Comparison of ammonia and monoethanolamine solvents to reduce CO$_2$ greenhouse gas emissions

An Chin Yeh, Hsunling Bai*

Institute of Environmental Engineering, National Chiao Tung University, 75, Po-Ai Street, Hsinchu 30039, Taiwan

Received 9 September 1998; accepted 4 January 1999

Abstract

This paper presents experimental results on the evaluation of two reagents, ammonia (NH$_3$) and monoethanolamine (MEA) solvents, for scrubbing carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) greenhouse gas emissions. The scrubbing of CO$_2$ by NH$_3$ solvent is a novel study developed by the authors, and the MEA process is a traditional process for gas purification of removing CO$_2$. The performance of these two solvents are compared in terms of CO$_2$ removal efficiency and absorption capacity. Test results show that both the CO$_2$ removal efficiency and absorption capacity of NH$_3$ solvent are better than those of MEA solvent under the operating conditions conducted in this study. The maximum CO$_2$ removal efficiency by NH$_3$ solvent can achieve 99% and the CO$_2$ absorption capacity can approach 1.20 kg CO$_2$/kg NH$_3$. On the other hand, the maximum CO$_2$ removal efficiency and absorption capacity by MEA solvent are 94% and 0.40 kg CO$_2$/kg MEA, respectively, under the same operating conditions tested by NH$_3$ solvent. Besides, the temperature increases due to exothermal reactions in the NH$_3$ scrubbing process are lower than those in the MEA scrubbing process. This indicates that the energy requirement for the regeneration of NH$_3$ reagent should be less than that for the regeneration of MEA reagent. © 1999 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

The Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (IPCC, 1990) has published a report concluding that human activities result in the production of four gases (carbon dioxide, methane, chlorofluorocarbon and nitrous oxide) which significantly contribute to global warming, and that the global warming caused by increasing emissions of these gases is one of the most serious environmental problems. Among these gases, CO$_2$ has the greatest adverse impact on the observed greenhouse effect causing approximately 55% of the observed global warming (IPCC, 1990). Hence, the reduction of CO$_2$ emissions from the fossil fuel energy systems is considered to be the most urgent to slow down the global warming trend.
Several alternative strategies have been proposed to reduce the emission of CO into the atmosphere. These strategies include fuel alternative, energy conservation and improving power generation efficiencies (Blok et al., 1993; Huang, 1993; Bai and Wei, 1996). However, their implementation may have a limited impact on the emission reduction of CO. Therefore, various end-of-pipe technologies have also been tested to remove and recover CO from flue gas streams. These include chemical solvent absorption, physical adsorption, cryogenic separation, membrane separation, biological fixation as well as the \( \text{O}_2/\text{CO}_2 \) combustion process (Wolsky et al., 1994; Kimura et al., 1995; Nishikawa et al., 1995). Among these techniques, chemical solvent absorption methods have been extensively studied and are considered as a reliable and relatively low cost method for reducing CO emission from fossil fuel power plants (Chakma, 1995).

The MEA scrubbing is so far the most acceptable chemical solvent method to react with CO. The chemical reaction has been described by Kohl and Riesenfeld (1985) and Hendriks et al. (1989):

\[
\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{OH} \text{NH}_2(\text{l}) + \text{CO}_2(\text{g}) + \text{H}_2\text{O}(\text{l}) \leftrightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{OH} \text{NH}_3(\text{aq}) + \text{HCO}_3(\text{aq})
\]

(1)

The MEA scrubbing is widely used in the chemical engineering process of gas purification. However, current practices of applying MEA solvent to remove CO from flue gas have found their limitations (Xu et al., 1991; Molburg et al., 1994): (1) MEA solvent has a low absorption capacity for CO; and (2) the CO absorption capacity of MEA solvent is easily degraded by the presence of SO\(_2\) and O\(_2\) in the flue gas. Oxygen is capable of oxidizing MEA solvent, and SO\(_2\) may react with MEA solvent to form irreversible byproducts thus reducing the reaction rate of the absorption process as well as the MEA solvent CO\(_2\) absorption capacity. Besides, it also makes the solvent more difficult to be recovered. Wolsky et al. (1994) has addressed the problems associated with MEA solvent and suggested that future research efforts should be directed toward developing better solvents for removal of CO\(_2\). An ideal solvent should have at least two desirable characteristics: (1) it has an ideal capacity of one unit weight of CO\(_2\) absorbed per unit weight of solvent; and (2) it can be recovered at a relatively lower temperature to reduce the energy requirement.

