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1. Introduction

Sulfur-compounds, including hydrogen sulfide (H2S) and sulfur dioxide (SO2), frequently appear as contaminants in process streams in the production, processing and refining of fossil fuels [1–4]. Emissions of these compounds are regulated because of their potential for adverse health and environmental effects. H2S poisons water-gas-shift catalysts and hydrogen separation membranes used in integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) processes for electricity production from coal. Many current-generation technologies for removal of sulfur-compounds from gas streams are based on absorption by liquids, usually amine solutions or oxygenated solvents. Amine-based systems are suitable for current emissions requirements, but cannot achieve future regulation levels; processes based on oxygenated solvents are typically expensive and energy intensive [5,6].

Solid sorbents have seen growing interest for both capture and conversion of sulfur-compounds. Low-cost, environmentally benign activated carbon is unique among solid sorbents because of its high surface area (as high as 3000 m2/g), its pore size distribution (typically in the 5–30 Å range), its broad range of surface functional groups, and its relatively high mechanical strength [1,7–9]. Activated carbon can be used at typical flue gas outlet temperatures, so there is no need to cool or reheat the process stream. Both chemical interactions, which depend on the chemical nature of the adsorbate, co-adsorbates and the surface, and physical factors, which include size exclusion and pore-diffusion, influence the capture of molecules by activated carbons [9,10]. Carbons can also promote partial catalytic oxidation reactions, providing the potential for conversion of the captured sulfur-compounds to valuable commodity chemicals [3–6,11].

Generally, carbon surfaces are non-polar and, thus, will not adsorb polar molecules. Activation of the carbon increases its affinity for adsorption of polar species such as H2S and SO2. Activated carbon is derived from materials with high carbon contents such as coal, wood, lignite, and peat [9]. The activation process consists of two primary steps: pulverization and exposure to high temperatures [5,9]. The process forms an amorphous heterogeneous carbon matrix in a random ordering of imperfect aromatic (“graphene”) sheets [12]. Within the carbon sheets, two carbon atom hybridizations, sp2 and sp3, typically exist in an 80:20 ratio [13,14]. As shown schematically in Fig. 1a, most carbon atoms in the sheet are organized in high atom-density basal planes with 3-fold sp2 coordination, forming σ-bonds in hexagonal rings [15]. These planes form parallel layers, as in graphite, so that the fourth valence electron of the sp2 atom lies in a π-orbital normal to the σ-bonding plane. Surface defects, which are often active for chemisorption, most frequently appear at the edges of misaligned graphene sheets. They can have the form of sp2-hybridized carbon atoms with incompletely saturated valences or sp3-hybridized carbon atoms with both unpaired electrons and unsaturated valences [9,12–14]. Activation also significantly reduces the number of organic compounds adsorbed on the carbon surface.
while heteroatoms such as oxygen, nitrogen, and hydrogen all remain to differing degrees [10].

Previous studies of activated carbon as a catalytic sorbent for sulfur-compounds have focused on behavior under dynamic conditions at atmospheric pressure and report material performance in breakthrough capacity tests. These studies have addressed the effects of gas composition, temperature, pressure, microporosity, heteroatoms/surface modifiers, metal dopants, the acidic/basic nature of the surface, the role of solvents, most notably water, and the possibilities for thermal regeneration [1,3,4,7,8,10,16–22]. However, little is known at the molecular level about the nature of sulfur-compound adsorption onto carbonaceous surfaces. In this work, we prepare a set of well-controlled model carbon surfaces and apply the methods of ultra-high vacuum (UHV) surface science to determine how microstructure and surface chemical modification influence adsorption capacity and desorption kinetics for H₂S and SO₂. This approach allows us to isolate and understand important elementary steps in capture of sulfur-compounds by carbon surfaces; our results will contribute to a basis for rational design of next-generation activated carbons for fossil fuel application.

2. Experimental details

All experiments were carried out in a stainless steel UHV chamber evacuated with a turbomolecular pump, a cryogenic pump, and a titanium sublimation pump to a base pressure of 10⁻⁹ Torr. The chamber is equipped with an X-ray photoelectron spectrometer (XPS) system for verification of the cleanliness of deposition substrates and surface chemistry of the films. XPS measurements were carried out with a single pass hemispherical energy analyzer and an X-ray source operating at 13 kV and 20 mA at an angle of incidence of 54.7° to the sample. Additional details of the apparatus have been described elsewhere [23].

