Kinetic analysis of non-isothermal calcination TG curves of natural Turkish dolomites

Ayşegül Ersoy-Meriçboyu * and Sadriye Küçükbayrak

Istanbul Technical University, Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering Faculty, 80626 Maslak, Istanbul (Turkey)

(Received 3 May 1993; accepted 2 June 1993)

Abstract

Calcination kinetics of six dolomite samples originating from different parts of Turkey were investigated by using the non-isothermal thermogravimetry technique. Calcination TG curves of samples were obtained under two different atmospheres of (1) pure nitrogen and (2) a mixture consisting of 15 vol.% CO₂ and 85 vol.% dry air, by using a constant heating rate of 10 K min⁻¹. Kinetic analysis of the curves was achieved by applying four different methods of calculation; also, 14 different model equations of possible solid-state rate controlling mechanisms were considered. Arrhenius parameters *E* and *A* and the model function $f(\alpha)$ that best describes the reaction mechanism were evaluated for the decomposition reactions of both MgCO₃ and CaCO₃ components of samples. A computer program in BASIC which enables regression analysis to be carried out was used to obtain kinetic results from experimental non-isothermal TG data. It was observed that besides differences in the chemical composition of samples, gaseous atmosphere and the method of calculation influenced the results obtained.

INTRODUCTION

According to the heating curves recorded between 293 and 1273 K the thermal decomposition of dolomite occurs in two main steps; the first mass loss corresponds to the decomposition of $MgCO_3$ (eqn. (1)) and the second step is attributed to the decomposition of $CaCO_3$ (eqn. (2)) [1]

$$MgCO_3 \cdot CaCO_3(s) + heat \rightleftharpoons MgO \cdot CaCO_3(s) + CO_2(g)$$
(1)

$$MgO \cdot CaCO_{3}(s) + heat \rightleftharpoons MgO \cdot CaO(s) + CO_{2}(g)$$
(2)

In recent years thermoanalytical methods have been widely used to study the kinetics of various solid state decomposition reactions. Kinetic studies can be carried out with a simple and rapid experimental procedure by using the non-isothermal thermogravimetry technique [2]. Several computation

^{*} Corresponding author.

methods have been presented in the literature which utilize non-isothermal TG data to obtain kinetic information [3-10].

Generally the rate of mass loss for a decomposition reaction is described by the equation

$$d\alpha/dt = kf(\alpha) \tag{3}$$

where α is the degree of conversion, t is the time, k is the reaction rate constant and $f(\alpha)$ is the conversion function which depends on the reaction mechanism. The temperature T dependence of the reaction rate constant can be given by the Arrhenius equation

$$k = A \exp(-E/RT) \tag{4}$$

$$T = T_0 + bt \tag{5}$$

where A and E are the pre-exponential factor and apparent activation energy, respectively, R is the gas constant and b is the linear heating rate. By combining the above expressions the general non-isothermal kinetic equation

$$\left[(\mathrm{d}\alpha/\mathrm{d}T)/f(\alpha) \right] = (A/b) \exp(-E/RT) \tag{6}$$

is obtained. Most of the existing methods used to evaluate non-isothermal kinetic parameters are based on this general equation (eqn. (6)).

In the present work, kinetic analysis of the calcination TG curves of six natural Turkish dolomites was achieved by using computational techniques. The non-isothermal thermogravimetry technique was employed to obtain the calcination TG curves of the samples.

EXPERIMENTAL

Thermogravimetric experiments of samples were performed by using a Shimadzu TG 41 thermal analyser. The initial mass and particle size of samples used in the measurements were about 100 mg and $<250 \,\mu$ m, respectively. The experiments were carried out from room temperature to 1223 K with a programmed heating rate of 10 K min⁻¹. Pure N₂ and a mixture consisting of 15 vol.% CO₂ and 85 vol.% dry air were used as gaseous atmospheres. The flow rate of gases was maintained at a constant rate of 40 cm³ min⁻¹ throughout the measurements. Calcination TG curves were traced by using a chart speed of 2.5 mm min⁻¹.

In order to determine the chemical composition of dolomite samples ASTM standards [11] were followed and the results are presented in Table 1.

