University of Wollongong

Research Online

Faculty of Engineering and Information
Sciences - Papers: Part B

Faculty of Engineering and Information
Sciences

2018

Experimental and modeling investigation on separation of methane from coal seam gas (CSG) using hydrate formation

Yiwei Wang

China University of Petroleum, yw367@uowmail.edu.au

Ye Deng

Sinopec Group

Xuqiang Guo

China University of Petroleum, guoxq@cup.edu.cn

Qiang Sun

China University of Petroleum

Aixian Liu

China University of Petroleum

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/eispapers1>

Part of the [Engineering Commons](#), and the [Science and Technology Studies Commons](#)

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

Experimental and modeling investigation on separation of methane from coal seam gas (CSG) using hydrate formation

Abstract

The effects of temperature, pressure, initial promoter concentration and coal seam gas/liquid ratio on the separation of methane from coal seam gas were experimentally investigated. Low temperature, high pressure and high promoter concentration lead to high separation efficiency and high recovery rate of CH₄, but reduce the CH₄ capture selectivity in hydrate. Experimental simulation of a three-stage separation shows that CH₄ can be concentrated from 34.6 to 81.3 mol% in the dissociated gas, while its content is only 7.2 mol% in the residual gas. An innovative model was established to predict the separation performance. The modeling results reasonably match the experimental data in predicting the effects of different influential factors, with an average relative deviation of 2.83%, the maximum relative deviation 11.2%, and the average relative variance 0.1044. The modeling results of a three-stage separation process include 81.0 mol% of CH₄ in the final dissociated gas and 5.5 mol% of CH₄ in the final residual gas. The recovery rate of CH₄ was 90.1 mol% and the separation factor was 73.0.

Disciplines

Engineering | Science and Technology Studies

Publication Details

Wang, Y., Deng, Y., Guo, X., Sun, Q., Liu, A., Zhang, G., Yue, G. & Yang, L. (2018). Experimental and modeling investigation on separation of methane from coal seam gas (CSG) using hydrate formation. *Energy*, 150 377-395.

Authors

Yiwei Wang, Ye Deng, Xuqiang Guo, Qiang Sun, Aixian Liu, Guangqing Zhang, Gang Yue, and Lanying Yang

1 **Experimental and modeling investigation on separation of**
2 **methane from coal seam gas (CSG) using hydrate formation**

3 Yiwei Wang^a, Ye Deng^c, Xuqiang Guo^{b,*}, Qiang Sun^a, Aixian Liu^b, Guangqing Zhang^d,
4 Gang Yue,^a Lanying Yang^a

5 *^aState Key Laboratory of Heavy Oil Processing, China University of Petroleum*
6 *(Beijing), Beijing, 102249, China*

7 *^bState Key Laboratory of Heavy Oil Processing, China University of Petroleum Beijing*
8 *at Karamay, Karamay, 834000, China*

9 *^cSinopec Yangzi Petrochemical Company LTD. Nanjing, 210048, China*

10 *^dSchool of Mechanical, Materials, Mechatronic and Biomedical Engineering,*
11 *University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW2500, Australia*

12 Corresponding author: Xuqiang Guo*, email: guoxq@cup.edu.cn

1 **Abstract**

2 The effects of temperature, pressure, initial promoter concentration and coal seam
3 gas/liquid ratio on the separation of methane from coal seam gas were experimentally
4 investigated. Low temperature, high pressure and high promoter concentration lead to
5 high separation efficiency and high recovery rate of CH₄, but reduce the CH₄ capture
6 selectivity in hydrate. Experimental simulation of a three-stage separation shows that
7 CH₄ can be concentrated from 34.6 to 81.3 mol% in the dissociated gas, while its
8 content is only 7.2 mol% in the residual gas. An innovative model was established to
9 predict the separation performance. The modeling results reasonably match the
10 experimental data in predicting the effects of different influential factors, with an
11 average relative deviation of 2.83%, the maximum relative deviation 11.2%, and the
12 average relative variance 0.1044. The modeling results of a three-stage separation
13 process include 81.0 mol% of CH₄ in the final dissociated gas and 5.5 mol% of CH₄ in
14 the final residual gas. The recovery rate of CH₄ was 90.1 mol% and the separation factor
15 was 73.0.

16 **Key words:** Separation; Methane, Coal seam gas; Semi-clathrate hydrate;
17 **Modeling; Multistage separation.**

18

1. Introduction

Coal seam gas (CSG)^[1] is an unconventional source of natural gas extracted from coal beds during the mining process which can be utilized when the CH₄ content is above about 80 mol%.^[2] The concentration of CH₄ in the CSG usually ranges between 10 mol% and 70 mol%, which limits the direct utilization of CSG and makes CSG explosive.^[3,4] Since CSG is one of the main causes of mine disasters and is difficult and risky to recycle,^[5] it is mostly emitted into the atmosphere after dilution.^[6] About 5.54×10^{12} m³ CSG is emitted into the atmosphere every year,^[7] which is a serious environmental problem because CH₄ has a global warming effect equivalent to 72 times of CO₂ on the weight basis^[7,8]. In order to utilize this natural gas resource and reduce its greenhouse effect, it is necessary to recover CSG and concentrate the CH₄ to about 80 mol%.^[2, 9] Although the processes such as pressure swing adsorption, cryogenic liquefaction and membrane technology are shown to be effective,^[2,10] they are rarely used in industry due to economic and technical reasons.^[2]

Separation of CH₄ from CSG based on hydrate formation is an innovative technology^[9, 11-13] which has mild reaction conditions,^[14,15] large gas storage capacity,^[16,17] simple process^[18,19] and low energy consumption,^[19,20] and has attracted much attention. Clathrate hydrates are non-stoichiometric inclusion compounds made up of guest molecules encaged within ice-like crystalline structure of water molecules.^[21,22] Thermodynamically, different gases need different operating conditions to form hydrates,^[23] which is utilized to separate CH₄ from CSG. During the hydrate formation, the component possessing milder hydrate formation condition (CH₄) is enriched and stored in the hydrate phase while the other component (N₂) is enriched in the gas phase.^[9, 11-13] The hydrate formation process is not only a process of the recovery and storage

of CH₄ but also a process of the CH₄ emission reduction.