A homogeneous HOPG (highly oriented pyrolytic graphite, 12 mm × 12 mm × 2 mm) substrate was used as a reference carbon surface in this work. The HOPG crystal was mounted in a Ni foil sample holder. To improve thermal contact, Ag paste was applied between the HOPG crystal and the holder. Carbon thin films were deposited onto a polycrystalline Ni substrate (12.5 mm diameter × 0.5 mm) using a DC magnetron sputtering source. Both the Ni foil and the Ni substrate were mounted, via Ta leads, to a copper block which was cooled with liquid nitrogen to 90 K and resistively heated to 1000 K. The temperature was measured with a chromel-alumel (K-type) thermocouple spot welded to the back side of the Ni.

The HOPG surface was cleaned outside of the chamber by cleaving the top layer with Scotch™ tape to remove the topmost crystalline layers and to expose a new basal plane. In UHV the HOPG was annealed to 1000 K. The Ni substrate was cleaned outside of the chamber by polishing with Buehler MetaDi® II 1 μm diamond polish. Further cleaning was performed in vacuum by cycles of Ar⁺ sputtering followed by 1000 K anneals to remove the primary contaminant (oxygen) to less than ~3 at.% (determined by XPS) before carbon film deposition.

Four types of sputtered carbon thin films were prepared: amorphous carbon (a-C), oxidized amorphous carbon (a-COₓ), amorphous carbon nitride (a-CNₓ), and amorphous hydrogenated carbon (a-CHₓ). All films were deposited with 75 W power, using a 1.3³ high-purity (99.99%) pyrolytic graphite target. Gases used for thin film deposition were introduced via mass flow controllers. The a-C surface was prepared in an Ar plasma at a pressure of 8 mTorr [24]. During the 15 min deposition, the nickel substrate was held at 600 K, with a floating bias [24]. The a-COₓ film was initially prepared in the same manner as the a-C film, but was subsequently exposed to O₂ at a pressure of 6 × 10⁻⁴ Torr for approximately 10 h [24,25]. X-ray photoemission analysis of the product film revealed a surface concentration of atomic oxygen ranging from 10 to 15 at. %, similar to oxygen contents reported for commercial activated carbons [16,17]. The a-CNₓ film was prepared in an atmosphere of N₂ at a pressure of 5 mTorr [24,26]. The unbiased sample was heated to a temperature of 500 K during the 20 min deposition [24,26]. The a-CHₓ film was prepared in a 7:1 Ar:CH₄ gas mixture at a pressure of 8 mTorr. The electrically grounded sample was heated to a temperature of 443 K during the 25 min deposition [26].

The nature of the interactions between the sulfur-compounds and the carbon surfaces was characterized in temperature programmed desorption (TPD) experiments. TPD provides insight into desorption kinetics and allows estimation of the energy of desorption, E_d, a measure of the strength of the affinity that the surface has for the adsorbed molecule. For the TPD experiments,
the carbon surfaces were exposed to H₂S or SO₂ (Matheson Tri Gas, research grade) introduced into the chamber via an external leak valve. A quadrupole mass spectrometer (QMS) was used as a detector for the desorbing molecules. TPD of SO₂ and H₂S from HOPG was performed by first exposing the surface to adsorbate at 100–110 K and then monitoring SO₂ (m/q = 64) or H₂S (m/q = 34) desorption with the QMS while heating the surface at 0.5 K/sec. TPD from the sputter-deposited amorphous carbon surfaces was performed by exposing the surface to SO₂ or H₂S at temperatures between 89 and 92 K and then monitoring desorption of the species with the QMS while heating the surface at 1 K/s.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. TPD of SO₂ from the carbon surfaces

Fig. 2 displays the thermal desorption spectra of SO₂ from the HOPG surface for exposures from 0.6 to 8 L (1 L = 10⁻⁶ Torr s). The shapes of the TPD spectra—common leading edges followed by rapid fall to zero desorption rate upon depletion of adsorbed molecules—are characteristic of zero-order desorption kinetics [27]. Using the leading edge analysis of Habenschaden and Kuppers [28], E_{des}, the energy of desorption for SO₂ from HOPG was estimated to be 35 ± 1 kJ/mol. This value is consistent with E_{des} for SO₂ desorption from multilayers on other surfaces [29,30] and is only slightly higher than SO₂’s heat of sublimation, ∆H_{sub} = 32.32 kJ/mol [31]. These results suggest a cooperative adsorption mechanism in which adsorbate–adsorbate attractive interactions play a significant role, resulting in condensation of the polar SO₂ molecules on the surface as multilayer islands or clusters [32]. The condensed molecules are bound to the surface via weak van der Waals interactions with the π-electrons in the aromatic rings of the carbon surface [9].

