

# TOPIC 23: URBAN MINING OF RARE EARTH ELEMENTS FROM RARE EARTH MAGNETS – EVALUATION OF AN EXTRACTION COLUMN DESIGN

# MODULE: LABORATORY PROJECT - ENCH4LA

NAME: DIYA SINGH

STUDENT NUMBER: 218016567

PARTNER'S NAME: TEJAL MISRA

PARTNER'S STUDENT NUMBER: 218002638

DATE OF SUBMISSION: 7<sup>th</sup> June 2021

SUPERVISORS: PROF P. NAIDOO, DR M. WILLIAMS-WYNN & DR K. MOODLEY

### STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

### <span id="page-1-0"></span>I, \_\_\_DIYA SINGH\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, declare that:

- (i) The information reported in this report, except where otherwise indicated, is my original work.
- (ii) This report has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.
- (iii) This report does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons.
- (iv) This report does not contain other persons' writing, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted, then:
	- a. Their words have been re-written but the general information attributed to them has been referenced;
	- b. Where their exact words have been used, their writing has been placed inside quotation marks, and referenced.
- (v) This report does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the internet, unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the thesis and in the references sections.

 $\frac{\int \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}}{8/6/2021}$ 

STUDENT'S SIGNATURE Date

#### ABSTRACT

<span id="page-2-0"></span>Over the recent years there has been an increasing demand for technological devices as the  $4<sup>th</sup>$ industrial revolution accelerates. These devices utilize rare earth elements (REE) such as neodymium, europium and samarium which act as vital components in devices such as smartphones and digital cameras. With the fairly short lifespan of these devices, the waste electronic and electrical equipment (WEEE) are disposed of in landfill sites. Thus, WEEE forms one of the fastest growing waste streams globally. Therefore, it is imperative that methods of recycling WEEE are researched and implemented. Liquid- liquid extraction (LLE) is one method that can be used to recycle the metal present in WEEE.

Liquid-liquid extraction involves the use of a solvent to extract a solute from a binary mixture and can be performed using various types of extraction devices. This work focused on the use of a vibrating plate extraction column (VPE) to perform liquid-liquid extraction. This extraction equipment was chosen since it can operate at higher frequencies and lower amplitudes than other equipment. It was originally required that the efficiency of the VPE column should be investigated when removing the valuable rare earth metal neodymium from an aqueous solution. However, due to the limited availability of neodymium, a different system of ethanol-cyclohexane-water was chosen. This system was assumed to adequately replicate the expected column behavior for the rare earth metal system. The aim of this research was to re-commission the VPE column and to investigate the performance of the VPE column using the cyclohexane-water-ethanol system

Four experimental runs were performed, whereby the VPE column was operated in batch mode for two runs and semi-batch mode for the other 2 runs. The samples obtained during experimental runs were analyzed using a gas chromatograph. The effect of frequency, solvent to feed ratio and the mode of operation on the effectiveness of separation and the percentage of ethanol extracted were investigated. The number of equilibrium stages for separation was also obtained by stepping off on the ternary diagram for the system. Results indicated that using a higher frequency for the batch runs, of approximately 15 Hz, allowed for better mixing with a larger percentage of ethanol extracted (64.268%). Likewise, a higher solvent to feed ratio, which was used for semi-batch run 2b, allowed more solvent to be available to perform the extraction and thus led to a higher percentage of ethanol extracted (83.360%). For all runs, less than 1 equilibrium stage was obtained for the separation. It was deduced that operating the column in semi-batch mode allowed for efficient contacting of the phases due to the presence of a recycle stream and was thus a more effective mode of operation than batch mode.

 $\checkmark$ 

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

<span id="page-3-0"></span>I extend my deepest gratitude to the following persons:

My supervisors Prof P. Naidoo, Dr K. Moodley and Dr M. Williams- Wynn for their guidance and advice throughout the duration of this project.

Mr. N. Brijmohan, for his advice and assistance with the experimental equipment and procedure.

The Chemical Engineering Technicians, especially Mr. A. Khanyile for his continuous assistance with the experimental work.

Ms. S. Naicker, for her guidance and assistance with the experimental work.

My partner Tejal Misra for her invaluable support, motivation and assistance throughout the duration of the project.  $\checkmark$ 

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**





# <span id="page-6-0"></span>LIST OF FIGURES





# <span id="page-7-0"></span>LIST OF TABLES







 $\checkmark$ 

# **NOMENCLATURE**

<span id="page-8-0"></span>

#### <span id="page-9-0"></span>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Rare earth elements (REE) are a group of 17 metals with unique properties. These elements are difficult to mine since their concentrations in ore are not economically viable, however there is an abundance of rare earth deposits on the earth's surface (Somaran, 2013). The mining of rare earth metals leads to various environmental issues, such as soil erosion and acidification (Ives, 2013). REE are utilized as components in electrical devices, since it has unique properties that are crucial in the proper functioning of these devices. For instance, europium is a REE that is utilized in television sets to produce images in colour (Somaran, 2013).

The majority of global REE deposits are located in China, which forms 36% of the world's deposits (Bunting, 2018). China is imposing restrictions worth \$110 billion on exports of REE to other countries (Morrison, 2019). The explosion in the demand of REEs, accompanied by the tariff hikes imposed by China, has lead to an increase in the price of REEs globally. The increase in demand for REEs globally is shown in [Figure 1-1.](#page-9-1)



<span id="page-9-1"></span>**Figure 1-1: Increase in the demand of REE in recent years (Walton, et al., 2017)**

Rare earth elements are also mined in South Africa at the Steenkampskraal mine, which is located in the Western Cape (NS Energy, 2020). The mine has the highest grade of REEs globally. The most valuable metal mined at this mine is neodymium, which was valued at \$49 763 per metric ton in 2020 (Garside, 2021). Neodymium can be alloyed with iron and boron to form very strong permanent magnets, which can be used in a variety of electrical devices such as loudspeakers, mobile phones and computer hard drives (Menad & Seron, 2017).

In this digital age, there is an increasing demand for technological devices such as  $\delta$ mputers and mobile phones. This has subsequently resulted in the large-scale production of electrical and electronic equipment, which are disposed of in landfill sites upon reaching the end of their lifespan (Tuncuk, et al., 2012). Waste electronic and electrical equipment (WEEE) is one of the fastest growing waste streams globally and has drastic environmental impacts since toxic substances from WEEE can leak into the water supply (Vaccari, et al., 2019)

In recent years, there has been a spike in the amount of WEEE generated globally, with 20-50 million metric tons of WEEE generated in the world annually (Tuncuk, et al., 2012). Since August 2016, light bulbs have been restricted from being disposed of in landfill sites in South Africa, while the prohibition on the disposal of other types of WEEE in landfill sites is effective as of 2021 (EnviroServ Waste Management, 2021). WEEE can be utilized as a secondary source of rare earths, due to the high content of metals used in electrical equipment. Therefore, it is crucial that methods of recycling WEEE are researched and implemented, which also allows the reuse of valuable rare earths such as neodymium. Methods of recycling WEEE include the use of gravity, magnetic or electrostatic separation to remove rare earths from other components (Tuncuk, et al., 2012).

One attractive option of recycling WEEE is liquid-liquid extraction (LLE), also known as solvent extraction. Liquid-liquid extraction is a unit operation that involves the use of a solvent to extract a solute from a binary mixture (Seader & Henley, 2011). When thermodynamic equilibrium between the phases is reached, the extraction process is completed (Naidoo, 2012). LLE can be used to extract valuable rare earth metals from waste mixtures using equipment such as extraction columns.

LLE is an important separation method in various chemical industries, such as petroleum, metallurgy and waste management (Usman, et al., 2008). It is preferred due to the low requirement of energy to perform the separation (Usman, et al., 2008), as heat is generally not required to affect the separation. Previous work by Gruber and Carsky (Gruber & Carsky, 2020) focused on the extraction of REEs from magnets using LLE. Those results showed that a purity of 99% was obtainable, highlighting LLE as a viable method of extracting rare earths.

To improve the separation efficiency in LLE processes, the use of vibrating plate columns have been proposed in literature. Prochazka and his co-workers (Lo & Prochazka, 1983) designed the first vibrating plate extraction column (VPE) which operates via the reciprocating movement of an assembly of sieve plates to improve mixing and mass transfer. This type of column exhibits a plate design that has perforations to allow for the flow of the dispersed phase, and downcomers for the flow of the continuous phase. The VPE plates are advantageous over other plates, since these plates can be utilized at higher frequencies and lower amplitudes (Lo, et al., 1992). Previous experimental work was performed on the VPE column by (Naidoo, 2012) and (Rathilal, 2010) to investigate the effect of solvent- to – feed ratio and agitation level on the performance of the column.

This work originally required the efficiency of the VPE column to be investigated when removing the valuable rare earth metal neodymium from an aqueous solution of nitric acid and kerosene. However, due to the limited availability of neodymium, and the column requiring a re-commissioning after prolonged storage, a different system of ethanol-cyclohexane-water was chosen, which is assumed to adequately replicate the expected column behavior for the rare earth metal system.

This system was chosen due to the availability and low costs of the chemicals, as well as the extensive range of LLE data available. These chemicals are also not highly toxic and corrosive, and thus the materials of construction of the column were not affected (Joshi & Adhikar, 2019). This system of cyclohexane, water and ethanol was used to commission the column for further experiments involving the extraction of neodymium that is part of an ongoing research project at the Thermodynamics Research Unit.

### <span id="page-11-0"></span>1.1.Aim and objectives

The aim of this research was to re-commission the VPE column and to investigate the performance of the VPE column using the cyclohexane-water-ethanol system. The objectives included:

- i. Cleaning, leak tests, reconnecting electrical components of the VPE column and evaluating the operability of the column
- ii. Investigating the effect of crucial parameters, such as solvent-to-feed ratio and agitation level, on the performance of the column via measurements with the cyclohexane, ethanol and water system.

Various experimental runs were performed where the column was operated in batch and semibatch mode, and different key parameters were altered for each run. Samples were removed from the column and gas chromatography was utilized to obtain the composition of components in the streams/phases.

# CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

<span id="page-12-0"></span>This chapter presents a concise view on the fundamentals of liquid-liquid extraction and extraction equipment used at bench and pilot scale.

### <span id="page-12-1"></span>2.1.Liquid – Liquid Extraction (LLE)

Liquid- liquid extraction, also known as solvent extraction or partitioning, is the method of removing a solute from a mixture by contacting it with a solvent in which the solute is miscible. Liquid- liquid extraction, along with distillation, form two of the most important industrial separation processes (Thornton, 1992). When thermodynamic equilibrium between the phases is reached, the transfer of solute is terminated. Liquid-liquid extraction processes are performed at room temperature and atmospheric pressure (Humphrey & Keller, 1997).

Liquid-liquid extraction systems consist of the following constituents (Rathilal, 2010):

- Solute the material that is removed from the carrier by the solvent. It is miscible with the solvent and carrier.
- Solvent- the fluid that removes solute from carrier. It is immiscible/ partially immiscible with the carrier.
- Carrier the fluid that remains after the solute has been extracted.

The feed which enters liquid-liquid extraction equipment contains the solute and the carrier. The phases exiting the liquid-liquid extraction columns are the extract and raffinate phases. The extract phase is the liquid phase that contains the removed solute, while the raffinate phase is the exiting liquid phase that is carrier- rich (Seader & Henley, 2011). The light phase, which is less dense, travels to the top of the extraction column where it accumulates (Rathilal, 2010). The heavy phase, which is denser, flows to the bottom of the column where it accumulates (Rathilal, 2010). The dispersed phase is the phase that forms due to the splitting up of an intact phase of liquid into droplets (Visual Encyclopedia of Chemical Engineering, 2020), while the continuous phase is the bulk fluid phase that flows without the splitting of the liquid into droplets (Rathilal, 2010).