Additives, as either kinetic or thermodynamic promoters, are added to promote the hydrate formation.^[24, 25] Thermodynamic promoters participate in hydrate formation thereby alter the hydrate phase equilibrium resulting in more moderate conditions of hydrate formation (lower pressure and higher temperature than forming pure gas hydrates).^[26] Commonly used thermodynamic additives for hydrate formation include tetrahydrofuran (THF),^[27, 28] tetra-n-butyl-ammonium bromide (TBAB)^[29, 30] and cyclopentane (CP).^[31, 32] Zhong et al.^[12] found that the equilibrium hydrate formation pressure of the model CSG (30 mol% CH₄+70 mol% N₂) at 273.15 K can be reduced from 6.9 MPa to lower than 0.3 MPa by adding 1 mol% THF. Wang et al.^[13] reduced the equilibrium hydrate formation pressure of the model CSG (34.6 mol% CH₄+65.4 mol% N₂) at 282.15K from 16.54 MPa to lower than 1.02 MPa by adding 0.901 mol% TBAB. Kinetic promoters (commonly surfactants) do not participate in hydrate formation and have no effect on the phase equilibrium curve, but change the properties of liquid like viscosity and the gas/liquid interfacial tension so as to increase hydrate formation rates.^[26] Commonly used kinetic promoters include sodium dodecyl sulfate(SDS),^[33, 34] sodium dodecyl benzene sulfonate (SDBS)^[34] and leucine.^[35] The promotion of kinetic promoter on the hydrate formation depends on the concentration of the promoter. Zhou et al.^[36] found that the viscosity of SDS solution reaches a peak at 0.05 wt%, and then decreases slowly from 0.05 wt% to 0.3 wt% at room temperature. Martinov et al.^[37] report the effect of the SDS concentration and surface tension on the mass transfer coefficient for aeration performance in a stirred tank reactor.

Hydrate based separation with additives are widely used in the separation of target components from different gas mixtures such as CH₄+CO₂^[24, 38, 39], H₂+CO₂^[40, 41], CO₂+N₂^[25, 32, 42] and model CSG (CH₄+N₂).^[9, 11-13] In the study of separating CH₄ from

CSG using a scale-up bubble column, Cai et al.^[9] found the storage of CH₄ in hydrate decreased with the increase of gas flow rate. In semi-batch and batch operation, Zhong et al.^[11] concentrated CH₄ from a CH₄-N₂ mixture from 30 to 70 mol% after two-stage separation. They also found the conversion of water to hydrate in the THF solution-saturated silica sand bed was better than in a stirred reactor.^[12] Wang et al.^[13] concentrated CH₄ from 34.6 to 79.9 mol% after four-step separation of CH₄+N₂ mixture in a continuous hydrate formation process.

TBAB is a very effective thermodynamic hydrate formation promoter for the separation of CH₄ from CSG. Besides, it has a number of advantages, e.g. environment-friendly, high solubility in water, low toxicity and good fluidity.^[43] In addition, TBAB hydrate are less likely to cause apparatus blockage due to very fine TBAB hydrate crystal particles, ranging between 10⁻⁴ and 10⁻⁵ m, which are hardly conglomerated with one another.^[43] So TBAB was chosen as the promoter in this study. This study aims to investigate the effects of various operating parameters on the hydrate based separation. Table 1 summarizes the experimental conditions employed in the current study in comparison with those in above references.

To better understand the hydrate based CSG separation, the effects of different factors on the separation efficiency and gas storage need to be quantitatively evaluated. In addition, for the application of the experimental data in industrial design, a mathematical model is needed to predict the performance of the hydrate based separation and gas storage capacity of hydrate under different operating conditions. Though much research has been done into the modelling of hydrate, it mainly focuses on formation mechanism,^[44,45] cold storage^[46] and phase equilibria.^[47-49] Fukumoto et al.^[50] proposed a model to predict the separation of CO₂ and H₂ at the hydrate melting point. Tumba et al.^[51] proposed a model to predict the separation of three binary-gas

1 mixtures of close-boiling point compounds ($\text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4$, $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{C}_3\text{H}_6$, and $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 +$
2 C_3H_8) with pure water. A mathematical model to predict the effects of different factors
3 on the separation efficiency and the gas storage has not been available in previous works.
4 The accuracy of the models in predicting separation performance needs to be improved,
5 and the ranges of the operating conditions the models can be applied need to be widened.
6 For these reasons, this work proposes new models for single stage and multistage
7 separation to quantitatively evaluate the effects of different factors on the hydrate based
8 separation and the gas storage. The effectiveness of the models in predicting the
9 performance of the hydrate based separation is verified by the experimental data of this
10 study.