The TPD spectra of SO₂ from the a-C surface following adsorption using exposures between 0.3 and 13 L are shown in Fig. 3. The peak shapes are very different from those observed for desorption from the HOPG surface. They display a distinct asymmetry, with peak temperatures that decrease with increasing exposure. This behavior is similar to that observed for desorption of alcohols and ethers from amorphous carbon surfaces. The decrease in the peak desorption temperature with increasing coverage is usually associated with second-order (bimolecular) desorption kinetics, but it is not likely that molecular desorption of SO₂ occurs via a second-order process. The decrease in the peak desorption temperature could also arise from repulsive interactions between adsorbed SO₂ molecules resulting in a differential heat of desorption that decreases with coverage. This also seems unlikely, given that desorption of SO₂ from the HOPG surface displays zero-order desorption kinetics (Fig. 2), suggesting that SO₂ molecules condense rather than repel one another.

A more likely scenario is that SO₂ desorbs with first-order kinetics from an energetically heterogeneous a-C surface. On the energetically heterogeneous surface, mobile adsorbed molecules sample available adsorption sites and choose those with the highest affinity for binding [9]. As the surface continues to fill at increasing coverages, adsorbed molecules must choose sites with lower binding energies. Peak temperatures for SO₂ desorption from a-C vary from 175 K at the lowest exposure to 145 K at the highest exposure. Based on a first-order Redhead analysis with a pre-exponential factor of ν = 10¹³ s⁻¹ [33], these peak temperatures correspond to desorption energies, E_{des}, that decrease from 47 ± 1 (lowest exposure) to 36 ± 1 kJ/mole (highest exposure). The observations of first-order rather than zero-order desorption kinetics and higher values of E_{des} illustrate that the a-C surface has a stronger affinity for SO₂ than does HOPG. This difference probably reflects the contribution of defects at the periphery of graphene sheets on the a-C surface, as illustrated in Fig. 1a. The observation of an energetically heterogeneous surface is consistent with the presence of more than one type of edge site.

Fig. 4 displays the thermal desorption spectra of SO₂ from the a-CO₂ surface for exposures between 0.5 and 20 L. As was the case for a-C, SO₂ desorbs from a-CO₂ with first-order kinetics and values of E_{des} that decrease with increasing coverage. The values of E_{des} for SO₂ on the a-CO₂ surface vary from 46 ± 1 (lowest exposure) to 38 ± 1 (highest exposure). This E_{des} range is the same as was observed for first-order desorption of SO₂ from a-C, suggesting that the strength of interaction between SO₂ and these two surfaces is similar. Fig. 5 shows the relative amounts of SO₂ that desorb from a-C and a-CO₂ as a function of exposure. At all exposures, a-C desorbs almost twice as much SO₂ as does a-CO₂. Assuming similar sticking coefficients for SO₂ adsorption onto a-C and a-CO₂, oxygen treatment appears to reduce the density of sites for SO₂ adsorption, perhaps by capping defect sites at the edges of the graphene sheets as phenolic or carboxylic groups, as illustrated in Fig. 1b.
TPD spectra of SO$_2$ from the a-CN$_x$ surface for exposures between 0.5 and 12 L appear in Fig. 6. As was observed for HOPG, peak shapes are consistent with zero-order desorption kinetics. $E_{\text{des}}$ for SO$_2$ desorption from a-CN$_x$, estimated by leading edge analysis, is 33 $\pm$ 1 kJ/mol. This value is marginally lower than $E_{\text{des}}$ estimated for SO$_2$ desorption from HOPG, suggesting that the SO$_2$ interaction with the a-CN$_x$ aromatic $\pi$-system may be slightly weaker than in HOPG. Fig. 7 displays the N1s XPS spectrum of the a-CN$_x$ film. The spectrum can be deconvoluted as two features at 400.8 eV (P1, FWHM = 2.7 eV) and 398.6 eV (P2, FWHM = 2.1 eV). The feature at 400.8 eV can be assigned to 3-fold coordinated nitrogen in a sp$^2$ carbon environment, i.e. substitutional graphite sites [26]. While its origin is less certain, Hellgren et al. suggest that the feature at 398.6 eV corresponds to either 3-fold coordinated nitrogen in a sp$^3$-hybridized carbon matrix or in a pyridine-like structure where 2-fold coordinated sp$^2$-hybridized nitrogen forms two bonds at the edge of the graphitic structure [26]. A model of the a-CN$_x$ surface which is consistent with these observations appears in Fig. 1c. Without the unsaturated edge defect sites that characterize a-C, a-CN$_x$ bears a strong resemblance to HOPG and the mechanisms for interaction between SO$_2$ and the surface are likely similar in the two cases. However, the presence of N-atoms may cause some subtle differences. For example, ring-N can withdraw electron density from the $\pi$-sites, thus decreasing the strength of the dispersion forces [12]. This effect could be responsible for the slightly lower $E_{\text{des}}$ (relative to HOPG) observed for a-CN$_x$. Significantly, the basic surface groups in a-CN$_x$ do not appear to generate new surface adsorption sites.

