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Abstract

Converting CO₂-rich waste streams such as raw biogas, landfill gas and power plant flue gas into synthetic fuels and chemicals will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and provide revenue at the same time. One option is to convert CO₂ into CH₄ by hydrogenation via Sabatier reaction. This synthetic methane is renewable if the H₂ required for the reaction is generated via water electrolysis using solar and wind energy or hydroelectricity. However, to realize the potential of this approach, a number of technological challenges related to the Sabatier reactor design have to be resolved, including thermal management and catalyst deactivation. The high exothermic nature of the Sabatier reaction can lead to reactor overheating while high temperatures are unfavorable to the exothermic and reversible methanation process, resulting in low CO₂ conversions and methane production. In addition, catalyst coking deactivation due to filamentous carbon accumulation caused by methane cracking at high temperature can also lead to low methane production and short operation period. A simulation-based study of a Sabatier reactor was performed in order to optimize the removal of heat, while maximizing CO₂ conversion and CH₄ production and minimizing deactivation at the same time. The heat exchanger type packed bed reactor with internal cooling by a molten salt was simulated using a transient, pseudo-homogeneous mathematical model. Reactor performance was evaluated in terms of CO₂ conversion and CH₄ yield. The simulation results showed that feed temperature, feed flow rate and molten salt flow rate are the crucial parameters affecting the reactor performance and catalyst activity. For the optimized operating conditions, the model predicts CO₂ conversions and CH₄ yields above 90% at high reactor throughputs, with space velocities up to 10,000 h⁻¹. A preliminary techno-economic evaluation is provided and opportunities and challenges are outlined.
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coolant compartment surface-to-volume ratio, m\(^{-1}\)

\( A_c \)  
total cross-sectional area of cooling tubes, m\(^2\)

\( A_j \)  
pre-exponential factor of the rate coefficient of reaction \( j \), units of \( k_j \)

\( B_j \)  
pre-exponential factor of the adsorption coefficient of species \( i \), units of \( K_j \)

\( C_i \)  
molar concentration of species \( i \), mol/m\(^3\)

\( C_r \)  
total molar concentration, mol/m\(^3\)

\( C_{pc} \)  
coolant heat capacity, kJ/(kg K)

\( C_{pg} \)  
gas heat capacity, kJ/(mol K)

\( d \)  
wall thickness, m

\( d_p \)  
catalytic pellet diameter, m

\( D \)  
diameter, m

\( D_{ae} \)  
effective axial diffusion coefficient, m\(^2\)/s

\( D_a \)  
gas molecular diffusivity, m\(^2\)/s

\( E_j \)  
activation energy of reaction \( j \), kJ/mol

\( G_{MS} \)  
molten salt gravimetric (mass) flow rate, kg/s

\( h_{nc} \)  
natural convection heat transfer coefficient, kJ/(m\(^2\) s K)

\( h_w \)  
effective wall heat transfer coefficient, kJ/(m\(^2\) s K)

\( \Delta H_i \)  
adsorption enthalpy change of species \( i \), kJ/mol

\( k_{ae} \)  
effective axial thermal conductivity, kJ/(m s K)

\( k_j \)  
rate constant of reaction \( j \)

\( K_i \)  
adsorption constant of species \( i \), bar\(^{-1}\)

\( K_{j,eq} \)  
equilibrium constant of reaction \( j \)

\( L \)  
reformer length, m

\( LHV \)  
lower heating value, kJ/mol

\( N_c \)  
coolant tubes number

\( Nu \)  
Nusselt number

\( p_i \)  
partial pressure of gaseous species \( i \), bar

\( P \)  
reactor pressure, bar

\( Pr \)  
Prandtl number

\( P_{tf} \)  
total feed gas pressure, bar

\( Re \)  
Reynolds number

\( R_j \)  
rate of reaction \( j \), mol/(kg s)
\( R_g \) gas constant, kJ/(mol K)

\( SV \) gas hourly space velocity, h\(^{-1}\)

\( t \) time, s

\( T \) reactor temperature, K

\( T_c \) coolant temperature, K

\( T_e \) environment temperature, K

\( U_w \) overall effective wall heat transfer coefficient, kJ/(m\(^2\) s K)

\( v \) fluid velocity, m/s

\( V \) compartment volume, m\(^3\)

\( z \) reactor length coordinate, m

**Greek letters**

\( \varepsilon \) catalyst bed porosity

\( \phi \) Thiele modulus

\( \eta_j \) effectiveness factor of reaction \( j \)

\( \lambda \) thermal conductivity, kW/(m K)

\( \mu \) viscosity, kg/(m s)

\( \rho_c \) coolant density, kg/m\(^3\)

\( \rho_g \) gas molar density, mol/m\(^3\)

\( \rho_s \) solid density, kg/m\(^3\)

\( \tau_b \) catalyst bed tortuosity

**Subscripts**

\( c \) coolant

\( eff \) effective

\( eq \) equilibrium

\( f \) feed

\( g \) gas

\( HE \) heat exchange

\( HL \) heat loss

\( int \) initial

\( nc \) natural convection

\( p \) packed bed
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1. Introduction

1.1 Problem statement and motivation

The intensive use of fossil fuels leads to growing CO$_2$ emissions that accelerate global warming. It is absolutely necessary to capture anthropogenic CO$_2$. Once captured, CO$_2$ can be stored (e.g., in geological formations) but this approach requires high capital and operating costs, hindering its widespread commercialization. The alternative to CO$_2$ storage is CO$_2$ conversion into synthetic fuels and chemicals that closes the artificial carbon cycle, and also provide additional revenues. Being a harmful greenhouse gas, CO$_2$ is also an excellent source of carbon, non-flammable and non-corrosive. Resources are abundant, including flue gases from coal- and natural gas-fired power plants, biogas and landfill gas (up to 40% CO$_2$) and off-gas streams in several industrial processes such as ammonia production and fermentation. Large resources of CO$_2$ exist in natural gas and oil production wells, which is typically flared or even vented into the atmosphere.

Since conversion of captured CO$_2$ into synthetic fuels and chemicals is an attractive avenue for reduction of CO$_2$ emissions, this topic has attracted the interest of many research groups around the world [1-3]. Many research efforts have focused on photochemical and electrochemical reduction of CO$_2$ in an aqueous environment using water as a source of H$_2$ for CO$_2$ reduction [1, 2]. This approach is apparently attractive as it only uses water and CO$_2$ as the starting materials and solar energy and (potentially) renewable electricity. However, photochemical CO$_2$ reduction has inherent limitations of solar energy utilization, while electro-chemical reduction of CO$_2$ has low efficiencies of electricity utilization. Both processes are limited by low CO$_2$ solubility in water and have severe diffusion limitations [1, 2]. Thermocatalytic conversion combines high
temperatures with the use of a heterogeneous catalyst, providing fast reaction rates and, therefore, allowing for large volume production [3].

One of the thermocatalytic routes is CO\(_2\) methanation, also called the Sabatier reaction [3, 4]. The strongly exothermic Sabatier reaction, Eq. (1), is typically accompanied by the mildly endothermic reverse water gas shift, Eq. (2), and exothermic CO methanation, Eq. (3).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CO}_2 + 4\text{H}_2 & \rightleftharpoons \text{CH}_4 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \Delta H_{298}^\circ = -164.9 \text{ kJ/mol} \\
\text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2 & \rightleftharpoons \text{CO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \Delta H_{298}^\circ = 41.2 \text{ kJ/mol} \\
\text{CO} + 3\text{H}_2 & \rightleftharpoons \text{CH}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \Delta H_{298}^\circ = -206.1 \text{ kJ/mol}
\end{align*}
\]

Historically, methanation systems were designed for conversion of synthesis gas [5], but, recently, CO\(_2\) was also considered as a feedstock for methanation [6]. The overall process is highly exothermic which requires efficient heat removal, in order to facilitate CH\(_4\) production. In addition to this thermodynamic constraint, reactor overheating can also lead to fast catalyst deactivation by sintering and coking resulting in reduction of methane production, CO\(_2\) conversion, and reactor service life. The nickel-based catalysts should be operated at temperatures below 550 °C to prevent their deactivation [6].

The actively-cooled packed bed reactor design can potentially provide a low-cost solution for single-pass CO\(_2\) methanation process. However, improvement of the reaction heat removal efficiency and optimization of operating conditions are required to promote methane production and to prevent catalyst deactivation. In this study, a heat-exchanger type packed bed reactor is simulated using a mathematical model. The reactor is assumed to be internally cooled by molten salt flowing through multiple cooling tubes.
1.2 Project objectives

Recently reported modeling studies did not account for coolant temperature variations, assuming constant temperature of the heat transfer fluid [7, 8]. Such a situation is achievable only when the heat transfer fluid flow rate is very high [9]. On the other hand, process optimization will require minimization of the coolant flow rate to enhance the reactor performance. In the presented herein study, the heat-exchanger type Sabatier reactor cooled by a molten salt is investigated via numerical simulations in order to optimize the removal of heat, while maximizing CO$_2$ conversion and CH$_4$ production rate. Molten salts are advantageous over conventional heat carriers, such as steam and mineral oils, due to their ability to operate at higher operating temperatures, low working pressure, high density, high heat capacity and non-flammability [9].

![Fig. 1. Conceptual process flow diagram of the renewable natural gas generation system.](image)
A conceptual representation of the complete CO$_2$ methanation system comprising such a reactor is shown in Fig. 1. The Sabatier reactor converts a mixture of CO$_2$ and H$_2$ into CH$_4$ and water. Hydrogen which is required for the Sabatier reaction can be generated using renewable energy [10, 11]. The reaction heat is removed from the reactor by the molten salt recirculation system which can be used to preheat the feed, and can be utilized as well for electricity generation and residential heating.

The project presented herein focused on the design and thermal management of the Sabatier reactor, which was evaluated in terms of CO$_2$ conversion and CH$_4$ yield as a function of operating parameters, such as feed temperature, feed flow rate and molten salt flow rate. In addition, the influence of catalyst deactivation on reactor performance was investigated and crucial parameters affecting reactor performance decay were identified.
2. Literature review

2.1 Methanation process and reactor design

Methanation of CO\textsubscript{2} has been studied for decades [12-14] but a number of technological issues remain to be resolved in order to make this technology economically viable. Because of the highly exothermic nature of the methanation reaction, reactor temperature control becomes a major concern in the design of methanation systems [15-18]. Several reactor designs and corresponding process concepts that focus on thermal management, cost efficiency and process flexibility have been proposed.

**Fig. 2.** Packed-bed reactors with intermediate cooling and gas recirculation (TREMP\textsuperscript{TM}). Adapted from [21].
A typical approach is the use of the adiabatic packed-bed reactor. Such systems are based on cascades of adiabatic reactors (typically 2-6) with intermediate cooling and sometimes gas recycling. A methanation unit including two adiabatic packed bed reactors with internal cooling and gas recirculation was developed by Lurgi company back in the 1960s and 1970s. Practical experience was gained by applying this technology in industry [19, 20]. In the 1980s, Haldor Topsøe developed a similar methanation process consisting of 3-4 instead of 2 packed-bed reactor. The so-called TREMP (Topsøe Recycle Energy-Efficient Methanation) system [21] is commercially available, shown in Fig. 2. In this process, gas recirculation is used for temperature control of the first methanation reactor, keeping the reactor temperature below 700 °C. The effluent gas exiting from the first reactor is cooled by a heat exchanger and fed into the subsequent methanation stages in order to maximize methane production. The process configuration and the number of reactors depends on the specific application. Capital cost investment and energy consumption for operation are main concerns.

Ralph M. Parson suggested a high temperature methanation concept (RMP process [22]) consisting of 4-6 adiabatic packed-bed reactors in series with steam addition and intermediate cooling between reactors. Another similar once-through methanation process (ICI/Koppers process) was proposed by Imperial Chemical Industries aiming to convert syngas from a Koppers-Totzek gasifier to synthetic natural gas [23, 24]. Steam addition prevents reactor from overheating. Methane production is promoted with respect to thermodynamic limits through intermediate cooling and a staged gas feed into the reactor. Though this technology was developed mainly for CO methanation, it could be adapted for CO₂ methanation with some modification on operating conditions.
Despite a number of processes have been developed, widespread commercialization has not been realized. Recently, Schaaf et al. proposed a CO$_2$ methanation plant in which the process is divided into 6 reaction stages in series with inter-stage heat exchangers \[6\], as illustrated in Fig. 3. Temperature control is accomplished by intermediate gas coolers and staged gas feeding system. The four-stage feeding system distributes CO$_2$ in the feed gas in defined fractions to control the temperature of each stage below 550°C, so that gas recirculation devices are not necessary for the first-stage reactor. This concept still needs to be verified by practical implementation.