11 **2. Experimental Section**

12 **2.1 Materials and apparatus**

13 The actual CSG gas mainly consists of CH_4 , N_2 and O_2 .^[2, 52] The concentration of
14 the O_2 in CSG is far less than those of CH_4 and N_2 , and the equilibrium hydrate
15 formation conditions between O_2 and N_2 hydrate are close.^[53, 11, 13] Hence, CSG was
16 modeled by CH_4 - N_2 mixtures in this study.^[9, 11-13] The gas mixtures were supplied by
17 AP Beifen Gas Industry Co. in cylinders, containing 13.3, 23.7, 34.6, 50.9 and 65.9 mol%
18 of CH_4 , respectively. TBAB of 99.99 wt% purity was supplied by Shanghai Sinopharm
19 Chemical Reagent. The TBAB solutions were obtained by mixing TBAB and deionized
20 water which were weighed by an electronic balance with the precision of ± 0.1 mg. The
21 concentrations of TBAB in aqueous solutions include 10.0, 12.0, 14.0 and 16.0 wt%,
22 corresponding to 0.617, 0.756, 0.901 and 1.052 mol% correspondingly. The

1 compositions of the dissociated gas and residual gas were determined by a gas
2 chromatograph (Agilent 7890).

3 **2.2 Viscosity and interfacial tension** 4 **measurements**

5 The dynamic viscosity of TBAB solutions was measured using a KV-4 viscometer
6 (GB/T265-88). The experimental apparatus for measuring the interfacial tension
7 between TBAB solution and the model CSG containing 34.6 mol% CH₄ are reported
8 in previous papers published by this laboratory. [54, 55] The experimental procedures for
9 measuring the interfacial tension are reported in detail in previous papers published by
10 this laboratory. [54, 55]

11 **2.3. Hydrate based separation**

12 **2.3.1 Apparatus**

13 The schematic of the experimental apparatus is shown in Fig. 1. It consists of a
14 manual pump, an air bath, a crystallizer and a temperature and pressure measuring
15 system. The crystallizer is a volume variable cell with a maximum volume of 465 ml,
16 in which a stirrer is fixed to the bottom to continually stir the solution. The manual
17 pump with scale division lines of ± 0.05 ml uncertainty is used to control the volume of
18 the crystallizer. The air bath can control the temperature of the crystallizer between
19 243.15 K and 323.15 K. The temperature inside the crystallizer is measured by a
20 platinum resistance thermometer with an uncertainty of ± 0.05 K. The pressure in the

1 crystallizer is measured by a pressure sensor with an uncertainty of ± 0.005 MPa.

2 **2.3.2 Operation procedure**

3 Prior to an experiment, the crystallizer was washed with deionizer water and dried.
4 The volume of the crystallizer was then adjusted using the manual pump based on Eq.
5 (1).

$$6 \quad V_{cr,0} = V_{sol} + (V_{sol} \cdot CL) \cdot \frac{P_{stp}}{P} \cdot \frac{T}{T_{stp}} \cdot \frac{Z_{CSG}}{Z_{CSG,stp}} \quad (1)$$

7 where $V_{cr,0}$ is the volume of the crystallizer and V_{sol} is the volume of the TBAB solution
8 in the crystallizer at the beginning of an experiment. Z_{CSG} and $Z_{CSG,stp}$ are the
9 compressibility factors of the model CSG under experimental condition and under
10 273.15K, 101325Pa, respectively, calculated by Patel-Teja EOS.^[56] P and T denote the
11 experimental pressure and temperature. T_{stp} is 273.15 K and P_{stp} is 101325 Pa. CL
12 (CSG/liquid ratio) is the volumetric ratio of model CSG (under 273.15 K, 101325 Pa)
13 to the TBAB solution at the beginning of an experiment.

14 The temperature of the air bath was set at the desired value. A measuring cylinder
15 containing TBAB solution was put into the air bath to keep the TBAB solution at the
16 desired temperature. The crystallizer was evacuated and then filled with the model CSG.
17 When the crystallizer reached the experimental temperature, it was evacuated and a
18 desired amount of TBAB solution was injected from the measuring cylinder into the
19 crystallizer. The crystallizer and tubing were purged three times using the model CSG
20 to completely remove air from the system. When the temperature of the crystallizer and
21 TBAB solution became constant at the experimental temperature, the desired amount
22 of model CSG was injected into the crystallizer. Once the pressure in the crystallizer
23 reached the desired value, the valves of the crystallizer were closed to isolate the
24 crystallizer from the gas cylinder. The stirrer was started at a constant speed of 500 rpm.

1 This moment was noted as the start of a hydrate based gas separation experiment. Along
 2 with the consumption of CSG by hydrate formation, the pressure in the crystallizer was
 3 maintained constant by the manual pump. When the volume of the crystallizer remained
 4 constant for at least 2 h, it was considered that the separation reaction reached
 5 equilibrium and then ended. The stirrer was stopped, and the residual gas in the
 6 crystallizer was sampled at constant pressure and the composition analyzed. Then, the
 7 vent valve was opened, and the residual gas was quickly purged. Subsequently, the valve
 8 was closed, and the crystallizer was warmed to 298.15 K to allow the hydrate to
 9 dissociate completely. The composition of the dissociated gas was then analyzed. The
 10 sampling method was adopted from elsewhere. [39,57-60] The experiment under each
 11 operating condition was repeated for 3 times.. The simplified schematic of the
 12 experimental procedure is provided in Fig. 2.

13 2.4 Treatment of experimental data

14 The gas uptake in hydrate (N_d , mol) when the separation reached equilibrium (t_{eq})
 15 is calculated by Eq. (2).

$$16 \quad N_d = \frac{P \cdot V_{cr,0}}{Z_{CSG} \cdot R \cdot T} - \frac{P \cdot V_{cr,teq}}{Z_r \cdot R \cdot T} \quad (2)$$

17 where $V_{cr,teq}$ is the volume of the crystallizer when the separation reached equilibrium
 18 (t_{eq}), Z_r the compressibility factor of the gas mixture in the crystallizer when the
 19 separation reached equilibrium (the residual gas) under experimental condition. R is
 20 gas constant. ($8.3145 \text{ J} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{K}^{-1}$)

