

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/13858947)

# Chemical Engineering Journal



journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/cej](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/cej)

# Phase equilibria for separation of high boiling point organics from ionic liquids by supercritical  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  or  $C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>$

## Jie Liu, Xuewen Sun, Dongbao Fu, Suoqi Zhao<sup>∗</sup>

*State Key Laboratory of Heavy Oil Processing, China University of Petroleum, 18#, Fuxue Road, Beijing 102249, China*

#### article info

*Keywords:* Ionic liquid (IL) Supercritical (SC) Carbon dioxide Propane Naphthalene Dibenzothiophene (DBT) Solubility Extraction

## **ABSTRACT**

Application of room temperature ionic liquids (RTILs) as reaction media, catalysts and solvents, will encounter a problem of organics separation from RTILs systems. The utilization of supercritical fluids (SCFs) to separate high boiling point organics needs quantitative phase equibliria data and modeling. The phase equilibria and modeling for separating high boiling point organics from RTILs by supercritical (SC) CO<sub>2</sub> and  $C_3H_8$  have been studied thereof to take their advantage of low critical temperature. The long-term stability of 1-butyl-3-methylimidazolium hexafluorophosphate ([bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>]) and 1-butyl-3-methylimidazolium trifluoromethanesulfonate ([bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]) has been observed in SC CO<sub>2</sub> and  $C_3H_8$ , which for [bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>] is below 120 °C while [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] can stay stable at 120 °C over 72 h. The solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> and volume expansivity in  ${\rm [bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]}$  at 40, 50 and 60 °C and pressure of 1–20 MPa were measured, as well the solving behavior has been determined for  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] system under conditions of 100, 110 and 120 $\degree$ C, 1–9 MPa. C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub> give a much lower dissolving molarity in  $[bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$  than  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  under the same pressure and reduced temperature. The ternary phase equilibria of CO<sub>2</sub>–[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–DBT, C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>–[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–DBT, CO<sub>2</sub>–[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–naphthalene and  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–naphthalene are determined in a wide pressure and molality of solute in this ionic liquid (IL) at given temperature 323 and 393 K, respectively. Modified Chrastil's association model was extended to ternary system with the equation  $c_A/m_A = d^k \exp((a/T) + b)$  giving a good correlation. The error between experimental data and the calculated concentration of solute in SCF phase for  $CO_2$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–DBT,  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–DBT,  $CO_2$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–naphthalene and  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–naphthalene are 5.0, 6.0, 7.9 and 9.4%, respectively. Extraction of naphthalene from  $[bmin][CF_3SO_3]$  is calculated in continuous and batch processes. Batch SCF extraction may be applied to separate high boiling point organics from ILs. As long time and recycle solvent to feed ratio are necessary for using SC  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ ,  $C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>$  could be a good alternative since it shows nearly a magnitude higher solving power than  $SCCO<sub>2</sub>$ .

© 2008 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

### **1. Introduction**

One aspect concerned in ionic liquids (ILs) applications such as solvent, catalysts or reaction media is the separation of solutes, reactants or products. There are challenges in high boiling point organics separation because the long-term (>10 h) stability of ILs are generally below 200 $\degree$ C [\[1\].](#page-7-0) Apparently distillation is not applicable. Although liquid–liquid extraction is known as a feasible separation method, cross-contamination between the phases is a problem [\[2,3\].](#page-7-0) In addition, liquid extraction is not suitable for thermal liable compounds because the solvent recovery needs a higher temperature. Comparatively, SCF extraction with  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  have been introduced to extract both volatile and relatively non-volatile organic compounds from ILs without any IL contamination [\[4–6\],](#page-7-0)

showing a bright promise. Knowledge of the phase behavior of these systems is a crucial aspect of this methodology and has been the focus of many researches in recent years. Many investigations have been carried out on the phase behavior of the binary systems "SC  $CO<sub>2</sub> + ILS$ " [\[7–24\].](#page-7-0) But the SCF-liquid equilibrium data of the ternary systems "SC  $CO<sub>2</sub> + ILS +$  organics" [\[25–29\], w](#page-7-0)hich are more useful for the prospective extraction applications, were rarely reported. Scurto et al. [\[25,26\]](#page-7-0) reported that the solution of 1-butyl-3-methylimidazolium hexafluorophosphate ([bmim][ $PF_6$ ]) and methanol could be induced to form three phases in the presence of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  and investigated the effects of temperature, pressure and initial IL concentration on the liquid–liquid phase split. Najdanovic-Visak et al. [\[27\]](#page-7-0) studied the liquid–liquid phase behavior of the system "lbutyl-3-methylimidazolium bis{(trifluoromethyl)sulfonyl}imide  $([bmin][NTf<sub>2</sub>]) + 1$ -butanol + water" and the CO<sub>2</sub>-induced phase changes. Zhang et al. [\[28\]](#page-7-0) investigated the phase behavior of the ternary system " $CO<sub>2</sub> + 1-N$ -butyl-3-methylimidazolium tetrafluoroborate ([bmim][ $BF<sub>4</sub>$ ]) + water" by a static method at 278–298 K

<sup>∗</sup> Corresponding author. Tel.: +86 10 8973 3743; fax: +86 10 6972 4721. *E-mail address:* [sqzhao@cup.edu.cn](mailto:sqzhao@cup.edu.cn) (S. Zhao).