Fig. 3. Multiple-stage packed-bed reactor methanation system. Adapted from [6].
Although such systems can efficiently control the process temperature, the use of multiple reactors, recycle compressors, heat exchangers etc. result in system complexity and high capital cost investment. An alternative approach is to use a cooled packed-bed reactor [7, 8]. This method could potentially allow methanation to be conducted in a single-stage process, but heat removal optimization to avoid hot spot formation is a difficult task. Several alternative reactor designs have been suggested, aiming to achieve isothermal conditions. These alternative configurations include a heat-exchanger type packed-bed reactor with cooling tube bundles embedded in the catalytic bed [25], a structured microchannel reactor [26] and a honeycomb [27]. These methanation reactors have been developed to overcome the typical problem of temperature control and overheating in conventional packed-bed reactors. While isothermal operation makes the process design much simpler, the reactor itself becomes much more expensive because of the more complicated deposition of the metallic structure and the difficulty of replacing deactivated catalyst, especially for microchannel and honeycomb catalyst coating.

Fluidized-bed reactors are also widely suggested as ideal isothermal reactors due to the excellent mixing of gas and catalyst particles and efficient heat removal, which potentially allows for the use of a single reactor and a simple process to control [28-30], shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. Since 1952, process design with fluidized–bed reactors has been investigated and between 1975 and 1986 a pilot methanation plant was built in Germany by Thyssengas and the University of Karlsruhe [31]. In this process, the problem of heat removal was resolved with a single fluidized-bed reactor instead of using multiple adiabatic packed-bed reactors. However, attrition and entrainment of the catalyst in fluidized-bed reactors caused by high mechanical stress between the catalyst particles and the reactor wall remains a major problem which has not been resolved yet
Another disadvantage is that fluidized-bed reactors can only be operated in a narrow range of operating conditions dictated by the fluidization velocity, restricting reactor throughputs.

Another proposed design is a three-phase methanation reactor [34, 35], e.g. a slurry reactor shown in Fig. 6. Among the major drawbacks related to this reactor design are the gas-to-liquid mass transfer resistance and the decomposition and evaporation of the heat transfer liquid. In 2014, Gtöz et al. [36] suggested an innovative methanation process combining a three-phase methanation (3PM) reactor with a honeycomb methanation (HCM) reactor, as illustrated in Fig. 7. The 3PM reactor can be operated nearly isothermally. The HCM reactor is used for producing methane that reach the requirements for

\[ \text{Fig. 4. A fluidized-bed methanation reactor experimental system. Adapted from [30].} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 5. A flow diagram of the methanation process based on a fluidized bed reactor. Adapted from [31].} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 6. Three-phase CO}_2\text{ methanation reactor. Adapted from [35].} \]
injection into the gas grid without costly gas separation or recycle unit. Due to the tolerance to reactor load variations in the 3PM reactor, the system can be operated under both steady state and dynamic conditions.

![Diagram of the hybrid three-phase/honeycomb reactor methanation system.](image)

**Fig. 7.** The hybrid three-phase/honeycomb reactor methanation system. Adapted from [36].

In order to make the CO₂ methanation technology economically viable, the problems of thermal management and catalyst deactivation have to be resolved. One approach relies on the use of conventional packed-bed reactors, while resolving temperature control by intermediate cooling, gas recycle, and steam addition. This methodology involves a complicated system design and requires substantial capital and operating cost investments. An alternative approach for thermal management is the use of structured, fluidized-bed and three-phase reactors that can provide nearly-isothermal conditions. However, these reactor configurations incur significant transport limitations restricting the system throughput.

In this study, a heat-exchanger type Sabatier reactor is suggested, providing a low-cost solution for a single-pass methanation process due to system simplification and low capital cost investment. The reactor is cooled by a molten salt flowing through multiple tubes in order to optimize heat removal, while maximizing CO₂ conversion and CH₄ production rate. From the point of view of reduction of operating cost, we also suggested that the coolant flow rate be minimizing and the reactor performance be optimized.
2.2 Catalyst deactivation

Catalyst deactivation by poisoning, sintering and coking is another concern for Sabatier reaction [37]. The use of various catalysts and supports for CO$_2$ methanation has been extensively studied [38-42]. All metals located in groups 8-10 of the periodic table can catalyze the methanation reaction, with the activity decreasing in order Ru > Fe > Ni > Co > Mo and the selectivity order following a different trend: Ni > Co > Fe > Ru [43]. Accordingly, Ni-based catalysts are generally applied in commercial plants due to their relatively high activity, excellent selectivity and comparatively low price; γ-Al$_2$O$_3$ is typically used as a support, the γ-modification in particular [44]. However, Ni-based catalysts undergo serious deactivation by poisoning [37], sintering [45] or coking at high temperature [46].

![Fig. 8. The mechanism of sulphur poisoning of Ni/γ-Al$_2$O$_3$ catalyst. Adapted from [49].](image)

Poisoning of Ni-based catalysts generally occurs in the presence of sulphur compounds in feed gas stream, e.g. H$_2$S in biogas, due to the loss of catalyst active sites shown in Fig. 8. Relevant studies [47-49] have been conducted to investigate the deactivation of Ni-based catalysts. Poisoning deactivation can be prevented through desulfurization treatments. Along with poisoning, sintering of Ni-based catalysts also plays an important role in the deactivation [50], Fig. 9. Studies by Agnelli et al have indicated that sintering of catalyst proceeds by the formation of
Ni(CO)$_4$. This mechanism often called chemical sintering is quite unique as the rate of sintering decreases at higher temperatures [45].

![Fig. 9. SEM images of sintered catalyst. Adapted from [50]](image1)

![Fig. 10. TEM images of carbon fibers deposited on catalysts surface. Adapted from [51].](image2)

When operating in the temperature range generally employed for CO$_2$ methanation (700-800 K) and in the absence of catalytic poisons, the catalytic activity of Ni is mainly reduced by carbon deposition. Carbon deposition deactivates the catalyst by fouling the catalyst surface, blocking catalyst pores and disintegrating the catalyst support [37, 51], as illustrated in Fig. 10. The three major forms of carbon deposition on Ni-based catalyst are whisker-like carbon formed at temperatures greater than 450ºC, encapsulating hydrocarbon films formed by polymerization at temperatures below 500 ºC and pyrolytic carbon formed by cracking of hydrocarbons above 600 ºC [37]. The reactions leading to carbon deposition in the methanation process [52] are

\[
\text{Methane cracking} \quad \begin{aligned}
\text{CH}_4 & \rightleftharpoons C + 2H_2 \\
\Delta H_{298}^\circ &= -123.3 \text{ kJ/mol}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}
\]

\[
\text{Boudouard reaction} \quad \begin{aligned}
2\text{CO} & \rightleftharpoons C + \text{CO}_2 \\
\Delta H_{298}^\circ &= -125.2 \text{ kJ/mol}
\end{aligned} \tag{5}
\]
CO reduction

\[ \text{CO} + \text{H}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{C} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \Delta H_{298} = -84.0 \text{ kJ/mol} \]  

(6)

Claridge et al. investigated the effect of temperature on the rate of carbon deposition by the Boudouard reaction and methane cracking reaction, Fig. 11. Their results indicated that carbon deposition by methane cracking dominates at high temperature and the Boudouard reaction dominates at lower temperature with both process contributing equally to carbon formation at 890 K [53]. Other studies investigating the effect of different feed conditions have shown that low partial pressure of CO, high CO\(_2\) partial pressure and high H\(_2\)/CO ratio reduce the rate of carbon formation by the Boudouard reaction. This indicates that the major cause of carbon deposition on Ni-based catalyst in the CO\(_2\) methanation process is methane cracking [50, 54]. Analysis of the reaction mechanism involved in carbon deposition by methane cracking indicated that the rate limiting step in the process was the dissociative adsorption of methane on the catalyst with
hydrogen adsorption acting in competition. The rate of the reaction was found to depend on temperature and partial pressure of hydrogen and methane [55].

In recent years, methane cracking on Ni catalyst has been studied as a method to generate carbon nanotubes and hydrogen. The research in the development of carbon nanotubes has provided some interesting results. Nickel particles with an average size of 20-60 nm showed the greatest yield of carbon nanofibers [56]. These results are not surprising as it was reported previously that the thermodynamic equilibrium constant or the coking threshold during methane decomposition can be directly affected by the crystal size of nickel [57]. Addition of dopants [58] and the use of noble metal catalysts (e.g. Ru [59], Pt [60]) were also implemented to resolve catalyst deactivation issues.

In the present study, as the amount of CO formed during the course of CO$_2$ methanation was found to be almost negligible, we assume that the Boudouard reaction and CO reduction do not contribute to catalyst deactivation significantly. Thus the catalyst deactivation analysis focuses on CH$_4$ cracking. In order to minimize the effect of catalyst deactivation on reactor performance, while maximizing the CH$_4$ production and operation period duration (reactor lifetime), optimization of operating parameters is required. In this study, the reactor performance is analyzed as a function of parameters such as space velocity, cooling rate etc., during catalyst deactivation by CH$_4$ cracking.
3. Methodology

3.1 Model formulation

The suggested Sabatier reactor design is shown in Fig. 12. The reactor is a heat-exchanger type packed bed internally cooled by molten salt flowing in multiple cooling tubes. To minimize uncontrollable heat losses to the environment, the reactor is insulated by a layer of quartz wool. Both the external and internal tubes are made of stainless steel.

![Diagram of the reactor](image)

**Fig. 12.** Schematic of the molten salt-cooled, heat-exchanger type packed bed Sabatier reactor.

The dimensions used in numerical simulations are listed in Table 1. In order to minimize the heat transfer distance, the minimum number of cooling tubes was set to \( N_c = 12 \). For the dimensions described in Table 1 and evenly distributed tubes, the distance between any two adjusted cooling tubes will be \( 19 \pm 1 \text{ mm} \) for \( N_c = 12 \). Thermal conductivity of the packed bed should prevent large
radial gradients over that relatively small distance [61]. The maximum of \( N_c = 22 \) was set to allow space for catalytic pellets. Due to the high thermal conductivity of the molten salt, significant radial gradients are not expected to develop within the coolant tubes (\( D_c = 0.02 \text{ m} \)) [9].

**Table 1.** Reactor dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( D_r ) (m)</th>
<th>( D_c ) (m)</th>
<th>( d_w ) (m)</th>
<th>( d_{iw} ) (m)</th>
<th>( d_p ) (m)</th>
<th>( N_c )</th>
<th>( L ) (m)</th>
<th>( V_{PB} ) (( \text{m}^3 ))</th>
<th>( V_{MS} ) (( \text{m}^3 ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>12-22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0255</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( D_r \) and \( D_c \) denote the diameter of the packed bed (\( D_r \)) and coolant (\( D_c \)) compartments. \( L \) is the reactor length and \( N_c \) is the number of the molten salt coolant tubes. \( d_w \) denotes the thickness of the reactor wall and cooling tube, correspondingly; \( d_{iw} \) is the insulation layer thickness. \( V \) denotes the volume of the packed bed (\( V_{PB} \)) and coolant (molten salt) (\( V_{MS} \)) compartments; \( d_p \) is the catalytic pellet diameter.