21 The uncertainties in the volume of the crystallizer ($\pm 0.05 \text{ ml}$), temperature ($\pm$
 22 0.05 K) and pressure ($\pm 0.005 \text{ MPa}$) are considered while calculating the uncertainty in
 23 the gas uptake. The maximum ($N_{d,ijj,max}$) and minimum ($N_{d,ijj,min}$) gas intake in

individual experiments due to the uncertainties of measured parameters are calculated by Eqs. (3a) and (3b). The mean gas intake ($\overline{N_d}$) and the uncertainty caused by uncertainties of measurement in each experiment ($N_{d,u,jjj}$) and its uncertainty for three repeated experiments ($N_{d,u}$) are calculated by Eqs. (3c) and (3e):

$$N_{d,jjj,max} = \frac{P+0.005MPa}{R \cdot (T-0.05K)} \cdot \left(\frac{V_{cr,0}+0.05 \text{ ml}}{Z_{CSG}} - \frac{V_{cr,teq}-0.05 \text{ ml}}{Z_{r,jjj}} \right) \quad (3a)$$

$$N_{d,jjj,min} = \frac{P-0.005MPa}{R \cdot (T+0.05K)} \cdot \left(\frac{V_{cr,0}-0.05 \text{ ml}}{Z_{CSG}} - \frac{V_{cr,teq}+0.05 \text{ ml}}{Z_{r,jjj}} \right) \quad (3b)$$

$$\overline{N_d} = \Sigma N_{d,jjj} / 3 \quad (3c)$$

$$N_{d,u,jjj} = \max\{|N_{d,jjj,max} - N_{d,jjj}|, |N_{d,jjj} - N_{d,jjj,min}|\} \quad (3d)$$

$$N_{d,u} = \max\{|N_{d,jjj,max} - \overline{N_d}|, |\overline{N_d} - N_{d,jjj,min}|\} \quad (3e)$$

where jjj is the sequence number for the three repeated experiments. The mean gas storage capacity of hydrate slurry ($\overline{GSCHS}$, NL/L) is calculated by Eq. (4).

$$\overline{GSCHS} = \left(\Sigma \frac{Z_{d,stp,jjj} \cdot N_{d,jjj} \cdot R \cdot T_{stp}}{P_{stp} \cdot V_{sol}} \right) / 3 \quad (4)$$

The mean separation factor ($\overline{SF}$) and the mean recovery fraction ($\overline{RF}$) of the target gas component are calculated as follows:

$$\overline{SF} = \left(\Sigma \frac{x_{CH_4,jjj} \cdot y_{N_2,jjj}}{x_{N_2,jjj} \cdot y_{CH_4,jjj}} \right) / 3 \quad (5)$$

$$\overline{RF} = \left(\Sigma \frac{N_{d,jjj} \cdot x_{CH_4,jjj}}{N_{CSG} \cdot y_{CH_4,CSG}} \right) / 3 \quad (6)$$

where x_{CH_4} and x_{N_2} are the concentrations of CH_4 and N_2 in the dissociated gas; y_{CH_4} and y_{N_2} are the concentrations of CH_4 and N_2 in the residual gas; N_{CSG} is the molar amount of model CSG injected into the crystallizer; $y_{CH_4,CSG}$ is the concentration of CH_4 in model CSG. The uncertainties of $GSCHS$, SF and RF caused by the uncertainties of measurement in each experiment and the repeat experiments are calculated by Eqs. (7a) to (7e):

$$1 \quad \text{GSCHS}_{u,jjj} = \max\left\{\left|\frac{Z_{d,stp,jjj} \cdot N_{d,u,jjj} \cdot R \cdot T_{stp}}{P_{stp} \cdot V_{sol}}\right|\right\} \quad (7a)$$

$$2 \quad \text{GSCHS}_u = \max\left\{\left|\frac{Z_{d,stp,jjj} \cdot N_{d,jjj,max} \cdot R \cdot T_{stp}}{P_{stp} \cdot V_{sol}} - \overline{\text{GSCHS}}\right|, \left|\overline{\text{GSCHS}} - \frac{Z_{d,stp,jjj} \cdot N_{d,jjj,min} \cdot R \cdot T_{stp}}{P_{stp} \cdot V_{sol}}\right|\right\} \quad (7b)$$

$$3 \quad \text{RF}_{u,jjj} = \max\left\{\left|\frac{N_{d,u,jjj} \cdot x_{\text{CH}_4,jjj}}{N_{\text{CSG}} \cdot y_{\text{CH}_4,\text{CSG}}}\right|\right\} \quad (7c)$$

$$4 \quad \text{RF}_u = \max\left\{\left|\frac{N_{d,jjj,max} \cdot x_{\text{CH}_4,jjj}}{N_{\text{CSG}} \cdot y_{\text{CH}_4,\text{CSG}}} - \overline{\text{RF}}\right|, \left|\overline{\text{RF}} - \frac{N_{d,jjj,min} \cdot x_{\text{CH}_4,jjj}}{N_{\text{CSG}} \cdot y_{\text{CH}_4,\text{CSG}}}\right|\right\} \quad (7d)$$

$$5 \quad \text{SF}_u = \max\left\{\left|\frac{x_{\text{CH}_4,jjj} \cdot y_{\text{N}_2,jjj}}{x_{\text{N}_2,jjj} \cdot y_{\text{CH}_4,jjj}} - \overline{\text{SF}}\right|\right\} \quad (7e)$$

