

**DECOMPOSITION OF SULFUR TRIOXIDE
OVER MIXED METAL OXIDE CATALYSTS IN
THE SULFUR–IODINE CYCLE FOR
HYDROGEN PRODUCTION**

SACHIN TOMAR



**DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
DECEMBER 2022**

DECOMPOSITION OF SULFUR TRIOXIDE OVER MIXED METAL OXIDE CATALYSTS IN THE SULFUR–IODINE CYCLE FOR HYDROGEN PRODUCTION

by

SACHIN TOMAR

Department of Chemical Engineering

Submitted

in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

DECEMBER 2022

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled “**Decomposition of Sulfur Trioxide over Mixed Metal Oxide Catalysts in the Sulfur–Iodine Cycle for Hydrogen Production**” being submitted by **Mr. Sachin Tomar** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi for the award of Doctor of Philosophy is a record of bonafide research work performed by him under my guidance and supervision in accordance with the rules and regulations of Indian Institute of Technology Delhi.

This thesis contains original work that has not been submitted, in whole or in part, to any other university or institute for the award of a degree or diploma.



Dr. Sreedevi Upadhyayula

Professor

Department of Chemical Engineering

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

Hauz Khas, New Delhi–110016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by expressing my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Sreedevi Upadhyayula for her unwavering support of my Ph.D. studies and associated research, as well as for her patience, inspiration and vast knowledge. Her guidance was invaluable during the research and writing of this thesis. For my Ph.D. studies, I could not have imagined a better advisor and mentor.

In addition to my supervisor, I am very thankful to Head of Department Prof. A.K. Saroha, and my research committee members, Prof. Ashok N. Bhaskarwar (SRC Chairman), Prof. Anupam Shukla (Dept. Expert) and Prof. Kuntal Manna (Department of Chemistry, external expert) and all the faculty members of Chemical Engineering Department for their constant support, encouragement and valuable suggestions, as well as for the challenging question that motivated me to broaden my research from multiple perspectives. Additionally, I would like to thank Prof. Saswata Bhattacharya and Ms. Deepika Gill for valuable collaboration and constructive discussions. I acknowledge ONGC Energy Centre, India, for the financial support for this research work. I am deeply thankful to the Department of Chemical Engineering, staff members of Chemical Engineering Department, CRF and NRF of IIT Delhi.

I thank my lab mates, Mr. Surya Chand Tiwari, Ms. Ambreen Naizi, Mr. Aloka Kumar Sahu, Mr. Akash Bharadwaj, Ms. Chitrangada Singh, Mr. Sushant Yadav, and Mr. Debarun Banerjee for the intriguing conversations and support in research work. I am thankful to our lab manager, Mr. Sanjeev Mittal for the administrative work. I am indebted to all my friends, special thanks to Mr. Vaibhav Pandey, Mr. Deepchandra Joshi, Mr. Varun Gupta, Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Mr. Abhinav Nouduri, and Mr. Uttaran Basak who were constantly extremely helpful in many different ways.

I owe hugely to my dear mother Mrs. Devwati, father Er. Ramvir Singh, mother-in-law Mrs. Aruna Kumari, father-in-law Dr. Birendra Singh, brother Mr. Saurabh, sister-in-law Mrs. Mansi and all my extended family for their love, help, encouragement and immense support. I would like to thank my sweet little niece Mishi. I am sorry not being able to accompany her during the initial most difficult time of her life.

I would want to convey my gratitude to my beloved wife Mrs. Shipra Singh. I am extremely appreciative of her love, understanding and encouragement. Thank you for believing in me and for being there every step of the way. I dedicate this thesis to her.

I bow to the Almighty, whose grace guided me from the very beginning to the end of my research work.