A transient, one-dimensional, pseudo-homogeneous mathematical model [62, 63] was used to simulate the reactor. As opposed to assuming constant coolant temperature [7, 8], the model accounts for temperature variations in the heat transfer fluid. The model also includes axial mass and heat dispersion and for the temperature dependence of thermo-physical properties, and the following assumptions are made to simplify analysis:

1. All species in the gas mixture are ideal gas.
2. Negligible radial mass and heat dispersion.
3. The catalyst particles are assumed to be spherical with a diameter \( d_p \) and the packed bed is treated as a porous medium with homogenous porosity \( \varepsilon \).
4. The gas mixture flowing in the reactor is treated as plug-flow.
Component mass balance and energy balance for the packed bed compartment are given by Eq. (7) and Eq. (8), respectively; the temperature distribution in a single molten salt tube is described by Eq. (9). The corresponding boundary and initial conditions are listed in Eqs (10, 11). Pressure drop was calculated using Ergun equation, Eq. (12), with a fixed inlet pressure (adjusted by a back pressure regulator in a practical situation). Variations in the gas velocity due to change in number of moles are considered by Eq. (13) [64]. Effective heat capacity in Eq. (8) is defined by Eq. (14); \( N_c \) is the number of cooling tubes.

\[
\varepsilon \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial t} = D_{ae} \frac{\partial^2 C_i}{\partial z^2} - \varepsilon v_g \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z} + a\rho_s (1-\varepsilon) \sum_j \eta_j R_{ij} \tag{7}
\]

\[
(\rho C_p)_{\text{eff}} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = k_{ae} \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} - \varepsilon \rho g C_{pg} v_g \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} + a\rho_s (1-\varepsilon) \sum_j (-\Delta H_j) \eta_j R_j - U_{w,HE} \alpha_{r,HE} (T - T_c) - U_{w,int} \alpha_{r,HE} (T - T_c) \tag{8}
\]

\[
\rho c_{pc} \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial t} = \lambda_c \frac{\partial^2 T_c}{\partial z^2} - \rho c_{pc} v_c \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial z} - U_{w,HE} \alpha_c,HE (T_c - T) \tag{9}
\]

\[
z = 0 \quad \varepsilon v_g (C_{i,f} - C_i) = -D_{ae} \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z} \quad z = L \quad \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial z} = 0 \tag{10}
\]

\[
\varepsilon \rho g C_{pg} (T_f - T) = -k_{ae} \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \quad \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = 0 \quad \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial z} = 0
\]

\[
\rho c v_c (T_{f,c} - T_c) = -\lambda_c \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial z} \quad \frac{\partial T_c}{\partial z} = 0 \tag{11}
\]

\[
t = 0 \quad C_i(0,z) = C_{i,\text{int}} \quad T(0,z) = T_{\text{int}} \quad T_c(0,z) = T_{c,\text{int}} \tag{12}
\]

\[
\frac{dP}{dz} = -150 \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2 \mu_g}{d^2 \varepsilon^3} v_g - 1.75 \frac{(1-\varepsilon) \rho_g}{d \varepsilon^3} v_g^2 \quad P(0) = P_{if} \tag{12}
\]
3.2 Reaction kinetics

Reaction rates are calculated using the commonly adopted kinetics for methane steam reforming over the Ni/Al$_2$O$_3$ catalyst [65, 66], Eqs (15a-c). These kinetic expressions account for the reversibility of the reforming and water gas shift reactions and can be used therefore for modeling of the CO$_2$ methanation reaction system, Eqs (1-3). All parameters are tabulated in the Tables A.1 in Appendix [67]. Intraparticle and interphase transport limitations can be neglected for the size of catalytic pellets used in our simulations ($d_p = 3$ mm, Table 1) [63].

$$R_3 = k_3 \frac{p_{CH_4} p_{H_2O}^2}{p_{H_2}^3} \left( \frac{p_{H_2} p_{CO}}{K_{3,eq}} \right) \frac{1}{\text{den}^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15a)

$$R_2 = k_2 \frac{p_{CO} p_{H_2O}}{p_{H_2}} \left( 1 - \frac{p_{H_2}^2 p_{CO}}{K_{2,eq}} \right) \frac{1}{\text{den}^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15b)

$$R_1 = k_1 \frac{p_{CH_4} p_{H_2O}}{p_{H_2}^3} \left( 1 - \frac{p_{H_2}^3 p_{CO}}{K_{1,eq}} \right) \frac{1}{\text{den}^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15c)

$$\text{den} = 1 + K_{CO} p_{CO} + K_{H_2} p_{H_2} + K_{CH_4} p_{CH_4} + \frac{K_{H_2O} p_{H_2O}}{p_{H_2}}$$

$$k_j = A_j \exp \left( -\frac{E_j}{R g T} \right) \hspace{1cm} K_i = B_i \exp \left( -\frac{\Delta H_i}{R g T} \right)$$
The internal effectiveness factor was calculated using the standard expression for a spherical pellet [68], with the Thiele modulus defined for each reaction in terms of the corresponding rate constant $k_j$ in Eq. (15):

$$\eta_j = \frac{3}{\phi_j} \left( \frac{1}{\tanh \phi_j} - \frac{1}{\phi_j} \right) \quad \phi_j = \sqrt{\frac{k_j d_j^2}{4D_m}}$$

$$\hat{k}_1 = \frac{k_i \rho_i (1-\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{P_f \rho_s \varepsilon}} \quad \hat{k}_2 = \frac{k_s \rho_s (1-\varepsilon) P_f}{\rho_s \varepsilon} \quad \hat{k}_3 = \frac{k_3 \rho_s (1-\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{P_f \rho_s \varepsilon}}$$

(16)

### 3.3 Deactivation kinetics

An activity factor is used to account for the change of the reaction rate as a function of time due to catalyst deactivation, assuming that the reaction rate of the fresh catalyst is a maximum. The activity factor is defined as:

$$a(t) = \frac{\text{actual reaction rate}}{\text{reaction rate with fresh catalyst}}$$

(17)

A general form of the activity factor equation is described by Eq. (18):

$$-\frac{da}{dt} = r_a d^d$$

(18)

Various catalyst deactivation models have been developed and reported in the literature. A random carbon deposition model was developed by Chen et al. [69] to determine the catalyst activity factor from measurement of the concentration of deposited coke on the catalyst:

$$a = \exp\left(-\alpha_c C_k\right)$$

(19)

$C_k$ is the concentration of deposited coke on the catalyst (g/g of catalyst). The deactivation constant $\alpha_c$ is 28.8 g of catalyst/g of coke. Models for determination of $C_k$ can be found in the relevant
literature[70, 71]. Other models for the activity factor were obtained by determination of the
deactivation rate, assuming various deactivation orders, as given in Eq. (20) [72] and Eq. (21) [73]:
\[ a = (1 - 1.2r_d t)^{-1.2} \]  
(20)
\[ a = \left( \frac{1}{1 - 0.5k_d \left( k_{d,C} + k_{d,CH_4} P_{CH_4} + k_{d,H_2} P_{H_2}^{0.83} \right) t} \right)^{-0.8} \]  
(21)

In the presented herein (Section 4.4) analysis of the effect of the catalyst deactivation on the
reactor performance, the deactivation expression developed by Borghei et al. (2010) [55] was employed. Assuming 1st order deactivation ( \( d = 1 \) ) [55] and integrating Eq. (18), a simple form of the activity factor expression can be derived:
\[ a = \exp(-r_d t) \]  
(22)
\[ r_d = k_d P_{CH_4}^\alpha P_{H_2}^\beta \quad \alpha = 1.8; \quad \beta = -1.9 \quad k_d = k_{d0} \exp \left( \frac{-E_d}{R_g T} \right) \]  
(23)

As mentioned in the literature review on catalyst deactivation (Section 2.2), deactivation of the
commercial Ni-based catalyst is mainly caused by the accumulation of filamentous carbon on the
catalytic surface. The source of this carbon is mainly methane cracking that occurs at relatively
high temperature. The reverse direction of the methane cracking, Eq. (4), is also considered in the
catalyst deactivation expression above, Eq. (23). This process of carbon hydrogenation is expected
to affect the catalyst activity via carbon removal and, therefore, regeneration. To sum up, the
catalyst deactivation rate in Eq. (23) is a function of temperature, and the partial pressures of CH_4
and H_2; the dependence on partial pressures is calculated using an empirical power law expression
[74]. Values of all corresponding parameters are tabulated in the Table A. 2 in Appendix[55].
3.4 Transport coefficients

The effective axial mass dispersion coefficient is calculated using the following correlation [75]:

\[
D_{ae} = \varepsilon \left( \frac{D_m + 0.5d_p v_g}{\tau_b} \right) \quad \tau_b = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{0.5}}
\]  

(24)

The expression for the effective axial heat dispersion coefficient \(k_{ae}\), Eq. (25), was derived from the heat conductivity correlations developed for catalytic fixed beds [62, 76, 77]. Values of \(k_{ae}\) were calculated using original correlations [76, 77] in the relevant range of parameters, plotted versus particle Reynolds number \(Re_p\), and fitted using least squares analysis, resulting in the following correlation:

\[
k_{ae} = \dot{\lambda}_g \left( 8 + 0.05 Re_p^{1.09} \right) \quad Re_p = \frac{v_g \rho_g d_p}{\mu_g}
\]

(25)

Wall heat transfer coefficients are determined using the resistance-in-series approach:

\[
U_{w,HE} = \left( \frac{1}{h_{wr} + \frac{d_w}{\dot{\lambda}_w} + \frac{1}{h_{wc}}} \right)^{-1}
\]

(26a)

\[
U_{w,HL} = \left( \frac{1}{h_{wr} + \frac{d_w}{k_w} + \frac{d_{nc}}{k_{nc}} + \frac{1}{h_{nc}}} \right)^{-1}
\]

(26b)

The wall heat exchange coefficient between the catalytic bed and the coolant tube, \(U_{w,HE}\), accounts for resistances of the fixed bed, the coolant tube wall, and the molten salt, Eq. (26a). Similarly, the correlation for the wall heat loss coefficient, \(U_{w,HL}\), accounts for resistances through the catalytic bed, the reactor wall, the quartz wool insulation layer (Fig. 12) [78], accounting also for natural convection \((h_{nc})\) [79]. Since the insulation layer natural convection resistances are dominant in Eq. (26b), the wall heat loss coefficient was nearly constant in all simulations: \(U_{w,HL} \approx 0.01\ W/(m^2\ K)\).
The effective wall heat transfer coefficient for the reaction compartment \( (h_{wr}) \) is estimated using the following correlation obtained in the similar way as Eq. (25), using a complete set of the original correlations [62, 63, 76, 77]:

\[
Nu_{p} = \frac{h_{wr} d_p}{\lambda_g} = 24 + 0.34 \text{Re}_p^{0.77} \quad \text{Re}_p = \frac{v_g \rho_g d_p}{\mu_g}
\]  

(27)

The effective wall heat transfer coefficient for the coolant tube \( (h_{wc}) \) is estimated using the following correlations [80-82]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Re}_c &< 2030 \quad Nu_c = 3.66 + \frac{0.065 \text{Re}_c \text{Pr}_c (D_c / L)}{1 + 0.04[\text{Re}_c \text{Pr}_c (D_c / L)]^{2/3}} \\
2030 < \text{Re}_c &< 4000 \quad Nu_{wc} = 0.012(\text{Re}_c^{0.87} - 280) \text{Pr}_c^{0.4} \left[ 1 + (D_c / L)^{2/3} \right] \\
\text{Re}_c &> 4000 \quad Nu_c = 0.027 \text{Re}_c^{0.8} \text{Pr}_c^{1/3}
\end{align*}
\]  

(28a) (28b) (28c)

\[
Nu_{wc} = \frac{h_{wc} D_c}{\lambda_c} \quad \text{Re}_c = \frac{v_c \rho_c D_c}{\mu_c} \quad \text{Pr}_c = \frac{C_p \rho_c \mu_c}{\lambda_c}
\]

3.5 Numerical procedure

The model was solved using the MATLAB PDE solver with a second-order accurate spatial discretization based on a fixed set of user-specified nodes and time integration done by the stiff ODE solver (ode 15s). Dependencies of thermophysical properties (density, viscosity, heat capacity, diffusivity, and thermal conductivity) on temperature, pressure and composition were accounted for using polynomial regressions fitted to the data on thermophysical properties from the literature [80, 83-85]. Molten salt properties were adopted from the data on commercially available molten salts (Dynalene, Inc. [86], Dynalene MS-2). All regression equations are listed in Appendix.
4. Results and discussion

Reactor performance was evaluated via numerical simulations as a function of operating parameters, in terms of CO₂ conversion \( X_{CO_2} \), selectivity to CH₄ \( S_{CH_4} \) and CH₄ yield \( Y_{CH_4} \):

\[
X_{CO_2} = \frac{y_{CH_4} + y_{CO}}{y_{CH_4} + y_{CO} + y_{CO_2}}
\]

\[
S_{CH_4} = \frac{y_{CH_4}}{y_{CH_4} + y_{CO}}
\]

\[
Y_{CH_4} = \frac{y_{CH_4}}{y_{CH_4} + y_{CO} + y_{CO_2}}
\]

Outlet conversion, selectivity and yield are calculated based on the outlet mole fractions. In all simulations, except those described in Section 4.4, the feed pressure was 500 kPa and feed composition was set to the molar stoichiometric ratio of \( H_2/CO_2 = 4 \). The molten salt feed temperature was set to its minimum operating temperature of 415 K [86]. The operating conditions assumed for these simulations are listed in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Operating conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P_f (kPa)</th>
<th>H₂/CO₂</th>
<th>T_cf (K)</th>
<th>T_int (K)</th>
<th>T_f (K)</th>
<th>GHSV ((h^{-1}))</th>
<th>G_MS/G_MS,0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>500-600</td>
<td>450-650</td>
<td>100-50,000</td>
<td>0.1-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( P_f \) denotes the feed pressure and \( H_2/CO_2 \) is the molar feed ratio of \( H_2 \) to \( CO_2 \). \( T_cf \) stands for the coolant (molten salt) feed temperature. \( T_int \) and \( T_f \) are initial (start-up) and gas feed temperatures, respectively. \( GHSV \) is the gas hourly space velocity, Eq. (32). \( G_MS/G_MS,0 \) stands for the normalized gravimetric flow rate of the molten salt, Eq. (33).