6 **3. Modeling**

7 **3.1 TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate formation**

8 As discussed in introduction, TBAB participates in the formation of TBAB semi-
 9 clathrate hydrate (not gas hydrate), resulting in more moderate condition of hydrate
 10 formation. Meanwhile, TBAB is a salt which weakens the hydrogen bonds between
 11 water molecules, so TBAB can also inhibit hydrate formation. ^[61, 62] Therefore, TBAB
 12 has two competing effects on hydrate formation, and an inflection temperature is
 13 presented in the hydrate phase equilibrium diagram of the gas mixture + TBAB aqueous
 14 systems. ^[47, 63] When temperature is below the inflection temperature, TBAB works as
 15 a thermodynamic promoter, and the equilibrium hydrate formation pressure is lower
 16 than that in pure water systems; when temperature is above the inflection temperature,
 17 TBAB works as a thermodynamic inhibitor, and the equilibrium hydrate formation
 18 pressure is higher than that in pure water system. ^[47, 63]

19 Previous work ^[13] shows that in the temperature range of this study, a CSG
 20 consisting of 34.6 mol% CH₄ + 65.4 mol% N₂ has much lower equilibrium hydrate

formation pressure in the TBAB aqueous system than in pure water system. The experimental temperature is well below the inflection temperature, and TBAB works as a thermodynamic promoter. The operating pressure in this work is higher than the equilibrium hydrate formation pressure in the TBAB aqueous system but much lower than that in pure water system. The hydrate formed under the operating conditions in this work is mainly TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate rather than gas hydrate consisting of only gas and water molecules.

In this work, the two-step hydrate formation mechanism proposed by Chen and Guo^[44] is used to simulate the process of the formation of TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate:

First step: TBAB and water molecules form basic semi-clathrate hydrate. The concept of basic hydrate has been discussed in detail in a previous article.^[45] Following Long and Sloan,^[64] each TBAB molecule dissolved in water is assumed forming a labile cluster with the water molecules surrounding it. Then the clusters associate with one another to form the so-called basic hydrates. The formation of basic semi-clathrate hydrate is illustrated by the following equation:

λ_2 is the ratio of TBAB-to-water molecule numbers in a basic hydrate unit. Types A and B hydrate have $\text{TBAB} \cdot 26\text{H}_2\text{O}$ and $\text{TBAB} \cdot 38\text{H}_2\text{O}$ unit cells, respectively.^[65] Each TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate cell unit is composed of 2 TBA^+ and 2 Br^- along with 52 water molecules for type A and 76 water molecules for type B.^[65] TBA^+ is trapped into a basic cavity formed by two large tetrakaidecahedra and two pentakaidecahedra, respectively. It should be noted that four similar large cavities are involved, λ_2 is 2/52 for type A and 2/76 for type B. During this step, the linked cavities (the small cavities formed by 12 pentagons) form automatically.^[44]

Second step: small molecules like N_2 and CH_4 are captured into empty linked

cavities of basic semi-clathrate hydrate. The occupation of linked cavities by small gas molecules reduces the chemical potential of the basic hydrate, making the structure of the semi-clathrate hydrate more stable and leading to the formation of final semi-clathrate hydrate structure:

λ_1 is the ratio of the numbers of the linked cavities to water molecules in the basic TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate unit. λ_1 is 3/52 for type A and 3/76 for type B. ^[66] θ_{N_2} and θ_{CH_4} are the fractions of the linked cavities filled by N_2 and CH_4 , respectively.

Based on the two-step hydrate formation mechanism, there are two reaction equilibria in the system: the basic hydrate formation in the first step and the physical adsorption of the gas molecules in the linked cavities during the second step. For the chemical equilibrium of Eq. (8): ^[44, 45, 67]

$$\mu_{\text{B}}^0 - \mu_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} - \lambda_2 \mu_{\text{TBAB}}^0 = \lambda_2 RT \ln f_{\text{TBAB}}^0 \quad (10)$$

$$\mu_{\text{TBAB}} = \mu_{\text{TBAB}}^0 + RT \ln f_{\text{TBAB}} \quad (11)$$

where f_{TBAB}^0 is the fugacity of the TBAB in the basic TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate; μ_{B}^0 is the chemical potential of the basic TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate; $\mu_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ and μ_{TBAB} are the chemical potential of water and TBAB in the aqueous solution, respectively; μ_{TBAB}^0 is the chemical potential of the TBAB under standard condition (273.15 K, 101325 Pa). f_{TBAB} is the fugacity of the TBAB in the liquid phase under the experimental condition. The adsorption of CH_4 and N_2 molecules in the linked cavities reduces the chemical potential of the basic hydrate. At the adsorption equilibrium (Eq. 9), the chemical potential of the final hydrate μ_{B} is: ^[44]

$$\mu_{\text{B}} = \mu_{\text{B}}^0 + \lambda_1 RT \ln(1 - \theta_{\text{CH}_4} - \theta_{\text{N}_2}) \quad (12)$$

Therefore, the change of chemical potential during the formation of TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate is the difference between the value of the final state and the initial

1 state:

$$2 \quad \mu_{\text{initial}} = \mu_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \lambda_2 \mu_{\text{TBAB}} \quad (13)$$

$$3 \quad \Delta\mu = \mu_{\text{B}} - \mu_{\text{initial}} \quad (14)$$

4 Combining Eqs. (10) – (14), Eq. (15) is obtained:

$$5 \quad \Delta\mu = RT[\lambda_2 \ln \frac{f_{\text{TBAB}}^0}{f_{\text{TBAB}}} + \lambda_1 \ln(1 - \theta_{\text{CH}_4} - \theta_{\text{N}_2})] \quad (15)$$

6 Based on the Langmuir adsorption theory, θ_{CH_4} and θ_{N_2} can be calculated as
7 follows: [68,69]

$$8 \quad \theta_{\text{CH}_4} = \frac{f_{\text{CH}_4} C_{\text{CH}_4}}{1 + f_{\text{CH}_4} C_{\text{CH}_4} + f_{\text{N}_2} C_{\text{N}_2}} \quad (16a)$$

$$9 \quad \theta_{\text{N}_2} = \frac{f_{\text{N}_2} C_{\text{N}_2}}{1 + f_{\text{CH}_4} C_{\text{CH}_4} + f_{\text{N}_2} C_{\text{N}_2}} \quad (16b)$$