(SACHIN TOMAR)

ABSTRACT

The sulfur–iodine (S–I) cycle is one of the promising thermochemical methods for water–to–hydrogen conversion in an efficient and eco–friendly manner. SO_3 decomposition is the most endothermic reaction of the S–I cycle. Some of the major challenges in the SO_3 decomposition step of the S–I cycle are sintering, long term stability and cost of the catalytic system. Along with the better catalytic design, understanding of the kinetics of the catalytic decomposition is essential for the implementation of the process at a large scale. Reported literature primarily focused on the power–law type models. The literature till date is lacking in the heterogeneous kinetic modeling and validation of the models with the experimental studies of the reaction. Furthermore, separation of the acid mixture ($\text{HI–H}_2\text{O–I}_2$) is a matter of concern in the S–I process. There is presence of $\text{HI–H}_2\text{O–I}_2$ (HI_x) phase in sulfuric acid which is the feed for the SO_3 decomposition reaction. The impurities in sulfuric acid have a remarkable influence on the catalytic performance in the SO_3 decomposition reaction. The practical aspect on how the iodine–based impurities could affect catalytic activity has been scarcely addressed until now. From the commercial operation point of view, the severe impact of the feed impurities on the catalytic performance necessitates a highly active and stable catalytic system for SO_3 decomposition in the integrated S–I process.

Hence, there is a need for cost effective, highly active as well as stable catalysts with the right choice of supports in this high temperature endothermic reaction which is important for scale–up of the process. Copper ferrite (CuFe_2O_4) was dispersed over the suitable supports and characterized by different physicochemical techniques. The catalysts were activity tested and compared in high temperature (800–900 °C) endothermic SO_3 decomposition reaction in the S–I cycle for hydrogen production. The kinetic modeling over the synthesized catalysts was studied. Furthermore, the effect of the feed impurities on the catalytic performance was investigated.

सार

सल्फर-आयोडीन (S-I) चक्र एक कुशल और पर्यावरण के अनुकूल तरीके से जल-से-हाइड्रोजन रूपांतरण के लिए आशाजनक थर्मोकेमिकल विधियों में से एक है। SO_3 अपघटन S-I चक्र की सबसे एंडोथर्मिक प्रतिक्रिया है। S-I चक्र के SO_3 अपघटन चरण में कुछ प्रमुख चुनौतियाँ सिंटरिंग, दीर्घकालिक स्थिरता और उत्प्रेरक प्रणाली की लागत हैं। बेहतर उत्प्रेरक डिजाइन के साथ, बड़े पैमाने पर प्रक्रिया के कार्यान्वयन के लिए उत्प्रेरक अपघटन के कैनेटीक्स की समझ आवश्यक है। रिपोर्टेड साहित्य मुख्य रूप से पावर-लॉ टाइप मॉडल पर केंद्रित है। आज तक के साहित्य में प्रतिक्रिया के प्रायोगिक अध्ययन के साथ विषम काइनेटिक मॉडलिंग और मॉडलों के सत्यापन की कमी है। इसके अलावा, एसिड मिश्रण ($\text{HI-H}_2\text{O-I}_2$) का पृथक्करण S-I प्रक्रिया में चिंता का विषय है। सल्फ्यूरिक एसिड में $\text{HI-H}_2\text{O-I}_2$ (HI_x) चरण की उपस्थिति है जो SO_3 अपघटन प्रतिक्रिया के लिए फ्रीड है। सल्फ्यूरिक एसिड में अशुद्धियों का SO_3 अपघटन प्रतिक्रिया में उत्प्रेरक प्रदर्शन पर उल्लेखनीय प्रभाव पड़ता है। आयोडीन-आधारित अशुद्धियाँ उत्प्रेरक गतिविधि को कैसे प्रभावित कर सकती हैं, इस पर व्यावहारिक पहलू को अब तक शायद ही संबोधित किया गया हो। वाणिज्यिक संचालन के दृष्टिकोण से, उत्प्रेरक प्रदर्शन पर फ्रीड अशुद्धियों के गंभीर प्रभाव को एकीकृत एस-आई प्रक्रिया में SO_3 अपघटन के लिए एक अत्यधिक सक्रिय और स्थिर उत्प्रेरक प्रणाली की आवश्यकता होती है।

इसलिए, इस उच्च तापमान एंडोथर्मिक प्रतिक्रिया में समर्थन के सही विकल्प के साथ लागत प्रभावी, अत्यधिक सक्रिय और साथ ही स्थिर उत्प्रेरक की आवश्यकता है जो प्रक्रिया के स्केल-अप के लिए महत्वपूर्ण है। कॉपर फेराइट (CuFe_2O_4) को उपयुक्त सपोर्ट पर फैलाया गया और विभिन्न भौतिक-रासायनिक तकनीकों द्वारा विशेषता दी गई। उत्प्रेरकों का गतिविधि परीक्षण किया गया और हाइड्रोजन उत्पादन के लिए S-I चक्र में उच्च तापमान (800–900 °C) एंडोथर्मिक SO_3 अपघटन प्रतिक्रिया की तुलना की गई। संश्लेषित उत्प्रेरकों पर काइनेटिक मॉडलिंग का अध्ययन किया गया। इसके अलावा, उत्प्रेरक प्रदर्शन पर फ्रीड अशुद्धियों के प्रभाव की जांच की गई।