Variable operating parameters included initial temperature \( (T_int) \), gas stream feed temperature \( (T_f) \), gas hourly space velocity \( (GHSV) \) and the normalized cooling rate \( (G_MS/G_MS,0) \). The gas hourly space velocity is defined as follows:
\[ GHSV = \frac{V_{gf}}{L} \]  

The reference molten salt gravimetric flow rate is calculated assuming that the heat generation rate (for complete CO\textsubscript{2} conversion and no CO formation) is equal to the rate of heat removal by the molten salt (assuming that \( \Delta T_{MS} = 300 \text{ K} \); the operating range of the molten salt is 415-758 K [86]):

\[
G_{MS,0} = \frac{y_{CO,SR} \Delta H_{SR} F_f}{C_p \Delta T_{MS}} \quad F_f = \rho_{gf} V_{Pb} GHSV
\]

4.1 Model validation

![Graph showing CO\textsubscript{2} conversion and CH\textsubscript{4} selectivity over temperature]

**Fig. 13.** Approach to equilibrium: CO\textsubscript{2} conversion \( (X_{CO_2}) \) and selectivity to CH\textsubscript{4} \( (S_{CH_4}) \) obtained in numerical simulations with low space velocity (symbols) are compared to equilibrium values (lines). Parameters in numerical simulations: \( T_{in} = 550 \text{ K} \), \( T_f = 600 \text{ K} \), GHSV = 100 h\textsuperscript{-1}, \( G_{MS} = G_{MS,0} \).

For long residence times, i.e. low space velocity, it is expected that the reactor performance would approach to equilibrium. Comparison between the simulation results obtained at GHSV = 100 h\textsuperscript{-1} and equilibrium data [87] is shown in Fig. 13, in terms of CO\textsubscript{2} conversion and selectivity to CH\textsubscript{4}.
formation (parameters are listed in the figure caption). Excellent agreement with the equilibrium data was obtained. CO₂ conversion is favored at high pressures and low temperatures; CH₄ selectivity drops rapidly at T > 850 K.

![Graph showing approach to equilibrium: CH₄ yield (Y_CH₄) obtained in numerical simulations with low space velocity (symbols) as compared to equilibrium values (lines). Parameters in numerical simulations: T_int = 550 K, T_f = 600 K, GHSV = 100 h⁻¹, G_MS = G_MS,0.](image)

**Fig. 14.** Approach to equilibrium: CH₄ yield (Y_CH₄) obtained in numerical simulations with low space velocity (symbols) as compared to equilibrium values (lines). Parameters in numerical simulations: T_int = 550 K, T_f = 600 K, GHSV = 100 h⁻¹, G_MS = G_MS,0.

Because of a combined effect of the decrease of conversion and selectivity with increasing temperatures, CH₄ yield drops rapidly for T > 800 K, Fig. 14. Therefore, thermal management of the Sabatier process is crucial. Reactor temperature should be kept sufficiently high to accelerate catalytic reactions, but below 900 K, when considerably high CH₄ yield is achievable at slightly elevated pressures, Fig. 14. Moreover, for the reactor configuration studied here, molten salt operating range becomes a crucial parameter. The coolant feed temperature should be obviously kept above the molten salt melting point but also well below the temperature of its thermal decomposition. The recommended operating range for the type of molten salt used in the
simulations is 415 - 758 K [86]. The upper range of this temperature regime is also favorable for CH$_4$ formation, Fig. 14.

4.2 Spatial profiles within the reactor

![Graphs showing spatial profiles within the reactor](image)

Fig. 15. The spatiotemporal profile of reactor ignition (a) and steady state spatial profiles of temperature (b), mole fractions (c), and mole fractions calculated on dry basis (d). $T_{PB}$ and $T_{MS}$ in panel (b) denote temperatures in the packed bed (PB) and molten salt (MS) compartments, respectively; $y_i$ denotes the mole fraction of a component $i$. Parameters in numerical simulations: $N_c = 22$, $T_{int} = 550$ K, $T_f = 450$ K, GHSV = 1,000 h$^{-1}$, $G_{MS} = 0.1G_{MS,0}$.
Typical spatial reactor profiles are presented in Fig. 15, showing the reactor ignition (Fig. 15a) and stationary spatial profiles of temperatures and mole fractions. For the set of parameters listed in Fig. 15, ignition occurs approximately at the first third of the reactor length, with subsequent formation of a stationary thermal front after approximately 5 minutes of simulated time, Fig. 15a. The simulation predicts that steady state temperatures are identical in the packed bed and molten salt compartments, except for the small area at the temperature front, Fig. 15b. Mole fraction profiles form a sharp front coinciding with temperature distribution, Fig. 15c, d. CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2} are mainly consumed at the front, producing mainly CH\textsubscript{4} and H\textsubscript{2}O, as well as a small fraction of CO. Downstream the reactor, there is additional consumption of H\textsubscript{2}, as CO is converted via methanation, Eq. (3). Since the methanation reaction is highly exothermic, downstream cooling will be crucial for reactor performance, as discussed in Section 4.3.4.

Increasing the inlet temperature of the feed gas mixture (T\textsubscript{f}) shifts the location of the thermal front towards the reactor entrance, Fig. 16b. Reactor performance change accordingly (lower panels in Fig. 16). Slightly higher CH\textsubscript{4} yield is obtained for higher feed temperature, but in overall very similar performance is predicted in both cases, Fig. 16. However, the case shown in Fig. 16a is expected to be less beneficial for reactor operation. First, almost a third of the reactor stays cold with no reactions occurring there. Second, a thermal front located at some location within the reactor may be unstable and prone to downstream propagation which can result in reactor extinction, as discussed in Section 4.3.2.
4.3 Reactor performance

Reactor performance was evaluated as a function of variable parameters listed in Table 2: initial (start-up) temperature ($T_{\text{int}}$), inlet temperature of the feed mixture (the composition is $\text{H}_2/\text{CO}_2 = 4$, Table 2) ($T_{\text{f}}$), gas hourly space velocity (GHSV), and the molten salt gravimetric flow rate ($G_{\text{MS}}$) normalized to the reference rate ($G_{\text{MS},0}$). Initial and feed temperatures are expected to affect
the reactor performance significantly because of the high exothermicity of the Sabatier reaction system, Eqs (1-3). Feed flow rates in the reaction and coolant compartments (GHSV and G\textsubscript{MS}) should be crucial in determining the rates of heat generation and removal. To investigate the effects of operation parameters on reactor performance without the disturbance of catalyst deactivation, catalyst activity $a$ is assumed to be 1 in this section (no catalyst deactivation).

4.3.1 Start-up temperature

![Graph showing the effect of initial reactor temperature on reactor performance](image)

**Fig. 17.** Effect of the initial reactor temperature (pre-heating, start-up temperature) on reactor performance in terms of the outlet temperature (left panel) and outlet conversion, selectivity, and yield (right panel). *Parameters: $N_c = 13$, $T_f = 520$ K, GHSV = 1,000 h\(^{-1}\), $G_{\text{MS}} = 0.38G_{\text{MS,0}}$.***

Though the Sabatier reaction is highly exothermic, preheating will be required in a practical situation in order to ignite the reactor (an example of the simulated reactor ignition is shown in Fig. 15a). The effect of the initial (start-up) temperature is shown in Fig. 17: outlet temperatures, conversion, selectivity, and yield are plotted versus initial temperature. It is assumed that the entire reactor is heated to the same temperature, which can be achievable by flowing the molten salt through the cooling tubes before feeding the gas mixture. There is a sharp threshold temperature
of 545 K. Above this temperature, reaction ignition takes place, while further increase in the preheating temperature has virtually no effect on the reactor performance.

### 4.3.2 Effect of feed temperature

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 18.** Moving thermal fronts propagating upstream (a), as a result of increasing feed temperature from $T_r = 510$ K to $T_r = 550$ K, and downstream (b), as a result of switching feed temperature from $T_r = 510$ K to $T_r = 450$ K. Right panels show 2D representation of the spatiotemporal 3D patterns shown in left panels. Parameters: $N_c = 13$, $T_{int} = 550$ K, $GHSV = 1,000$ h$^{-1}$, $G_{MS} = 0.38G_{MS,0}$.

The gas feed temperature ($T_r$) is a crucial operating parameter affecting the temperature distribution within the reactor, Fig. 16. It is expected that below a certain threshold feed temperature reactions will not take place, similarly to the effect of preheating, Fig. 17. On the other
hand, exceedingly high feed temperatures can result in reactor overheating, negatively affecting product distribution of the highly exothermic Sabatier reaction system, Eqs (1-3). In a practical situation, it is desirable to keep the feed temperature as low as possible to save energy. Another important consideration is feed temperature fluctuations which are unavoidable in real systems.

The effect of a step-wise change of the feed temperature is demonstrated in Fig. 18. For parameters listed in Fig. 18 and a feed temperature of $T_f = 510$ K, the simulation predicts formation of a stationary thermal front in the second half of the packed bed, left panels in Fig. 18 for $t < 1$ h. A step-wise increase of the feed temperature to $T_f = 550$ K immediately induces upstream front propagation with subsequent stabilization of the thermal front at the reactor entrance, Fig. 18a. If the feed temperature is abruptly decreased to $T_f = 450$ K, the front propagates downstream, eventually leading to the reactor extinction, Fig. 18b. Such moving thermal fronts are known to form in packed bed reactors with catalytic exothermic reactions; the propagation is due to the combine effect of heat generation, axial heat dispersion, and convection [62, 63]. Understanding this phenomenon is important from the practical point of view, in order to avoid operating under conditions that can lead to the formation of downstream propagating thermal fronts that result in reactor extinction.

Ignition-extinction curves obtained by the gradual increase or decrease of the feed temperature are shown in Fig. 19, in terms of the maximum and outlet packed bed temperature as a function of the feed temperature. For low feed temperatures, which are below the ignition threshold, both the maximum and outlet temperatures increase linearly, until the ignition threshold of $T_f > 500$ K is reached. A small increase in the feed temperature beyond this threshold leads to reactor ignition, Fig. 19. Further increase in the feed temperature results in a moderate decrease of the maximum
and outlet temperature, which can be attributed to the complex coupling of the reaction heat generation, inter-compartment heat transfer, and heat removal by the molten salt. When the feed temperature is gradually decreased following the top branch of the ignition-extinction curve, extinction occurs at $T < 480$ K.

![Fig. 19. Ignition-extinction curves showing the packed bed maximum temperature (a) and the packed bed outlet temperature (b) as a function of the gas feed temperature. Parameters: $N_c = 13$, $T_{int} = 550$ K, $GHSV = 1,000$ h$^{-1}$, $G_{MS} = 0.38G_{MS,0}$.]

Since the extinction temperature is different from the ignition threshold, there is a small region of bi-stability, where both the ignited and extinguished states co-exists. For practical applications, it is favorable to operate the reactor well outside the region of bi-stability where sudden reactor extinctions can occur as a result of fluctuations in the feed temperature. Fluctuations in operating parameters are expected to occur in real situations and other operating parameters can affect the extinction-ignition behavior as well, such as space velocity [62, 63].
4.3.3 Effect of space velocity

Increasing space velocity is beneficial from the point of view of maximizing reactor throughput. However, in the reactor configuration analyzed herein, Fig. 12, the coupling of the reaction heat generation with the heat transfer between the compartments and heat removal by the molten salt can result in nontrivial behavior. The effect of increasing space velocity on reactor profiles is demonstrated in Fig. 20, where elevated cooling rate was used ($G_{MS} = 0.5G_{MS,0}$). At low space velocity, Fig. 20a, the inter-compartment heat transfer is very efficient, resulting in equal temperatures in the packed bed and molten salt compartment, except for the small temperature difference at the reactor entrance, Fig 20 (upper panel). For the parameters used in Fig. 20a, the simulation predicted highly efficient cooling. Both the gas stream and molten salt leave the reactor at the temperature which is only slightly higher than the molten salt feed temperature. Note, that heat losses to the environment was accounted for in the current study, last term in Eq. (8).