Sample code	CaO	MgO	Fe ₂ O ₃	SiO ₂	Al ₂ O ₃
D 01	36.02	14.66	0.60	2.67	1.40
D 02	32.50	16.87	0.17	4.97	0.97
D 03	31.85	19.21	0.36	1.16	0.36
D 04	31.52	19.87	0.12	0.64	0.26
D 05	20.30	22.60	0.25	13.30	1.90
D 06	30.04	19.22	0.32		1.23

TABLE 1

Chemical	analysis	in	%	of	the	dolomite	samples
~	Constant i Ono			~			

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Four different computational methods which are given below were used to evaluate the kinetic results from the calcination TG curves: (1) Method I, Coats-Redfern [5]; (2) Method II, Horowitz-Metzger [4]; (3) Method III, Dharwadkar-Karkhanavala [9] and (4) Method IV, Doyle [3] modified by Zsakó [10].

According to the general non-isothermal kinetic equation (eqn. (6)) a plot of $\ln[(d\alpha/dT)/f(\alpha)]$ versus 1/T should give a straight line if the appropriate $f(\alpha)$ function is selected. Arrhenius parameters (*E* and *A*) can be obtained from the slope and intercept, respectively after the selection of $f(\alpha)$ function is satisfied. In this study, 14 different kinetic models were tested to determine the most appropriate mechanism describing the calcination reactions. Table 2 lists these models with their corresponding $f(\alpha)$ and $[g(\alpha) = \int d\alpha/f(\alpha)]$ expressions.

The determination of the non-isothermal kinetic parameters for the decomposition reactions (eqns. (1) and (2)) were carried out by using a BASIC computer program. The experimental data such as constant heating rate, initial and final sample masses, initial and final reaction temperatures and $\alpha - T$ data derived from TG curves were used as input parameters for the computer programme.

The $f(\alpha)$ functions which provide a resonably good fitting to the experimental data were chosen as those which give the highest correlation coefficient for methods I, II and III and give the lowest standard deviation for method IV.

Tables 3 and 4 summarize the calculated kinetic parameters for the first step decomposition (eqn. (1)) reactions carried out in N_2 and dry air + CO₂ atmospheres, respectively.

Similarly, the kinetic parameters determined for the second step decomposition (eqn. (2)) in N_2 and dry air + CO₂ atmospheres are shown in Tables 5 and 6, respectively.

TABLE 2 Model equations used	in the kinetic analysis [12–14]		
Model	Mechanism	Differential function $f(\alpha)$	Integral function $g(\alpha) = \int d\alpha / f(\alpha)$
(1) First-order eqn. $(n = 1)$	Chemical reaction	$(1-\alpha)$	$-\ln(1-\alpha)$
(2) Zero-order eqn. $(n = 0)$	Chemical reaction		a 2010-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-
(3) Une-third order eqn. $(n = 1/3)$ (4) One-half order eqn. $(n = 1/2)$	Chemical reaction Chemical reaction	$\frac{(1-\alpha)^{1/2}}{(1-\alpha)^{1/2}}$	$(3/2)[1-(1-\alpha)^{1/2}]$ $2[1-(1-\alpha)^{1/2}]$
(5) Two-thirds order eqn. (n = 2/3)	Chemical reaction	$(1-\alpha)^{23}$	$3[1-(1-\alpha)^{1/3}]$
(6) Second-order eqn. $(n = 2)$	Chemical reaction	$(1-lpha)^2$	$-[1-(1-\alpha)^{-1}]$
(7) Phase boundary controlled	Contracting geometry (cylindrical	$2(1-\alpha)^{1/2}$	$1 - (1 - \alpha)^{1/2}$
reaction	symmetry) (K2)		
(8) Phase boundary controlled reaction	Contracting geometry (spherical symmetry) (R3)	$3(1-\alpha)^{2/3}$	$1 - (1 - \alpha)^{1/3}$
(9) Avrami-Erofeev ean.	Random nucleation and growth of	$2(1-\alpha)[-\ln(1-\alpha)]^{1/2}$	$[-\ln(1-\alpha)]^{1/2}$
	nuclei $(n=2)$ $(A2)$		
(10) Avrami-Erofeev eqn.	Random nucleation and growth of nuclei $(n = 3)$ (A3)	$3(1-\alpha)[-\ln(1-\alpha)]^{2/3}$	$[-\ln(1-\alpha)]^{1/3}$
(11) Avrami-Erofcev eqn.	Random nucleation and growth of nuclei $(n = 4)$ (A4)	$4(1-\alpha)[-\ln(1-\alpha)]^{3/4}$	$\left[-\ln(1-lpha) ight]^{1/4}$
(12) Valensi-Barrer eqn.	Two-dimensional diffusion (D2)	$(-\ln(1-\alpha))^{-1}$	$\frac{\alpha+(1-\alpha)\ln(1-\alpha)}{1000000000000000000000000000000000000$
(13) Jander eqn.	I hree-dimensional diffusion (spherical symmetry) (D3)	$(3/2)(1-\alpha)^{-1}[1-(1-\alpha)^{-1}]$	$[1-(1-\alpha)^{m}]^{2}$
(14) Grinstling-Brounshtein eqn.	Three-dimensional diffusion	$(3/2)[(1-\alpha)^{-1/3}-1]^{-1}$	$[1-(2/3)\alpha]-(1-\alpha)^{2/3}$
	(chunuicai shumeny) (that)		