<sup>1385-8947/\$ –</sup> see front matter © 2008 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. doi:[10.1016/j.cej.2008.11.017](dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2008.11.017)

<span id="page-1-0"></span>and pressure up to 16 MPa. They calculated the distribution coefficients of  $[bmin][BF<sub>4</sub>]$  between IL-rich phase and waterrich phase and discussed the separation of IL and water. Liu et al. [\[29\]](#page-7-0) studied the phase behavior of the ternary system "SC  $CO<sub>2</sub> + [bmin][PF<sub>6</sub>] + methanol"$  and the viscosity of the liquid phases at 313 K and the pressure of 7.15 and 10.00 MPa, and calculated the fugacity coefficients of the components in the system by the Peng–Robinson state equation and some thermodynamic functions. In all, most involved ILs are [bmim][BF<sub>4</sub>] and [bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>] and almost all system used SC  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ . Few investigations have been carried out for the phase equilibria of the ternary systems involving high boiling point organics, and even fewer paid particular attention to the quantitative concentration distribution of organics between SC  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  and ILs.

As is known, propane is another wide used SCF in petrochemical industry because of its high solving power, for example, petroleum residuum deasphalting. Propane has a moderately higher critical temperature 369.83 K and lower critical pressure 4.248 MPa, compared to  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  which is 304.13 K and 7.375 MPa. [bmim][ $CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>$ ] is believed to be more stable than  $[bmin][PF_6][1]$ . In this work, phase equilibria experiments and modeling of naphthalene and dibenzothiophene (DBT)–[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–CO<sub>2</sub> or C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub> were conducted. And the feasibility of extracting organics from IL by SC propane will be discussed comparing with SC carbon dioxide.

#### **2. Experimental**

#### *2.1. Chemicals*

 $CO<sub>2</sub>$  with a purity of 99.995% and  $C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>$  over 99% were supplied by Beijing Analytical Instrument Factory. Naphthalene, DBT and 1-chlorobutane were AR grade and produced by Beijing Chemical Reagent Factory. Potassium hexafluorophosphate (98% purity) was used as received from Fluka. [bmim][PF $_6$ ] was synthesized and characterized by the procedures reported elsewhere [\[31,32\].](#page-7-0)  $[bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$  was synthesized according the following procedure: about 30 mL 1,1,1-trichloroethane was added into a flask firstly, 17.23 g  $CF_3SO_3CH_3$  was also added slowly under Ar to prevent it from hydrolysis, and then 12.42 gram 1-butyl-3-methyl imdazolium was added slowly into the flask droply and refluxed 2 h at mild temperature. When the reaction was completed, 26.9 g  $[bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$  was gained through separation and vacuum distillation.

#### *2.2. Apparatus and procedures*

Two main experiments were carried out. One is the detection of phase equilibrium of binary system of SC solvent in IL. The methods have been described elsewhere [\[24\]. T](#page-7-0)he RUSKA-2370 Hg free PVT was applied for the measurement of SCF–IL phase equilibrium. In a typical experiment, given amounts of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  and [bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>] were metered into the main cell where the samples were vigorously stirred to ensure equilibrium quickly. The criterion of reaching phase equilibrium is the whole volume keep invariable over 40 min in constant pressure mode. Subsequently, the liquid phase volume was determined at constant pressure. The composition of the ILrich liquid phase was calculated on the basis of material balance, along with the assumption of a pure  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  vapor phase based on the low solubility of ionic liquid in  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ .

Another apparatus is a micro-SFE system with high pressure UV online detector system [\[30\]. T](#page-7-0)he phase equilibrium system consists of an ISCO syringe pump, a preheater, and an equilibrium cell. The detection system consists of an ISCO syringe pump, a preheater, a sample injector, a six-way valve, an UV–vis detector, a chromatography workstation, an accumulator and a counterbalance valve.

In a typical experiment, the IL solution of naphthalene or DBT with given composition was added quantitatively into the equilibrium cell and then SC  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  was pumped into it very slowly. After the mixture reached equilibrium at the present temperature and pressure, the  $CO_2$ -rich fluid in the quantitative tube of the six-way valve was injected into the detection system by switching it. The concentration of solute (g/L) in SC-rich phase was then determined by online ultraviolet detector. Since scarcely any ILs dissolved in the SC-rich phase [\[4–6,10\],](#page-7-0) the phase can be considered as a mixture of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  and solute. So the equilibrium naphthalene molality in the liquid phase was attained as  $m_A = n_B/ms_A$  (mol/kg) where  $ms_A$  is the mass of IL.