Increasing the space velocity ten-folds leads to a very different distribution within the reactor, Fig. 20b. Though for the most of the reactor, the temperatures are equal in both compartments, a very significant temperature gradient exists in the first quarter of the reactor, upper panel in Fig. 20b. The cooling is much less efficient, though same ratio of $G_{MS} = 0.5G_{MS,0}$ is kept; the outlet temperature is ~ 600 K. The exceedingly high packed bed temperature at the reactor entrance affects the mole fraction distribution within the reactor. As a result of less efficient cooling, the outlet mole fraction of CH₄ is lower, lower panel in Fig. 20b. For high space velocities, the heat removal could be limited by the heat transfer between the compartments, which is represented in the model by the heat exchange terms, in Eqs (8, 9).
Wall heat transfer coefficients \( U_{w,HL} \) and \( U_{w,HE} \) are calculated from correlations, Eqs (26-28), and, therefore, cannot be arbitrary manipulated. The reactor geometry is fixed in this study except for the number of cooling tubes \( N_c \) which can be varied within the restriction of the reactor design, Table 1. The effect of the number of coolant tubes on the reactor performance at high space velocity (GHSV = 10,000 h\(^{-1}\)) is demonstrated in Fig. 21. For \( N_c = 22 \), which was used in all simulations presented until this point, both streams (the reaction mixture and the coolant) exit the reactor at same temperature. Decreasing the number of cooling tubes leads to slightly lower outlet temperatures, until a significant difference between the outlet temperatures appear for \( N_c < 12 \). As

---

**Fig. 20.** Temperature profiles (upper panels) and mole fraction distributions (lower panels) for low space velocity, GHSV = 100 h\(^{-1}\) (a) and for elevated space velocity, GHSV = 1,000 h\(^{-1}\) (b). Parameters: \( N_c = 22 \), \( T_{int} = 550 \text{ K} \), \( T_f = 600 \text{ K} \), \( G_{MS} = 0.5 G_{MS,0} \).
molten salt gravimetric flow rate is constant and molten salt should be distributed evenly in all of coolant tubes, the increase of the number of cooling tubes leading to the increase of total cross-sectional area of coolant compartment will result in a decrease of the molten salt velocity in each coolant tube. Thus, more heat is transferred from packed-bed compartment to coolant compartment due to sufficient heat exchange and molten salt temperature increases. However, for $N_c>12$, less heat is removed from the reactor system due to the lower residence time of molten salt in the coolant compartment, so the packed-bed compartment temperature increases accordingly. So for $N_c>12$, higher molten salt gravimetric flow rate is recommended. Although CO$_2$ conversion and CH$_4$ yield are not affected to a significant extent by the inefficient heat transfer (right panel in Fig. 21), the heat removal appears to be limited by the insufficient heat exchange area for $N_c < 12$. Note that the simulations predict CH$_4$ yields over 90% at the elevated space velocity of GHSV = 10,000 h$^{-1}$.

**Fig. 21.** Effect of the number of cooling tubes on the reactor performance at high space velocity. Outlet temperatures of the packed bed (PB) and coolant, molten salt (MS) compartments (a) and outlet conversion, selectivity, and yield (b) are plotted versus the number of cooling tubes ($N_c$) in the reactor. *Parameters: $T_{int} = 550$ K, $T_f = 650$ K, GHSV = 10,000 h$^{-1}$, $G_{MS} = G_{MS,0}$.***
As it is highly desirable to maximize the reactor throughput to increase the rate of CH$_4$ production and thus to reduce the capital cost investment, reactor performance should be investigated over the range of space velocities. In Fig. 22, the reactor performance is evaluated as a function of space velocity ranging from 1,000 l/h to 25,000 l/h using $N_c = 13$, as reducing number of tubes will simplify reactor manufacturing and operation. Elevated rate of cooling was used, $G_{MS} = 0.4G_{MS,0}$, as previous simulations showed insufficient heat removal for $G_{MS} = 0.1G_{MS,0}$ (compare Fig. 16 and Fig. 20). The effect of the space velocity on the outlet CO$_2$ conversion, selectivity to CH$_4$, CH$_4$ yield is demonstrated in the left panel of Fig. 22; showing also the normalized pressure drop, $\Delta P_N = (P_f - P_{out})/P_f$. Corresponding outlet temperatures are shown on the right panel of Fig. 22.

![Figure 22](image)

**Fig. 22.** Effect of space velocity on the reactor performance. Outlet conversion, selectivity, yield, and normalized pressure drop (left panel) and outlet temperatures in the packed bed and molten salt compartments (right panel) are plotted versus gas space velocity. Normalized pressure drop is defined as $\Delta P_N = (P_f - P_{out})/P_f$. Parameters: $N_c = 13$, $T_{int} = 550$ K, $T_f = 600$ K, $G_{MS} = 0.4G_{MS,0}$.

For relatively low space velocities (GHSV < 5,000 h$^{-1}$), outlet CO$_2$ conversions and CH$_4$ yields higher than 90% are achieved, while full selectivity to the formation of CH$_4$ is predicted at the
reactor outlet. These results indicate that the cooling is sufficient to prevent the formation of CO. Indeed, as it can be seen from Fig. 22 (right panel), the outlet packed bed temperatures are below 700 K for GHSV < 5,000 h⁻¹, for which the equilibrium predicts virtually no CO formation. Even though some CO can still be formed in the hottest part of the reactor, it is converted into CO₂ downstream.

As space velocity is further increased, the conversion and yield drop below 90% and the pressure drop starts to be significant, left panel of Fig. 22. The packed bed outlet temperature gradually increase, while the outlet molten salt temperature decreases. For GHSV > 7,000 h⁻¹, there is a substantial difference between outlet temperatures, indicating insufficient heat removal due to the transport limitations, i.e., the rate of heat transfer through the walls of the cooling tubes is significantly lower than the rate of reaction heat generation. Importantly, the 80% CH₄ yield is still achieved at a high space velocity of GHSV = 15,000 h⁻¹, while the outlet molten salt temperature is well above the solidification point and below the thermal decomposition threshold; the operating range of the molten salt is 415-758 K [86]. Above the threshold of GHSV > 15,000 h⁻¹, the reactor performance drops sharply, which can be attributed to overcooling. Note that the gas feed, which enters the reactor at a relatively low temperature of Tᵢ = 600 K, also contributes to the cooling, especially at high space velocities. Pressure drop also increases considerably for GHSV > 15,000 h⁻¹, which can also contribute to the performance drop, as low pressures are thermodynamically unfavorable for the Sabatier reaction, Figs 13, 14. Note that in all simulations the inlet pressure was fixed to Pᵢ = 500 kPa, Table 2.
4.3.4 Optimization of cooling rate

For process optimization, it is highly desirable to maximize the reactor throughput, while keeping high CH$_4$ yields. At the same time, the molten salt flow rate should be minimized in order to reduce energy investment in pumping and storage. However, decreasing the rate of cooling will lead to the increase of the reactor temperature reducing CO$_2$ conversion and, therefore, CH$_4$ production. Therefore, optimization of the molten salt flow rate, i.e., cooling rate, will be crucial for the reactor performance improvement and, therefore, for system optimization.

Effect of the cooling rate on the reactor performance is first examined for a fixed space velocity, Fig. 23. For low cooling rate of $G_{MS} = 0.1G_{MS,0}$, Fig. 23a, the heat removal is insufficient and CO$_2$ is only consumed at the reactor entrance. There is further consumption of H$_2$ downstream the reactor, but only due to the CO conversion, lower panel of Fig. 23a. Importantly, the molten salt temperature is above 800 K for the most of the reactor, which is outside the operating range and thus will lead to thermal decomposition of the molten salt. Increasing the cooling rate ten-fold, to $G_{MS} = G_{MS,0}$, changes reactor profiles dramatically, Fig. 23b. The molten salt temperature is within its operating range, upper panel in Fig. 23b and the packed bed temperature is cooled down along the reactor. As a result, in addition to the CO$_2$ consumption at the reactor entrance, there is additional CO$_2$ consumption downstream the reactor, resulting in a dramatic improvement of CH$_4$ production, lower panel in Fig. 23b. Once can conclude that a declining temperature profile is highly favorable for CH$_4$ production via Sabatier reaction. From the thermodynamic point of view, relatively high temperatures in the first part of the packed bed favor CO$_2$ conversion into CH$_4$ but also to CO, Fig. 13. As temperature declines downstream the reactor, the CO formed is converted into more CH$_4$, as it is predicted by the equilibrium, Fig. 13.
The reactor performance for low and high cooling rates is analyzed in Fig. 24 over a wide range of space velocities, in terms of outlet conversion, selectivity, and yield (also showing pressure drop). From analyzing Fig. 24 in comparison with Fig. 22 (intermediate cooling rate), one can conclude that the sharp drop in the reactor performance can be rather attributed to overcooling by the molten salt. As the cooling rate is increased from low ($G_{MS} = 0.08G_{MS,0}$, left panel in Fig.
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**Fig. 23.** Effect of the cooling rate on the reactor performance. Spatial temperature profiles (upper panels) and mole fraction distributions (lower panels) for low cooling rate, $G_{MS} = 0.1G_{MS,0}$ (a), and elevated cooling rate, $G_{MS} = G_{MS,0}$ (b). Parameters: $N_c = 22$, $T_{int} = 550 K$, $T_f = 600 K$, $GHSV = 2,000 h^{-1}$. 
to intermediate ($G_{MS} = 0.38G_{MS,0}$, left panel in Fig. 22), and to high ($G_{MS} = 0.77G_{MS,0}$, right panel in Fig. 24), the performance drop threshold decreases from $GHSV = 36,000 \text{ h}^{-1}$, to $GHSV = 15,000 \text{ h}^{-1}$, and $GHSV = 8,000 \text{ h}^{-1}$.

![Graphs](image)

**Fig. 24.** Effect of the heat removal rate on the reactor performance. Outlet conversion, selectivity, yield, and normalized pressure drop are plotted versus space velocity for relatively low cooling rate, $G_{MS} = 0.08G_{MS,0}$ (a) and elevated cooling rate, $G_{MS} = 0.77G_{MS,0}$ (b). Parameters: $N_c = 13$, $T_{int} = 550 \text{ K}$, $T_f = 600 \text{ K}$.

Pressure drop can also contribute to the drop in performance, particularly for the case of the low cooling rate: the pressure drop becomes very significant at the threshold space velocity of $GHSV = 36,000 \text{ h}^{-1}$ (Fig. 24, left panel). Since CH$_4$ production is favored by high pressures (Figs 13, 14), it is desirable to keep the entire reactor at high pressure. Operation at low cooling rate is also disadvantageous from the point of view of conversion and selectivity. High conversion and selectivity are only attainable for low space velocity. As the space velocity is increased, both CO$_2$ conversion and selectivity to CH$_4$ drop significantly, resulting in CH$_4$ yields below 60%. This can be attributed to insufficient cooling that results in exceedingly high temperatures that suppress CH$_4$ production.
production. Overcooling, i.e. high cooling rate (Fig. 24, right panel) is also disadvantages. Though high CH₄ yield is obtained, operation is limited to GHSV < 10,000 h⁻¹.

![Fig. 25. Effect of the cooling rate on the reactor performance at high space velocities. Outlet conversion, selectivity, and yield are plotted versus the molten salt flow rate for GHSV = 20,000 h⁻¹ (a) and GHSV = 45,000 h⁻¹ (b). Ranges of the molten salt flow rate correspond to G_{MS} = (0.2-2.3)G_{MS,0} (a) and G_{MS} = (0.05-0.4)G_{MS,0} (b). Parameters: N_c = 13, T_{int} = 550 K, T_f = 650 K.](image)

Since the reactor performance is strongly affected by the rate of heat removal, cooling rate optimization is of crucial importance. The effect of the cooling rate at high (fixed) space velocities is examined in Fig. 25. Outlet conversion, selectivity, and yield are plotted versus the molten salt flow rate for GHSV = 20,000 h⁻¹ (Fig. 25a) and GHSV = 45,000 h⁻¹ (Fig. 25b). The increase in the molten salt gravimetric flow rate initially leads to a considerable improvement in CH₄ production, which is followed by a sharp drop after a certain threshold, similarly to the effect of space velocity, Figs 22, 24. While for GHSV = 20,000 h⁻¹ the selectivity to CH₄ remains almost complete over the entire range, GHSV = 45,000 h⁻¹ increasing the molten salt flow rate results in a very significant improvement, right panel in Fig. 25. In both cases, the optimum in the CH₄ yield is observed, more
pronounced for the higher space velocity. Also, the sharp drop in the reactor performance occurs at a lower $G_{MS}/G_{MS,0}$ ratio for $GHSV = 45,000$ h$^{-1}$.

To summarize the findings discussed in two last sub-sections, it can be concluded that both space velocity and cooling rate (molten slat flow rate) are crucial parameters affecting the reactor performance. The (desirable) increase in the space velocity unavoidably leads to the declining CH$_4$ yield and, eventually, a threshold-like drop in performance leading to conversions and yields which cannot be considered practical (below 20%). Moderately elevated ($GHSV < 10,000$ h$^{-1}$) space velocities with intermediate cooling rates ($G_{MS} \approx 0.5G_{MS,0}$) are recommended for the reactor configuration analyzed here.