10 where f_{N_2} and f_{CH_4} denote the fugacity of N_2 and CH_4 in the gas phase which is
11 calculated by Patel-Teja EOS. [56] C_{N_2} and C_{CH_4} are the Langmuir constants of the
12 adsorption of N_2 and CH_4 in TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate and correlated as an Antoine
13 type equation:

$$14 \quad C = X' \exp\left(\frac{Y'}{T-Z'}\right) \quad (17)$$

15 The Antoine parameters for N_2 and CH_4 are fitted based on the experimental data
16 in this study by trial-and-error method. The fitting process is shown in supplementary
17 materials. The obtained values of X' , Y' and Z' are listed in Table 2:

18 f_{TBAB}^0 can be calculated as follows: [47, 48]

$$19 \quad f_{\text{TBAB}}^0 = f_{\text{T}}^0(T) \exp\left(\frac{\beta_{\text{P}}}{T}\right) \alpha_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}^{-1/\lambda_2} \quad (18)$$

$$20 \quad \alpha_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = \exp(-0.03321w_{\text{TBAB}}^2 - 0.09463w_{\text{TBAB}} - 2.5874 \times 10^{-4}) \quad (19)$$

$$21 \quad f_{\text{T}}^0(T) = \exp\left(-\frac{A_{\text{CH}_4} \cdot \theta_{\text{CH}_4} + A_{\text{N}_2} \cdot \theta_{\text{N}_2}}{T}\right) \cdot A' \exp\left(\frac{B'}{T-C'}\right) \quad (20)$$

$$22 \quad A_{\text{N}_2} = -400w_{\text{TBAB}} + 50 \quad (21a)$$

$$23 \quad A_{\text{CH}_4} = -1600w_{\text{TBAB}} + 260 \quad (21b)$$

where $f_r^0(T)$ is a function of temperature. The Antoine constants A' , B' and C' for TBAB are shown in Table 3. A_{CH_4} and A_{N_2} are the corrected coefficients between small gas molecules (N_2 and CH_4) and TBAB which can be expressed as a function of TBAB concentration. β is a parameter which depends on the structure of the hydrate; it is 2.8 K/bar for type A and 3.5 K/bar for type B. α_{H_2O} is the activity of water in the TBAB solution. w_{TBAB} is the mass fraction of TBAB in solution.

f_{TBAB} can be calculated as follows:^[48, 69-74]

$$f_{TBAB} = x_{TBAB} \gamma_{TBAB} P_{TBAB}^{sat} \exp\left[\frac{v_{TBAB}^L (P - P_{TBAB}^{sat})}{RT}\right] \quad (22)$$

$$\gamma_{TBAB} = -0.5057 w_{TBAB}^3 + 1.1603 w_{TBAB}^2 - 1.3689 w_{TBAB} + 0.7655 \quad (23)$$

$$\ln P_{TBAB}^{sat} = 10.1406 - \frac{3978.91}{T - 60.29} \quad (24)$$

$$v_{TBAB}^L = \frac{M_{sol}}{\rho_{sol}} \quad (25)$$

$$\rho_{sol} = \rho_w + O_1(100w_{TBAB}) + O_2(100w_{TBAB})^2 + O_3(100w_{TBAB})^3 \quad (26a)$$

$$O_i = q_i + g_i(T/K) + s_i(T/K)^2 \quad (26b)$$

where x_{TBAB} , v_{TBAB}^L , and γ_{TBAB} are the molar fraction, molar volume and activity coefficient of TBAB in solution, respectively; P_{TBAB}^{sat} is the saturated vapor pressure of TBAB; M_{sol} and ρ_{sol} are the molecular weight and density of TBAB solution; ρ_{H_2O} is the density of water; q_i , g_i , and s_i are empirical constants, which are presented in Table 4. In Eq. (26a), ρ_{sol} is in g/cm^3 .

3.2 CSG separation via hydrate forming

During a CSG separation process, the hydrate formation rate and gas composition continuously change due to the changes in the hydrate formation driving force and the preferential CH_4 capture by the hydrate slurry. In this study, the CSG separation process

was simulated by the differential method. The separation duration was divided into thousands of time units (Δt). During each time unit, the process was approximated as a steady state, i.e. the gas composition and amount, the concentration of TBAB in the liquid phase, and the hydrate slurry composition are assumed to remain constant. Thus, the driving force for hydrate formation and preferential CH_4 capture by hydrate slurry remains constant. The conceptual model of the hydrate-based gas separation is shown in Fig. 4.

At the beginning of an experiment ($t = 0$), no hydrate is present; there are only model CSG and fresh TBAB solution in the crystallizer. The initial conditions are:

$$N_{\text{CSG}} = \frac{P_{\text{stp}} \cdot CL \cdot V_{\text{sol}}}{R \cdot Z_{\text{CSG,stp}} \cdot T_{\text{stp}}} \quad (27)$$

$$y_{\text{CH}_4,0} = y_{\text{CH}_4,\text{CSG}} \quad (28a)$$

$$y_{\text{N}_2,0} = y_{\text{N}_2,\text{CSG}} \quad (28b)$$

$$N_{\text{gCH}_4,0} = N_{\text{CSG}} \cdot y_{\text{CH}_4,0} \quad (29a)$$

$$N_{\text{gN}_2,0} = N_{\text{CSG}} \cdot y_{\text{N}_2,0} \quad (29b)$$

$$H_{\text{gCH}_4,0} = H_{\text{gN}_2,0} = 0 \quad (30)$$

$$N_{\text{TBAB},0} = \frac{w_{\text{TBAB},0} \cdot m_{\text{sol}}}{M_{\text{TBAB}}} \quad (31)$$