The TPD spectra of SO$_2$ from the a-CH$_x$ surface for exposures between 0.5 and 12 L, shown in Fig. 8, display the characteristic zero-order peak shape. $E_{\text{des}}$, estimated by analysis of the leading edges, is 32 $\pm$ 1 kJ/mol. This value is slightly lower than $E_{\text{des}}$ of SO$_2$ from HOPG and equivalent to $E_{\text{des}}$ of SO$_2$ from a-CN$_x$; it is comparable to $\Delta H_{\text{sub}}$ of SO$_2$. The mechanism for adsorption is likely the same as described earlier for SO$_2$ on both HOPG and a-CN$_x$. During growth of the a-CH$_x$ film, the surface defects associated with higher values of $E_{\text{des}}$ and first-order desorption kinetics either do not form or are reduced by hydrogen atoms, creating a surface that is much like HOPG (Fig. 1d), with only $\pi$-electrons available for weak interaction with SO$_2$. The slightly lower value of $E_{\text{des}}$ observed for the a-CH$_x$ surface may reflect a smaller aromatic domain than in HOPG.

Fig. 4. Temperature programmed desorption of SO$_2$ from the a-CO$_x$ surface for a series of different exposures. Exposures were performed at ~90 K. The heating rate was 1 K/s. Peak shapes suggest first-order desorption from an energetically heterogeneous surface.

Fig. 5. Relative quantities of SO$_2$ desorbed (measured as thermal desorption peak area) as a function of exposure for the five carbon surfaces.

Fig. 6. Temperature programmed desorption of SO$_2$ from the a-CN$_x$ surface for a series of different exposures. Exposures were performed at ~90 K; the heating rate was 1 K/s. Peak shapes are characteristic of zero-order desorption kinetics.

Fig. 7. N 1s region of the XPS spectrum of a-CN$_x$ film. P1 corresponds to substitutional graphite sites. P2 corresponds to either N in a 3-fold coordinated sp$^3$-hybridized carbon state or in a pyridine-like structure at the edge of the graphene sheets.
As noted during the discussion of SO\textsubscript{2} adsorption on a-C-O\textsubscript{x}, different surfaces can display different capacities for SO\textsubscript{2} adsorption. Fig. 5 includes plots of the TPD peak area as a function of exposure for each of the carbon surfaces studied. XPS analysis of the carbon surfaces after TPD shows that no SO\textsubscript{2} remains, therefore, the desorption peak areas can be used as a relative measure of the amounts of SO\textsubscript{2} adsorbed by the different carbon surfaces. Differences in the slopes of the lines reflect differences in both SO\textsubscript{2} sticking coefficient and adsorption site density. The a-C surface adsorbs the most SO\textsubscript{2}, likely due to a high density of high energy edge defect sites. As described earlier, post-treatment of a-C by exposure to O\textsubscript{2} blocks a fraction of the a-C edge sites to form a-C-O\textsubscript{x}; in Fig. 5, this effect is reflected as a smaller slope for a-C-O\textsubscript{x} than for a-C.

The coverage-exposure plots for HOPG, a-CN\textsubscript{x}, and a-CH\textsubscript{x} also display lower slopes than a-C. These surfaces do not possess the high energy edge defects; their interactions with SO\textsubscript{2} occur via the weaker π-bond and could be characterized by lower sticking coefficients. There are subtle, but potentially important, differences among this trio: HOPG adsorbs the most SO\textsubscript{2} followed by a-CN\textsubscript{x} and a-CH\textsubscript{x}. This is the same order as their $E_{\text{des}}$, suggesting that stronger interaction between condensed SO\textsubscript{2} islands and the surface may promote formation of more or larger islands.