## **3. Solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub> in [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]**

#### *3.1. Long-term stability of [bmim][PF6] and [bmim][CF3SO3] in SC solvents*

The long-term stability of [bmim][ $PF_6$ ] and [bmim][ $CF_3SO_3$ ] was observed under high pressure with SC solvent in the PVT and compared to the one without SC solvent. The phenomena of IL decomposing is the color darken and with solid precipitation and gas production. The data are shown in Table 1. Generally speaking, the temperature is the most significant parameter, while pressure does not show obvious influence. Compared with  $[bmin][PF_6]$ which can keep stable 8 h at 120 °C, [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] is more stable and may be used under  $120^{\circ}$ C without significant decomposition.

## *3.2. Solubility and liquid phase volume expansivity of CO2 in [bmim][CF3SO3]*

The solubility and liquid phase volume expansivity of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] at 40, 50 and 60 °C, pressure of 1–20 MPa were measured. The density of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  was calculated by the state equation of Huang et al. [\[33\]](#page-7-0) and the density of propane was calculated by the BWR state equation (abbreviated as BRWS) modified by Starling [\[34\]. A](#page-7-0)ccording to [Fig. 1,](#page-2-0) the solubility of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] changes with temperature and pressure in the same tendency with the solubility of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in [bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>]. When the pressure is higher than 9 MPa,  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  is more soluble in [bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>]. While the pressure is lower than 9 MPa, the solubility of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  is higher in  $[bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>].$ 

Liquid phase volume expansivity has two definitions [\[30\]. O](#page-7-0)ne is based on the change of total volume of liquid phase:

$$
\frac{\Delta V}{V} = \frac{V_L(T, P, x_1) - V_2(T, P_0)}{V_2(T, P_0)}
$$
\n(1)

where  $V_L$  is the total volume of the liquid mixture under temperature *T* and pressure *P*.  $V_2$  is the volume of liquid under the same temperature and 1 atm.

Another definition is based on the change of molar volume:

$$
\frac{\Delta V_m}{V_m} = \frac{\tilde{V}_L(T, P, x_1) - \tilde{V}_2(T, P_0)}{\tilde{V}_2(T, P_0)}
$$
\n
$$
\tag{2}
$$

 $\tilde{V}_L$  and  $\tilde{V}_2$  are molar volumes under different conditions.

**Table 1**

Thermal stability of ionic liquid [bmim][PF $_6$ ] and [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>].

System	Temperature	Pressure	Thermal stability (h)		
$[bmin][PF6]-CO2$	$80^{\circ}$ C	10 MPa	>72		
[bmim][ $PF_6$ ]–CO <sub>2</sub>	$90^{\circ}$ C	10 MPa	48		
$[bmin][PF_6]-C_3H_8]$	$100^{\circ}$ C	5 MPa	30		
[bmin][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	$120^{\circ}$ C	$0.1$ MPa	8		
[bmim][ $CF3SO3$ ]	$120^{\circ}$ C	$0.1$ MPa	>72		
[bmim][ $CF_3SO_3$ ]– $CO_2$	$120^{\circ}$ C	10 MPa	>72		
[bmim][ $CF3SO3$ ]- $C3H8$	$120^{\circ}$ C	5 MPa	>72		

<span id="page-2-0"></span>

**Fig. 1.** Comparison of the solubility of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in [bmim][ $CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>$ ] with that of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in [bmim][ $PF_6$ ] at 40–60  $°C$ .

The liquid phase volume expansivity of  $CO_2$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] system is shown in Figs. 2 and 3, which are calculated by Eqs. [\(1\)](#page-1-0) [and \(2\), r](#page-1-0)espectively. According to Figs. 2 and 3, the liquid phase expansivity of  $CO_2$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] system has a similar varying tendency to the expansivity of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ –[bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>] system. Volume of IL-rich phase barely increases even when large amounts of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  dissolve in the liquid phase, while the molar volume decreases linearly when  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  dissolved in IL.



**Fig. 2.** Liquid phase volume expansivity of the systems  $CO_2$ –[bmim][ $CF_3SO_3$ ] and  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ –[bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>] at various temperatures.



Fig. 3. Liquid phase molar volume expansivity of the systems  $CO_2$ -[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] and  $CO_2$ –[bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>] at various temperatures.