mosphere
N ₂ at
Е.
nites
dolor
of
decomposition
thermal
st step
fir
the
for
ters
arame
netic p
Kii
с Ш
ABLI

IADLE		c param		i litst step 1	Inermal	decomposit	TOD TO HOL	omites it	1 N ₂ atmosp	here		
Sample	Coats-Re	dfern		Horowitz-1	Metzger		Dharwadk	ar-Karkha	navala	Doyle-Mod	lified by Zs	ako
	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	log(A/ s ⁻¹)	$f(\alpha)$	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	log(A/ s ⁻¹)	<i>f</i> (α)	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	$f(\alpha)$	E/ kJ mol ^{~1}	log(A/ s ⁻¹)	f(a)
D 01	139.65	3.53	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	172.73	6.16	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	194.74 152.03	7.32	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	142.29	6.83	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$
D03	20.202 171.29	0.20 4.35	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$ $(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	202.40	7.88	$(1 - \alpha) = 1$ $(1 - \alpha)^0 = 1$	223.30 223.30	6.98 8.98	$(1 - \alpha) = 1$ $(1 - \alpha)^0 = 1$	259.47 184.14	6.16 9.16	$(1-\alpha) = 1$ $(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$
D 04	316.42	7.99	$(1-\alpha)^2$	338.67	15.21	$(1 - \alpha)^2$	245,96	10.31	$(1-\alpha)^2$	322.25	16.77	$(1-\alpha)^2$
D 05	127.45	3.17	D2	77.92	1.24	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	116.74	3.43	$(1-\alpha)^0=1$	133.92	6.27	D2
D 06	214.69	5.37	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	251.22	10.20	$(1-\alpha)^n = 1$	260.85	10.69	$(1-\alpha)^0=1$	221.81	11.03	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$
TABLE	4 Kineti	c parame	sters for the	first step t	thermal	decomposit	ion of dok	omites in	$1 \text{ CO}_2 + \text{dry}$	air atmosp	here	
Sample code	Coats-Rec	lfern		Horowitz-A	Metzger		Dharwadki	ar-Karkhaı	navala	Doyle-Mod	lified by Zs	ako
rone	E/	$\log(A)$	f(α)	E/	log(A/	f(a)	E/	log(A/	f(α)	E/	$\log(A)$	f(a)

		hai aiik		ווואו אוכף ו		neconhosin				au aunosp	nere	
Sample	Coats-Redi	fern		Horowitz-N	fetzger		Dharwadka	r-Karkha	navala	Doyle-Mod	ified by Z	sako
200	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	log(A/ s ⁻¹)	$f(\alpha)$	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	<i>f</i> (α)	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	f(α)	E/ kJ mol ^{~1}	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	f(a)
D 01	276.48	7.07	$(1-\alpha)^2$	302.64	13.51	$(1-\alpha)^2$	237.47	10.02	$(1-\alpha)^2$	284.58	14.87	$(1-\alpha)^2$
D 02	347.04	8.71	$(1-\alpha)^2$	353.32	16.38	$(1-\alpha)^2$	269.20	11.85	$(1-\alpha)^2$	380.84	19.86	$(1-\alpha)^2$
D 03	327.61	8.23	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	361.07	16.51	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	323.93	14.54	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	334.80	17.38	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$
D 04	408.54	14.25	$(1-\alpha)^2$	423.36	24.04	$(1-\alpha)^2$	285.62	16.68	$(1-\alpha)^2$	435.24	26.95	$(1-\alpha)^2$
D 05	99.41	2.81	$(1-\alpha)^2$	119.09	3.66	$(1-\alpha)^2$	194.89	7.87	$(1-\alpha)^2$	117.18	6.24	$(1-\alpha)^2$
D 06	435.03	10.68	$(1-\alpha)^2$	446.41	20.84	$(1-\alpha)^2$	272.39	11.70	$(1-\alpha)^2$	477.09	24.67	$(1-\alpha)^2$

omites in N ₂ atmosphere
dob
of
decomposition
nal
thern
step
second
the
leters for
ic param
Kinet
TABLE 5