### <span id="page-12-2"></span>2.2.Applications of LLE

Industrial applications of LLE include the use of LLE to recover heavy metals, separate aromatics from hydrocarbons, purify antibiotics and for metallurgical purifications (Talebi, et al., 2018). Liquid-liquid extraction can be a valuable alternative when processes such as distillation, evaporation and crystallization are too expensive or are unfeasible (Rathilal, 2010). It is preferred over distillation for the following separations (Seader & Henley, 2011):

- Separation of liquids that have close boiling points or close melting points
- Separation of liquids that have a low relative volatility
- Separation of azeotropic mixtures
- Separation of heat-sensitive materials
- Separation of mixtures according to chemical type instead of relative volatility
- Extraction of contaminants that are available in low concentrations

# <span id="page-13-0"></span>2.3.Advantages and Disadvantages of LLE

The following advantages of LLE were obtained from (Humphrey & Keller, 1997):

- LLE can be used for the separation of components that have close boiling points or that form azeotropes.
- LLE can be used to separate heat sensitive components, such as in pharmaceutical industries, since the process occurs at ambient temperatures.
- The separation of large volumes of liquid can occur without the consumption of large amounts of energy.
- LLE can be used for separation according to chemical type, instead of relative volatility.
- Many chemical methods use up reagents, thus LLE may be a more cost-effective alternative for these methods.
- LLE is an attractive substitute to distillation under high vacuum and low temperature conditions
- LLE can be utilized in the separation of materials with high boiling impurities, such as in aqueous solutions.

The following disadvantages of LLE were obtained from (Humphrey & Keller, 1997):

- There are additional cost expenses since the solvent will need to be recovered using a solvent-recovery system.
- The final product may be contaminated since it contains the solvent.
- Due to the requirement that the solvent must be immiscible with the original solution, the solvent chosen will be chemically different and thus expensive materials of construction may be utilized to prevent corrosion.
- Large volumes of solvent are required for efficient mass transfer, which may increase capital costs.
- There is also a requirement of solvent storage tanks and distribution systems.

### <span id="page-14-0"></span>2.4.Counter-current liquid-liquid extraction

The feed and the solvent enter extraction columns or equipment from opposite sides, otherwise known as counter-current extraction, which thus leads to intense contact between the material in the feed and solvent (Seader & Henley, 2011). The solvent can be a pure component or a mixture. This also leads to improved mass transfer and efficiency. [Figure 2-1](#page-14-2) indicates the counter-current extraction process that is used in various chemical processes.



<span id="page-14-2"></span>**Figure 2-1: Counter-current liquid-liquid extraction process (adapted from (Seader & Henley, 2011))**

#### <span id="page-14-1"></span>2.5.Classification of extractors

The methods used for dispersing phases and the creation of counter-flow arrangements can be employed to classify extractors. The different phases can contact either by gravity or by centrifugal force (Lo & Baird, 1994). [Figure 2-2](#page-15-0) shows the categorization of different extraction columns.



<span id="page-15-0"></span>**Figure 2-2: Classification of commercial extractors (taken from (Lo & Baird, 1994))**

# <span id="page-16-0"></span>2.6.Comparison of the different extractors

The following advantages and disadvantages of different extractors are obtained from (Seader & Henley, 2011) and (Naidoo, 2012):

Type of equipment	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>		
Mixer - Settlers	<b>Efficient contacting</b> $\bullet$ Allows for wide flow ratio $\bullet$ Optimal flexibility Able to operate with high viscosity liquids Many stages available High-stage efficiency	Large holdup Large floor space required High power costs High investment Requirement of interstage pumping		
Centrifugal extractors	Low holdup capacity Short holdup time Small floor space Operates with low density difference between phases Small amounts of solvent required	High operating costs ٠ High start-up costs Maintenance is costly Limited stages in a single unit (between 2-7 stages)		
Continuous, counterflow contactors (no mechanical agitation)	• Low initial cost Low operating cost Simple construction	Limited throughput with low $\bullet$ density difference Cannot operate with high flow ratios Difficult scale-up Low efficiency depending on $\bullet$ operating conditions High headroom		
Continuous, counterflow contactors (mechanical agitation)	Relatively low cost $\bullet$ Many stages possible Good dispersion	Cannot operate with high flow $\bullet$ ratios Limited throughput with low $\bullet$ density difference Unable to handle emulsifying $\bullet$ systems		

<span id="page-16-1"></span>*Table 2-1: Comparison of the different extractors*

# <span id="page-17-0"></span>2.7.Description of the vibrating plate extraction (VPE) column

Reciprocating plate extraction columns (RPC) function by moving an assembly of sieve plates which forms a reciprocating motion (Humphrey & Keller, 1997). Three different types of RPCs are used in industrial processes, which were created by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These include the Karr column, the vibrating plate extraction column and the vanedperforation plate column (Dijk, 1935).

The vibrating plate extraction (VPE) column was created by Prochazka and his team in Czechoslovakia in 1971 (Prochazka, et al., 1971). This type of reciprocating plate extraction column exhibits a plate design which consists of small perforations for the dispersed phase to flow through, and downcomers for the flow of the continuous phase (Lo, et al., 1992). The VPE consists of a stack of plates that are installed on a shaft which is manoeuvred by a vibrating motor to form reciprocating movements, that allows the system in the column to mix (Lo, et al., 1992). VPE plates can function at higher frequencies and lower amplitudes than other RPCs. The VPE column is most similar to a continuous, counterflow contactor with mechanical agitation.

# <span id="page-17-1"></span>2.8.Advantages and disadvantages of the VPE column

The advantages of a vibrating plate extraction column are indicated as follows (Prochazka, et al., 1971):

- The VPE can handle high flow rates, which leads to an increased efficiency.
- Easy scale-up of the VPE.
- Construction and maintenance are simple.
- The column can be modified to handle a variety of system properties.
- Capable of functioning in both the mixer-settler regime and in the emulsion regime.
- Segmental downcomers permit larger throughput.

The disadvantages of a vibrating plate extraction column are indicated as follows (Prochazka, et al., 1971):

- Since the column is susceptible to impurities, it is not ideal for liquid mixtures containing solids.
- Axial mixing is increased with greater energy requirements, which minimizes the column's total effectiveness.
- Entrainment issues may occur due to small droplets.

• Temperature control is difficult due to the height of the column. Large amounts of energy would be required for temperature control.

### <span id="page-18-0"></span>2.9.Modes of Operation

The VPE column can be operated in the following modes (Seader & Henley, 2011):

- Batch: material enters the VE column at the beginning and is only removed at the end of the run.
- Semi-batch: material periodically enters the VPE column and material periodically exits the column. This can include a recycle stream.
- Continuous mode: material flows into the VPE column via the feed and solvent streams and material is removed from the VPE column continuously via the extract and raffinate streams.

### <span id="page-18-1"></span>2.10.Equations

### Mass balance on extraction column

When the column is operated in continuous mode, feed (F) and the solvent (S) are pumped into the column, while the extract (E) and the raffinate (R) exit the column. The mass balance on the extraction column is shown as follows (Seader & Henley, 2011):

$$
F + S = E + R \tag{1}
$$

The following equation indicates the ethanol balance over the extraction column:

$$
x_{ethanol, feed} F = x_{ethanol, extract} E + x_{ethanol, raffinate} R
$$
 (2)

### Percentage of solute extracted

The percentage of solute extracted can be calculated as follows (Seader & Henley, 2011):

% solute extracted = 
$$
\frac{x_{\text{feed}} (n_{\text{feed}}) - x_{\text{raffinate}} (n_{\text{raffinate}})}{x_{\text{feed}} (n_{\text{feed}})}
$$
 x 100 (3)

Where  $x_{feed}$  is the fraction of solute in the feed, and  $x_{raffinate}$  is the fraction of solute in the raffinate.

# <span id="page-19-0"></span>2.11.Parameters affecting efficiency and separation of the VPE column

The following parameters affect the rate of mass transfer, separation and hence efficiency of the VPE (Rathilal, 2010):

- Temperature
- Solvent-to-feed ratio
- Agitation level
- Solvent selection
- Physical properties of the components of the system (density, viscosity, etc.)

## <span id="page-19-1"></span>2.12.Solvent selection

The amount of solute that is extracted is dependent upon the solvent that is selected, and this therefore affects the extent and efficiency of the column. It was required that the solvent chosen should fulfil the following criteria (Humphrey & Keller, 1997):

- The solvent chosen should be immiscible with the carrier but should be miscible with the solute. This prevents the need of having a further separation system to recover the solvent from the raffinate.
- The solvent should be widely available and should have a reasonable cost, since large volumes of solvent may be required for extraction of the solute. This would also minimize costs of replacing solvent due to losses.
- The solvent should not be highly flammable or toxic, for health and safety considerations.
- The solvent should not be highly corrosive as this would increase costs of material of construction for the column.
- A significant density difference between the extract and raffinate phases would allow for higher capacities to be obtained. The solvent should not have a high viscosity since this can lead to subsequent problems in pumping and dispersion, which decreases the rate of mass transfer.
- A high value of the distribution coefficient is required, since this signifies that the solvent has a high affinity for the solute which improves the performance of the column.
- The solvent, carrier and solute must produce a high separation factor since this reduces the number of equilibrium stages required. The separation factor, or selectivity, is defined as the ratio of the activity coefficients of the solute- solvent and carrier-solvent pairs at infinite dilution.

#### <span id="page-20-0"></span>2.13.Types of ternary systems

.

The Gibbs equilateral triangle is used for the plotting of the ternary diagrams in this work. The corners of the diagram indicate the pure constituents of the system, while the edges show the binary mixtures of the components. The points within the triangle charaterize the mixture of all 3 components (Thornton, 1992). The most common ternary system is the Type I system shown in [Figure 2-3.](#page-20-1) This was the type of system considered in this work. Outside the phase envelope, there is only one phase; however, within the phase envelope there are 2 liquid phases. This system occurs when the carrier and the solvent are immiscible, and there is complete miscibility between the carrier-solute and solvent-solute pairs. Type I systems have a plait point where the tie-lines converge and where the two liquid phases have similar compositions (Seader & Henley, 2011). The plait point is a critical point at which no separation can be obtained using those compositions (Humphrey & Keller, 1997). The tielines on the diagram are used to connect the extract and the raffinate phases and their intersection with the binodal curve indicate the compositions for the liquid-liquid phases upon splitting.



**Figure 2-3: Ternary liquid-liquid Type I system (Seader & Henley, 2011)**

<span id="page-20-1"></span>The type II system depicted in [Figure 2-4](#page-21-0) indicates immisicibility between the solute and solvent (Humphrey & Keller, 1997). It was required that for viable liquid-liquid extraction processes to occur, the compositions of the ternary system had to be within the two phase region (Humphrey & Keller, 1997).



**Figure 2-4: Ternary liquid-liquid Type II system (Seader & Henley, 2011)**

<span id="page-21-0"></span>As mentioned, the ethanol-cyclohexane-water system utilized in this work is a type I system. The ternary diagram for the system is depicted in [Figure 2-5.](#page-21-1)  $x_1$  represents the mole fraction of water,  $x_2$  represents the mole fraction of ethanol and  $(1 - x_1 - x_2)$  represents the mole fraction of cyclohexane (Moriyoshi, et al., 1991). Water has a higher selectivity for ethanol than cyclohexane, therefore water was chosen as the solvent.



<span id="page-21-1"></span>**Figure 2-5: Ternary phase diagram for the ethanol-cyclohexane-water system in mole fractions at 298.15K and 0.1 MPa (Moriyoshi, et al., 1991)**

# CHAPTER 3: EXPERIMENTAL WORK

### <span id="page-22-1"></span><span id="page-22-0"></span>3.1.Experimental system

The cyclohexane-ethanol-water system was chosen due to the availability and low costs of the chemicals, as well as the extensive range of LLE data available. These chemicals are also not highly toxic and corrosive, and thus the materials of construction of the column were not affected. Ethanol was the component that was extracted. Cyclohexane and water are immiscible due to the difference in polarity of the cyclohexane and water molecules. Water has stronger hydrogen bonds and is polar, while cyclohexane is non-polar and has weaker London dispersion forces (Moriyoshi, et al., 1991). According to the ternary diagram in [Figure 2-5,](#page-21-1) water was more efficient in extracting ethanol than cyclohexane, therefore water was chosen as the solvent and cyclohexane was the carrier. [Table 3-1](#page-22-2) shows the properties of the system components.