## *3.3. The solubility and liquid phase volume expansivity of propane in [bmim][CF3SO3]*

The solubility of propane in  $[bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$  are measured under 100–120 ◦C, 1–9 MPa in similar reduced temperature and pressure with  $CO_2$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] system. The data for the two systems were compared in [Fig. 4,](#page-3-0) which shows that the solubility of propane in  $[bmin][CF_3SO_3]$  is much lower than the solubility of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  under the same conditions. For example, when the reduced pressure is 1.5, the solubility of propane in mole fraction is about 0.1, but that for carbon dioxide is higher to 0.6. The higher solubility of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] is mainly due to the lewis acid–base interaction between the carbon dioxide and the anion of the ionic liquid ( $[CF_3SO_3]^-$ ) [\[35\].](#page-7-0) This kind of interaction does not exist in the propane–[bmim][ $CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>$ ] system. Higher solubility of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in IL may facilitate the interaction between  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  and organics in the SCF exaction process. This is an advantage of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  in the SC extraction process compared to propane.

The liquid phase volume expansivity  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] system is calculate by Eqs. [\(1\)](#page-1-0) and [\(2\)](#page-1-0) and shown in [Figs. 5 and 6,](#page-3-0)

<span id="page-3-0"></span>

**Fig. 4.** Comparison of the solubility of  $CO_2$  in [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] with that of  $C_3H_8$  in [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] at the same reduced pressures and approximate reduced temperatures.



Fig. 5. Liquid phase volume expansivity of the system C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>-[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] at various temperatures.

respectively. Comparing to [Figs. 2 and 3](#page-2-0), the expansivity of  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] has a much mild change trend to the expansivity of  $CO_2$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] system due to  $C_3H_8$  lower solubility in  $[bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$ .

## **4. Phase equilibria of SC–Organics–ILs**

## 4.1. High-pressure state equilibrium of CO<sub>2</sub>(propane)–[bmim] *[CF3SO3]–DBT ternary system*

The conditions for ternary phase equilibria of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ –[bmim]  $[CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] - DBT$ ,  $C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub> - [bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] - DBT$ ,  $CO<sub>2</sub> - [bmin]$  $[CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$ –naphthalene and  $C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–naphthalene are listed in Table 2. The temperature for two  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  systems was kept at 323 K by adjusting the pressure and solute molality, while



**Fig. 6.** Liquid phase molar volume expansivity of the system  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] at various temperatures.



Fig. 7. Concentration of DBT in the  $CO_2$ -rich phase at indicated DBT molality in the liquid phase as a function of pressure at 323 K (the curves were calculated by Chrastil's association model).

that for two  $C_3H_8$  system is 393 K at the about the same reduced temperature.

The variation tendency of concentration of DBT in the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ -rich phase for  $CO_2$ -[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]-DBT system is shown in Fig. 7. Under the constant temperature and pressure, the weight molalities of DBT in the  $CO_2$ -rich phase and in the [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]-rich phase follow a double logarithmic correlation, as shown in [Fig. 8.](#page-4-0) The variation tendency of concentration of DBT in the propane-rich phase is shown in [Fig. 9. U](#page-4-0)nder the constant temperature and pressure, the relation between molalities of DBT in the propane-rich phase and in the  $[bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$ -rich phase is shown in [Fig. 10.](#page-4-0)

The variation tendency of concentration of naphthalene in the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ -rich phase is shown in [Fig. 11.](#page-4-0) Under the constant temperature and pressure, the relationship between the weight molalities of naphthalene in the  $CO_2$ -rich phase and in the [bmim][ $CF_3SO_3$ ]-

**Table 2**

Phase Equilibria conditions for 4 ternary systems and correlation results of modified Chrastil model.

System		Range of conditions			Regressed parameter	
	T(K)	P(MPa)	Solute molarity (mol/kg)		$((a/T) + b)$	
$CO2$ -[bmim][CF <sub>3</sub> SO <sub>3</sub> ]-DBT	323	$10 - 15$	$0.0091 - 0.0856$	3.9421	$-24.138$	5.0
$C_3H_8$ -[bmim][CF <sub>3</sub> SO <sub>3</sub> ]-DBT	393	$4.61 - 8.64$	0.0074-0.0288	2.3415	$-10.343$	6.0
$CO2$ -[bmim][CF <sub>3</sub> SO <sub>3</sub> ]-naphthalene	323	$8 - 15$	$0.044 - 0.210$	2.9706	$-16.967$	7.9
$C_3H_8$ -[bmim][CF <sub>3</sub> SO <sub>3</sub> ]	393	$4.61 - 8.64$	$0.031 - 0.094$	1.8316	$-7.0113$	9.4

<span id="page-4-0"></span>

**Fig. 8.** Concentration of DBT in the  $CO_2$ -rich phase as a function of DBT molality in the liquid phase at 323 K and various pressures (the lines were calculated by Chrastil's association model).