Sample	Coats-Red	lfern		Horowitz-A	Aetzger		Dharwadk	ar-Karkha	ınavala	Doyle-Mod	ified by Z	sako
cone	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	log(A/ s ⁻¹)	f(a)	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	f(a)	<i>E/</i> kJ mol ⁻¹	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	f(a)	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	log(A/ s ⁻¹)	f(a)
D 01	122.59	3.12	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	145.49	4.08	$\left(1-\alpha\right)^{0}=1$	110.40	2.34	$(1-\alpha)^0=1$	125.55	5.98	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$
D 02	156.32	4.00	$(1-\alpha)^{1/2}$	172.86	5.62	$(1-\alpha)^{1/2}$	130.40	3.49	$(1-\alpha)^{1/2}$	159.03	7.83	$(1-\alpha)^{1/2}$
D 03	276.63	6.55	D2	304.75	11.83	D2	220.13	7.76	D2	276.21	13.20	D2
D 04	254.54	6.10	D2	281.55	10.87	D2	213.30	7.55	D2	255.29	12.28	D2
D 05	197.35	4.60	D4	219.40	70.T	D4	130.40	3.52	D4	196.69	8.92	D4
D 06	361.52	8.10	D4	202.36	6.96	$(1-\alpha)^{1/2}$	143.00	4.04	$(1-\alpha)^{1/2}$	364.10	16.76	D4

ohere
air atmos
dry a
-2^{+}
Ы
č
SĽ
dolomite
Ť
position c
I decom
thermal
step
second
r the
s fo
c parameter
Kineti
ABLE 6
Г

		1			1				. 700	unn un fr		
Sample	Coats-Red	lfern		Horowitz-A	detzger		Dharwadka	r-Karkha	navala	Doyle-Modi	ified by Z	sako
	<i>E/</i> kJ mol ⁻¹	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	$f(\alpha)$	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	$f(\alpha)$	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	log(A/ s ⁻¹)	f(a)	E/ kJ mol ⁻¹	$\log(A/s^{-1})$	f(a)
D 01	137.55	3.43	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	163.62	4.78	$(1-\alpha)^0=1$	116.82	2.52	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$	138.11	6.50	$(1-\alpha)^0 = 1$
D 02	283.51	6.49	D2	311.56	11.85	D2	236.80	8.33	D2	284.58	13.13	D2
D 03	278.47	6.45	D2	307.18	11.66	D2	216.77	7.39	D2	280.40	13.08	D2
D 04	295.75	6.80	D2	321.93	12.39	D2	230.48	8.07	D2	297.14	13.83	D2
D 05	236.88	5.99	$(1-\alpha)^2$	253.87	9.46	$(1-\alpha)^2$	155.58	4.66	$(1-\alpha)^2$	242.73	12.32	$(1-\alpha)^2$
D 06	309.70	7.10	D2	338.73	13.10	D2	231.60	8.06	D2	313.88	14.62	D2
A CONTRACT OF A CONTRACT OF												

The kinetic results obtained for the first step thermal decomposition of samples (Tables 3 and 4) indicate that there are marked variations in the value of Arrhenius parameters (*E* and *A*) depending on sample properties, gaseous atmosphere and the method of calculation. However the selected kinetic models $[f(\alpha)]$ are only strongly affected by calcination gaseous atmosphere. Although the $f(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha)^0 = 1$ and $f(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha)^2$ model equations were selected most often for the first step decomposition reactions of samples in N₂ and dry air + CO₂ atmospheres, respectively; other equations which are $(1 - \alpha)^2$, $[-\ln(1 - \alpha)]^{-1}$ for N₂ and $(1 - \alpha)^0 = 1$ for dry air + CO₂ atmospheres were indicated as well. These slight variations can be attributed to the sample properties and the method of calculation.