<span id="page-22-2"></span>

	Cyclohexane	Ethanol	Deionized	Acetone
			Water	
Chemical formula	$C_6H_{12}$	$C_2H_5OH$	H <sub>2</sub> 0	$C_3H_6O$
CAS no.	110-82-7	$64 - 17 - 5$	7732-18-5	$67 - 64 - 1$
Molar mass $(g/mol)$	84.16	46.07	18.02	58.08
Density $(g/cm^3)$	0.780	0.790	0.998	0.784
Purity $(wt\%)$	$\geq 99.5\%$	$\geq 99.5\%$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\geq 99.5\%$
Supplier	Honeywell	Sigma-Aldrich	Elga	Sigma-Aldrich
	Riedel-de Haën			

**Table 3-1: Properties of the system components**

The conductivity of deionized water used in experiments was 0.069 μS/cm.

# <span id="page-23-0"></span>3.2.Experimental set-up

The experimental set-up of the VPE column is depicted in [Figure 3-1](#page-23-1) and [Figure 3-2.](#page-24-0)

<span id="page-23-1"></span>

**Figure 3-1: Experimental set up of the bottom of the VPE column**

<span id="page-24-0"></span>

**Figure 3-2: Experimental set up of the top of the VPE column**



<span id="page-25-0"></span>**Figure 3-3: Schematic of VPE column taken from (Naidoo, 2012)**

 $\checkmark$ 

# <span id="page-26-0"></span>3.3.Description of equipment

The following equipment was used in the experiment:

- 1 litre measuring cylinder
- 1  $\mu$ L injector
- Feed drums
- Kern weighing balance
- Thirty 18 ml sampling vials
- VPE column

The ancillaries of the VPE column are described below. For a full description of the equipment associated with the VPE column, please refer to (Rathilal, 2010) and (Naidoo, 2012).

# 3.3.1 Extraction Column

<span id="page-26-1"></span>The specifications of the vibrating plate extraction column are provided in [Table 3-2.](#page-26-1)



# **Table 3-2: VPE column specifications (Naidoo, 2012)**

# 3.3.2 Perforated plates

The plates in the extraction column are constructed of stainless steel and consisted of small perforations for the movement of the dispersed phase, and downcomers for the movement of the continuous phase (Rathilal, 2010). Each plate consists of 26 perforations and 3 downcomers, as illustrated i[n Figure 3-4.](#page-27-0) [Table 3-3](#page-27-1) shows the specifications of the perforated plate.

<span id="page-27-1"></span>





**Figure 3-4: Perforated plate in VPE column obtained from (Naidoo, 2012)**

<span id="page-27-0"></span>The plates are assembled on a central shaft in the VPE column, with the downcomers on each successive plate arranged on opposite ends. This positioning of the plates permits the continuous phase to flow across the perforations of each plate (Naidoo, 2012). The liquids which form the continuous and dispersed phases is dependent upon the wettability of the liquid with the extraction column internals.

# 3.3.3 Vibration motor

A variable speed vibration motor is used to reciprocate the plates in the VPE column, by driving an adjustable yoke above the extraction column which was connected to the central shaft (Naidoo, 2012). The perforated plates are assembled along the central shaft. The vibration motor operated with the specifications as follows: 220V, power of 0.75 kW and 3.37 amp. The agitation level, which is the product of frequency and amplitude, is varied by adjusting the frequency of the vibration motor (Rathilal, 2010).

# 3.3.4 Peristaltic pump

One peristaltic pump was used to pump the feed mixture and the solvent consecutively into the column. The peristaltic pump used was Heidolph PD5106. The specifications of this pump are depicted in [Table 3-4.](#page-28-1) [Figure 3-5](#page-28-0) depicts the peristaltic pump used in the experiment.

<span id="page-28-1"></span>**Table 3-4: Heidolph PD5106 pump specifications (Naidoo, 2012)**

Minimum speed (rpm)	
Maximum speed (rpm)	600
Maximum flow rate $(l/h)$	-60



**Figure 3-5: Peristaltic pump**

<span id="page-28-0"></span>The flow rate of liquid into the column can be adjusted by changing the speed of the pump. The pump is able to pump liquid both into and out of the column, since it could be operated in both clockwise and anti-clockwise directions (Naidoo, 2012).

# 3.3.5 Settling tanks

Two settling tanks, which permitted the separation of the phases, are located above and below the VPE column. The interface between the organic and aqueous phases was sustained in the top settling tank, since the dispersed phase was the light phase (Sincuba, et al., 2015). The feed distributor, which is utilized for the dispersion of the dispersed phase, is located in the bottom settling tank (Naidoo, 2012). The top settling tank is shown in [Figure 3-6.](#page-29-0)



**Figure 3-6: Top settling tank**

# <span id="page-29-0"></span>3.3.6 Sampler

Three sample points are located at different lengths along the column. The location of the sampler points along the column is shown in [Table 3-5.](#page-29-1)

# <span id="page-29-1"></span>**Table 3-5: Sampler locations (Naidoo, 2012)**



# 3.3.7 Gas chromatograph

The Shimadzu Gas Chromatograph shown in [Figure 3-7](#page-30-1) was used to obtain the composition of the samples attained from the column. An injector was used to inject a  $1 \mu L$  sample into the packed column in the gas chromatograph. Carrier gas (He) transported the sample through the column. The GC is fitted with a thermal conductivity detector. [Figure 3-6](#page-29-0) shows the gas chromatograph specifications.

# <span id="page-29-2"></span>**Table 3-6: Gas Chromatograph Specifications (Naidoo, 2012)**







**Figure 3-7: Shimadzu Gas Chromatograph**

# <span id="page-30-1"></span><span id="page-30-0"></span>3.4.Experimental Procedure

The column was run in batch mode and semi-batch mode. On the days the experiments were conducted, the temperatures were approximately 25.4 ℃ and the surrounding pressure was 99.481 kPa. The temperatures obtained using PT-100 Probe with  $\pm$ 0.05°C uncertainty, while the pressures were obtained using Mensor CPC 3000 with  $\pm 0.025\%$  (full-scale) uncertainty.

# 3.4.1. Batch mode

- 1. The feed solution of 21.50 wt. % ethanol and 78.50 wt. % cyclohexane was prepared. This constituted 2.2 litres of ethanol and 8.2 litres of cyclohexane.
- 2. The feed pump was started, and the speed of the feed pump was set to 100 rpm.
- 3. The solvent (water) was first pumped into the column through the top.
- 4. Thereafter the feed solution of cyclohexane and ethanol was pumped into the column, also through the top. The same pump was used to pump both the solvent and the feed into the column consecutively.
- 5. When all the solution was fed into the column, the pump was then stopped. A total volume of 11.8 litres was fed into the column.
- 6. The frequency was adjusted to 10 Hz for run 1a and 15 Hz for run 1b in order to vary the agitation level (product of frequency and amplitude).
- 7. A period of time was allowed for an assumed steady state to be reached (previous experiments carried out by (Rathilal, 2010), showed that 45 minutes was adequate). It was assumed that compositions after 45 minutes would remain constant. For this experiment, an hour was allowed for steady state to be reached.
- 8. The vibrations were then stopped and the solution in the column was allowed to settle for another hour.
- 9. The samples of solution at the sampler points along the column were then obtained, as well as the sample of the feed.
- 10. The samples obtained at different lengths along the column were thereafter analysed using gas chromatography analysis to establish the amount of ethanol present.

### 3.4.2. Semi-batch mode

- 1. The feed solution of ethanol and cyclohexane was prepared in specific ratios of:
	- 54% ethanol and 46 wt. % cyclohexane for run 2a
	- 52.04% ethanol and 47.96wt. % cyclohexane for run 2b

8.06 litres of ethanol and 7 litres of cyclohexane were used for run 2a, while 5.74 litres of ethanol and 5.29 litres of cyclohexane were used for run 2b.

- 2. The pump was started after checking the solvent valve was opened and the speed of the pump was set to 100 rpm.
- 3. The solvent (water) was fed into the column through the top. 3 litres of water were fed into the column for run 2a, and 4 litres of water was fed into the column for run 2b.
- 4. The feed valve was then opened and the valve for the solvent was closed. The feed solution of cyclohexane and ethanol was then fed into the column through the bottom using the feed pump. Enough solution was prepared so that the overflow line was reached. This solution overflowed and was collected in the feed drum and was then fed back into the column via the bottom inlet, so that the solution was recycled. A volume of 2 litres was kept constant in the feed drum, and a total volume of 18 litres was used for the semi-batch runs.
- 5. A period of time (15 min) was allowed for the system to stabilize, as well as for mixing to occur with the vibration set to 15 Hz.
- 6. After 15 minutes, the mixture from the drum was sampled (approximately 5-10 ml was withdrawn for each sample) and this was continued for 1 hour over 10 min intervals.
- 7. Samples were removed from two sampling points along the column.
- 8. The vibrations were then stopped. The feed pump was then switched off and the column was drained.
- 9. The samples were stored in the fridge and then analysed using gas chromatography in order to obtain the amount of solute (ethanol) present in the feed drum and at the different points along the column.

## 3.4.3. Gas Chromatograph operation procedure

- 1. The gas flow was turned on and the flow rate was set to 30 ml/min.
- 2. The oven was then turned on and the detector and injector temperatures were set to 200℃.
- 3. The column temperature was then set to 180℃.
- 4. When the oven temperature stabilized, the detector filament was then turned on.
- 5. The samples were then removed from the fridge and approximately 1-4g of acetone was added to the samples.
- 6. The samples were then injected into the gas chromatograph.
- 7. After the sample analyses were complete, the gas chromatograph was shut down. The detector was switched off, and the gas flow rate was set to 3ml/min.
- 8. The detector, injector and column temperatures were then set  $\chi$  25°C, and the system was allowed to cool.
- 9. When the detector temperature cooled to below 50℃, the gas was switched off.

# 3.4.4. Calibration of the Gas Chromatograph Detector

The gas chromatograph detector was calibrated by injecting binary mixtures of each component with an internal standard. In this manner, the ratios of the component to a known amount of standard could be evaluated to solve for the unknown compositions. Cyclohexane and water are immiscible therefore it was required that a miscible solvent be added to the sample before injection into the gas chromatograph. Acetone was added as the internal standard. Mixtures of ethanol (1)-acetone (4), cyclohexane (2)-acetone (4) and water  $(3)$  – acetone (4) were prepared in specific ratios. The samples were weighed using a Kern weighing scale, which had a readability of  $0.0001g$  and a precision of  $\pm 0.00048g$ . These mixtures were prepared in

concentrated and dilute regions of each component, in the ranges of  $\frac{x_4}{x_i}$  between 0 and 1.2, and the ranges of  $\frac{x_i}{x_4}$  between 0 and 1.2, where  $x_4$  is the composition of acetone. These samples were well mixed and then injected into the gas chromatograph, after which the peaks showing each component were outputted and the peak areas were then obtained. The ratio of these areas was then plotted against the mass fraction ratios, which were compared to determine the accuracy of the calibrations. The calibration graphs were used to obtain the mass of the components in the samples obtained from experiments, by using the ratio of the peak areas to obtain the mass fraction ratios.

#### CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

<span id="page-34-0"></span>This chapter presents the results and discussion, beginning with the GC detector calibrations, and uncertainties of the measured variables. The results from the separation of the ternary system with the compositions using the VPE column is reported thereafter, with a discussion of the performance of the column based on the percentage extracted. The number of equilibrium stages obtained for each separation is also presented.

#### <span id="page-34-1"></span>4.1.Calibration of the gas chromatograph detector

Calibrations were performed for the systems of ethanol- acetone, water- acetone and cyclohexane- acetone. The masses of the components in each sample used for calibration are shown in [Table A-](#page-49-1) 1, [Table A-](#page-50-0) 2, and [Table A-](#page-51-0) 3in appendix A for the 3 different systems. Two different peaks were obtained from the gas chromatograph for the two components in each system. The samples were injected twice to ensure repeatability and to obtain the uncertainty in calibration. The calibration graphs, shown in Appendix C, were obtained by plotting the ratio of the areas of each component with acetone against the ratio of the mass fractions.