Fig. 9. Concentration of DBT in the C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>-rich phase at indicated DBT molality  $m_{\text{DBT}}$ in the liquid phase as a function of pressure at 393 K (the lines were calculated by Chrastil's association model).

rich phase also follows a double logarithmic correlation, as shown in Fig. 12. The variation tendency of concentration of naphthalene in the propane-rich phase at 393K is shown in Fig. 13. Under the constant temperature and pressure, the relation between weight



**Fig. 10.** Concentration of DBT in the  $C_3H_8$ -rich phase as a function of DBT molality in the liquid phase at 393 K and various pressures (the lines were calculated by Chrastil's association model).



**Fig. 11.** Concentration of naphthalene in the  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ -rich phase at indicated naphthalene molality in the liquid phase as a function of pressure at 323 K (the lines were calculated by Chrastil's association model).



**Fig. 12.** Concentration of naphthalene  $c_N$  in the CO<sub>2</sub>-rich phase as a function of naphthalene molality in the liquid phase at 323 K and various pressures (the lines were calculated by Chrastil's association model).

molalities of naphthalene in the propane-rich phase and in the [bmim][ $CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>$ ]-rich phase is shown in [Fig. 14.](#page-5-0)

According to above data, systems of  $CO_2$ -[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]-DBT,  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–DBT, CO<sub>2</sub>–[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–naphthalene and  $C_3H_8$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–naphthalene have a similar variation



Fig. 13. Concentration of naphthalene in the  $C_3H_8$ -rich phase at indicated naphthalene molality in the liquid phase as a function of pressure at 393 K (the lines were calculated by Chrastil's association model).

<span id="page-5-0"></span>

**Fig. 14.** Concentration of naphthalene in the  $C_3H_8$ -rich phase as a function of naphthalene molality in the liquid phase at 393 K and various pressures (the curves were calculated by Chrastil's association model).

trend to  $CO_2$ -[bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>]-naphthalene ternary system. Generally, the concentration of organics in SC phase increases with the increase of its concentration in the IL liquid phase, which follows double logarithmic correlations. As well, the distribution of organics increases when the pressure increases [\[30\].](#page-7-0)

#### *4.2. Modified Chrastil association model for ternary system*

In our previous work, the Chrastil association model for ternary system of naphthalene–IL–CO<sub>2</sub> have been derived as following:

$$
\frac{c_B}{m_B} = d^{k''} \exp\left(\frac{a''}{T + b''}\right) \tag{3}
$$

where  $k''$ ,  $a''$ ,  $b''$  are all constants for a given system,  $m_B$  is the solute molality in the IL liquid phase,  $c_B$  is the solubility of organics in SC phase in g/L, and *d* is the density of supercritical fluid in g/mL.

The densities of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  were calculated with Huang's accurate EOS [\[36\]](#page-7-0) for carbon dioxide. The parameters regressed for naphthalene- [bmimPF<sub>6</sub>]–CO<sub>2</sub> are *k*" = 2.7552, *a*" = 1470.9, *b*" = −10.752, respectively and show good agreement over wide conditions. For the naphthalene molality in the liquid phase ranging from 0.0169 to 0.378 mol/kg, and within temperature and pressure ranges of 313–333 K and 8–20 MPa, they give a mean relative deviation 14.9% [\[30\].](#page-7-0)

The regressed parameters are also shown in [Table 2.](#page-3-0) The calculated results are shown in [Figs. 7–14](#page-3-0) as lines. The error between experimental data and the calculated concentration of solute in SC phase for  $CO_2$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–DBT, C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>–[bmim]  $[CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] - DBT$ ,  $CO<sub>2</sub> - [bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] - naphthalene$  and  $C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub> -$ [bmim][ $CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>$ ]–naphthalene are 5.0, 6.0, 7.9 and 9.4%, respectively. The parameters regressed are considered reasonable for the wide range of conditions. The association solvent numbers *k* is smaller for  $C_3H_8$  than  $CO_2$  for the same solute and IL, which represent solvent molecule number to solve a solute. The parameter  $(a/T)$  + *b* represents the total association energy.  $C_3H_8$  system shows a lower number under higher temperature, which means high temperature favoring disassociation.

## 4.3. Comparison of dissolvability of SC CO<sub>2</sub> and SC propane to the *organics in ionic liquid*

Comparison of dissolvability of  $SCCO<sub>2</sub>$  and  $SC$  propane to the DBT or naphthalene in [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] is shown in Figs. 15 and 16. According to Fig. 15, the solubility of DBT in SC  $C_3H_8$  is 3.3–13.1 times higher than that in SC  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ , under the same reduced tem-



**Fig. 15.** Comparison of DBT dissolving from  $\text{[bmin]}[CF_3SO_3]$  between SC  $C_3H_8$  and SC CO<sub>2</sub> at reduced temperature  $T_r$  = 1.062 and various reduced pressures.