### 4.3.5 Techno-economic evaluation

The economic viability of the reactor configuration analyzed in this study should be discussed at the level of the entire system, Fig. 1. Herein, we only provide a preliminary techno-economic evaluation. One of the important considerations is the reactor compactness, which can be evaluated by calculating the power density as a function of the reactor throughput:

$$P = \frac{F_{CH_4, out} LHV_{CH_4}}{V_r}$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

The calculated power densities shown in Fig. 26 (left panel) correspond to the results presented in Fig. 22. The power density increases nearly linearly for increasing reactor throughputs, as the rate of CH$_4$ production increases, for the fixed reactor size. Very high power density is achieved at the optimum, before the reactor performance declines sharply, resulting in a drop of CH$_4$ production.
To evaluate CH\textsubscript{4} production cost, we consider the most essential elements of the synthetic methane generation system shown in Fig. 1: a molten salt pump, a steam turbine, and the reactor itself. The H\textsubscript{2} production infrastructure cost is lumped in the price of H\textsubscript{2}. It is assumed that a pure stream of CO\textsubscript{2} is available. The production cost was calculated using the following equation:

\begin{equation}
\text{production cost} = \text{capital investment} + \text{pumping cost} \times t + \\
+ \left[ F_{H_2,f} \times H_2 \text{ price} - \eta_{ST} G_{MS} C_{p,MS} (T_{MS,\text{out}} - T_{MS,f}) \times \text{electricity price} \right] \times t
\end{equation}  

The capital investment includes the cost of the reactor, molten salt pump, and steam turbine. The reactor cost will not be a significant contribution, since the price of Ni-based catalysts considered herein is less than 10 $/kg and the reactor construction material is stainless steel. The packed bed volume is \( \sim 25 \) L, which will result in approximately $3,000 cost of a single reactor. The molten salt pump and steam turbine costs were assumed to be $40,000 and $58,000, respectively. These are typical prices for the small-to-medium scale equipment (http://www.rh-pumps.com/pump-application/molten-salts/, http://wabashpower.com/inventory/turbine-generators/steam-turbines/510-kw-
The electricity consumption for pumping is considered in Eq. 35 as well, but this contribution was found to be rather insignificant to another time-dependent cost which is H₂ consumption. A (rather optimistic) projection of 2 $/kg was used as a price of renewable H₂. The cost of H₂ consumed can be partially recovered by electricity generation by a steam turbine, Fig. 1, using the reactor outlet molten salt to generate steam. The overall efficiency of the electricity generation from the molten salt heat (ηₚ) was assumed to be 30% and the electricity ceiling price was fixed to 0.13 $/kWh.

The obtained production costs, right panel in Fig. 26, clearly cannot compete with the current low prices of natural gas (~2.5 $/GJ), though historically the price of natural gas fluctuated well above 10 $/GJ (in 2008). Also, the process analyzed in this study consumes CO₂, which can be potentially used for carbon trading. Even though the produced renewable natural gas (RNG) will be eventually burned to generate electricity and heat, the use of RNG reduces the consumption of the fossil natural gas, reducing therefore CO₂ emissions. This is particularly beneficial if the source of CO₂ is not fossil, such as fermentation flue gas or biogas.

As it can be seen from Fig. 26, increasing the number of reactors reduces the production cost substantially. For the relatively small reactor size analyzed herein, no additional molten salt pump or steam turbine is required up to ten reactors, and the cost of reactors is low. As a result, when the number of reactors is increased, the capital cost remains almost same, reducing the production cost. For a small number of reactors, it is beneficial to operate at high space velocities. For ten reactors, similar price is obtained over the entire range, though there is a slight optimum for moderately high space velocity. Importantly, the production cost drops down below 20 $/GJ, starting to approach the price of H₂: 2 $/kg is equivalent to 16.6 $/GJ for H₂, using the low heating.
value. From the thermodynamic point of view, the maximum of 83% of the H\(_2\) energy content can be recovered via the Sabatier reaction (low heating values of CH\(_4\) and H\(_2\) are 802.3 kJ/mol and 241.8 kJ/mol, respectively); the rest is dissipated as heat, Eq. (1). In this case, the CH\(_4\) production cost will be ~ 20 $/GJ. Because some heat is recovered from the molten salt stream for electricity generation, Fig. 1, Eq. (35), it is possible to reduce the production cost even below 20 $/GJ even for incomplete CO\(_2\) conversion and CH\(_4\) yield.

### 4.4 Effect of catalyst deactivation on the reactor performance

The analysis of the catalyst deactivation-dependent reactor operation was conducted via evaluating the reactor performance in the range of operating parameters listed in Table 3: feed pressure (P\(_f\)), steam feed mole fraction (SFMF), gas hourly space velocity (GHSV), and the normalized molten salt flow rate (G\(_{MS}\)/G\(_{MS,0}\)). As the partial pressure of CH\(_4\) can influence the catalyst activity, Eq. (23), the effect of catalyst deactivation was analyzed for two different feedstocks. The first case, denoted as “pure CO\(_2\) feed”, is the feed gaseous mixture that contains only CO\(_2\) and H\(_2\). In the second case, denoted as “biogas feed”, H\(_2\) is fed into reactor along with a raw biogas (60% CH\(_4\) and 40% CO\(_2\)) instead of pure CO\(_2\); it is assumed that impurities that can cause deactivation (e.g., H\(_2\)S) are removed from the raw biogas feed upstream to the reactor. In all simulations, the molar stoichiometric ratio of H\(_2\)/CO\(_2\) = 4 was kept. All relevant parameters are listed in Table 3.

**Table 3. Operating conditions for catalyst deactivation analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H(_2)/CO(_2)</th>
<th>T(_f) (K)</th>
<th>T(_c) (K)</th>
<th>G(<em>{MS})/G(</em>{MS,0})</th>
<th>P(_f) (bar)</th>
<th>SFMF</th>
<th>GHSV (h(^{-1}))</th>
<th>TOS (h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0.08-0.77</td>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>0-0.5</td>
<td>1000-25,000</td>
<td>10-10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H\(_2\)/CO\(_2\) denotes the ratio of feed mole fraction of H\(_2\) to CO\(_2\). T\(_f\) and T\(_c\) stand for the feed temperature of reactants and coolant. G\(_{MS}\)/G\(_{MS,0}\) stands for the normalized gravimetric flow rate of the molten salt, Eq. (33). P\(_f\) denotes the feed pressure and SFMF is the steam feed mole fraction. GHSV is the gas hourly space velocity, Eq. (32). TOS stands for time-on-stream.
4.4.1 Reactor fed with pure CO₂

4.4.1.1 Catalyst deactivation effect

![Graphs showing spatiotemporal profiles](image)

**Fig. 27.** The spatiotemporal profile of activity (a), normalized reaction rate (b), catalyst activity (c) and calculated reactor performance as a function of operation period (d). \( X_{\text{CO}_2}, S_{\text{CH}_4}, \) and \( Y_{\text{CH}_4} \) denote conversion, selectivity, and yield, Eqs. (29-31). Parameters: \( P_f = 5 \) bar, \( T_f = 650 \) K, \( \text{GHSV} = 25,000 \) \( h^{-1} \), \( G_{\text{MS}} = 0.40G_{\text{MS,0}} \)

An example of the spatiotemporal profiles of catalyst activity, normalized Sabatier reaction rate, and reactor temperature, and the dynamic reactor performance are illustrated in Fig. 27. Catalyst activity at the entrance of the reactor is \( \sim 100\% \) since no CH₄ is present in the feed gas,
and a substantial decrease of activity appears when a thermal front is subsequently formed, Fig. 27c. However, activity increases slightly downstream the reactor due to the reaction temperature drop caused by heat removal. Deactivation influencing catalyst activity is also a major parameter affecting reactor temperature, performance, etc. The deactivation effect on reactor performance is presented in Fig. 27d, showing CO$_2$ conversion and CH$_4$ yield experience a sharply decrease initially and a graduated decrease afterwards.

The trend of reactor performance is expected to coincide with the catalyst activity variation. Summarizing the findings in Fig. 27, one can conclude that a considerable rise of temperature along with large amount of CH$_4$ production and H$_2$ consumption lead to a significant catalyst deactivation. However, the decrease of catalyst activity can result in the decrease of reactor temperature. Therefore, deactivation rate will also decrease due to the exponential dependence of the deactivation rate on temperature, Eqs (22, 23).

Spatial profiles of temperatures in the reactor and cooling compartments and mole fractions at TOS = 10 h and TOS = 10,000 h are shown in Fig. 28; TOS stands for time on stream. At TOS = 10 h, when catalyst activity is still high, the reactor performs very well and deactivation barely affect it, Fig. 28a. However, when TOS is up to 10,000 h, reactor temperature, and corresponding CH$_4$ production and H$_2$ consumption are much lower than those at TOS = 10 h, which can be attributed to catalyst deactivation. In addition, by comparing the spatiotemporal profile of activity, Fig. 27a, with the mole fraction distribution, Fig. 28 (right panel), it can be seen that the catalyst activity at the reactor outlet is higher. Since the CH$_4$ mole fraction is actually higher at the reactor outlet than at the location of the thermal front, the catalyst deactivation can be mainly attributed to the effect of high temperature. Indeed, analysis of the catalyst deactivation expression, Eqs (22,
shows the strong, exponential dependence of the deactivation rate on temperature, while the dependence on the CH₄ mole fraction is less steep.

Fig. 28. Spatial temperature profiles (left panel) and mole fraction distribution (right panel) for short-term operation, TOS=10 h (a) and long-term operation, TOS=10,000 h (b). T₁ and Tₑ in left panel denote temperatures in the reactor and coolant compartments, respectively; Parameters: Pₑ = 5 bar, Tₑ = 650 K, GHSV = 25,000 h⁻¹, Gₘₛ = 0.40Gₘₛ₀

4.4.1.2 Effect of steam addition

Since deactivation rate is strongly dependent on temperature, as discussed in Section 4.4.1.1, feed gas diluted by steam is suggested herein to use for prevention of catalyst deactivation via
suppressing reaction heat and shifting products distribution. Steam is advantageous over other gas, such as inert gas and N₂, due to low-cost and recyclability in the methanation system, Eqs. (1-3). Therefore, although the effect of steam gasification, Eq. (6), is not included in the catalyst deactivation kinetics used herein, the addition of steam still can affect the deactivation rate.

The effects of steam addition in feed gas on temperature, mole fractions distributions and catalyst activity are shown in Fig. 29. It can be seen that steam diluting feed gas can suppress reaction and then decrease the temperature, Fig. 29 (upper panel), furthermore, steam addition can change mole fractions distribution via shifting reaction equilibrium, Eqs. (1-3), Fig. 29 (middle panel). In addition, the difference of catalyst activity in Fig. 29 (lower panel) indicates that steam addition in feed gas can prevent catalyst deactivation.

More apparent effects of steam addition on temperature, mole fractions distributions and prevention of catalyst deactivation can be found at high space velocity (SV=25,000 h⁻¹) due to more efficient heat removal, Fig. 30. In addition, steam addition preventing the formation of thermal front can lead to nearly isothermal operation of the reactor, also resolving the overheating issues, Fig. 30b (upper panel). Therefore, despite suppressing reaction and decreasing CH₄ production, steam addition can prevent catalyst deactivation, leading to longer operation period.
Fig. 29. Spatial profiles of temperature and mole fractions and the spatiotemporal profile of catalyst activity at SFMF = 0 (a) and SFMF = 0.5 (b) and GHSV=10,000 h⁻¹; Parameters: \( P_f = 5 \) bar, \( T_f = 650 \) K, \( G_{MS} = 0.40G_{MS,0} \). TOS = 10,000 h
Fig. 30. Spatial profiles of temperature and mole fractions and the spatiotemporal profile of catalyst activity at SFMF = 0 (a) and SFMF = 0.5 (b) and GHSV=25,000 h\(^{-1}\); Parameters: \(P_f = 5\) bar, \(T_f = 650\) K, \(G_{MS} = 0.40G_{MS,0}\), TOS = 10,000 h
The influence of the steam feed mole fraction (SFMF) on CH₄ yield is shown in Fig. 31. It can be seen that for the short-term operation (TOS = 100 h), CH₄ yield decrease with the increase of SFMF, whereas, for longer term operation (TOS = 1,000 h and TOS = 10,000 h), SFMF influences CH₄ yield very slightly, Fig. 31a. In Fig. 31b, it can be seen that the sharp decrease of CH₄ yield indicates that deactivation influence reactor performance significantly at SFMF = 0 (i.e. no steam in feed gas), and increasing SFMF from 0 to 0.3 can lead to CH₄ yield decrease gradually, indicating steam addition in feed gas can prevent catalyst deactivation. When SFMF is further increased to 0.5, the effect on preventing catalyst deactivation become more apparent. Despite steam addition in feed gas will decrease CH₄ yield and the decrease become more significant as SFMF increase, but this negative effect can only influence reactor performance at initial operation period. Therefore, one can conclude that steam addition in feed gas can prevent catalyst deactivation, even though it will reduce the CH₄ production for short-term operation, but the decrease is negligible for long-term operation, indicating steam addition in feed gas can extend reactor operation period.