<span id="page-34-2"></span>

	Gradient of	Inverse slope	Gradient of	Uncertainty of	Uncertainty of
	calibration	(acetone-	calibration	calibration	calibration
	graph in	dilute region)	graph in	(acetone – dilute (acetone – rich	
	acetone-dilute		acetone-rich	region)	region)
	region		region		
Ethanol-	1.0717	0.9330	$0.9558=$	0.28%	0.69%
acetone			(1/1.0462)		
Water-	0.8519	1.1738	$1.115=$	2.80%	1.26%
acetone			(1/0.8969)		
Cyclohexane -	0.7238	1.3816	$1.3878=$	6.62%	3.45%
acetone			(1/0.7206)		

*Table 4-1: Uncertainties in calibration of the gas chromatograph detector*

[Table 4-1](#page-34-2) presents the response ratios  $(A_i/A_j \text{vs } x_i/x_j)$  or factors for the binary calibrations with the aforementioned systems. The trendline fit of the calibration graphs was grounded at the origin and the gradient of the trendline was obtained. From [Table 4-1,](#page-34-2) it can be deduced that the inverse of the gradient of the calibration graph for each system in the acetone dilute region is similar to the gradient of the calibration graph in the acetone rich region, correct to one decimal place. This criterion shows that the calibrations were performed accurately. The calibration graphs were used to obtain the masses of each component in the samples taken from the column during experimental runs.

The uncertainty of the calibrations is shown in the final two columns in [Table 4-1.](#page-34-2) The error for cyclohexane and acetone is significantly higher than other systems. This is attributed to the fact that the temperature of the oven in the gas chromatograph had to be changed from 200℃ to 180℃ when using this system since the peaks of different components were overlapping. These uncertainties can also be attributed to equipment such as the mass balance which took long periods of time to stabilize. Acetone, which was used as the internal standard, has a relatively low boiling point of 56 ℃, and thus the samples had to be stored in the refrigerator to ensure the acetone did not evaporate. Higher room temperatures on the day the experiment was conducted may have resulted in acetone evaporating and would thus affect the results and contribute to higher uncertainties.

#### <span id="page-35-0"></span>4.2.Batch runs 1a and 1b

Samples of the feed, extract and raffinate were taken at the end of the batch run, after 1 hour each was allowed for mixing and settling. The continuous phase was the aqueous phase which flowed to the bottom of the column, whereas the organic phase formed the dispersed phase. The VPE column was vibrated at frequencies of 10Hz and 15Hz for runs 1a and 1b respectively. These frequencies were chosen since too high frequencies cause flooding in the column, and too low frequencies do not allow for efficient mixing (Naidoo, 2012). A solvent to feed ratio of 1:1.5 was used for both runs 1a and run 1b. Table 4.2 presents the compositions of samples obtained from batch run 1a and 1b.

<b>Mass fraction</b>	Batch run 1a	Batch run 1b
$x_{ethanol, feed}$	0.49	0.49
Xethanol, extract	0.390	0.457
$x_{ethanol, raffinate}$	0.261	0.209

<span id="page-35-1"></span>**Table 4-2: Compositions of samples obtained from batch run 1a and 1b**

[Table 4-2](#page-35-1) indicates that the mass fraction of ethanol in the extract was higher for run 1b than run 1a. This is due to a higher frequency being used for run 1b, which allows for better mixing and therefore a greater rate of mass transfer.
#### 4.3. Experiments- Semi-batch runs

#### 4.3.1. Semi-batch run 2a

For the semi-batch runs, samples of the feed, extract and raffinate were taken over 10-minute intervals after allowing mixing to occur for 15 minutes. The VPE column was vibrated at 15 Hz and a solvent to feed ratio of 1:4 was used for run 2a. [Figure 4-1](#page-36-0) depicts the change in the composition of ethanol in the extract, raffinate and feed over time.



**Figure 4-1: Composition profile for semi- batch run 2a**

<span id="page-36-0"></span>The composition of ethanol in the extract increased from 0.458 at the beginning of the run to 0.546 at 65 minutes, since the mass transfer of ethanol from the carrier (cyclohexane) to the solvent (water) occurred during this time interval. The composition of ethanol in the raffinate was expected to decrease over time. The composition in the raffinate initially decreases at 25 minutes, and thereafter increases to 0.418 at 35 minutes. This can be attributed to errors such as incorrect sampling, as well as the presence of immiscibility between the different phases within the sample. This would lead to inaccurate compositions being obtained from the gas chromatograph. The composition of ethanol in the raffinate thereafter decreases to 0.226 at 65 minutes, which indicates that ethanol was extracted by water and therefore decreases the amount of ethanol present in the carrier.

A volume of 2 litres was maintained in the feed drum during semi-batch operation. It was observed that the composition of ethanol in the feed decreased within the 0-35 minute interval but increased to 0.585 at 45 minutes. This is due to experimental errors such as the storage vessel not being shaken thoroughly before sampling, and immiscible samples being obtained from the feed drum. Insufficient acetone could have been added, hence not allowing the sample to dissolve properly which leads to immiscibility in the sample. Inaccurate results could have also been obtained due to the incorrect sampling of the feed solution, since a pipette was used to obtain solution from a large feed vessel that was obstructed by pipes and the silicon tubing of the pump. Inaccurate results could have also been obtained due to the incorrect sampling of the feed solution, since a pipette was used to obtain solution from a large feed vessel that was obstructed by pipes and the silicon tubing of the pump.

Overall, the increase of the ethanol in the extract, with the decrease of the solute in the feed and raffinate are observed and were expected trends.

#### 4.3.2. Semi-batch run 2b

The experimental procedure for run 2a was repeated for run 2b. [Figure 4-2](#page-37-0) depicts the change in the composition of ethanol in the extract, raffinate and feed over time. A solvent to feed ratio of 1:3 was used for run 2b, and vibrations occurred at a frequency of 15Hz.



**Figure 4-2: Composition profile for semi- batch run 2b**

<span id="page-37-0"></span>The composition of ethanol in the extract was expected to increase with time. However, as shown in [Figure 4-2,](#page-37-0) the composition of ethanol in the extract decreased at 25 minutes, and thereafter increased to 0.597 ethanol at 55 minutes. The composition of ethanol in the raffinate decreased from 0.544 to 0.128 during the run; however, at 25 minutes, the composition of ethanol in the raffinate increased to 0.577. These observations are similar to the previous run.

These discrepancies can be attributed to immiscible samples taken from the column, which would therefore lead to inaccurate results. According to the graph of the extract ethanol composition, steady state was approached at 55 minutes. In order for steady state to be attained, the column would need to be vibrated for a period longer than 55 minutes. The ethanol feed composition decreased at 25 minutes and remained constant until a sharp decrease in the composition in the 45-55 minute interval. This sharp decrease could be due to immiscible samples being drawn from the feed vessel, as well as the fact that the storage vessel was not shaken before sampling. Final extract compositions of 0.547 and 0.597 were obtained for runs 2a and 2b respectively. A higher solvent to feed ratio was used for run 2b, therefore more solvent was available to extract ethanol from cyclohexane and thus a slightly higher ethanol extract composition was obtained for run 2b than for run 2a.

#### 4.4.Percentage of ethanol extracted

Material balances over the VPE column were used to obtain the moles of ethanol in the feed and raffinate. The sample calculation for percentage extracted is depicted in Appendix B. The performance of the VPE column was evaluated using the percentage of ethanol extracted. The equation for the percentage extracted is shown in Chapter 2 as equation (2). Table 4.3 presents the percentage of ethanol extracted for all experimental runs performed.

<span id="page-38-0"></span>

		$n_{ethanol, raffinate}$	Percentage ethanol
	$n_{ethanol, feed}$ (mol)	(mol)	extracted $(\% )$
Run 1a (Batch)	63.383	25.058	60.466
Run 1b (Batch)	63.383	22.648	64.268
Run 2a (Semi-batch)	138.054	26.696	80.663
Run 2b (Semi-batch)	124.596	20.733	83.360

**Table 4-3: Percentage of ethanol extracted**

When the VPE column was operated in semi-batch mode, it was observed that a greater degree of mixing and mass transfer occurred since phases were distributed uniformly throughout the column. Therefore, higher percentages of ethanol were extracted for the semi-batch runs, as shown in [Table 4-3.](#page-38-0)

It was observed that operating the VPE column in batch mode did not allow for efficient mixing since the solution in the column appeared murky on the top of the column and clear on the bottom. Thus, lower percentages of ethanol were extracted for the batch runs. The lowest percentage of ethanol (60.466%) was extracted for batch run 1a, which can be attributed to the fact that the VPE column was vibrated at a frequency of 10 Hz, whereas for the other runs, the column was vibrated at a frequency of 15 Hz. Higher frequencies effect better mixing and mass

transfer of ethanol from the carrier (cyclohexane) to the solvent (water). The approximate 4% improvement in the extraction of ethanol between runs 1a and 1b can be attributed to the slightly improved mixing. Although a higher mass solvent to feed ratio of 1: 1.5 was used for the batch runs 1a and 1b, the mode of operation did not allow for efficient contacting of the phases since the extract and raffinate phases were not continually removed, and no recycle stream was present.

Similarly, for the semi-batch mode, a higher percentage of ethanol (83.360%) was extracted for run 2b when compared to run 2a. The reproducibility of the result with a difference of 3.4% between runs 2a and 2b is quite good. The improvement in run 2 is also due to a higher solvent to feed ratio of 1:3 being used for run 2b whereas a solvent to feed ratio of 1:4 was used for run 2a.

#### 4.5. Calculation of equilibrium stages

The comparison of the number of equilibrium stages obtained for each run and the number of stages required to obtain 99 mol% cyclohexane in the raffinate are shown in [Table 4-4.](#page-41-0) The stages that were stepped off on the ternary diagram for the ethanol-cyclohexane-water system are shown in Appendix C. Note that the graphs shown in Appendix C are in mol% for the compositions, while the data in previous tables in Appendix C reported the compositions in weight %. The data was converted to a consistent format. The number of equilibrium stages required is dependent on the solvent to feed ratio and agitation level used in each run, as well as the mode of operation (Naidoo, 2012).

[Figure 4-3](#page-40-0) shows the equilibrium stages that were stepped off for semi- batch run 2a. The feed, extract and raffinate points are shown on the diagram. The Hunter Nash graphical equilibrium stage method was used to obtain the equilibrium stages for each experimental run (Seader & Henley, 2011). The alternate use of the steep tie lines and operating lines, which are joined to the operating point P, were used to step off the equilibrium stages (Seader & Henley, 2011). It can be seen that the feed concentrations (around 68 mol% ethanol), are in fact quite high in ethanol. However due to the volume of chemicals, and lack of cyclohexane, these runs were performed regardless of the higher ethanol in the concentration in the feed. The purpose of the experiments were to show the distribution of the solute and gain understanding in the operation of the column.



<span id="page-40-0"></span>**Figure 4-3: Equilibrium stages for semi-batch run 2a stepped off on ternary diagram**

<span id="page-41-0"></span>

	Number of equilibrium stages obtained from experiment	Number of stages required to obtain 99 mol% cyclohexane in the raffinate
<b>Batch run 1a</b>	0.75	$\overline{2}$
<b>Batch run 1b</b>	0.72	1.8
Semi-batch run 2a	0.5	1.7
Semi-batch run 2b	0.45	1.5

**Table 4-4: Equilibrium stages for the cyclohexane-ethanol-water system**

The number of stages obtained for batch run 1a were the highest, while the number of stages obtained for semi- batch run 2b were the lowest. Less than 1 stage was obtained for all 4 runs. Batch run 1a was performed at the lowest frequency of 10 Hz. The degree of separation achieved from the experiments corresponds to 0.75 theoretical stages. For the same mixture, 2 theoretical stages would be required to achieve 99% cyclohexane in the raffinate. The stages stepped off on the ternary diagram for this run is shown in [Figure C-](#page-71-0) 7. Batch run 1b was performed using a frequency of 15 Hz. The degree of separation corresponded to a lower number of 0.72 stages, which is shown in [Figure C-](#page-72-0) 8. For the same experimental run, to achieve 99% cyclohexane in the raffinate, 1.8 theoretical stages were obtained. Therefore, using a higher frequency allowed for better mixing and mass transfer to occur, which resulted in less stages being attained for separation.