Ammonia seems to be an alternative solvent for removing CO\(_2\) from flue gas. This is partly due to that ammonia reagent which has already been used in the De-NO\(_x\) process (such as selective catalytic reduction and selective non-catalytic reduction) in the flue gas systems. The ammonia gas or solvent is also an excellent reagent for removing SO\(_2\) and HCl from waste gas streams (Bai et al., 1994; Bai and Chu, 1997). Therefore, it may be possible using the ammonia reagent to scrub all acid pollutants including the CO\(_2\) greenhouse gas. However, NH\(_3\) scrubbing is a new process for removing CO\(_2\) emissions from flue gas in the environmental engineering field and limited information on its technical as well as economical effectiveness is available. A review of the NH\(_3/\text{CO}_2\) reactions is referred to Bai and Yeh (1997), who conducted a preliminary study of CO\(_2\) removal by NH\(_3\) scrubbing. The results showed that possible reactions between CO\(_2\) and NH\(_3\) solvent in the CO\(_2\) scrubber were:

\[
2\text{NH}_3(\text{l}) + \text{CO}_2(\text{g}) + \text{H}_2\text{O}(\text{l}) \leftrightarrow (\text{NH}_4)_2\text{CO}_3(\text{s})
\]

(2)

\[
\text{NH}_3(\text{l}) + \text{CO}_2(\text{g}) + \text{H}_2\text{O}(\text{l}) \leftrightarrow \text{NH}_4\text{HCO}_3(\text{s})
\]

(3)

It was also found that the crystalline products formed in the CO\(_2\) scrubber should be primarily composed of white NH\(_4\)HCO\(_3\) crystals.

This paper is an extensive study of Bai and Yeh (1997). A semi-continuous flow reactor is used to study the removal of CO\(_2\) using the NH\(_3\) solvent. The CO\(_2\) removal efficiency as well as the CO\(_2\) absorption capacity of NH\(_3\) solvent is evaluated under various operating conditions. A similar study is also performed using the MEA solvent under the same operating conditions. The removal efficiency of CO\(_2\) and the CO\(_2\) absorption capacity of the two solvents are then compared.
2. Experimental method

The schematic diagram of the experimental system for studying the reaction between CO$_2$ and NH$_3$ solvent is shown in Fig. 1. The CO$_2$ absorber was a semi-continuous flow reactor with CO$_2$ gas continuously fed into the absorber, but the absorbent in the absorber was not circulated during each test. Compressed air was passed through a HEPA filter (Gelman Science, Ann Arbor, MI) to remove particulates and then dehumidified by passing it through a silica gel air dryer. The clean air was then served as diluting gas and it was mixed with pure CO$_2$ gas before entering the absorber via a fritted sparger. The CO$_2$ gas was obtained from a pure CO$_2$ cylinder (99.9%). The CO$_2$ absorber was a 60-mm i.d. glass bottle containing 200 ml of NH$_3$ or MEA solvent. The scrubber was approximately 21 cm long. It was installed in a constant temperature controller. Stock solutions of NH$_3$ (FISON, 35% w/w) and MEA (R.D.H., 99% w/w) were diluted using Milli-Q water (Millipore Corp., Bedford, MA) to obtain the desired solvent concentrations. Bai and Yeh (1997) reported that NH$_3$ solvent reacted with CO$_2$ and resulted in the formation of white ammonium bicarbonate solid particles. Since the solid particles would escape and plug the pipe line, a 0.45 µm glass fiber filter (Gelman Sciences, Ann Arbor, MI) was placed after the scrubber to capture the escaping particles.

