035>.
- [43] I. Aloisi, A. Di Giuliano, A. Di Carlo, P.U. Foscolo, C. Courson, K. Gallucci, Sorption enhanced catalytic Steam Methane Reforming: experimental data and simulations describing the behaviour of bi-functional particles, *Chem. Eng. J.* 314 (2017) 570–582, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2016.12.014>.
- [44] A. Di Giuliano, K. Gallucci, P.U. Foscolo, Determination of kinetic and diffusion parameters needed to predict the behavior of CaO-Based CO<sub>2</sub> sorbent and sorbent-catalyst materials, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 59 (2020) 6840–6854, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.9b05383>.
- [45] B. Malsegna, M. Materazzi, F. Di Luca, A. Di Giuliano, K. Gallucci, Preliminary assessment of sorption capacity on solid CO<sub>2</sub>-sorbents at conditions for sorption-enhanced processes, *Chem. Eng. Trans.* 100 (2023) 685–690, <https://doi.org/10.3303/CET23100115>.
- [46] X. Zhu, S. Li, Y. Shi, N. Cai, Recent advances in elevated-temperature pressure swing adsorption for carbon capture and hydrogen production, *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* 75 (2019) 100784, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecs.2019.100784>.
- [47] B. Najmi, O. Bolland, S.F. Westman, Simulation of the cyclic operation of a PSA-based SEWGS process for hydrogen production with CO<sub>2</sub> capture, *Energy Procedia* 37 (2013) 2293–2302, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2013.06.110>.
- [48] G. hua Xiu, J.L. Soares, P. Li, A.E. Rodrigues, Simulation of five-step one-bed sorption-enhanced reaction process, *AIChE J.* 48 (2002) 2817–2832, <https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.690481210>.
- [49] S. Ergun, Fluid flow through packed columns, *Chem. Eng. Prog.* 48 (1952) 89–94.
- [50] Y. Ding, E. Alpay, Adsorption-enhanced steam-methane reforming, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 55 (2000) 3929–3940, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2509\(99\)00597-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2509(99)00597-7).
- [51] Y. Ding, E. Alpay, Equilibria and kinetics of CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption on hydrotalcite adsorbent, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 55 (2000) 3461–3474, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2509\(99\)00596-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0009-2509(99)00596-5).
- [52] B. Smith, M. Loganathan, M.S. Shantha, A review of the water gas shift reaction kinetics, *Int. J. Chem. React. Eng.* 8 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.2202/1542-6580.2238>.
- [53] D. Mendes, V. Chibante, A. Mendes, L.M. Madeira, Determination of the low-temperature water-gas shift reaction kinetics using a Cu-based catalyst, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 49 (2010) 11269–11279.
- [54] W.E. Schiesser, G.W. Griffiths, *A Compendium of Partial Differential Equation Models: Method of Lines Analysis with Matlab*, Cambridge University Press, 2009. [https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=it&lr=&id=dVcEJsh7524C&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=A+compendium+of+partial&ots=GpVBmyAMgJ&sig=aDjUVzfcj7R27HRd2m-wTYtULsY&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=A%20compendium%20of%20partial&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=it&lr=&id=dVcEJsh7524C&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=A+compendium+of+partial&ots=GpVBmyAMgJ&sig=aDjUVzfcj7R27HRd2m-wTYtULsY&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=A%20compendium%20of%20partial&f=false) (accessed March 29, 2023).
- [55] A. Murugan, A.S. Brown, Review of purity analysis methods for performing quality assurance of fuel cell hydrogen, *Int. J. Hydrog. Energy* 40 (2015) 4219–4233, <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJHYDENE.2015.01.041>.
- [56] J.L. Aprea, Quality specification and safety in hydrogen production, commercialization and utilization, *Int. J. Hydrog. Energy* 39 (2014) 8604–8608, <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJHYDENE.2014.01.005>.
- [57] X. Zhu, Y. Shi, S. Li, N. Cai, Elevated Temperature Pressure Swing Adsorption Process for Reactive Separation of CO/CO<sub>2</sub> in H<sub>2</sub>-Rich Gas, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2018.05.030>.
- [58] X. Zhu, Y. Shi, S. Li, N. Cai, Two-Train Elevated-Temperature Pressure Swing Adsorption for High-Purity Hydrogen Production, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.08.093>.
- [59] R. Reijers, E. Van Selow, P. Cobden, J. Boon, R. Van Den Brink, SEWGS process cycle optimization, *Energy Procedia* 4 (2011) 1155–1161, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2011.01.168>.
- [60] J. Boon, V. Spallina, Y. van Delft, M. van Sint Annaland, Comparison of the efficiency of carbon dioxide capture by sorption-enhanced water-gas shift and palladium-based membranes for power and hydrogen production, *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*. 50 (2016) 121–134, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2016.04.033>.
- [61] A.D. Wright, V. White, J.R. Hufton, R. Quinn, P.D. Cobden, E.R. Van Selow, Energy procedia CAESAR: development of a SEWGS model for IGCC, *Energy Procedia* 4 (2011) 1147–1154, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2011.01.167>.