A mass solvent to feed ratio of 1:4 was used for semi-batch run 2a. The degree of separation achieved corresponded to 0.5 stages for separation which is shown in [Figure 4-3.](#page-40-0) Semi-batch run 2b used a solvent to feed ratio of 1:3 and 0.45 stages for separation was obtained, as depicted in [Figure C-](#page-73-0) 9. Therefore, a higher solvent to feed ratio allowed more solvent (water) to be available for the extraction of ethanol and thus required less stages for separation.

From these results, it can be deduced that operating the column in semi-batch mode allowed for efficient separation to occur since less equilibrium stages were obtained when compared to the stages stepped off when operating the column in batch mode. The composition of 99 mol% cyclohexane in the raffinate represents the optimum composition that can be obtained in the raffinate. Thus, more stages were required to obtain this extraction of ethanol since the compositions of cyclohexane in the raffinate for the experimental runs were less than 99%. The most equilibrium stages stepped off for a composition of 99 mol% cyclohexane in the raffinate

were obtained for batch run 1a as shown in [Table 4-4,](#page-41-0) while the least number of stages was obtained for semi- batch run 2b.

#### CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The system of cyclohexane, ethanol and water was used to commission the column in this work since the chemicals were cheaper than the initial proposed systems, and readily available in the quantities necessary.

Four experimental runs were performed, whereby the VPE column was operated in batch mode for two runs and semi-batch mode for the other two runs. Samples were drawn from the sampling points on the VPE column and from the feed vessel. The effect of solvent to feed ratio, frequency and the mode of operation on the effectiveness of the separation was investigated.

The gas chromatograph was calibrated to minimize uncertainties and to obtain the calibration plots, which were used to obtain the mass fractions of the components in each sample drawn from the VPE column. The uncertainties for calibration obtained were  $\pm 1\%$ , except for the cyclohexane—acetone system which displayed the highest error of 6.62%.

Batch run 1a was performed using a frequency of 10Hz and a low percentage of 60.466% of ethanol was extracted. Batch run 1b was performed by vibrating the VPE column at a frequency of 15Hz and 64.268% of ethanol was extracted. It is observed that a higher frequency of 15 Hz allowed for more efficient mixing and mass transfer.

The semi- batch runs were performed using a frequency of 15 Hz. Solvent to feed ratios of 1:4 and 1:3 were utilized for semi- batch runs 2a and 2b respectively. A higher percentage of 83.360% of ethanol was extracted for run 2b, while 80.663% ethanol was extracted for run 2a. Subsequently, a higher solvent to feed ratio allows for more ethanol to be extracted since there is more water was available to perform the extraction.

Approximately 0.75 and 0.72 stages were obtained after stepping off on the ternary diagram for batch runs 1a and 1b respectively, while 0.5 and 0.45 stages were obtained for semi-batch runs 2a and 2b respectively. Therefore, operating the column in semi- batch mode requires less stages, and it can be concluded that semi-batch mode is more effective than batch mode and allows for a better rate of mass transfer of ethanol from the carrier. Less than 1 stage for separation was obtained for all four runs.

There were some discrepancies in the concentration profiles obtained for the semi-batch runs. These were due to experimental errors such as immiscible samples being drawn from the column, and uncertainties due to calibration. The feed storage vessel was not agitated before sampling, which also affects the accuracy of the results. Recommendations for the sample  $\overline{\mathbf{v}}$ withdrawal technique are proposed to overcome these errors.

- For the system investigated, the use of a feed with ethanol (composition  $\langle 15\% \rangle$ ) should be tested.
- Additional experiments are proposed to investigate the effect of varying frequencies on the effectiveness of separation when operating the VPE column in semi- batch mode.
- More experiments are also required to investigate the effect that different solvent to feed ratios have on the effectiveness of separation when operating the VPE column in batch mode.
- The VPE column should also be operated in continuous mode (with both phases being in counter current flow) and the results thereof compared to other modes of operation. This will require greater quantities of chemicals which may likely be expensive.
- When calibrating the gas chromatograph, internal standards other than acetone should be investigated since acetone has a relatively low boiling point and thus evaporates very quickly. This should decrease the uncertainty and error associated with the composition reporting, and prevents immiscibility in samples.
- Experiments should be run for a longer period of time, possibly 2 hours, when operating the column in semi- batch mode to investigate when steady state is reached.
- The number of actual stages in the VPE column and the efficiency of the separation when varying different parameters and using different modes of operation should be investigated.
- Parameters such as tray spacing and temperature also affect separation effectiveness and thus more experiments are required to investigate the effect of these parameters.

### REFERENCES

Bunting, 2018. *Ever Increasing Rare Earth Metals Demand.* [Online] Available at: https://www.buntingeurope.com/ever-increasing-rare-earth-metals-demand/ [Accessed 05 May 2021].

Dijk, W. V., 1935. *Process and Apparatus for Intimately Contacting Fluids.* The Hague, Netherlands, Patent No. Patent No: 2,011,186.

EnviroServ Waste Management, 2021. *Environmental Legislation in South Africa.* [Online] Available at: https://www.enviroserv.co.za/about/legislative-framework [Accessed 13 May 2021].

Garside, M., 2020. *Growth rate of demand for neodymium-iron-boron (NdfeB) permanent magnets worldwide from 2019 to 2022.* [Online] Available at: https://www.statista.com/statistics/1134603/neodymium-iron-boron-permanentmagnet-demand-growth-rate-worldwide/

[Accessed 12 May 2021].

Garside, M., 2021. *Forecast of rare earth oxide neodymium oxide price globally 2009-2030.*  [Online]

Available at: https://www.statista.com/statistics/450152/global-reo-neodymium-oxide-priceforecast/#:~:text=The%20price%20of%20the%20rare,U.S.%20dollars%20per%20metric%20 ton.

[Accessed 12 May 2021].

Gruber, V. & Carsky, M., 2020. New technology for lanthanide recovery from spent Nd-Fe-B magnets. *South African Journal of Chemical Engineering,* Volume 33, pp. 35-38.

Humphrey, J. L. & Keller, G., 1997. *Separation Process Technology.* Illustrated ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ives, M., 2013. *Boom in Mining Rare Earths Poses Mounting Toxic Risks.* [Online] Available at:

360.yale.edu/features/boom\_in\_mining\_rare\_earths\_poses\_mounting\_toxic\_risks#:~:text=A %20half%20century%20of%20rare,with%20a%20"high%20concentration"%20of [Accessed 13 May 2021].

Joshi, D. R. & Adhikar, N., 2019. An Overview on Common Organic Solvents and Their Toxicity. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International,* 28(3), pp. 1-18.

Lo, T. & Baird, M., 1994. *Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology.* 4 ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc..

Lo, T., Baird, M. & Rao, N. R., 1992. The Reciprocating Plate Column- Development and Applications. *Chemical Engineering Communications,* Volume 116, pp. 67-88.

Lo, T. C., Baird, M. H. I. & Hanson, C., 1983. *Handbook of Solvent Extraction.* 1983 ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lo, T. & Prochazka, J., 1983. Reciprocating Plate extraction columns. In: *Handbook of Solvent Extraction.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, p. Chapter 12.

Menad, N. & Seron, A., 2017. Characteristics of Nd-Fe-B Permanent Magnets Present in Electronic Components. *International Journal of Waste Resources,* 7(1).

Moriyoshi, T., Uosaki, Y., Takahashi, K. & Yamakawa, T., 1991. (Liquid + liquid) equilibria of (water + ethanol + cyclohexane) at the temperatures 298.15 K and 323.15 K. *Journal of Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics,* Volume 23, pp. 27-42.

Morrison, W. M., 2019. *Trade Dispute with China and Rare Earth Elements.* [Online] Available at: https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/IF11259.pdf [Accessed 13 May 2021].

Naidoo, P., 2012. *Investigation of the effects of the process and equipment parameters on the separation efficiency of a vibrating plate extractor, Msc.Eng.Thesis, School of Engineering, University of KwaZulu-Natal,* Durban, South Africa: s.n.

NS Energy, 2020. *Steenkampskraal Rare Earth Elements Mine.* [Online] Available at: https://www.nsenergybusiness.com/projects/steenkampskraal-rare-earthelements-mine/ [Accessed 12 May 2021].

Prochazka, J., Heyberger, A., Landau, J. & Souhrada, F., 1971. Reciprocating-plate extraction column. *British Chemical Engineering,* 16(1), pp. 42-44.

Rathilal, S., 2010. *Modelling of a vibrating-plate extraction column,PhD.Eng.Thesis, School of Engineering,* University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa: s.n.

Seader, J. & Henley, E. J., 2011. *Separation process principles.* 3 ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc..

Sincuba, N. D., Rathilal, S. & Carsky, M., 2015. Investigation of the effects of tray downcomer design on the efficiency of a vibrating plate extractor. *South African Journal of Chemical Engineering,* 20(3), pp. 1-10.

Somaran, A., 2013. *What's So Rare About Rare Earth Elements?.* [Online] Available at: https://www.thermofisher.com/blog/mining/whats-so-rare-about-rare-earthelements/

[Accessed 13 May 2021].

Talebi, A. et al., 2018. The recovery of rare earth metals from WEEE leaching solution via liquid-liquid extraction. *Global Nest,* 20(4), pp. 719-724.

Thornton, J., 1992. *Science and Practice of liquid-liquid extraction.* Volume 1 ed. Oxford: Oxford Engineering Science Series 27.

Thornton, J. D., 1992. *Science and Practice of Liquid-Liquid Extraction.* s.l.:Oxford Science Publications.

Tuncuk, A. et al., 2012. Aqueous metal recovery techniques from e-scrap: Hydrometallurgy in recycling. *Minerals Engineering,* pp. 28-37.

Usman, M., Rehman, L. & Bashir, M., 2008. Drop Size and Drop Size Distribution in a Pulsed. *The Proceedings of the Pakistan Academy of Sciences,* 45(1), pp. 41-46.

Vaccari, M. et al., 2019. *WEEE Treatment in Developing Countries: Environmental Pollution and Health Consequences—An Overview.* [Online]

Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6539380/ [Accessed 15 May 2021].

Visual Encyclopedia of Chemical Engineering, 2020. *Extractors.* [Online] Available at: https://encyclopedia.che.engin.umich.edu/Pages/SeparationsChemical/Extractors/Extractors.h tml#:~:text=The%20dispersed%20phase%20is%20introduced,flow%20of%20the%20two%2 0phases.

[Accessed 13 May 2021].

Walton, A., Sheridan, R. S., Binnemans, K. & Yang, Y., 2017. REE Recovery from End-of-Life NdFeB Permanent Magnet Scrap: A Critical Review. *Journal of Sustainable Metallurgy,*  3(2199-3823).

Woodward, A., 2019. *China could restrict its export of rare-earth metals as a trade-war tactic. Here's what they are and why they're so crucial..* [Online] Available at: https://www.businessinsider.co.za/rare-earth-metals-elements-what-they-are-2019-6?r=US&IR=T

[Accessed 12 May 2021].

## APPENDIX A: RAW DATA

## **Table A- 1: Calibrations for ethanol- acetone system**





## **Table A- 2: Calibrations for water- acetone system**



# **Table A- 3: Calibrations for cyclohexane- acetone system**

## *Table A- 4: Feed quantities used for each run*





# **Table A- 5: Sample masses and areas obtained from gas chromatograph for batch runs 1a and 1b**



# **Table A- 6: Sample masses and areas obtained from gas chromatograph for semi-batch run 2a**



# **Table A- 7: Sample masses and areas obtained from gas chromatograph for semi- batch run 2b**

#### APPENDIX B:SAMPLE CALCULATIONS

The sample calculations for the top sampling point (raffinate) for semi- batch run 2 at 55 minutes are shown in this section.

#### B.1. Calibration Uncertainty

The sample calculation for the uncertainty of the ethanol-acetone system in the acetone rich region is shown as follows:

The peak areas of ethanol and acetone were obtained from the gas chromatograph. The sample was injected twice to allow for repeatability.

First injection:

$$
A_{1,ethanol} = 81\,309
$$
  

$$
A_{4,acetone} = 913514
$$

Second injection:

 $A_{1,ethanol} = 78\,614.7$  $A_{4, acetone} = 886029.9$ 

The ratio of these areas were then calculated. Since this sample was in the acetone rich region, the ratio  $\frac{A_1}{A_4}$  was used.