CONTENTS

Certificate	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
संर	iv
Contents	v
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	xiii
Nomenclature	xiv
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	2
1.2 Hydrogen production methods	4
1.3 Worldwide programs for hydrogen production using Sulfur–iodine cycle	7
1.4 Sulfur–Iodine cycle	8
1.5 Thesis organization	10
2. Literature Review	12
2.1 Different categories of the catalysts for SO ₃ decomposition	13
2.1.1 Nobel metal catalysts	15
2.1.2 Metal oxide catalysts	18
2.1.3 Mixed metal oxide catalysts	19
2.2 Kinetic aspects	22
2.3 Mechanistic studies	24
2.4 Gaps in literature and motivation for the present work	26
2.5 Research objectives	27
3. Materials and Methods	28

3.1 Synthesis of the catalysts	29
3.2 Characterization of the catalysts	32
3.2.1 X-ray diffraction (XRD)	32
3.2.2 Fourier transform infra-red spectroscopy (FT-IR)	32
3.2.3 Thermo-gravimetric analysis (TGA)	32
3.2.4 Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET)	33
3.2.5 X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS)	33
3.2.6 Field emission scanning electron microscope-energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (FESEM-EDS)	33
3.2.7 Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) and high resolution (HR)-TEM	33
3.3 Performance evaluation of the catalysts	34
4. SO₃ decomposition over CuFe₂O₄ supported on β-SiC and SiO₂: Characterization, performance and kinetics	36
4.1 Introduction	37
4.2 Catalyst characterization	38
4.3 Performance evaluation of the catalysts	49
4.4 Kinetic study	51
4.4.1 Mass transfer considerations	51
4.4.2 Homogeneous kinetic modeling	54
4.4.3 Heterogeneous kinetic modeling	56
4.5 Conclusion	58
5. Effect of surface modification of β-SiC on the catalytic decomposition of sulfur trioxide	59
5.1 Introduction	60
5.2 Catalyst characterization	60

5.3 Performance evaluation of the catalysts	68
5.4 Theoretical analysis	70
5.5 Conclusion	73
6. Effect of the feed impurities on catalytic performance of $\text{CuFe}_2\text{O}_4/\beta\text{-SiC}$	74
6.1 Introduction	75
6.2 Activity and stability of the catalyst with feed impurities	76
6.3 Spent catalysts characterization	78
6.4 Modeling, statistical analysis and validation	84
6.5 Conclusion	87
7. Enhancing SO_3 decomposition in a packed bed reactor using $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported CuFe_2O_4	88
7.1 Introduction	89
7.2 Catalyst characterization	89
7.3 Catalytic performance evaluation	98
7.4 Comparison of heat transfer coefficients, mass transfer coefficients and pressure drop	100
7.4.1 Geometric features of the $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam	100
7.4.2 Heat transfer coefficient	101
7.4.3 Mass transfer coefficient	103
7.4.4 Pressure drop	104
7.5 Conclusion	105
8. Conclusions and Recommendations	106
8.1 Thesis conclusions	107
8.2 Recommendations	110
References	111
Appendices	127
Bio-Data	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 Cost and GWP comparison of various hydrogen production technologies. GWP: Global warming potential; SMR: Steam methane reforming; CG: Coal gasification; PEW: Photoelectrochemical water splitting.	6
Figure 1.2 Illustrative representation of the S–I cycle.	8
Figure 3.1 Schematic representation of the synthesis process of the catalysts.	31
Figure 3.2 Schematic illustration of the synthesis of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (F).	32
Figure 3.3 Schematic representation of the experimental setup for SO ₃ decomposition.	34
Figure 4.1 XRD pattern of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC.	39
Figure 4.2 XRD pattern of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	39
Figure 4.3 FT–IR of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC.	40
Figure 4.4 FT–IR of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	40
Figure 4.5 TGA curve of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC.	41
Figure 4.6 TGA curve of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	41
Figure 4.7 XPS spectra of Cu 2p of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC.	42
Figure 4.8 XPS spectra of Fe 2p of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC.	42
Figure 4.9 XPS spectra of Cu 2p of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	43
Figure 4.10 XPS spectra of Fe 2p of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	43
Figure 4.11 Nitrogen adsorption–desorption isotherms of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC.	44
Figure 4.12 Nitrogen adsorption–desorption isotherms of and CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	45
Figure 4.13 TEM, SAED, HR–TEM and lattice fringes of the (a1–a4) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC.	45
Figure 4.14 TEM, SAED, HR–TEM and lattice fringes of the (a1–a4) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	46
Figure 4.15 FESEM–EDS and elemental mapping of the (a1–a7) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC.	47