Fig. 16. Comparison of naphthalene dissolvability from [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] between supercritical propane and SC CO<sub>2</sub> at reduced temperature  $T_r = 1.062$  and various reduced pressures.

perature and pressure and DBT concentration in liquid phase. As in Fig. 16, the solubility of naphthalene in SC propane is 1.9–11.8 times higher than that  $SCCO<sub>2</sub>$ , under the same reduced temperature and pressure and naphthalene in liquid phase concentration.

Because propane has a much lower critical pressure (4.248 MPa) than carbon dioxide does (7.375 MPa), the practical operation pressure of propane can be much lower than carbon dioxide. So even under a mild condition (such as 8.6 MPa), SC  $C_3H_8$  has an obviously higher dissolvability than  $SCCO<sub>2</sub>$  does under a very high pressure (15 MPa).

## **5. Analysis of extraction process**

To understand the extraction applicability, the extraction of organics is simulated in batch and continuous way using  $SCCO<sub>2</sub>$ and propane as solvent, respectively.

#### *5.1. Batch extraction*

The process of batch extraction: IL is pumped into extractor in batch and solvent is pumped into extractor continuously from the bottom. The extracted organics are separated from the solvent and collected by the separator on the top of extractor. After the extraction, ionic liquid are separated from solvent and collected by the separator.

<span id="page-6-0"></span>

**Fig. 17.** Extraction time as a function of outlet solute molar fraction in IL.

Because ILs show very low solubility in SC liquid [\[4,5\]an](#page-7-0)d the equilibrium is easy to achieve in the process of SCF extraction, extraction process can be simulated by equilibrium mode. The operation equation can be deduced by material balance easily:

$$
y\rho_{\text{SCF}}Q_{\text{SCF}}dt = -n_{\text{IL}}^0 d\left(\frac{x}{1-x}\right) \tag{4}
$$

*y*, solubility of organics in SCF (molarity); *x*, solubility of organics in IL (molarity);  $\rho_{SCF}$ , molarity concentration of SCF (mol L<sup>-1</sup>); *Q*SCF, volume flow of SCF (L h−1); *n*IL, moles of IL in extractor; where equilibrium equation is:

$$
\ln y = a + b \ln x \tag{5}
$$

Considering SCF as diluted solution, the extraction solubility of naphthalene–SCF system by Eq. (4) was analyzed and the following correlations for extraction time were acquired.

$$
t = \frac{n_{\text{IL}}^0}{a(1-b)\rho_{\text{SCF}}Q_{\text{SCF}}} (x_0^{1-b} - x_{\text{end}}^{1-b})(b \neq 1)
$$
 (6)

$$
t = \frac{n_{\rm IL}^0}{a\rho_{\rm SCF}Q_{\rm SCF}}(\ln x_0 - \ln x_{\rm end})(b=1)
$$
 (7)

So the extraction of high boiling-point organics from IL is suitable to perform under lower temperature and appropriated pressure. The higher concentration of high boiling-point organics in IL, the higher the extraction solubility, the shorter the time is needed. Suppose the volume of extractor is 200L, which is fed in 100 L [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] with naphthalene mole fraction 0.01 and the extraction conditions for SC  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  are 322 K, 15 MPa. The circulation volume of liquid CO<sub>2</sub> (283 K) *Q* is set to 500 Lh<sup>-1</sup>, mass flow rate is  $500 \times 0.862$  or 431 kg h<sup>-1</sup>, molar flow rate is 9795 mol h<sup>-1</sup>. The density of [bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>] is:  $\rho = a_0 + b_0 \times (T - 60)$ , where  $a_0$  = 1.2799,  $b_0$  = −8.00E−4, T is the temperature in  $\circ$ C. The moles of IL  $n = (1278 \times 100)/288 = 443.8$  mol. The calculated extraction time in hour under different outlet concentrations is shown in Fig. 17. The lower concentration of organics in end extracted IL, the longer the extraction time is necessary. If the outlet concentration of organics needs to be very low, the extraction time would be doubled. When the concentration of naphthalene in outlet IL is  $10^{-3}$ ,  $10^{-4}$  and  $10^{-5}$ , respectively, the corresponding extraction time is 5, 10 and 15 h, and the corresponding circulation solvent to IL molar ratio S/F (mol/mol) are 110, 220 and 330, which are quite high numbers. In contrast,  $C_3H_8$  needs shorter time and lower pressure than  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  to achieve the same end naphthalene concentration. When the extraction temperature is 393 K, the pressure is only 6 MPa. The IL feed quantity and the mole flow rate of  $C_3H_8$  are taken the same



**Fig. 18.** Minimum Solvent to IL flow rate molar ratio as a function of organics concentration in IL feed.

number. The lower of end naphthalene concentration in IL is, the larger of the time gap is between two solvents. Only 2 h are needed for naphthalene in  $[bmin][CF_3SO_3]$  molar fraction to reach 10<sup>-5</sup>. Circulation solvent ratio has a prominent effect on the energy consuming in extraction process. The smaller the ratio, the less energy consuming and high efficiency are. So  $C_3H_8$  is a good alternative if ILs are stable enough around 100 ◦C to perform extraction to reduce the investment of facilities and increase efficiency. But Its higher critical temperature may be not suitable to some ILs with poor thermal stabilities. Regarding its safety issues, petrochemical industry can solve flammable and explosive problems.