First injection:

$$
\frac{A_1}{A_4} = \frac{81309}{913514} = 0.0890
$$

Second injection:

$$
\frac{A_1}{A_4} = \frac{78614.7}{886029.9} = 0.0887
$$

The standard deviation of the above ratios was calculated using the standard deviation function on excel STD.P. The standard deviation obtained was  $1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ .

The average of these two ratios was also calculated:

$$
Average = \frac{0.0890 + 0.0887}{2} = 8.885 \times 10^{-2}
$$

The error in calibration was then computed as follows:

$$
Percentage\ error = \frac{standard\ deviation}{average}x100 = \frac{1.4x10^{-4}}{8.885x10^{-2}}x100 = 0.157
$$

#### B.2. Compositions of each component in samples

The calibration plots were used to obtain the masses of each component present in the samples. The procedure is outlined as follows:

The sample was weighed using a mass balance. The vial which contained the sample had a mass of 16.387g while the mass of the sample was 7.733g.

Acetone was added to the samples obtained from the column as the internal standard and to dissolve any immiscibility between the phases. The mass of acetone added to the top sample at 55 minutes was 4.808g.

The composition of acetone in the sample was then calculated:

$$
x_{4,acetone} = \frac{m_{acetone}}{m_{total}} = \frac{4.808}{7.733 + 4.808} = 0.383
$$

The peak areas obtained from the gas chromatograph for each component are indicated below:

 $A_{1,ethanol} = 78863.7$ 

$$
A_{2,water} = 26217
$$

$$
A_{3, cyclohexane} = 918863.7
$$

$$
A_{4,acetone} = 401824.2
$$

#### Composition of ethanol

The ratio of the areas of ethanol and acetone was then calculated. If  $A_{1,ethanol} > A_{4,acetone}$ , then the ratio  $\frac{A_{4,acetone}}{A_{1,ethanol}}$  was used and the corresponding plot in the ethanol rich region, however if  $A_{4,acetone} > A_{1,ethanol}$ , then the ratio  $\frac{A_{1,ethanol}}{A_{4,acetone}}$  was used and the corresponding plot in the acetone rich region was used. This procedure was repeated for all components.

Since  $A_{4,acetone} > A_{1,ethanol}$ , the ratio of  $\frac{A_{1,ethanol}}{A_{4,acetone}}$  was used:

$$
\frac{A_{1,ethanol}}{A_{4,acetone}} = \frac{78863.7}{401824.2} = 0.196
$$

The corresponding calibration plot for the ethanol- acetone system in the acetone rich region as shown in Figure C- 1: Calibration of GC with ethanol- [acetone system in the acetone rich](#page-62-0)  [region](#page-62-0) was then used to obtain the mass fraction ratios of ethanol and acetone. The gradient of the calibration plot was calculated to be 0.956.

The ratio of the mass fractions was obtained using the straight-line equation  $y = mx +c$  as follows:

$$
\frac{A_{1,ethanol}}{A_{4,acetone}} = m \cdot \frac{x_{1,ethanol}}{x_{4,acetone}}
$$

$$
\frac{x_{1,ethanol}}{x_{4,acetone}} = \frac{0.196}{0.956} = 0.205
$$

The composition of ethanol in the sample was then calculated since the mass fraction of acetone in the sample was already known.

$$
\frac{x_{1,ethanol}}{0.383} = 0.205
$$

$$
x_{1,ethanol} = 0.0785
$$

The mass of ethanol in the sample was thereafter computed.

$$
m_{ethanol} = x_{1,ethanol} * m_{total} = 0.0785 * 12.541 = 0.984g
$$

Composition of water

Similarly, the masses of the other components in the sample were computed using the corresponding plots in Appendix C. Since  $A_{4,acetone} > A_{2,water}$ , the ratio of  $\frac{A_{2,water}}{A_{4,acetone}}$  was used:

$$
\frac{A_{2,water}}{A_{4,acetone}} = \frac{26217}{401824.2} = 0.0652
$$

The corresponding calibration plot for the water- acetone system in the acetone rich region as shown in [Figure C-](#page-63-0) 3 was then used to obtain the mass fraction ratios of water and acetone. The gradient of the calibration plot was calculated to be 1.115.

The ratio of the mass fractions was obtained using the straight-line equation  $y = mx + c$  as follows:

$$
\frac{A_{2,water}}{A_{4,acetone}} = m \cdot \frac{x_{2,water}}{x_{4,acetone}}
$$

50

$$
\frac{x_{2,water}}{x_{4,acetone}} = \frac{0.0652}{1.115} = 0.0585
$$

The composition of water in the sample was then calculated since the mass fraction of acetone in the sample was already known.

$$
\frac{x_{2,water}}{0.383} = 0.0585
$$

$$
x_{2,water} = 0.0224
$$

The mass of water in the sample was thereafter computed.

$$
m_{water} = x_{2,water} * m_{total} = 0.0224 * 12.541 = 0.281g
$$

#### Composition of cyclohexane

Since the compositions of the other 3 components in the sample are known, the composition of cyclohexane can now be calculated:

$$
x_{3, cyclohexane} = 1 - (x_{1,ethanol} + x_{2,water} + x_{4,acetone})
$$

$$
= 1 - (0.0785 + 0.0224 + 0.383) = 0.516
$$

The mass of ethanol in the sample was thereafter computed.

$$
m_{ethanol} = x_{1,ethanol} * m_{total} = 0.516 * 12.541 = 6.471g
$$

 $m_{cyclohexane} = 6.471g$ 

Acetone was not in the original sample obtained from the column and thus the original compositions of cyclohexane, ethanol and water were calculated.

$$
x_{ethanol} = \frac{0.984}{7.733} = 0.127
$$

$$
x_{water} = \frac{0.281}{7.733} = 0.0036
$$

$$
x_{cyclohexane} = \frac{6.471}{7.733} = 0.836
$$

These compositions were then plotted on the composition profile for the semi- batch runs.

#### B.3. Percentage Extracted

In order to calculate the percentage extracted, a mole balance had to be carried out over the VPE column.

The total mass of the feed was 11.03kg while the mass of ethanol in the feed was 5.74kg. The mass fraction of ethanol in the feed was then computed:

$$
x_{ethanol, feed} = \frac{m_{ethanol, feed}}{m_{feed}} = \frac{5.74}{5.74 + 5.29} = 0.520
$$

The mass fraction of ethanol in the raffinate was previously calculated to be 0.127, while the mass fraction of ethanol in the extract at the end of the run (55 minutes) was obtained as 0.634. The following ethanol balance and overall balance were solved simultaneously:

$$
x_{ethanol, feed} F = x_{ethanol, raffinate} R + x_{ethanol, extract} E
$$

$$
0.520F = 0.127R + 0.634E
$$

There was no ethanol in the solvent and thus the solvent term was neglected. Solving the above equation for E yields:

$$
E = \frac{0.520F - 0.127R}{0.634}
$$

The overall balance is shown as follows:

$$
F + S = 4 + 11.03 = 15.03
$$

$$
F + S = 15.03 = E + R
$$

Substituting for E and solving for R:

$$
\frac{5.74 - 0.127R}{0.634} + R = 15.03
$$

Therefore,  $R=7.473$ kg and  $E=7.557$ kg.

The number of moles of ethanol in the feed was then calculated:

$$
n_{ethanol, feed} = \frac{m_{ethanol, feed}}{M_{ethanol}} = \frac{5.74}{46.070} = 0.126 \, kmol
$$

The number of moles of ethanol in the raffinate was also calculated:

$$
n_{ethanol,raffinate} = \frac{m_{ethanol,raffinate}}{M_{ethanol}} = \frac{0.127 (7.473)}{46.070} = 0.0206 kmol
$$

Therefore, the percentage extracted was computed as follows:

$$
Percentage\ extracted = \frac{n_{feed} - n_{raffinate}}{n_{feed}} \times 100
$$

$$
=\frac{0.126-0.0206}{0.126} \times 100
$$

$$
= 83.651\,\%
$$

### APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL RESULTS

### C.1. Calibration plots



<span id="page-62-0"></span>**Figure C- 1: Calibration of GC with ethanol- acetone system in the acetone rich region**



**Figure C- 2: Calibration of GC with ethanol- acetone system in the ethanol rich region**



<span id="page-63-0"></span>**Figure C- 3: Calibration of GC with water- acetone system in the acetone rich region**



**Figure C- 4: Calibration of GC with water- acetone system in the water rich region**



**Figure C- 5: Calibration of GC with cyclohexane- acetone system in the acetone rich region**



**Figure C- 6: Calibration of GC with cyclohexane- acetone system in the cyclohexane rich** 

**region**

## C.3. Calibration Uncertainties

$x_1/x_2$	$A_{1,ethanol}$	$A_{4,acetone}$	$A_1/A_4$	Standard	Average	Error	% Error
				Deviation			
0.1	81309	913514	0.089				
	78614.7	886029.9	0.089	0.000	0.089	0.002	0.157
0.5	286630.1	708347.7	0.405				
	267599.8	680872.5	0.393	0.006	0.399	0.015	1.457
0.9	393527.2	572550.3	0.687				
	402785.1	591435.5	0.681	0.003	0.684	0.005	0.460
						Average %	0.691
						error	

**Table C- 1: Calibration uncertainty for ethanol- acetone system in acetone rich region**

**Table C- 2: Calibration uncertainty for ethanol- acetone system in ethanol rich region**

$x_2/x_1$	$A_{1,ethanol}$	$A_{4,acetone}$	$A_4/A_1$	Standard	Average	Error	% Error
				Deviation			
0.1	831687.9	133408	0.160				
	867635.6	139464.9	0.161	0.000	0.161	0.001	0.104
0.5	604096.5	399088.6	0.661				
	593446.6	396187.7	0.668	0.003	0.664	0.005	0.525
0.9	434648.8	522099.3	1.201				
	453512.4	542417.2	1.196	0.003	1.199	0.002	0.215
						Average %	0.281
						error	

$x_2/x_4$	A <sub>2,water</sub>	$A_{4,acetone}$	$A_2/A_4$	Standard	Average	Error	% Error
				Deviation			
0.1	45536.5	919134.7	0.050				
	45815.9	953718.4	0.048	0.001	0.049	0.015	1.541
0.5	145864.9	873322.7	0.167				
	144217.1	877633.4	0.164	0.001	0.166	0.008	0.814
0.9	252552.2	812272	0.311				
	255219.3	797808.1	0.320	0.004	0.315	0.014	1.424
						Average %	1.260
						error	

**Table C- 3: Calibration uncertainty for water- acetone system in acetone rich region**

**Table C- 4: Calibration uncertainty for water- acetone system in water rich region**

$x_4/x_2$	$A_{2,water}$	$A_{4,acetone}$	$A_4/A_2$	Standard	Average	Error	% Error
				Deviation			
0.1	916268.1	303374.3	0.331				
	994001.9	301598.7	0.303	0.014	0.317	0.044	4.362
0.5	504154.2	683547.5	1.356				
	470804.3	669493.3	1.422	0.033	1.389	0.024	2.383
0.9	320804.5	800817.9	2.496				
	334870	808590.8	2.415	0.041	2.455	0.017	1.662
						Average %	2.802
						error	

$x_4/x_3$	$A_{4,acetone}$	$A_{3, cyclohexane}$	$A_4/A_3$	Standard	Average	Error	% Error
				Deviation			
0.1	11049.6	87110.3	0.127				
	13235.3	93582.1	0.141	0.007	0.134	0.054	5.436
0.5	250679.6	634479.9	0.395				
	398149.8	796802.2	0.500	0.052	0.447	0.117	11.689
0.9	372686.6	487167.8	0.765				
	354460.6	438783.7	0.808	0.021	0.786	0.027	2.722
						Average %	6.616
						error	