$$N_{\text{H}_2\text{O},0} = \frac{(1 - w_{\text{TBAB},0}) \cdot m_{\text{sol}}}{M_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}} \quad (32)$$

where N_{gCH_4} and N_{gN_2} are the moles of the CH_4 and the N_2 in the gas phase in the crystallizer. H_{gCH_4} and H_{gN_2} are the moles of the CH_4 and the N_2 in the hydrate slurry in the crystallizer. N_{TBAB} and $N_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ are the moles of the TBAB and the water in the solution in the crystallizer. w_{TBAB} is the mass fraction of the TBAB in the fresh TBAB solution. Subscript “0” denotes the initial values of corresponding variables. $y_{\text{CH}_4,\text{CSG}}$ and $y_{\text{N}_2,\text{CSG}}$ are the concentrations of the CH_4 and the N_2 in the model CSG. M_{TBAB} and

1 M_{H_2O} are the molecular weight of TBAB and water. m_{sol} is the mass of the fresh TBAB
2 solution injected into the crystallizer.

3 The molar fraction of TBAB in the TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate is between 2.56
4 mol% and 4 mol%,^[57] which is much higher than that of TBAB in the solution. Along
5 with the formation of the TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate, the concentration of TBAB in
6 the liquid phase decreases. Because of preferential CH_4 capture by the hydrate slurry
7 ($\theta_{CH_4}/\theta_{N_2} > y_{CH_4}/y_{N_2}$), the concentration of CH_4 in the residual gas also decreases. These
8 changes reduce the driving force of the hydrate formation ($-\Delta\mu$), so the hydrate
9 formation rate decreases along with the progress of the separation. Finally, as the
10 driving force approaches zero ($-\Delta\mu \approx 0$), the amount of the hydrates stop increasing, that
11 is, the separation reaches an equilibrium state.

12 The gas capture rate r ($\text{mol} \cdot \Delta t^{-1}$) is a function of the hydrate formation driving
13 force ($-\Delta\mu$) which is determined by TBAB concentration, pressure, temperature and gas
14 composition. Based on the GSCHS and the initial concentration of TBAB in the
15 solution in this study, the CSG separation in this study is controlled by driving force
16 (thermodynamics). The calculation of the hydrate formation during the j^{th} time unit is
17 illustrated below.

18 As discussed previously, within the very short time interval of Δt , the formation of
19 basic hydrate and its uptake of CH_4 and N_2 from gas phase can be considered as steady
20 state. Their rates were determined according to the condition at the beginning of the j^{th}
21 time unit, which is noted by subscript “j-1”. Furthermore, it is assumed that the
22 composition of the final hydrate formed before the j^{th} time unit does not change during
23 the j^{th} time unit; this is based on the experimental observation that once final hydrate is
24 formed, its composition does not change with the change of the gas phase condition
25 until it is melted. That is to say, once the basic hydrate is formed following Reaction

(8), the uptake of CH₄ and N₂ by the hydrate formed during Δt reaches equilibrium instantly based on the condition at that moment. The rate of TBAB consumption due to the formation of basic semi-clathrate hydrate and the amount of TBAB consumed within the time unit Δt are:^[76]

$$r_{\text{TBAB},j} = k \cdot N_{\text{H}_2\text{O},j-1} \cdot \left(\exp\left(\frac{-\Delta\mu_{j-1}}{RT}\right) - 1 \right) \quad (34a)$$

$$h_{\text{TBAB},j} = r_{\text{TBAB},j} \Delta t \quad (34b)$$

where k (mol·mol water⁻¹· Δt ⁻¹) is the rate constant of the formation of semi-clathrate basic hydrate. Correspondingly, the rates and amounts of the uptake of CH₄ and N₂ by the hydrate formed during the j^{th} Δt are: ^[76]

$$h_{\text{CH}_4,j} = r_{\text{CH}_4,j} \Delta t = \alpha \cdot \theta_{\text{CH}_4,j} \cdot h_{\text{TBAB},j} \quad (34c)$$

$$h_{\text{N}_2,j} = r_{\text{N}_2,j} \Delta t = \alpha \cdot \theta_{\text{N}_2,j} \cdot h_{\text{TBAB},j} \quad (34d)$$

$$\alpha = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \quad (35)$$

α is the ratio of the numbers of the linked cavities to the TBAB semi-clathrate basic cavities. $\Delta\mu_{j-1}$ is calculated by Eq. (15). According to the changes of the amounts of TBAB and water in solution and those of CH₄ and N₂ in gas phase, the condition after the j^{th} time unit is obtained.

It can be seen from Eqs. (34a) to (34d) that, when the hydrate formation driving force ($-\Delta\mu$) is positive, the formation of hydrate and the uptake of CH₄ and N₂ in hydrate continue. When the hydrate formation driving force ($-\Delta\mu$) becomes negative, the rate of hydrate formation becomes negative, which means the hydrate dissociates. The iteration in simulating the separation process terminates when the hydrate formation driving force ($-\Delta\mu$) becomes close enough to zero according to the convergence criteria in Fig. 4.