Figure 4.16 FESEM–EDS and elemental mapping of the (a1–a7) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	47
Figure 4.17 (a) and (b) FESEM of fresh CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC and CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ , respectively. a1, b1 and b2 correspond to FESEM, TEM and SAED pattern, respectively of spent CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC. a2, b3 and b4 correspond to FESEM, TEM and SAED pattern, respectively of spent CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	48
Figure 4.18 Variation of SO ₃ conversion (%) with temperature at 8.1 h ^{–1} WHSV.	50
Figure 4.19 Variation of SO ₃ conversion (%) with time (hr) at 8.1 h ^{–1} WHSV and 850 °C.	51
Figure 4.20 Effect of external mass transfer resistance on conversion of SO ₃ (X) over CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC catalyst. Conditions: Temperature = 850 °C; catalyst size = 0.5 mm; a, with 1 g catalyst; b, with 3 g catalyst.	52
Figure 4.21 Effect of intra–particle diffusion on conversion of SO ₃ (X) over CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC catalyst. Conditions: Temperature = 850 °C, catalyst weight = 1 g.	53
Figure 4.22 Arrhenius plot for SO ₃ decomposition over CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC and CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ .	55
Figure 4.23 Variation of SO ₃ conversions with space time at 800, 825, 850, and 875 °C.	57
Figure 4.24 Parity plot for the rate of SO ₃ conversion at 800 (R ² = 0.97), 825 (R ² = 0.97), 850 (R ² = 0.95) and 875 °C (R ² = 0.96).	57
Figure 5.1 XRD of (a) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (T) and (b) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (UT).	61
Figure 5.2 FTIR of (a) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (T) and (b) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (UT).	62
Figure 5.3 BET of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (T), and CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (UT).	63
Figure 5.4 XPS (a) Cu 2p and (b) Fe 2p of the CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (T), (c) Cu 2p and (d) Fe 2p of the CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (UT).	64
Figure 5.5 FESEM–EDS and elemental mapping of the (a1–a7) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (T).	65
Figure 5.6 FESEM–EDS and elemental mapping of the (b1–b7) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (UT).	66
Figure 5.7 TEM, SAED, HR–TEM, lattice fringes and particle size distribution of the (a1–a5) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (T) and (b1–b5) CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β–SiC (UT).	67
Figure 5.8 SO ₃ conversion (%) with temperature.	69

Figure 5.9 SO₃ conversion (%) with time (hr) at 850 °C and 8.1 h⁻¹ WHSV. 70

Figure 5.10 Free energy profiles for adsorption and dissociation of SO₃ on the surface of CuFe₂O₄/β-SiC (UT) and CuFe₂O₄/β-SiC (T) catalysts, respectively. 71

Figure 5.11 Reaction profile for the decomposition of SO₃ with initial state (IS), transition state (TS) and final state (FS) on (a) CuFe₂O₄ cluster and (b) CuFe₂O₄ cluster with oxygen vacancy. Structure and charge density difference contours for SO₃ adsorbed on top of cluster (c) CuFe₂O₄, (d) CuFe₂O₄ with O-vacancy) and (e) Fe₂O₃ with O-vacancy. In charge density difference plots cyan and yellow colours correspond to the negative and positive charge, respectively. 72