3.2. Interactions of H\textsubscript{2}S with the carbon surfaces

Exposures as high as 20 L at 92–110 K did not result in the adsorption of H\textsubscript{2}S onto the HOPG, a-CN\textsubscript{x}, or a-CH\textsubscript{x} surfaces. Note that these are the three surfaces on which SO\textsubscript{2} adsorbed through self-interaction to form islands bound via weak van der Waals interactions with π-electrons in the aromatic rings of the carbon surface. H\textsubscript{2}S has a significantly lower value of $D_{\text{H}}$ sub than SO\textsubscript{2} (23.01 vs. 32.32 kJ/mol) \cite{31}, reflecting a lower degree of self-interaction which may prevent condensation and island formation on these surfaces.

Thermal desorption spectra of H\textsubscript{2}S from the a-C and a-C-O\textsubscript{x} surfaces, after exposures in the range 0.5–21 L are shown in Figs. 9 and 10, respectively. On both surfaces, H\textsubscript{2}S desorption is first-order, with the peak desorption temperature varying from 150 K (low coverage) to 115 K (high coverage). This trend is similar to that observed for SO\textsubscript{2} on the a-C and a-C-O\textsubscript{x} surfaces, suggesting that H\textsubscript{2}S also binds at edge defect sites. Using the first-order Redhead analysis with a pre-exponential factor of $n = 10^{13}$ s\textsuperscript{-1}, the values of $E_{\text{des}}$ for desorption of H\textsubscript{2}S from both a-C and a-C-O\textsubscript{x} were estimated. For both surfaces, the value of $E_{\text{des}}$ varied from 39 ± 1 (low coverage) to 30 ± 1 kJ/mol (high coverage). These values are larger than H\textsubscript{2}S' heat of sublimation, $\Delta H_{\text{sub}} = 23.01$ kJ/mol \cite{31}; they fall between the values of $E_{\text{des}} = 20.6$ kJ/mol reported by Doleva et al. for H\textsubscript{2}S on carbon black \cite{34} and the range of values reported by Bagreev et al. for a number of commercial activated carbons ($E_{\text{des}} = 39 – 47$ kJ/mol) \cite{17}. According to Bagreev et al., the larger values of $E_{\text{des}}$ on commercial activated carbons results from their microporosity. Effects such as capillary condensation contribute to a higher effective activation barrier to desorption.

As was the case for SO\textsubscript{2}, post treatment of a-C to form a-C-O\textsubscript{x} does not affect the kinetics of H\textsubscript{2}S desorption, but does reduce its capacity for H\textsubscript{2}S adsorption. Therefore the oxygen species appears to inhibit adsorption via the site blocking mechanism described for SO\textsubscript{2}.

4. Conclusion

We have applied the methods of ultra-high vacuum surface science to characterize adsorption and desorption of SO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}S...
for a series of model carbon surfaces. We have shown that both microstructure and chemical composition of carbonaceous materials contribute to their interactions with \( \text{SO}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \). \( \text{SO}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) interact with the carbon surfaces via two primary mechanisms. First, both sulfur-compounds can adsorb at unsaturated defect sites at the periphery of aromatic sheets within the carbon structure. These "edge defects" exist in a variety of configurations leading to an energetically heterogeneous surface that displays a distribution of desorption energies, \( E_{\text{des}} \). This type of site is responsible for the relatively strong adsorption of \( \text{SO}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) onto a-C and a-CO\(_x\); desorption from these surfaces proceeds via first-order kinetics. Second, \( \text{SO}_2 \) can condense as islands that are weakly bound to the surface, probably via van der Waals interaction with the \( \pi \)-electron systems in the aromatic carbon structure. Desorption from the island edges occurs via a zero-order process. This pattern is characteristic of adsorption of \( \text{SO}_2 \) onto HOPG, a-CN\(_x\), and a-CH\(_x\). Although \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) was not observed to interact with these surfaces, adsorption must occur at temperatures lower than those accessible in this work and may also exhibit zero-order desorption kinetics.

Since adsorption and desorption are key primary steps in capture and release of sulfur-compounds by industrially-relevant activated carbon sorbents, our results can provide guidance for development of next-generation carbons. Clearly, maintaining a high density of surface defects, such as those present in a-C, is important for development of sorbents with high affinity and capacity for sulfurous-gases. However, post-oxidation of a-C appears to titrate surface defects, thereby reducing the density of adsorption sites. Incorporation of H or N into the developing carbon structure minimizes formation of surface defects and reduces the strength of the interaction between condensed \( \text{SO}_2 \) islands and the surface.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Radisav Vidic and Jason Monnell at the University of Pittsburgh for helpful discussions.

This technical effort was performed in support of the National Energy Technology Laboratory under the RDS contracts DE-AC26-04NT41817.606.01.05 and DE-AC26-04NT41817.630.01.10.

References