#### *5.2. Continuous countercurrent extraction*

The difference between the continuous countercurrent extraction and batch extraction is that the IL and SCFs are continuous flows or not. So the collecting of extract and discharging of IL process can be performed continuously.

The operation equation of continuous countercurrent extraction under given pressure and temperature is:

$$
y = \frac{\rho_{\rm IL} Q_{\rm IL}}{\rho_{\rm SCF} Q_{\rm SCF}} \left( \frac{x}{1 - x} - \frac{x_{\rm out}}{1 - x_{\rm out}} \right)
$$
(8)

where equilibrium equation is same as Eq. (5). Corresponding to a concentration of organic in outlet liquid phase is *x*, the correlation between the minimum solvent to IL flow rate molar ratio and



Fig. 19. Equilibria stage determination of continuous countercurrent SFE by CO<sub>2</sub>.

<span id="page-7-0"></span>the inlet concentration of organic in IL are shown in [Fig. 18.](#page-6-0) The minimum solvent ratio goes up rapidly with rise of inlet organic concentration. Taking naphthalene/[bmim]  $[CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$  as example also, when its molar fraction in outlet IL is required as 10−4, SC  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  is used as extraction solvent under 323 K and 15 MPa, the minimum molar solvent to feed ratio S/F is calculated 47.8. If the operation was carried in S/F 1.3 times to the minimum number, then nine theoretical plates is necessary in the extraction column as shown in [Fig. 19.](#page-6-0) While it is not a big number, from engineering point, it is very difficult or impossible to operate at very high solvent to feed ratio. If  $C_3H_8$  is applied, a reasonable minimum S/F 6.34 is required only and continuous extraction becomes possible.

#### **6. Conclusions**

Pressure does not show obvious influence on long-term stability of two ILs [bmim][PF $_6$ ] and [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] in SCCO<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>. The long-term stability is mainly determined by temperature, which for [bmim][PF<sub>6</sub>] is below 120 °C. While [bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] can be stable at 120 ◦C over 72 h.

 $C_3H_8$  gives a much lower dissolving molarity in [bmim][ $CF_3SO_3$ ] than  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  under the same reduced pressure and the same reduced temperature.

Modified Chrastil association model was extended to ternary system and deduced the equation  $c_A/m_A = d^k \exp((a/T) + b)$  and give a good correlation for the error between the calculated concentration of solute in SC phase. The deviations for  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ –[bmim]  $[CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] - DBT$ ,  $C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub> - [bmin][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>] - DBT$ ,  $CO<sub>2</sub> - [bmin]$  $[CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]$ –naphthalene and  $C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>$ –[bmim][CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>]–naphthalene are 5.0, 6.0, 7.9 and 9.4%, respectively.

Batch SCF extraction may be applied to separate high boiling points organics from ILs with reasonable operating conditions. Because long time and recycle solvent to feed ratio is necessary for using SC CO<sub>2</sub>. SC C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub> could be a good alternative to CO<sub>2</sub> since it shows a very higher solving power for DBT or naphthalene and needs much shorter extraction time. Continuous extraction generally needs very high  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  to feed IL ratio, thus may be not practical. However, continuous extraction of those organics form IL by  $C_3H_8$ is possible.

#### **Acknowledgement**

Financial supports from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 20676150 and No. 20490209) are gratefully acknowledged.