Concentrations of the gases were controlled using mass flow controllers (MKS Instruments, Inc., Andover, MA). The ZRH model infrared gas analyzer (California Analytical Instruments, Inc., Orange, CA) was used for measuring the CO$_2$ inlet and outlet gas concentrations. The analyzer was capable of detecting CO$_2$ with a concentration range of 0.00–40.00% (v/v). Although the absorber was placed in a constant temperature controller, temperature variations during the reaction were unavoidable due to endothermal–exothermal reactions occurring in the absorber. Hence a temperature sensor was placed at 4 cm above the bottom of the scrubber and the temperatures were continuously recorded during the reactions.

Several operating parameters such as CO$_2$ inlet concentration, total gas flow rate, solvent concentration and operating temperature were systematically varied in order to investigate their influences on the CO$_2$ removal efficiency and absorption capacity of the two solvents. The inlet concentrations of CO$_2$ were from 8.00 to 16.00% (v/v). The total gas flow rates of CO$_2$ and clean air were kept at 2–10 l/min. The solvent concentrations were in the range of 7–35% (w/w). The

Fig. 1. Schematic diagram of the experimental setup.
3. Results and discussion

3.1. Effect of operating time

Fig. 2a shows the change of CO\textsubscript{2} outlet concentrations as a function of operating time by the NH\textsubscript{3} and MEA scrubblings. The absorber was operated at an operating temperature of 25°C, a CO\textsubscript{2} inlet concentration of 8.00% (v/v), a gas flow rate of 2 l/min and solvent concentration of 28% (w/w) for both the NH\textsubscript{3} and MEA solvents. It is seen that the operating time required to
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Fig. 2. The effect of operating time on (a) CO\textsubscript{2} outlet concentration and (b) reaction temperature using NH\textsubscript{3} and MEA solvents. The operating conditions were at CO\textsubscript{2} inlet concentration of 16.00% (v/v), gas flow rate of 2 l/min, solvent concentration of 28% (w/w), and operating temperature of 25°C.
reach a stable and maximum CO\textsubscript{2} removal rate is approximately 1 min for the NH\textsubscript{3} solvent. The CO\textsubscript{2} outlet concentration is 0.46% (v/v) which corresponds to 94% CO\textsubscript{2} removal, and the high CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiency can be maintained over 70 min. However, the CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiency does not reach its maximum value until after 10 min of operation using the MEA solvent. This indicates that the reaction rate of the NH\textsubscript{3} solvent with CO\textsubscript{2} is faster than that of the MEA solvent. Furthermore, the high CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiency by the NH\textsubscript{3} scrubbing is maintained longer than that by the MEA scrubbing. Therefore, using the NH\textsubscript{3} solvent for scrubbing CO\textsubscript{2} from the flue gas provides a wider operating range than by using the MEA solvent.

Although the operating temperature was kept constant, temperature variations in the absorber were unavoidable due to endothermal–exothermal reactions between CO\textsubscript{2} and the absorbents. The temperature variations in the absorber were plotted in Fig. 2b as a function of operating time. The operating conditions were the same as those for Fig. 2a. As can be seen, the temperature variations of NH\textsubscript{3} scrubbing in the absorber decrease initially, and the minimum reaction temperature is 16\degree C. It then gradually increases to its maximum temperature of 26\degree C and decreases until it reaches 25\degree C of its original reaction temperature. However, the temperature variation of MEA scrubbing in the absorber gradually increases to its maximum temperature of 38\degree C, and then decreases to its original controlled temperature of 25\degree C. The results indicate that the CO\textsubscript{2}–NH\textsubscript{3} reactions are a series of endothermal–exothermal reactions. On the other hand, the CO\textsubscript{2}–MEA reaction is typically an exothermal reaction process.