Figure 6.1 SO₃ conversion (%) with (a) temperature (°C), and (b) time (hr) with the different feed compositions over CuFe₂O₄/β-SiC: F-A: 98 wt % H₂SO₄; F-B: 98 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % HI; F-C: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % HI-H₂O solution; F-D: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-10 wt % HI-H₂O solution; F-E: 98 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % KI; F-F: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % KI-H₂O solution; F-G: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-10 wt % KI-H₂O solution. 78

Figure 6.2 XRD of the spent CuFe₂O₄/β-SiC catalysts with the different feed compositions: F-A: 98 wt % H₂SO₄; F-B: 98 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % HI; F-C: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % HI-H₂O solution; F-D: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-10 wt % HI-H₂O solution; F-E: 98 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % KI; F-F: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % KI-H₂O solution; F-G: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-10 wt % KI-H₂O solution. 79

Figure 6.3 Adsorption-desorption curves of the spent CuFe₂O₄/β-SiC catalysts with the different feed compositions: F-A: 98 wt % H₂SO₄; F-B: 98 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % HI; F-C: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % HI-H₂O solution; F-D: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-10 wt % HI-H₂O solution; F-E: 98 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % KI; F-F: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-1 wt % KI-H₂O solution; F-G: 50 wt % H₂SO₄-10 wt % KI-H₂O solution. 80

Figure 6.4 FESEM-EDS and elemental mapping of the spent CuFe₂O₄/β-SiC catalysts with the different feed compositions: (a) F-A: 98 wt % H₂SO₄; (b) F-B: 98 wt % H₂SO₄ - 1 wt % HI; (c) F-C: 50 wt % H₂SO₄ - 1 wt % HI - H₂O solution; (d) F-D: 50 wt % H₂SO₄ - 10 wt % HI - H₂O solution; (e) F-E: 98 wt % H₂SO₄ - 1 wt % KI; (f) F-F: 50 wt % H₂SO₄ - 1 wt % KI - H₂O solution; (g) F-G: 50 wt % H₂SO₄ - 10 wt % KI - H₂O solution; (h) FESEM image of the fresh catalyst. 83

Figure 6.5 TEM images of the spent $\text{CuFe}_2\text{O}_4/\beta\text{-SiC}$ catalysts with the different feed compositions: (a) F-A: 98 wt % H_2SO_4 ; (b) F-B: 98 wt % H_2SO_4 – 1 wt % HI; (c) F-C: 50 wt % H_2SO_4 – 1 wt % HI – H_2O solution; (d) F-D: 50 wt % H_2SO_4 – 10 wt % HI – H_2O solution; (e) F-E: 98 wt % H_2SO_4 – 1 wt % KI; (f) F-F: 50 wt % H_2SO_4 – 1 wt % KI – H_2O solution; (g) F-G: 50 wt % H_2SO_4 – 10 wt % KI – H_2O solution; (h) TEM image of the fresh catalyst.	84
Figure 6.6 Plot of experimental and predicted SO_3 conversion (%), ($R^2 = 0.96$).	85
Figure 7.1 XRD pattern of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite.	90
Figure 7.2 FT-IR of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite.	91
Figure 7.3 TGA of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite.	92
Figure 7.4 Nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherms of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite.	93
Figure 7.5 XPS (a) Cu 2p, and (b) Fe 2p of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite.	94
Figure 7.6 XPS of (a) O 1s, (b) Si 2p and (c) C 1s of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite.	95
Figure 7.7 (a) FESEM of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam, (b) FESEM, and (c) EDS of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite.	97
Figure 7.8 (a) TEM, (b) SAED, (c) HR-TEM, and (d) lattice fringes of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite.	97
Figure 7.9 Variation of SO_3 conversion (%) with temperature.	99
Figure 7.10 Variation of SO_3 conversion (%) with time at 850 °C.	100
Figure 7.11 Size distributions of (a) pores, and (b) struts of the $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam.	101
Figure 7.12 Comparison of the heat transfer coefficients of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite and the pelletized catalyst in a packed bed reactor.	102
Figure 7.13 Comparison of the mass transfer coefficients of $\beta\text{-SiC}$ foam supported copper ferrite and the pelletized catalyst in a packed bed reactor.	104

Figure 7.14 Comparison of the pressure drop of β -SiC foam supported copper ferrite and the pelletized catalyst in a packed bed reactor.