**Table C- 5: Calibration uncertainty for cyclohexane- acetone system in cyclohexane rich region**

**Table C- 6: Calibration uncertainty for cyclohexane- acetone system in acetone rich region**

$x_3/x_4$	$A_{4,acetone}$	$A_{3, cyclohexane}$	$A_3/A_4$	Standard	Average	Error	% Error
				Deviation			
0.1	91210.8	12632.7	0.139				
	91862.4	11556.8	0.126	0.006	0.132	0.048	4.803
0.5	251782.4	121802.5	0.484				
	255329.8	125203.5	0.490	0.003	0.487	0.007	0.677
0.9	485291.6	491502.8	1.013				
	446943.6	410607.7	0.919	0.047	0.966	0.049	4.872
						Average %	3.451
						error	

## C.4. Compositions of samples from runs



## **Table C- 7: Batch run 1a extract and raffinate compositions**

## **Table C- 8: Batch run 1b extract and raffinate compositions**





# **Table C- 9: Feed, extract and raffinate compositions for semi-batch run 2a**



# **Table C- 10: Feed, extract and raffinate compositions for semi-batch run 2b**

### C.5. Equilibrium stages on ethanol-cyclohexane-water ternary diagram



<span id="page-71-0"></span>**Figure C- 7: Equilibrium stages for batch run 1a stepped off on ternary diagram**


**Figure C- 8: Equilibrium stages for batch run 1b stepped off on ternary diagram**



**Figure C- 9: Equilibrium stages for semi-batch run 2b stepped off on ternary diagram**

## APPENDIX D: MATERIAL AND SAFETY DATA SHEETS

#### **Safety Data Sheet**

according to 29CFR1910/1200 and GHS Rev. 3

Effective date: 12.20.2014 Page 1 of 8 Cyclohexane SECTION 1 : Identification of the substance/mixture and of the supplier Product name: Cyclohexane **Manufacturer/Supplier Trade name: Manufacturer/Supplier Article number:** S25292A Recommended uses of the product and uses restrictions on use: **Manufacturer Details:** AquaPhoenix Scientific 9 Barnhart Drive, Hanover, PA 17331 **Supplier Details: Fisher Science Education** 15 Jet View Drive, Rochester, NY 14624

#### **Emergency telephone number:**

Fisher Science Education Emergency Telephone No.: 800-535-5053

**SECTION 2 : Hazards identification** 

#### **Classification of the substance or mixture:**



STOT SE 3 Asp. Tox. 1 Aquatic AcTox. 1 Aquatic ChrTox. 1

#### Signal word : Danger

#### **Hazard statements:**

Highly flammable liquid and vapour Causes skin irritation May cause drowsiness or dizziness May be fatal if swallowed and enters airways Very toxic to aquatic life with long lasting effects

**Safety Data Sheet**<br>according to 29CFR1910/1200 and GHS Rev. 3

**Effective date** : 12.20.2014

 $P$ ane 2 of 8



#### **Other Non-GHS Classification:**

**WHMIS** D<sub>2</sub>B B<sub>2</sub> **NFPA/HMIS Health**  $\overline{2}$ **Flammability**  $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ **Physical Hazard**  $\overline{0}$ Personal X 0 Protection NFPA SCALE (0-4) HMIS RATINGS (0-4)

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

according to 29CFR1910/1200 and GHS Rev. 3



a comfortable position.Seek medical advice if discomfort or irritation persists.

After skin contact: Wash affected area with soap and water. Rinse/flush exposed skin gently using water for 15-20 minutes. Seek medical attention if irritation persists or if concerned.

After eve contact: Protect unexposed eve. Rinse/flush exposed eve(s) gently using water for 15-20 minutes. Remove contact lens(es) if able to do so during rinsing. Seek medical attention if irritation persists or if concerned.

After swallowing: Rinse mouth thoroughly. Do not induce vomiting. Have exposed individual drink sips of water. Seek medical attention if irritation, discomfort or vomiting persists.

#### Most important symptoms and effects, both acute and delayed:

Irritation, Nausea, Headache, Shortness of breath.:

#### Indication of any immediate medical attention and special treatment needed:

If seeking medical attention, provide SDS document to physician.

#### **SECTION 5 : Firefighting measures**

#### **Extinguishing media**

Suitable extinguishing agents: Foam. Dry chemical powder. Carbon dioxide. If in laboratory setting, follow laboratory fire suppression procedures. Use appropriate fire suppression agents for adjacent combustible materials or sources of ignition

For safety reasons unsuitable extinguishing agents: Water may be ineffective because it may not cool the material below its flash point.

#### Special hazards arising from the substance or mixture:

Combustion products may include carbon oxides or other toxic vapors. Risk of ignition. Flammable. Vapors may travel to source of ignition and flash back. Containers may explode when heated.

#### **Advice for firefighters:**

#### **Protective equipment:**

Additional information (precautions): Move product containers away from fire or keep cool with water spray as a protective measure, where feasible.

#### **SECTION 6 : Accidental release measures**

#### Personal precautions, protective equipment and emergency procedures:

Wear protective equipment. Use respiratory protective device against the effects of fumes/dust/aerosol. Keep unprotected persons away. Ensure adequate ventilation. Keep away from ignition sources. Protect from heat.Stop the spill, if possible. Contain spilled material by diking or using inert absorbent. Transfer to a disposal or recovery container.

#### **Environmental precautions:**

according to 29CFR1910/1200 and GHS Rev. 3



Prevent from reaching drains, sewer or waterway. Collect contaminated soil for characterization per Section 13

#### Methods and material for containment and cleaning up:

If in a laboratory setting, follow Chemical Hygiene Plan procedures.Collect liquids using vacuum or by use of absorbents. Place into properly labeled containers for recovery or disposal. If necessary, use trained response staff/contractor

#### **Reference to other sections:**

#### **SECTION 7 : Handling and storage**

#### **Precautions for safe handling:**

Prevent formation of aerosols. Follow good hygiene procedures when handling chemical materials. Do not eat. drink, smoke, or use personal products when handling chemical substances. Avoid splashes or spray in enclosed areas.Use only under chemical fume hood. Wear personal protective equipment. Wash hands after handling. Avoid contact with skin, eyes, and clothing, Do not breathe in vapors or spray mist. Keep away from open flames, hot surfaces and sources of ignitions. Use only non-sparking tools. Use explosion proof equipment. Take precautionary measures against static discharge.

#### Conditions for safe storage, including any incompatibilities:

Provide ventilation for containers. Avoid storage near extreme heat, ignition sources or open flame. Store away from foodstuffs. Store away from oxidizing agents. Store in cool, dry conditions in well sealed containers. Store with like hazards. Keep in a flammables area.

#### **SECTION 8 : Exposure controls/personal protection**







**Safety Data Sheet**<br>according to 29CFR1910/1200 and GHS Rev. 3

Effective date: 12.20.2014

#### Cyclohexane

Page 5 of 8

#### **SECTION 9 : Physical and chemical properties**



#### **SECTION 10: Stability and reactivity**

#### **Reactivity:**

Chemical stability: No decomposition if used and stored according to specifications. Possible hazardous reactions: Vapours may form explosive mixture with air. Conditions to avoid: Store away from oxidizing agents, strong acids or bases. Incompatible materials, excess heat. Keep away from open flames, hot surfaces and sources of ignition. Incompatible materials: Strong acids. Strong bases. Strong oxidizing agents. Hazardous decomposition products:Carbon oxides (CO, CO2).

#### **SECTION 11 : Toxicological information**



according to 29CFR1910/1200 and GHS Rev. 3

Effective date: 12.20.2014

**Cyclohexane** 



#### **SECTION 12 : Ecological information**

#### **Ecotoxicity**

Freshwater Algae: 72 Hr EC50 Desmodesmus subspicatus: >500 mg/L Freshwater Fish: 96 Hr LC50 Pimephales promelas: 3.96 - 5.18 mg/L [flow-through] Freshwater Fish: 96 Hr LC50 Pimephales promelas: 23.03 - 42.07 mg/L [static] Freshwater Fish: 96 Hr LC50 Lepomis macrochirus: 24.99 - 44.69 mg/L [static] Freshwater Fish: 96 Hr LC50 Poecilia reticulata: 48.87 - 68.76 mg/L [static] Persistence and degradability: Readily degradable in the environment. **Bioaccumulative potential:** Mobility in soil: Aqueous solution has high mobility in soil.

Other adverse effects:

#### **SECTION 13 : Disposal considerations**

#### **Waste disposal recommendations:**

Product/containers must not be disposed together with household garbage. Do not allow product to reach sewage system or open water.It is the responsibility of the waste generator to properly characterize all waste materials according to applicable regulatory entities (US 40CFR262.11). Consult federal state/ provincial and local regulations regarding the proper disposal of waste material that may incorporate some amount of this product.

#### **SECTION 14 : Transport information**

#### **UN-Number**

1145

**UN proper shipping name** 

Cyclohexane

**Transport hazard class(es)** 

Class: 3 Flammable liquids

Packing group: Il **Environmental hazard: Transport in bulk: Special precautions for user:** 

**SECTION 15 : Regulatory information** 

#### **United States (USA)**

#### SARA Section 311/312 (Specific toxic chemical listings):

Acute, Fire

Created by Global Safety Management, Inc. - Tel: 1-813-435-5161 - www.gsmsds.com

Page 6 of 8

according to 29CFR1910/1200 and GHS Rev. 3

Effective date: 12.20.2014

#### **Cyclohexane**

Page 7 of 8

### **SARA Section 313 (Specific toxic chemical listings):**

110-82-7 Cyclohexane

#### **RCRA** (hazardous waste code):

None of the ingredients is listed

**TSCA (Toxic Substances Control Act):** 

All ingredients are listed.

#### CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act):

110-82-7 Cyclohexane 1000 lbs

#### **Proposition 65 (California):**

#### **Chemicals known to cause cancer:**

None of the ingredients is listed

#### Chemicals known to cause reproductive toxicity for females:

None of the ingredients is listed

Chemicals known to cause reproductive toxicity for males:

None of the ingredients is listed

#### Chemicals known to cause developmental toxicity:

None of the ingredients is listed

#### Canada

#### **Canadian Domestic Substances List (DSL):**

All ingredients are listed.

#### Canadian NPRI Ingredient Disclosure list (limit 0.1%):

None of the ingredients is listed

#### Canadian NPRI Ingredient Disclosure list (limit 1%):

None of the ingredients is listed

#### **SECTION 16 : Other information**

This product has been classified in accordance with hazard criteria of the Controlled Products Regulations and the SDS contains all the information required by the Controlled Products Regulations. Note:. The responsibility to provide a safe workplace remains with the user. The user should consider the health hazards and safety information contained herein as a guide and should take those precautions required in an individual operation to instruct employees and develop work practice procedures for a safe work environment. The information contained herein is, to the best of our knowledge and belief, accurate. However, since the conditions of handling and use are beyond our control, we make no guarantee of results, and assume no liability for damages incurred by the use of this material. It is the responsibility of the user to comply with all applicable laws and regulations applicable to this material.

#### **GHS Full Text Phrases:**

#### **Abbreviations and acronyms:**

IMDG: International Maritime Code for Dangerous Goods PNEC: Predicted No-Effect Concentration (REACH) CFR: Code of Federal Regulations (USA) SARA: Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (USA) RCRA: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (USA) TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act (USA)

according to 29CFR1910/1200 and GHS Rev. 3

Effective date: 12.20.2014

#### Cyclohexane

Page 8 of 8

NPRI: National Pollutant Release Inventory (Canada) DOT: US Department of Transportation IATA: International Air Transport Association GHS: Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals ACGIH: American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists CAS: Chemical Abstracts Service (division of the American Chemical Society) NFPA: National Fire Protection Association (USA) HMIS: Hazardous Materials Identification System (USA) WHMIS: Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System (Canada) DNEL: Derived No-Effect Level (REACH)

Effective date: 12.20.2014 **Last updated: 03.19.2015** 



# **MATERIALS SAFETY DATA SHEET** (MSDS)



Ethanol ( $C_2H_5OH$ )









seek medical attention.