![Fig. 31. Effect of the steam mole fraction in the feed on CH₄ yield (a), and CH₄ yield variation with time (b); Parameters: \(P_f = 5\)bar, \(T_f = 650\)K, \(GHSV = 25,000\) h⁻¹, \(G_{MS} = 0.40G_{MS,0}\) ]
4.4.2 Reactor fed with biogas feed

4.4.2.1 Effect of feed pressure effect

Using raw biogas as a feed could be an attractive alternative to the use of pure CO\(_2\) as a feedstock, since it does not require costly CO\(_2\) separation; gas clean-up to remove H\(_2\)S will be still required. However, raw biogas contains a high fraction of CH\(_4\) (~60%) which can cause catalyst deactivation immediately at the reactor entrance due to high partial pressure of CH\(_4\) accompanied by a relatively high feed temperature. For biogas feed conditions, feed pressure will affect the CH\(_4\) partial pressure affecting the catalyst deactivation rate. In practical applications, processes are frequently conducted at elevated pressures in order to maximize the process throughput.

![Figure 32](image)

**Fig. 32.** Effect of feed pressure on methane yield (a), and spatial profile of catalyst activity (b); Parameters: \(T_f = 700\) K, GHHSV = 10,000 h\(^{-1}\), \(G_{MS} = 0.40\) \(G_{MS,0}\), TOS = 10,000 h

Fig. 32 demonstrates the effect of feed pressure on the catalyst activity and reactor performance. It can be seen that increasing of feed pressure results in the CH\(_4\) yield decrease and high pressures accelerate the catalyst deactivation, Fig. 32a. Higher pressures increase the gas mixture density resulting in higher molar flow rate for a fixed space velocity. As a result, increasing feed pressure leads to more heat generation and thus higher reactor temperatures that suppress CH\(_4\)
formation via the exothermic Sabatier reaction. Therefore, though high pressures favor CH₄ production according to the equilibrium, Fig. 14, the resulted higher reactor temperatures shift the reaction equilibrium towards less CH₄ production, Fig 32a. Moreover, high operating pressures result in high CH₄ partial pressure, accelerating catalyst deactivation and reducing the reactor lifetime.

Spatial profiles of the catalyst activity at TOS=10,000 h at various feed pressure are shown in Fig. 32b. At the reactor entrance, catalyst deactivation is significant, due to the high partial CH₄ pressure in the reactor feed. At relatively low pressures, catalyst is deactivated in the entire reactor. However, for elevated feed pressures, catalyst activity increases downstream the reactor, which can be attributed to the catalyst regenerated by H₂ at low CH₄ yields. Low CH₄ yields could result from the reactor overcooling; catalyst downstream the reactor is then regenerated by excess H₂, leading to the catalyst activity recovery.

4.4.2.3 Effect of space velocity

It is highly desirable to operate reactor at elevated space velocities in order to maximize reactor throughput. However, higher CH₄ production will also accelerate catalyst deactivation. In addition, in some cases, high space velocity can result in reactor overcooling, causing reactor extinction, Fig. 22. In Fig. 33, reactor performance is evaluated as a function of space velocity to investigate the effect of high throughput operation on catalyst deactivation. It can be seen that CH₄ yield is up to 90% at low space velocity, while increasing space velocity leads to reactor overcooling and, as a result, decreasing CH₄ yields, as discussed in Section 4.3.3.
The effect of catalyst deactivation is apparent for long-term operation, which can be attributed to decaying catalyst activity, Fig. 33a. At low space velocity (1,000 h\(^{-1}\)), catalyst deactivation is slower, however, faster deactivation and significant decline in CH\(_4\) yield occur as space velocity is increased, Fig. 33b. At SV > 20,000 h\(^{-1}\), a larger decrease occurs in CH\(_4\) yield due to rapid catalyst deactivation. The corresponding trends of outlet mole fractions (on dry basis) at different space velocities are shown in Fig. 34. Similarly to CH\(_4\) yield, CH\(_4\) mole fraction decreases with time, and with increasing space velocity which leads to faster catalyst deactivation.

**Fig. 33.** Effect of space velocity on reactor performance (a), and methane yield as a function of operation time (b); Parameters: \(P_f = 2\) bar, \(T_f = 650\) K, \(G_{MS} = 0.40G_{MS,0}\). \(TOS = 10,000\) h
At relatively low space velocity (GHSV = 1,000 h⁻¹) heat removal is very effective, leading to equal temperatures in both the reaction and cooling compartments, except for the small temperature difference at the reactor entrance, Fig. 35a. Despite highly-efficient cooling, catalyst deactivation is still affecting the reactor performance but a relatively higher CH₄ production (more than 40% of methane at the reactor outlet) can be achieved under the influence of deactivation even after 10,000 h of operation, Fig. 35b.

**Fig. 34.** Reactor outlet mole fractions (on dry basis) as a function of time at GHSV = 1,000 h⁻¹ (a), GHSV=10,000 h⁻¹ (b), GHSV=20,000 h⁻¹ (c), GHSV= 25,000 h⁻¹ (d); Parameters: Pᵢ = 2bar, Tᵢ = 650 K, G_{MS} = 0.40 G_{MS,0}, TOS = 10,000 h
For high space velocities (GHSV = 20,000 h⁻¹), there is a substantial difference between outlet temperatures, Fig. 36a, indicating insufficient heat removal due to the heat transfer limitations. The higher outlet reactor temperature results in the decrease of CH₄ yield and, at the same time, accelerated catalyst deactivation. After 10,000 h of operation, CH₄ production is extremely low, Fig. 36b.
4.4.2.4 Effect of cooling rate

Cooling rate is of vital importance to the improvement of methanation reactor throughput, as discussed in Section 4.3.4, but it will also affect catalyst activity. Effective heat removal can decrease reactor temperature favoring CH$_4$ production according to the thermodynamic equilibrium, Fig. 14. However, in some cases increased CH$_4$ production can lead to faster catalyst deactivation due to CH$_4$ cracking and coking of the catalyst surface, as discussed in Section 4.4.2.3. Therefore, cooling rate is a crucial parameter for the reactor performance.
In Fig. 37, reactor performance is evaluated as a function of the normalized cooling rate \( \frac{G_{MS}}{G_{MS,0}} \). It can be seen that increasing cooling rate can promote CH\(_4\) production due to the effective heat removal. However, above the threshold of \( \frac{G_{MS}}{G_{MS,0}} = 0.54 \), further increase of the cooling rate results in reduced CH\(_4\) yield, which can be seen after TOS = 10,000 h, Fig. 37a; TOS denotes time on stream, i.e. time of operation. In some cases, increasing cooling rate can lead to faster catalyst deactivation, Fig. 37b. High molten salt flow rate leads to efficient heat removal that promotes CH\(_4\) production. However, increased CH\(_4\) production can also lead to accelerated catalyst deactivation due to methane cracking and carbon deposition. The effect of cooling rate on deactivation at fixed space velocities is analyzed in Fig. 37b. For TOS < 4,000 h, CH\(_4\) yield increases with cooling rate, with the highest yield achieved at \( \frac{G_{MS}}{G_{MS,0}} = 0.88 \). However, for TOS > 4000 h, the yield at \( \frac{G_{MS}}{G_{MS,0}} = 0.88 \) drops sharply.

**Fig. 37.** Methane yield as a function of the normalized molten salt flow rate (a), and methane yield variation with operation time (b); **Parameters:** \( P_f = 2 \) bar, \( T_f = 650 \) K, \( GHSV = 10,000 \) h\(^{-1}\), TOS = 10,000 h

For the threshold cooling rate of \( \frac{G_{MS}}{G_{MS,0}} = 0.54 \), heat removal is efficient and outlet temperatures are almost equal in the reaction and cooling compartments, leading to 50% of CH\(_4\) at the reactor
outlet for TOS = 100 h, Fig. 38a. As cooling rate is further increased to \(G_{MS}/G_{MS,0}=0.88\), the reactor performs well at TOS = 100 h, Fig. 39a, but catalyst deactivation becomes more serious and reaction extinction happens at TOS = 10,000 h due to the rate of heat generation is significantly lower than heat transfer through the walls of the cooling tubes, Fig. 39b.

![Spatial profiles of temperatures and mole fractions](image-url)

**Fig. 38.** Spatial profiles of temperatures and mole fractions for TOS = 100 h (a) and TOS = 10,000 h (b) and \(G_{MS} = 0.54G_{MS,0}\); Parameters: \(P_f = 2\) bar, \(T_f = 650\) K, \(GHSV = 10,000\) h\(^{-1}\)
4.4.2.5 Optimization of operating parameters

The existence of catalyst deactivation makes the problem of the reactor performance optimization very complicated, since optimum operating conditions can change during the course of reactor operation. The two important and relatively easily adjustable operating conditions are space velocity (reactor throughput) and molten salt flow rate (cooling rate). Elevated space velocities increase reactor throughput, but can lead to short catalyst lifetime requiring frequent catalyst replacement and, thus, increased maintenance cost. On the other hand, for low space velocities,
less CH₄ is produced per unit time, but longer reactor service life can be achieved. Increasing molten salt flow rate at a fixed space velocity can increase CH₄ yield by improving heat removal, but more CH₄ production can accelerate catalyst deactivation and decrease reactor service life. Therefore, elevated cooling rates are not always adaptable for long-term operation. In addition, high molten salt flow rate is not desirable for elevated space velocities due to reactor overcooling, Fig. 39b. Therefore, optimization of operation parameters at various conditions is crucial for reactor performance improvement.

![Fig. 40. CH₄ yield as function of space velocity (SV) and the normalized molten salt flow rate (Gₘₛ/Gₘₛ,₀) for TOS = 100 h (a), TOS = 1,000 h (b), and TOS = 10,000 h; Parameters: Pₛ=2bar, Tₛ=650K.](image)
In Fig. 40, CH₄ yield is evaluated as a function of the space velocity (SV) and normalized molten salt flow rate (G_MS/G_MS,0). It was found that even though CH₄ yield is relatively low, elevated space velocities (20,000 h⁻¹ – 25,000 h⁻¹) are still recommended for short-term operation in order to maximize CH₄ production per unit time. At high space velocities, relatively lower cooling rate (0.2 < G_MS/G_MS,0 < 0.4) is necessary for ensuring a high CH₄ yield (~60%) and avoiding reactor overcooling, Fig. 40a. When TOS is up to 1,000 h, high CH₄ yield (more than 50%) is still achievable at elevated space velocities with relatively lower cooling rate, Fig. 40b. However, as TOS is further increased up to 10,000 h, CH₄ yield is decreased to around 30%, Fig. 40c, which indicates that elevated space velocities are not adaptable for long-term operation due to rapid catalyst deactivation.

At low space velocities, CH₄ yield increases with molten salt flow rate and decreases very slightly (~10%) as TOS increases from 100 h to 10,000 h, Fig. 40a and Fig. 40c. Therefore, low space velocities with high molten salt flow rate are recommended to be applied for long-term operation due to higher CH₄ yield and longer reactor service life.

For the intermediate region of space velocities, CH₄ yield increases with cooling rate, and after the threshold of cooling rate, increasing molten salt flow rate further will decrease CH₄ yield due to reactor overcooling. At the same time, higher molten salt flow rate for the intermediate space velocities will accelerate catalyst deactivation due to more methane production, resulting in short reactor service time, as discussed in Section 4.4.2.4. Therefore, relatively low cooling rate (e.g. G_MS/G_MS,0 ~ 0.4) is recommended for long-term operation at intermediate space velocities, because lower molten salt space velocity can reduce operation cost and increase operation period.
To summarize the findings discussed above, one can conclude that space velocity and cooling rate (molten slat flow rate) are crucial parameters affecting the reactor performance and catalyst activity. Elevated space velocities with low cooling rates are recommended to apply for short-term operations, and relatively lower space velocities with higher cooling rates are beneficial for long-term operations. Moderately elevated space velocities (GHSV ≈ 10,000 h⁻¹) with intermediate cooling rates (GMS ≈ 0.4GMS,0) are the most appropriate from the point of view of both short-term and long-term operation.
5. Concluding remarks

The molten salt-cooled heat exchanger type packed bed reactor was suggested as a novel design configuration for synthetic methane production via Sabatier reaction. A mathematical model was defined and analyzed using numerical simulations in order to determine the effects of operating parameters and to find optimal operation regimes. The reactor performance was evaluated in terms of CO\textsubscript{2} conversion and CH\textsubscript{4} yield, as a function of various parameters including feed temperature, space velocity and cooling rate, which were found to be of crucial importance for the reactor performance. The simulations predicted that under certain optimized operating conditions it is possible to obtain CH\textsubscript{4} yields of more than 90\% at elevated, industrially relevant space velocities.