The comparison of CO\textsubscript{2} scrubbing by NH\textsubscript{3} and MEA reagents is further studied in terms of solvent concentration, total gas flow rate, operation temperature, and CO\textsubscript{2} inlet concentration. Because the variations of CO\textsubscript{2} removal in the absorber with respect to operating time for other tests are similar to those shown in Fig. 2a, the following discussion on the CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiency is focused on the comparison of maximum efficiencies of both solvents.

### 3.2. Effect of solvent concentration

In order to compare the performance of the two solvents, the maximum CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiencies using the NH\textsubscript{3} and MEA solvents are shown in Fig. 3a. The operating conditions were at a gas flow rate of 2 l/min, a CO\textsubscript{2} inlet concentration of 16.00% (v/v) and an operating temperature of 25\degree C. It is seen that the maximum CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiencies using the NH\textsubscript{3} solvent are approximately 6–7% higher than that using the MEA solvent. The maximum CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiencies using the NH\textsubscript{3} solvent increase from 48% to 99% for NH\textsubscript{3} solvent concentrations, increase from 7% (w/w) to 35% (w/w). The maximum CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiencies are from 42% to 92% for MEA solvent concentrations range from 7% (w/w) to 35% (w/w).

One can also observe that as the NH\textsubscript{3} and MEA solvent concentrations are greater than 28% (w/w), the increasing rate of CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiency decreases. This is because the CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiencies are already very high. Therefore, it is practical to use 28% (w/w) of solvents concentration for obtaining a high CO\textsubscript{2} removal efficiency.

The curves shown in Fig. 2a are similar to the breakthrough curve as obtained in many sorption tests. The point at which the CO\textsubscript{2} outlet concentration equals to the inlet concentration was selected as the ‘breakthrough point’ for the CO\textsubscript{2} absorption process. When the breakthrough point was reached, the experiment was terminated. The time to reach the breakthrough point for each experiment was different depending on the operating conditions. It varied from 20 min to 3 h. The total quantities of CO\textsubscript{2} removal were calculated via the breakthrough curves, and the CO\textsubscript{2} absorption capacity expressed in kg CO\textsubscript{2}/kg solvent was obtained.

The comparison of CO\textsubscript{2} absorption capacity as functions of NH\textsubscript{3} and MEA solvent concentrations is shown in Fig. 3b. It is seen that the influence of solvent concentration on the CO\textsubscript{2} absorption capacity using the NH\textsubscript{3} solvent is more than that using the MEA solvent. The CO\textsubscript{2} absorption capacity of NH\textsubscript{3} solvent decreases with increasing the NH\textsubscript{3} solvent concentration. It is
1.20 kg CO$_2$/kg NH$_3$ for the NH$_3$ solvent concentration of 7% (w/w). And for the NH$_3$ solvent concentration of 35% (w/w) the measured CO$_2$ absorption capacity is 0.85 kg CO$_2$/kg NH$_3$. The CO$_2$ absorption capacity of NH$_3$ solvent is close to or even exceeds that of an ideal solvent as proposed by Wolsky et al. (1994). On the contrary, the CO$_2$ absorption capacity of MEA solvent is almost not affected by the solvent concentration. They are approximately 0.38–0.36 kg CO$_2$/kg MEA for MEA solvent concentrations range from 7% to 35% (w/w). These values are similar to those measured by Jou et al. (1995) and Shen and Li (1992), who obtained the CO$_2$ absorption capacity of 0.36 kg CO$_2$/kg MEA. Based on the results obtained in this study, the mass
basis CO₂ absorption capacity of NH₃ solvent was 2.4–3.2 times of that of the MEA solvent. The purchase price for industrial grade NH₃ solvent is approximately one-sixth of that for the MEA solvent at the same weight basis in the world market (Kohl and Riesenfeld, 1985; Handbook of Fine Chemicals, 1996). On the other hand, the MEA solvent is the most economical reagent among all alkanolamines from the cost of reagent. Therefore, it is economical using the NH₃ solvent as a scrubbing reagent.