(MSDS)















# **MATERIALS SAFETY DATA SHEET**

# (MSDS)

**Ethanol (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH)** 



## 9. Physical and Chemical Properties:





# **MATERIALS SAFETY DATA SHEET** (MSDS) **Ethanol (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH)**







(MSDS)

Ethanol (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH)



### 13. Disposal Considerations: Disposal methods : Only under conditions approved by local authorization. See also Section 6. Disposal of packaging : Empty containers may contain flammable and hazardous residues. Always obey hazard warnings. 14. Transport Information: UN No  $: 1170$ Substance Identity No : UN 1170 ADR/RID class  $: 3$ ADR/RID item No  $: 3(b)$ ADR/RID hazard identity No : 3 IMDG - shipping name : Ethanol  $IMDG - class$  $: 3.2$  $\div \mathrm{II}$ IMDG - packaging group IMDG - marine pollutant : Not a marine pollutant IMDG - EMS No  $: F-E, S-D$ IMDG - MFAG table No  $: 3074$ IATA - shipping name : Ethanol Solutions IATA - class  $: 3$ IATA - subsidiary risk(s) : Flammable liquid  $ADNR - class$ : UN-No.:1170; Class 3, Packaging Group II UK-description : Not available UK- emergency action class : Not available UK-classification : Not available **Tremcard No**  $: 1170$



# **MATERIALS SAFETY DATA SHEET** (MSDS) **Ethanol (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH)**





see below). Hazardous Chemicals Data Book, Environmental Health Review No. 4 Edited by G. Weiss.  $2.$ 

 $3.$ Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety. Record No. 516022

#### 17. Other Information



This product may be denatured upon request with small quantities (s 5%"/, ) of one or more of the following denaturants: Menthol,  $2.$ Denatonium Benzoate (Bitrix), Propylene Glycol, Iso-propyl alcohol, Methanol, Wood Naphtha, Di-ethyl Pthalate (DEP), Hibatane or Butanol or formulations as per the Specilaised Denaturants list in the Industrial Solvents handbook.



 $NCP/P/1$ **MSDS Number MATERIALS SAFETY DATA SHEET** Version 2.0 Version number 3rd May 2012 Date issued Next Review date **May 2014** Page No. Page 9 of 9

#### 18. References



2. Bretherick, L.Handbook of Reactive Chemical Hazards (3rd edition)

(MSDS)

Ethanol (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH)

- 3. Univ. Saf. Assocn. Saf. News 1982, (16)
- 4. Laboratory Hazards Bulletin 1982, 584
- 5. Laboratory Hazards Bulletin 1983, 113
- 6. Pratt, E.F.; et al. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1954, 75, 54
- 7. Braendstrom, A. Acta Chem. Scand. 1951, 4, 1608-1010
- 8. Wimer, W.W.; et al. Alcohols Toxicology (Noyes Data, 1983)
- 9. Henson, E.V. JOM, J. Occup. Med. 1960, 2, 497
- 10. Lester, D.; Greenberg, L.A. J. Stud. Alcohol. 1951, 12, 167
- 11. Encyclopedia of Occupational Health & Safety ILO. Ethyl Alcohol and Alcoholism
- 12. Emery, M. Occup. Saf. Health 1979, 9(9), 8-13
- 13. Madden, J.S. J. Soc. Occup. Med. 1976, 26(2), 61-64
- 14. Christensen, J.M. Acta, Pharmacol. Toxicol. 1983, 53, Suppl. II 15. Woolverton, W.L.; Balster, R.L. Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol. 1981, 59(1), 1-7
- 
- 16. Riihimaki, V.; et al. Scand. J. Work, Environ. Health 1982, 8(1), 77-79
- 17. Baarson, K.A.; et al. Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol. 1982, 64(3), 393-404 18. Munoz, P.J.; et al. Rev. Med. 1984, 22(2), 79-83
- 19. Ito, Y.; et al. J. Sci. Labour 1984, 60(6), 255-267
- 20. Lynch, J.; et al. JOM, J. Occup. Med. 1979, 21(5), 333-341
- 21. Tuyns, A.J.; at al. Int. J. Cancer 1979, 23(4), 443-447
- 22. McCann, J.; et al. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 1975, 72(12), 5135
- 23. Badr, F.M.; R.S. Nature 1975, 253, 134
- 24. Machemer, L.; D. Mutat. Res. 1975, 29, 209
- 25. Chaubey, R.C.; et al. Mutat. Res. 1977, 43, 441
- 26. Tze, W.J.; Lee, M. Nature 1975, 257, 479
- 27. Skosyreva, A.M. Akush. Ginekol. 1973, 4, 15
- 28. Schwetz, B.A.; et al. Teratology 1978, 18(3), 385
- 29. Hemminki, K.; Viriei, P. Teratog. Carcinog. Mutagen. 1985, 5(4), 251-318
- 30. www\_static.shell.com/ethanol\_CAS\_64\_1\_5\_gb\_stl1:pdf
- 31. International Agency for Research on Cancer, World Health Organization. (1988). Alcohol drinking. Lyon: World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on Cancer. ISBN 92-832-1244-4. http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol44/volume44.pdf. p8
- 32. www.inchem.org/documents/sids/sids/64175.pdf
- 33. Toxicity and risks induced by Occupational Exposure to chemical compounds Pg.259.





Safety Data Sheet<br>according to Federal Register / Vol. 77, No. 58 / Monday, March 26, 2012 / Rules and Regulations<br>Issue date: 11/15/2013 Revision date: 06/26/2020 Supersedes: 06/12/2018

Version: 1.4



#### **Safety Data Sheet** according to Federal Register / Vol. 77, No. 58 / Monday, March 26, 2012 / Rules and Regulations  $42$ Most important symptoms and effects (acute and delayed) Potential Adverse human health effects and : Based on available data, the classification criteria are not met. symptoms Symptoms/effects : Not expected to present a significant hazard under anticipated conditions of normal use. 4.3. Immediate medical attention and special treatment, if necessary Treat symptomatically. **SECTION 5: Fire-fighting measures** Suitable (and unsuitable) extinguishing media  $5.1.$ Suitable extinguishing media : Foam. Dry powder. Carbon dioxide. Water spray. Sand. Specific hazards arising from the chemical  $5.2.$ Fire hazard : Not flammable. 5.3 Special protective equipment and precautions for fire-fighters Firefighting instructions : Use water spray or fog for cooling exposed containers. Exercise caution when fighting any chemical fire Protection during firefighting : Do not enter fire area without proper protective equipment, including respiratory protection. **SECTION 6: Accidental release measures**  $6.1.$ Personal precautions, protective equipment and emergency procedures 6.1.1. For non-emergency personnel **Emergency procedures** : Evacuate unnecessary personnel. 6.1.2 For emergency responders Protective equipment : Equip cleanup crew with proper protection. Emergency procedures : Ventilate area.  $6.2$ **Environmental precautions** Prevent entry to sewers and public waters. Notify authorities if liquid enters sewers or public waters.  $6.3.$ Methods and material for containment and cleaning up Methods for cleaning up : Soak up spills with inert solids, such as clay or diatomaceous earth as soon as possible.  $6.4.$ Reference to other sections See Heading 8. Exposure controls and personal protection. **SECTION 7: Handling and storage** Precautions for safe handling  $71$ Precautions for safe handling : Wash hands and other exposed areas with mild soap and water before eating, drinking or smoking and when leaving work. Conditions for safe storage, including any incompatibilities  $7.2.$ Storage conditions : Keep container closed when not in use. Incompatible products : Metallic sodium. Incompatible materials : Sources of ignition. Direct sunlight. **SECTION 8: Exposure controls/personal protection**  $8.1.$ **Control parameters** Water (7732-18-5) No additional information available

#### $8.2.$ Appropriate engineering controls

#### Appropriate engineering controls : Provide adequate general and local exhaust ventilation.

#### Individual protection measures/Personal protective equipment 83.

#### Personal protective equipment:

Safety glasses.

06/26/2020

EN (English US)

 $2/6$ 

## **Safety Data Sheet**

according to Federal Register / Vol. 77, No. 58 / Monday, March 26, 2012 / Rules and Regulations

#### Eye protection:

Chemical goggles or safety glasses

#### **Respiratory protection:**

None necessary.

Personal protective equipment symbol(s):



#### Other information:

Do not eat, drink or smoke during use.



06/26/2020

EN (English US)

 $3/6$ 

## Safety Data Sheet





### **Safety Data Sheet**

according to Federal Register / Vol. 77, No. 58 / Monday, March 26, 2012 / Rules and Regulations

Other information

: No other effects known.

## **SECTION 13: Disposal considerations**

13.1. Disposal methods

Waste disposal recommendations

: Dispose in a safe manner in accordance with local/national regulations.

#### **SECTION 14: Transport information**

**Department of Transportation (DOT)** 

In accordance with DOT Not regulated

**Transport by sea** 

Not regulated

#### Air transport

Not regulated



California Proposition 65 - This product does not contain any substances known to the state of California to cause cancer, developmental and/or reproductive harm

### **SECTION 16: Other information**

according to Federal Register / Vol. 77, No. 58 / Monday, March 26, 2012 / Rules and Regulations



06/26/2020

EN (English US)

 $5/6$ 

## Water Safety Data Sheet

according to Federal Register / Vol. 77, No. 58 / Monday, March 26, 2012 / Rules and Regulations



SDS US LabChem

Information in this SDS is from available published sources and is believed to be accurate. No warranty, express or implied, is made and LabChem Inc assumes no liability resulting from the use of this<br>SDS. The user must de



## **Acetone MSDS**

Effective Date: December 03, 2012 **24 Hour Emergency Contact:** ChemTel: (800)255-3924 www.pioneerforensics.com

## 1. PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION



## 2. HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION





## 3. COMPOSITION AND INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS





## **5. FIRE FIGHTING MEASURES**

<b>NFPA Ratings:</b>	Health: 2	Flammability: 3	Reactivity: 0
<b>Flammable Properties:</b>	HIGHLY FLAMMABLE! Vapors may cause a flash fire or ignite explosively. Vapors may travel considerable distance to a source of ignition and flash back. Heat may cause sealed containers to explode.		
<b>Flash Point:</b>	-20 $\degree$ C (-4 $\degree$ F) Closed Cup		
<b>Auto-ignition Temp:</b>	465° C (869° F)		

Product: Acetone

l

Revision Date: 12/03/2012



## 6. ACCIDENTAL RELEASE MEASURES



### 7. HANDLING AND STORAGE

Handling: Do not handle or open near flame, sources of heat, or sources of ignition. Protect material from direct sunlight. Wear personal protective equipment (see section 8). Use only in wellventilated areas. Provide sufficient air exchange and/or exhaust in work rooms. Avoid contact with skin, eyes and clothing. Do not breathe vapors or spray mist. Do not ingest. When using, do not eat, smoke, or drink. Take precautionary measures against static discharge. Keep away from incompatible materials. Handle in accordance with good

industrial hygiene and safety practice. Wash thoroughly after handling. Containers of this material may be hazardous when empty since they retain product residues (vapors, liquids). Observe all warnings and precautions listed for the product

Storage: Store in a cool, dry, ventilated area. Store away from flame, sources of ignition, heat, and incompatible materials. Store in original container. Keep containers tightly closed and upright. Keep away from food, drink and animal feedingstuffs. Keep out of the reach of children. Ground container and transfer equipment to eliminate static electric sparks. Comply with all national, state, and local codes pertaining to the storage, handling, dispensing, and disposal of flammable liquids.

### 8. EXPOSURE CONTROL AND PERSONAL PROTECTION



### 9. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES



Product: Acetone Revision Date: 12/03/2012



## **10. STABILITY AND REACTIVITY**



## 11. TOXICOLOGICAL INFORMATION



 $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ 



## **12. ECOLOGICAL INFORMATION**



## **13. DISPOSAL INFORMATION**



## **14. TRANSPORT INFORMATION**

#### DOT:



## **15. REGULATORY INFORMATION**

#### **U.S. Federal Regulations:**



\*A "Yes" indicates that the listed component(s) of this product comply with the inventory requirements administered by the governing country(s)



Product: Acetone Revision Date: 12/03/2012 infringement of any patent, copyright or trademark is made or implied. This MSDS is intended only as a guide to the appropriate handling of the material by a properly trained person. It shall be the user's responsibility to develop proper methods of handling and personal protection based on the actual conditions of use. Accordingly, Pioneer Forensics LLC assumes no liability whatsoever for the use of or reliance upon this information including results obtained, incidental or consequential damages, or lost profits.

**Issue Date:** 

12/03/2012

Not applicable

**Reason for Revision:** 

Product: Acetone Revision Date: 12/03/2012