Optimizing the rate of cooling, i.e. the molten salt flow rate, is a challenging task. On one hand, high cooling rates produce a declining temperature profile in the packed bed which is beneficial from the thermodynamic point of few: low temperatures facilitate methane formation in the exothermic Sabatier reaction. On the other hand, overcooling can lead to a sharp performance drop and even to reactor extinction. Low cooling rates should be avoided because they result in exceedingly high temperatures that negatively affect CH\textsubscript{4} formation and can lead, in a practical situation, to the thermal decomposition of the molten salt. Increasing space velocity is beneficial from the point of view of increased reactor throughputs and, therefore, higher rate of CH\textsubscript{4} production. However, high space velocities can lead to reactor extinction in a threshold-like manner similar to the effect of the overcooling by molten salt.
The effect of catalyst deactivation on the reactor performance was also investigated, by evaluating reactor performance as a function of the simulated time-on-stream, while accounting for catalyst deactivation by methane cracking and carbon deposition on the catalytic surface. It was found that feed pressure, space velocity and cooling rate (molten salt flow rate) are the most crucial parameters affecting the rate of catalyst deactivation. High pressures, which are favorable for methane production according to the equilibrium, actually causes faster catalyst deactivation. This rather complicated phenomenon results from several competing contributions, including the effect of high gas density and higher partial pressure of methane that promote catalyst deactivation and the positive effect of pressure on the equilibrium methane production. Elevated space velocities with low cooling rates are recommended to be applied for short term operations, while relatively lower space velocities with higher cooling rates are beneficial for long-term operation.

A preliminary techno-economic evaluation predicted renewable natural gas (RNG) production costs below 20 $/GJ, for multiple reactors and the optimized cooling rate and reactor throughput. Most of the energy content of H$_2$ consumed in the reaction is recovered in RNG produced and electricity co-generated (up to 80%). Since renewable H$_2$ produced in a distributed manner is less suitable for storage and transportation, converting it into RNG could be an attractive avenue. The most significant contribution to the production cost of RNG is expected to be the price of renewable H$_2$. Therefore, reducing the production cost of renewable H$_2$ can lead to a widespread introduction of RNG into the markets.
Reference

Appendix

A.1 Dimensionless model

\[
\frac{\partial u_{CO_2}}{\partial \tau} = \left( \frac{1}{Pe_m} \right) \frac{\partial^2 u_{CO_2}}{\partial \xi^2} - \frac{\partial u_{CO_2}}{\partial \xi} + Da(k^2_f \eta_2 + k_3 \eta_3)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_{H_2}}{\partial \tau} = \left( \frac{1}{Pe_m} \right) \frac{\partial^2 u_{H_2}}{\partial \xi^2} - \frac{\partial u_{H_2}}{\partial \xi} + Da(3 \hat{k}_1 \eta_1 + k^2 \eta_2 + 4 \hat{k}_3 \eta_3)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_{CO}}{\partial \tau} = \left( \frac{1}{Pe_m} \right) \frac{\partial^2 u_{CO}}{\partial \xi^2} - \frac{\partial u_{CO}}{\partial \xi} + Da(\hat{k}_1 \eta_1 - \hat{k}_2 \eta_2)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_{H_2,O}}{\partial \tau} = \left( \frac{1}{Pe_m} \right) \frac{\partial^2 u_{H_2,O}}{\partial \xi^2} - \frac{\partial u_{H_2,O}}{\partial \xi} + Da(-\hat{k}_1 \eta_1 - \hat{k}_2 \eta_2 - 2 \hat{k}_3 \eta_3)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_{CH_4}}{\partial \tau} = \left( \frac{1}{Pe_m} \right) \frac{\partial^2 u_{CH_4}}{\partial \xi^2} - \frac{\partial u_{CH_4}}{\partial \xi} + Da(-\hat{k}_1 \eta_1 - \hat{k}_3 \eta_3)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \tau} = \frac{1}{Pe_e} \frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial \xi^2} + \beta Da[k_1 f_1 (\Delta H_2) \eta_1 + k_2 f_2 (\Delta H_2) \eta_2 + k_3 f_3 (\Delta H_3) \eta_3] - nSt_1 (\theta - \theta_e) - St_2 (\theta - \theta_e)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \mathcal{\epsilon}}{\partial \tau} = \frac{1}{Pe_e} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{\epsilon}}{\partial \xi^2} - nSt_1 (\mathcal{\epsilon} - \mathcal{\epsilon}_e)
\]

\[
P = 1 - J \left( 1505 \hat{\nu}_e + 1.75 Re \hat{\nu}_e \right) \xi
\]

Dimensionless parameters:

\[
\theta = \frac{T}{T_f} ; \quad \theta_e = \frac{T_e}{T_f} ; \quad \theta_f = \frac{T_f}{T_f} ; \quad \theta_{cf} = \frac{T_{cf}}{T_f} ; \quad \tau = \frac{t}{L/v_g} ; \quad \hat{\xi} = \frac{z}{L} ; \quad u_t = \frac{C_t}{C_{gf}}
\]

\[
P = \frac{P_i}{P_{gf}} ; \quad P = \frac{P_i}{P_{gf}} ; \quad u_f = \frac{C_f}{C_{gf}} ; \quad \hat{\nu}_g = \frac{v_g}{v_{gf}} ; \quad (\Delta H_f) = \frac{-\Delta H_f}{-\Delta H_i}
\]

\[
f_1 = \left( \frac{y_{CH_4} y_{H_2,O} - \frac{y_{CO}^2}{K_{eq1}}}{y_{H_2}^2} \right) \left( \frac{\hat{\nu}_g}{\hat{\nu}_f} \right)^2 ; \quad f_2 = \left( \frac{y_{CO} y_{H_2,O} - \frac{y_{CO}^2}{K_{eq2}}}{y_{H_2}^2} \right) \left( \frac{\hat{\nu}_g}{\hat{\nu}_f} \right)^2 ; \quad f_3 = \left( \frac{y_{CH_4} y_{H_2,O} - \frac{y_{CO}^2}{K_{eq3}}}{y_{H_2}^2} \right) \left( \frac{\hat{\nu}_g}{\hat{\nu}_f} \right)^2
\]

\[
\text{DEN} = 1 + K_{CO} \hat{\nu}_f + K_{H_2} \hat{\nu}_f + K_{CH_4} \hat{\nu}_f + \frac{K_{H_2,O} P_{H_2}}{P_{H_2}}
\]
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\[ k_{\text{lad}} = A_i \exp(-\gamma_{\text{lad}}) \quad \gamma_{\text{lad}} = \frac{Ea}{RT_{\text{lad}}} \quad k_1 = \frac{k_2}{k_{\text{lad}}} \quad k_2 = \frac{P^{1.5}}{k_{\text{lad}}} \quad k_3 = \frac{K_{\text{eq}2}}{k_{\text{lad}}} \quad K_{\text{eq}1} = \frac{K_{\text{eq}1}}{P_t} \quad K_{\text{eq}3} = \frac{K_{\text{eq}3}}{P_t} \]

\[ \sigma = \frac{\eta_{\text{pg}} C_{\text{pg}} + (1 - \varepsilon) \rho_{\text{s}} C_{\text{ps}}}{\eta \rho_{\text{g}} C_{\text{pg}}} \quad \beta = \frac{(\Delta H_i)}{C_{\text{pg}} T_i u \tau} \quad Da = \frac{\rho_{\text{s}} (1 - \varepsilon) k_{\text{lad}}}{P_t^{0.5}} \quad Re = \frac{L \rho_{\text{g}} v_{gf}}{\mu_g} \]

\[ Pe_m = \frac{\nu_g L}{D_{\text{ae}}} \quad Pe_r = \frac{L v_e \rho_{\text{g}} C_{\text{pg}}}{k_{\text{ae}}} \quad Pe_c = \frac{L v_e \rho_c C_{\text{pc}}}{\lambda_c} \quad J = \frac{v_{gf} \mu_{\text{g}} (1 - \varepsilon)}{P_t \varepsilon^3 d_p} \quad S = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon) L}{d_p} \]

Dimensionless initial and boundary conditions:

\[ \xi = 0: \quad -\frac{1}{P_{e_m}} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial \xi} = (u_{j_i} - u_i) \quad \xi = 1: \quad \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial \xi} = 0 \quad \tau = 0: \quad u_i(0, \xi) = u_{i_{\text{int}}} \]

\[ -\frac{1}{P_{e_r}} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \xi} = (1 - \theta) \quad \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \xi} = 0 \quad \theta(0, \xi) = \theta_{\text{int}} \]

\[ -\frac{1}{P_{e_c}} \frac{\partial \theta_c}{\partial \xi} = (\theta_{c_{j}} - \theta_c) \quad \frac{\partial \theta_c}{\partial \xi} = 0 \quad \theta_c(0, \xi) = \theta_{c_{\text{int}}} \]

### A.2 Kinetic data

\[ K_{1,eq} = 1.198 \times 10^{17} \exp(\frac{-26830}{T}) \text{ kPa}^2 \]

\[ K_{2,eq} = 1.767 \times 10^{-2} \exp(\frac{4400}{T}) \text{ Dimensionless} \]

\[ K_{3,eq} = 2.117 \times 10^{15} \exp(\frac{-22430}{T}) \text{ kPa}^2 \]

### Table. A. 1. Reaction kinetic parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>( A_i ) and ( B_i )</th>
<th>( \text{Ea and } \Delta H \text{ (kJ/mol)} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( k_1 )</td>
<td>( 9.49 \times 10^{15} )</td>
<td>240.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_2 )</td>
<td>( 4.39 \times 10^6 )</td>
<td>67.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_3 )</td>
<td>( 2.29 \times 10^{15} )</td>
<td>243.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{\text{CO}} )</td>
<td>( 8.23 \times 10^{-5} )</td>
<td>-70.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{\text{CH}_4} )</td>
<td>( 6.65 \times 10^{-4} )</td>
<td>-38.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{\text{H}_2O} )</td>
<td>( 1.77 \times 10^5 )</td>
<td>88.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The units in the table are as follows: $k_1, k_3 = \text{kmol-bar}^{0.5}/\text{kg cat-h}$; $k_2 = \text{kmol/kg cat-h-bar}$; $K_{\text{CH}_4}, K_{\text{CO}}, K_{\text{H}_2} = \text{bar}^{-1}$.

Table A. 2. Catalyst deactivation kinetic parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$K_{d0}$</th>
<th>$E_d$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.35 \times 10^8$</td>
<td>$1.74 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.3 Regression equations of thermophysical properties

Gas components[83]:

Heat capacity (kJ/mol-K):

- $C_{p,\text{CO}} = -2 \times 10^{-8}T^2 - 5 \times 10^{-5}T + 0.0256$;
- $C_{p,\text{H}_2} = 3 \times 10^{-7}T^2 - 2 \times 10^{-6}T + 0.0297$;
- $C_{p,\text{CO}} = 10^{-8}T^2 - 7 \times 10^{-8}T + 0.0301$;
- $C_{p,\text{H}_2} = 10^{-8}T^2 - 5 \times 10^{-6}T + 0.0356$;
- $C_{p,\text{CH}_4} = 0.03\ln(T) - 0.1394$

Thermal Conductivity (kW/m-K):

- $\lambda_{\text{CO}} = 8 \times 10^{-8}T - 4 \times 10^{-6}$;
- $\lambda_{\text{H}_2} = 5 \times 10^{-7}T + 4 \times 10^{-5}$;
- $\lambda_{\text{CO}} = 6 \times 10^{-8}T + 8 \times 10^{-6}$;
- $\lambda_{\text{H}_2} = 10^{-7}T - 2 \times 10^{-5}$;
- $\lambda_{\text{CH}_4} = 2 \times 10^{-7}T - 3 \times 10^{-5}$

Viscosity (Pa s):

- $\mu_{\text{CO}} = 4 \times 10^{-8}T + 6 \times 10^{-6}$;
- $\mu_{\text{H}_2} = 2 \times 10^{-8}T + 5 \times 10^{-6}$;
- $\mu_{\text{H}_2} = 4 \times 10^{-8}T - 3 \times 10^{-6}$;
- $\mu_{\text{CH}_4} = 3 \times 10^{-8}T + 4 \times 10^{-6}$

Alumina support[84]:

Heat Capacity (kJ/kg-K): $C_{ps} = 1.0446 + 1.742 \times 10^{-4}T - 2.796 \times 10^4T^{-2}$;

Thermal Conductivity (kW/m-K): $\lambda_s = 5.5 \times 10^{-3} + 34.5 \times 10^{-3}\exp[-0.0033 \times (T - 273)]$;

Density (kg/m^3): $\rho_s = 3.85 \times 10^3$

Solar molten salt[86]:

Heat Capacity (kJ/kg-K): $C_{ps} = 2 \times 10^{-4}T + 1.2738$;

Thermal Conductivity (kW/m-K): $\lambda_s = 2 \times 10^{-7}T - 4 \times 10^{-4}$;

Density (kg/m^3): $\rho_s = -0.5572T + 2219.1$