Fig. 4a,b demonstrates plots of temperature variations in the absorber with respect to operating time using the NH₃ and MEA solvents, respectively. As can be seen in Fig. 4a, if the NH₃ solvent concentration is lower than 21% (w/w),
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Fig. 4. The effects of solvent concentration on (a) NH₃ and (b) MEA temperature variations. The operating conditions were at CO₂ inlet concentration of 16.00% (v/v), total gas flow rate of 2 l/min, and operating temperature of 25°C.
the CO$_2$–NH$_3$ reactions in the absorber appear to be an exothermic reaction process. However, if the NH$_3$ solvent concentration is greater than 28% (w/w), the CO$_2$–NH$_3$ reactions are a series of endothermic–exothermic reactions. And the maximum temperatures using the NH$_3$ solvent increase with increasing solvent concentrations. The reason for the effect of NH$_3$ solvent concentration on the endothermic–exothermic reaction is not well understood at the present time. On the other hand, it is seen from Fig. 4b that the CO$_2$–MEA reaction occurring in the absorber is clearly an exothermic reaction. The maximum temperatures using the MEA solvent increase with increasing the solvent concentration. One can also observe that the maximum temperatures for MEA solvent are higher than those for NH$_3$ solvent. For example, the maximum temperature using 35% (w/w) MEA solvent is approximately 50°C, while it is less than 40 using 35% (w/w) NH$_3$ solvent. The high temperature indicates that the heat released in the MEA scrubbing process will require more heat during regeneration. As a result, the energy requirement for the whole scrubbing–regeneration process should be higher for the MEA process as compared to the NH$_3$ process.

3.3. Effect of total gas flow rate

Fig. 5a shows the effect of total gas flow rate on the CO$_2$ removal efficiency. The gas flow rates evaluated in this study were in the range of 2–10 l/min, corresponding to gas residence times of 6.0–1.2 s. The definition of gas residence time is the solvent volume divided by the gas flow rate. The CO$_2$ inlet concentration was 16.00% (v/v), the operating temperature was 25°C and the solvent concentration was 28% (w/w). It was observed that the maximum CO$_2$ removal efficiencies using the NH$_3$ solvent decrease from 97% to 72% for gas flow rates increase from 2 to 10 l/min. And the maximum CO$_2$ removal efficiencies decrease from 92% to 62% using the MEA solvent.

Fig. 5b shows the effect of the gas flow rate on the CO$_2$ absorption capacity of NH$_3$ and MEA solvents. It was also observed that the gas flow rate has a slight influence on the CO$_2$ absorption capacities of NH$_3$ and MEA solvents. The CO$_2$ absorption capacity of either the NH$_3$ or the MEA solvent decreases with increasing the gas flow rate. The absorption capacities for the NH$_3$ and MEA solvents are 0.90–0.76 kg CO$_2$/kg NH$_3$ and 0.38–0.26 kg CO$_2$/kg MEA, respectively, for gas flow rates from 2 to 10 l/min. The difference between the observed absorption capacities for the NH$_3$ and MEA solvents can be as high as 2.9 times under the same gas flow rate.

The effects of gas flow rate on the temperature variations in the absorber with respect to the operating time for the CO$_2$–NH$_3$ and CO$_2$–MEA reactions were similar to Fig. 4a,b. The CO$_2$–NH$_3$ reactions are also a series of endothermic–exothermic reactions, while the CO$_2$–MEA reactions are exothermic reactions. The maximum temperatures for both the NH$_3$ and MEA scrubbings increase as the total gas flow rate increases.

3.4. Effect of operating temperature

Fig. 6a shows the comparison of maximum CO$_2$ removal efficiencies using the NH$_3$ and MEA solvents under different operating temperatures. The inlet CO$_2$ gas as well as the original reagent solvents were kept at the operating temperature. However, the temperature in the reactor was changed due to exothermic–endothermic reactions. The CO$_2$ inlet concentration was 16.00% (v/v), the solvent concentration was 28% (w/w) and the gas flow rate was 2 l/min. As can be seen, increasing the operating temperature tends to increase the CO$_2$ removal efficiency. The CO$_2$ removal efficiencies using the NH$_3$ solvent are 92–99% for operating temperatures of 10–40°C. And the CO$_2$ removal efficiencies using MEA solvent are 88–94% for operating temperatures of 10–40°C.