105

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Hydrogen production methods and their source of energy.	6
Table 1.2 Worldwide programs for hydrogen production using Sulfur–Iodine thermochemical water splitting cycle.	8
Table 2.1 Catalytic systems for SO ₃ decomposition in the S–I cycle.	13
Table 2.2 Activation energy of the catalysts for SO ₃ decomposition step in the S–I cycle.	22
Table 4.1. Physicochemical properties of the CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β-SiC and CuFe ₂ O ₄ /SiO ₂ catalysts.	49
Table 4.2 Parameters and their values for internal and external diffusion.	53
Table 4.3 Comparison of the activation energy of the various catalysts in the SO ₃ decomposition reaction.	55
Table 5.1 Physicochemical properties of the CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β-SiC (T) and CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β-SiC (UT).	68
Table 6.1 Feed compositions for the activity and stability tests.	76
Table 6.2 BET surface area and pore volume of the spent CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β-SiC catalysts along with SO ₃ conversion (%) with the different feed compositions.	80
Table 6.3 Analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the model.	86
Table 6.4 Model validation.	86
Table 7.1 Comparison of BET surface area and pore volume of CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β-SiC (F) and CuFe ₂ O ₄ /β-SiC (Pellet).	93

NOMENCLATURE

Symbols

E_a	Activation energy (kJ/mol)
S_A	BET surface area (m^2/g)
d_p	Crystallite size (nm)
C_{WP}	Weisz–Prater parameter
r_A	Observed rate of reaction ($\text{mol}/\text{kg}_{\text{cat}} \text{ sec}$)
R	Radius of the catalyst pellet (m)
D_e	Effective diffusivity (m^2/sec)
C_{AS}	Surface concentration (mol/m^3)
n	Reaction order
k_c	Mass transfer coefficient (m/s)
X	SO_3 conversion
R	Gas constant (J/mol K)
W	Weight of the catalyst (g)
S_F	Exterior surface area per unit volume of reactor bed (Foam) ($\text{m}^2/\text{m}(\text{bed})^{-3}$)
S_p	Exterior surface area per unit volume of reactor bed (Pellet) ($\text{m}^2/\text{m}(\text{bed})^{-3}$)
D_p	Pellet diameter (m)
Re_F	Reynold number based on foam catalyst
Re_p	Reynold number based on pellet catalyst
v	Superficial velocity (m/s)
T	Temperature (K)
h_F	Heat transfer coefficient based on foam catalyst ($\text{W m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-1}$)
h_p	Heat transfer coefficient based on pellet catalyst ($\text{W m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-1}$)

D	Diameter of the reactor (m)
j_{DF}	Mass transfer factor based on foam catalyst
j_{Dp}	Mass transfer factor based on pellet catalyst
k_F	Mass transfer coefficient based on foam catalyst (m/sec)
k_p	Mass transfer coefficient based on pellet catalyst (m/sec)
Sc	Schmidt number
M_1, M_2	Molecular mass (g/mol)
V_1, V_2	Diffusion volume (cm ³ /mol)
ΔP	Pressure drop (Pa)
ρ_c	Density of the catalyst (kg/m ³)
ρ_b	Catalyst bulk density (kg/m ³)
λ	Thermal conductivity (W m ⁻¹ K ⁻¹)
ρ	Density of the gas (kg/m ³)
ε_F	Foam porosity
ε_p	Pellet porosity
μ	Viscosity of the gas (kg m ⁻¹ s ⁻¹)
D_{12}	Diffusivity (m ² /sec)
d_{fp}	Foam pore diameter (m)
d_t	Foam strut diameter (m)
d_F	Mean pore diameter of the foam (m)

Acronyms

S-I	Sulfur–Iodine
XRD	X–ray diffraction
FT–IR	Fourier transform infra–red spectroscopy
TGA	Thermo–gravimetric analysis

XPS	X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy
BET	Brunauer–Emmett–Teller
FESEM–EDS	Field emission scanning electron microscope–energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy
TEM	Transmission electron microscopy
HR–TEM	High resolution transmission electron microscopy
SAED	Selected area electron diffraction
WHSV	Weight hourly space velocity (h^{-1})
LHHW	Langmuir–Hinshelwood–Hougen–Watson
PPI	Pores per linear inch
RSM	Response surface methodology
DF	Degree of freedom
MS	Mean square
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
SS	Sum of squares