#### **References**

- [1] M. Kosmulski, J. Gustafsson, J.B. Rosenholm, Thermochim. Acta 412 (2004) 47–53.
- [2] J.G. Huddleston, H.D. Willauer, R.P. Swatloski, A.E. Visser, R.D. Rogers, Chem. Commun. 16 (1998) 1765–1766.
- [3] M.J. Earle, K.R. Seddon, P.B. McCormac, Green Chem. 2 (2000) 261–262.
- [4] L.A. Blanchard, D. Hancu, E.J. Beckman, J.F. Brennecke, Nature 399 (1999) 28–29.
- [5] L.A. Blanchard, J.F. Brennecke, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 40 (2001) 287-292.<br>[6] D. Fu, S. Zhao, J. Pu, X. Sun, Prog. Chem. (Chin.) 17 (2005) 793-799.
- [6] D. Fu, S. Zhao, J. Pu, X. Sun, Prog. Chem. (Chin.) 17 (2005) 793–799.
- [7] L.A. Blanchard, Z. Gu, J.F. Brennecke, J. Phys. Chem. B 105 (2001) 2437–2444.
- [8] J.L. Anthony, E.J. Maginn, J.F. Brennecke, J. Phys. Chem. B 106 (2002) 7315–7320. [9] P. Husson-Borg, V. Majer, M.F. Costa Gomes, J. Chem. Eng. Data 48 (2003)
- 480–485.
- [10] D. Camper, P. Scovazzo, C. Koval, R. Noble, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 43 (2004) 3049–3054.
- A. Shariati, C.J. Peters, J. Supercrit. Fluids 25 (2003) 109-117.
- [12] A. Shariati, C.J. Peters, J. Supercrit. Fluids 29 (2004) 43–48.
- [13] A. Shariati, C.J. Peters, J. Supercrit. Fluids 30 (2004) 139–144.
- [14] M. Costantini, V.A. Toussaint, A. Shariati, C.J. Peters, J. Chem. Eng. Data 50 (2005) 52–55.
- [15] M.C. Kroon, A. Shariati, M. Costantini, J. van Spronsen, G.-J. Witkamp, R.A. Sheldon, C.J. Peters, J. Chem. Eng. Data 50 (2005) 173–176.
- [16] A. Perez-Salado Kamps, D. Tuma, J. Xia, G. Maurer, J. Chem. Eng. Data 48 (2003) 746–749.
- [17] J.L. Anthony, J.L. Anderson, E.J. Maginn, J.F. Brennecke, J. Phys. Chem. B 109 (2005) 6366–6374.
- [18] S.N.V.K. Aki, B.R. Mellein, E.M. Saurer, J.F. Brennecke, J. Phys. Chem. B 108 (2004) 20355–20365.
- [19] R.E. Baltus, B.H. Culbertson, S. Dai, H. Luo, D.W. DePaoli, J. Phys. Chem. B 108 (2004) 721–727.
- [20] P. Scovazzo, D. Camper, J. Kieft, J. Poshusta, C. Koval, R. Noble, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 43 (2004) 6855–6860.
- [21] Q. Shi, F. Zheng, C. Li, G. Lu, Z. Wang, J. Chem. Ind. Eng. (Chin.) 56 (2005) 751– 756.
- [22] X. Huang, C.J. Margulis, Y. Li, B.J. Beme, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 127 (2005) 17842–17851.
- [23] M.B. Shiflett, A. Yokozeki, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 44 (2005) 4453–4464;
- C. Cadena, J.L. Anthony, J.K. Shah, T.I. Morrow, J.F. Brennecke, E.J. Maginn, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 126 (2004) 5300–5308.
	- [24] D. Fu, X. Sun, J. Pu, S. Zhao, J. Chem. Eng. Data 51 (2006) 371–375.
	- [25] A.M. Scurto, S.N.V.K. Aki, J.F. Brennecke, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 124 (2002) 10276–10277.
	- [26] A.M. Scurto, S.N.V.K. Aki, J.F. Brennecke, Chem. Commun. 5 (2003) 572–573.<br>[27] V. Naidanovic-Visak, L.P.N. Rebelo, M.N. da Ponte, Green Chem. 7 (20
	- V. Najdanovic-Visak, L.P.N. Rebelo, M.N. da Ponte, Green Chem. 7 (2005) 443–450.
	- [28] Z.F. Zhang, W.Z. Wu, H.X. Gao, B.X. Han, B. Wang, Y. Huang, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 6 (2004) 5051–5055.
	- [29] Z.M. Liu, W.Z. Wu, B.X. Han, Z.X. Dong, G.Y. Zhao, J.Q. Wang, T. Jiang, G.Y. Yang, Chem. Eur. J. 9 (2003) 3897–3903. [30] D.B. Fu, X.W. Sun, Y.H. Qiu, X.H. Jiang, S.Q. Zhao, Fluid Phase Equilib. 251 (2007)
	- 114–120. [31] P. Bonhote, A. Dias, N. Papageorgiou, K. Kalyanasundaram, M. Gratzel, Inorg.
	- Chem. 35 (1996) 1168–1178. [32] J. Dupont, C.S. Consorti, P.A.Z. Suarez, R.F. de Souza, Org. Synth. 79 (2002)
	- 236–241.
	- [33] F.H. Huang, M.H. Li, L.L. Lee, J. Chem. Eng. Jpn. 18 (1985) 490–496.
	- [34] K.E. Starling, Fluid Properties for Light Petroleum Systems, Gulf Publishing Company, 1973.
	- [35] S.G. Kazarian, B.J. Briscoe, T. Welton, Chem. Commun. (2000) 2047–2048.
	- [36] J. Chrastil, J. Phys. Chem. 86 (1982) 3016–3021.