Comparative results of the influence of operating temperature on the CO$_2$ absorption capacities of NH$_3$ and MEA solvents are shown in Fig. 6b. It is observed that the operating temperature has a slight influence on the CO$_2$ absorption capacity of MEA solvent. The absorption capacities of MEA solvent are approximately 0.35–0.40 kg CO$_2$/kg MEA for operating temperatures range from 10 to 40°C. However, the CO$_2$ absorp-
Fig. 5. The effects of gas flow rate on (a) CO₂ removal efficiency and (b) solvent absorption capacity. The operating conditions were at CO₂ inlet concentration of 16.00% (v/v), solvent concentration of 28% (w/w), and operating temperature of 25°C.

The effects of operating temperature on the temperature variations in the absorber with respect to operating time using the NH₃ and MEA solvents were similar to Fig. 4a,b. The CO₂–NH₃ reaction at 10°C of operating temperature is an exothermic reaction. However, the CO₂–NH₃ reactions at 20–40°C of operating temperatures are endothermic–exothermic reactions. And the
CO$_2$–MEA reactions at 10–40°C of operating temperatures are exothermal reactions.

3.5. Effect of CO$_2$ inlet concentration

The effect of CO$_2$ inlet concentration was also studied. However, the effects of CO$_2$ inlet concentration on the CO$_2$ removal efficiency as well as the CO$_2$ absorption capacity were not significant, so the results were not shown in this study. The maximum CO$_2$ removal efficiencies by the NH$_3$ scrubbing are 94–97%. While by the MEA scrubbing the maximum CO$_2$ removal efficiencies are 88–92% for the CO$_2$ concentration ranges
from 8.00 to 16.00% (v/v). The CO$_2$ absorption capacities of NH$_3$ and MEA solvents are relatively constants and they are approximately 0.90 kg CO$_2$/kg NH$_3$ and 0.38 kg CO$_2$/kg MEA, respectively, for CO$_2$ inlet concentrations of 8.00–16.00% (v/v). The calculated CO$_2$ absorption capacity of NH$_3$ solvent is about 2.4 times that of the MEA solvent.

3.6. Environmental impact of NH$_4$HCO$_3$ byproduct

A massive reaction product may be produced by the NH$_3$ process. This can be resolved by an installation of a regeneration system. In addition, since a large amount of NH$_3$ is required for the NH$_3$ scrubbing process to reduce CO$_2$ emission, decomposition of the reaction product to regenerate NH$_3$ and CO$_2$ gas is desired. A proper design of the regeneration system can separate the NH$_3$ and CO$_2$ gases. The regenerated NH$_3$ gas (or liquid) can be used again in the NH$_3$ scrubber and as a reagent for the selective catalytic reduction process for removing the NO$_x$ air pollutant. The regenerated CO$_2$ gas is in a pure state and can be used in many chemical plants.

Besides, if regeneration of the reaction product is not desirable, the NH$_4$HCO$_3$ product can be used as a source of fertilizer (Grayson and Eckroth, 1992). However, three problems may exist for NH$_4$HCO$_3$ as a fertilizer in the soil. First, according to the material safety data sheet (MSDS) (Material Safety Data Sheet, 1996), the byproduct (NH$_4$HCO$_3$) is slightly hazardous, but it does not have a significant influence on the soil. Second, the leaching of ammonia to ground water may also be possible. The ammonium bicarbonate decomposes at approximately 38–60°C (Shale et al., 1971; Grayson and Eckroth, 1992), dissociating into ammonia, carbon dioxide, and water. Rate of decomposition increases as temperature rises. However, it does not decompose at temperatures below 27°C (Grayson and Eckroth, 1992). In general, the temperature of soil is below 40°C (Tisdale et al., 1990). Therefore, there is little possibility of production of ammonia in that case if ammonium bicarbonate was used as a fertilizer in the soil. Besides, the soil has a pronounced capacity for adsorbing ammonia gas, the ability of leaching is greatly decreased (Tisdale et al., 1990).