It is clear from the results presented in Tables 5 and 6 that gaseous atmosphere, method of calculation and sample properties influenced the kinetic parameter values obtained for the second step decomposition reactions of samples. For the reactions which were carried out in N₂ atmosphere the variation of the best fitting expressions $[f(\alpha)]$ depending on sample properties was found to be the same when methods I and IV used; the $f(\alpha)$ functions determined with methods II and III also showed the same variation for all samples except D 06 (Table 5). The model equations of $f(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha)^n$ (n = 0.5, 0); $f(\alpha) = [-\ln(1 - \alpha)]^{-1}$ and $f(\alpha) = (3/2)[(1 - \alpha)^{-1/3} - 1]^{-1}$ were determined as best fitting expressions.

The results given in Table 6 indicate that the mechanisms of the reactions carried out in dry air + CO₂ atmosphere can be described by three different kinetic equations of $(1 - \alpha)^0 = 1$, $[-\ln(1 - \alpha)]^{-1}$ and $(1 - \alpha)^2$ depending on sample properties.

If we compare the calculated Arrhenius parameter values of both first and second step decomposition reactions of samples in two different atmospheres (Tables 3–6) it can be concluded that parameters are affected by the partial pressure of the gaseous product of reactions. Generally there is an increase in E values with increasing partial pressure of CO_2 in furnace atmosphere. This increase is due to the reversible nature of the reactions. An increment in the value of E is balanced by a corresponding increase in A. This linear relationship between E and A (the kinetic compensation effect) has been pointed out in the literature by several researchers [15–18]. The results reported in this work are in agreement with this effect.

REFERENCES

- 1 T. Takats and M. Boros, Silikattechnik, 14 (1963) 3.
- 2 W.W. Wendlandt, Thermal Analysis, 3rd edn., John Wiley, New York, 1986, pp. 57-83.
- 3 C.D. Doyle, Nature, 207 (1965) 290.
- 4 H.H. Horowitz and G. Metzger, A new analysis of thermogravimetric traces, Anal. Chem., 35 (1963) 1464–1468.

- 5 A.W. Coats and J.P. Redfern, Kinetic parameters from thermogravimetric data, Nature, 201 (1964) 68.
- 6 B.N.N. Archer, G.W. Brindley and J.H. Sharp, Proc. Int. Clay Conf., 1 (1966) 67.
- 7 J.H. Sharp and S.A. Wentworth, Kinetic analysis of thermogravimetric data, Anal. Chem., 41 (1969) 2060-2062.
- 8 E.S. Freeman and B. Carroll, The application of thermo-analitical techniques to reaction kinetics: the thermo-gravimetric evaluation of the kinetics of the decomposition of calcium oxalate monohydrate, J. Phys. Chem., 62 (1958) 394-397.
- 9 S.R. Dharwadkar and M.D. Karkhanavala, Calculation of activation energy of decomposition reactions from thermogravimetric analysis, in R.F. Schwenker, Jr. and P.D. Garn (Eds.), Thermal Analysis, Vol. II, Academic Press, New York, 1969, pp. 1049-1059.
- 10 J. Zsako, J. Therm. Anal., 8 (1975) 593.
- 11 Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Part 13, 1977, Method C-25-72.
- 12 T.P. Bagchi and P.K. Sen, Combined differential and integral method for analysis of non-isothermal kinetic data, Thermochim. Acta, 51 (1981) 175-189.
- 13 J.M. Criado, A. Ortega and F. Gotor, Correlation between the shape of controlled-rate thermal analysis curves and the kinetics of solid-state reactions, Thermochim. Acta, 157 (1990) 171-179.
- 14 O. Carp and E. Segal, BASIC program to discriminate among mechanisms of solid-gas decomposition, Thermochim. Acta, 185 (1991) 111-127.
- 15 P.K. Galagher and D.W. Johnson, Jr., Kinetics of the thermal decomposition of CaCO₃ in CO₂ and some observations on the kinetic compensation effect, Thermochim. Acta, 14 (1976) 255-261.
- 16 J. Zsako and H.E. Arz, Kinetic analysis of thermogravimetric data VII. Thermal decomposition of calcium carbonate, J. Therm. Anal., 6 (1974) 651-656.
- 17 P.D. Garn, An examination of the kinetic compensation effect, J. Therm. Anal., 7 (1975) 475-478.
- 18 A.E. Mericboyu, S. Küçükbayrak and B. Durus, Evaluation of kinetic parameters of natural Turkish limestones from their thermogravimetric curves using a computer program, J. Therm. Anal., 39 (1993) 707-714.