Finally, although ammonium bicarbonate has a definite fertilizing value, it cannot compete with other ammonium compounds if it is used as a fertilizer due to nitrogen content in the product (NH$_4$HCO$_3$) being quite low (18% N) as compared with urea (45% N) (Tisdale et al., 1990; Grayson and Eckroth, 1992). Therefore, ammonium bicarbonate is not an ideal source of fertilizer from an economical point of view. However, from the view of recycling materials, ammonium bicarbonate, as a source of fertilizer should be feasible. Besides, ammonium bicarbonate can also be used as fire extinguishers, dyes, and a scale-removing compound, etc. (Grayson and Eckroth, 1992).

4. Conclusions

This study performed comparative tests on the NH$_3$ and MEA solvents to reduce CO$_2$ greenhouse gas emissions. The tests showed that the NH$_3$ solvent is superior to MEA solvent in its capacity to absorb and remove CO$_2$ from flue gas systems. The CO$_2$ removal efficiency for the NH$_3$ solvent could be as high as 99% under proper operating conditions. And the CO$_2$ absorption capacity of NH$_3$ scrubbing could be over 1.0 kg CO$_2$/kg NH$_3$. On the other hand, the maximum CO$_2$ removal efficiency and absorption capacity using the MEA solvent are 94% and 0.40 kg CO$_2$/kg MEA, respectively. Besides, the rise in temperature in the NH$_3$ scrubber is less than that in the MEA scrubber. This implies that if regeneration of the absorbent is desired, the regeneration heat required for the NH$_3$ process should be less than that for the MEA process.

Although, the experimental results have shown that the potential for removing CO$_2$ via NH$_3$ scrubbing is very promising, however, there are also potential problems for the NH$_3$ scrubbing process. The NH$_3$ and white crystalline NH$_4$HCO$_3$ may evaporate and exit into the atmosphere from the NH$_3$ scrubbing. Therefore, it is possible for the formation of visible plume in the flue gases. However, because the NH$_3$ gas
and NH$_4$HCO$_3$ are very soluble in water (Perry and Green, 1984; Grayson and Eckroth, 1992), the unreacted NH$_3$ which is known as NH$_3$ slipped and escaped the NH$_4$HCO$_3$ crystalline and in the process can be minimized by the installation of a washwater mist eliminator at the top section of the scrubber.

In addition, the NH$_3$ scrubbing process is most feasible near room temperature (Kohl and Riesenfeld, 1985; Bai and Yeh, 1997). Therefore, the flue gas will have to be quenched before it enters the scrubbing system, and the exit gas temperature will be too low to produce buoyancy. As a result, a reheater may be required after scrubbing. The cooling and the reheat of the flue gas can be done by a heat exchanger to reduce the energy cost.

The impurities, such as SO$_2$ in the flue gases, degrades the absorbent function of amine. According to Steinberg (1984), MEA forms an insoluble non-regenerable salt together with SO$_2$. Although SO$_2$ can also react with the ammonia solution to form (NH$_4$)$_2$SO$_4$ products (Bai, 1992). However, the reaction is reversible and equilibrium is reached in a very short time. A proper design of the ammonia scrubbing process can, in fact, remove all acid gases in the flue gas. This is the motivation that leads the authors to develop the ammonia scrubbing process for CO control.

Besides, the NH$_3$–SO$_2$ reaction product is also a source of fertilizer. The quality of NH$_4$SO as a fertilizer is better than that of NH$_4$HCO$_3$ (Bai, 1992).

Future work must be conducted to test the feasibility of NH$_3$ scrubbing for CO$_2$ removal from stack gas using a continuous flow reactor. Once the feasibility of the CO$_2$ removal system is proved, it will provide another route for efficient control of CO$_2$ emissions from utility and industrial boilers.
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