After the j^{th} Δt , the molar amounts of CH₄ and N₂ in the gas phase are calculated

1 as:

$$2 \quad N_{gCH_4,j} = N_{gCH_4,j-1} - h_{CH_4,j} \quad (36a)$$

$$3 \quad N_{gN_2,j} = N_{gN_2,j-1} - h_{N_2,j} \quad (36b)$$

4 The molar amounts of CH₄ and N₂ in the hydrate slurry are:

$$5 \quad H_{gCH_4,j} = H_{gCH_4,j-1} + h_{CH_4,j} \quad (37a)$$

$$6 \quad H_{gN_2,j} = H_{gN_2,j-1} + h_{N_2,j} \quad (37b)$$

7 The amounts of TBAB and H₂O in the liquid phase become:

$$8 \quad N_{TBAB,j} = N_{TBAB,j-1} - h_{TBAB,j} \quad (38)$$

$$9 \quad N_{H_2O,j} = N_{H_2O,j-1} - \frac{1}{\lambda_2} h_{TBAB,j} \quad (39)$$

10 Due to above changes, the compositions of the gas and liquid phases are changed

11 as follows:

$$12 \quad y_{CH_4,j} = \frac{N_{gCH_4,j}}{N_{gCH_4,j} + N_{gN_2,j}} \quad (40a)$$

$$13 \quad y_{N_2,j} = \frac{N_{gN_2,j}}{N_{gCH_4,j} + N_{gN_2,j}} \quad (40b)$$

$$14 \quad x_{CH_4,j} = \frac{H_{gCH_4,j}}{H_{gCH_4,j} + H_{gN_2,j}} \quad (41a)$$

$$15 \quad x_{N_2,j} = \frac{H_{gN_2,j}}{H_{gCH_4,j} + H_{gN_2,j}} \quad (41b)$$

$$16 \quad x_{TBAB,j} = \frac{N_{TBAB,j}}{N_{TBAB,j} + N_{H_2O,j}} \quad (42)$$

$$17 \quad w_{TBAB,j} = \frac{x_{TBAB,j} \cdot M_{TBAB}}{x_{TBAB,j} \cdot M_{TBAB} + (1 - x_{TBAB,j}) \cdot M_{H_2O}} \quad (43)$$

$$18 \quad V_{d,j} = \frac{R \cdot (H_{gCH_4,j} + H_{gN_2,j}) \cdot Z_{d,stp} \cdot T_{stp}}{P_{stp}} \quad (44)$$

$$19 \quad V_{r,j} = \frac{R \cdot (N_{gCH_4,j} + N_{gN_2,j}) \cdot Z_{r,stp} \cdot T_{stp}}{P_{stp}} \quad (45)$$

20 The calculation flow chart is shown in Fig. 5. In order to make it convenient for

21 industrial application, mass fraction was used instead of mole fraction as the calculation

1 import data. $Z_{r, \text{stp}}$ is the compressibility factor of the residual gas under standard
 2 condition (273.15 K, 101325 Pa). Visual basic 6.0 was used to edit the iterative
 3 computation. It also can be edited by MATLAB or any other software which can use
 4 for iterative computation.

5 In above simulation calculation, the total gas uptake is obtained by numeric
 6 addition (Eq. 46a) as the approximation of Eq. (46b):

$$7 \quad N_d = \sum_j^{t_{\text{eq}}/\Delta t} (r_{\text{CH}_4, j} + r_{\text{N}_2, j}) \Delta t \quad (46a)$$

$$8 \quad N_d = \int_0^{t_{\text{eq}}} (r_{\text{CH}_4} + r_{\text{N}_2}) dt \quad (46b)$$

9 In a practical hydrate formation process, variables such as gas composition and
 10 hydrate formation rate change continuously. In the modeling calculation, they were
 11 assumed remaining constant during each Δt . The accuracy of the numeric calculation
 12 by Eq. 35a depends on the values of the changes of the variables such as gas
 13 composition and hydrate formation rate during each Δt . When the changes of the
 14 variables during each Δt are small enough, the difference between Eq. (46a) and Eq.
 15 (46b) can be ignored, which leads to a good accuracy of the numeric calculation by Eq.
 16 (46a). Conversely, large changes of the variables during each Δt leads to a great
 17 difference between Eq. (46a) and Eq. (46b), which leads to a poor accuracy of the
 18 numeric calculation by Eq. 35a. The values of the changes of the variables during each
 19 Δt are determined by k . k ($\text{mol} \cdot \text{mol water}^{-1} \cdot \Delta t^{-1}$) is the hydrate forming rate parameter.
 20 The purpose of this study was to investigate the final equilibrium gas uptake rather than
 21 the reaction kinetics, because the latter was affected by many factors in the engineering
 22 practice. The results of numeric calculations for a case at 281.15K, 2.5MPa, initial
 23 concentration of TBAB in solution at 0.901 mol% and CSG/liquid ratio at 30 NL/L,
 24 with different of $k \cdot \Delta t$ is presented in Table 5, which demonstrates the $k \cdot \Delta t$ for the
 25 numeric calculation.

1 It can be seen from Table 5 that the steps needed to reach the chemical equilibrium
 2 increases dramatically, from 31 steps when $k \cdot \Delta t$ is $0.1 \text{ mol} \cdot \text{mol water}^{-1}$ to 35336 steps
 3 when $k \cdot \Delta t$ is $0.00004 \text{ mol} \cdot \text{mol water}^{-1}$. Correspondingly, the calculation results (x_{CH_4} ,
 4 y_{CH_4} and GSCHS) change with the decrease of $k \cdot \Delta t$ at first, and become steady. The
 5 results practically do not change when $k \cdot \Delta t$ ratio is below $0.0001 \text{ mol} \cdot \text{mol water}^{-1}$. This
 6 is because the values of the changes of the variables during each Δt decrease with the
 7 decrease in k . When k is $0.1 \text{ mol} \cdot \text{mol water}^{-1} \cdot \Delta t^{-1}$, it takes only 31 iterations (31 Δt) for
 8 the separation to reach equilibrium in modeling calculation. The maximum change
 9 during each Δt is 1.686 mol% for the concentration of CH_4 in the hydrate phase, 3.799
 10 mole% for the concentration of the CH_4 in the gas phase and 4.715 NL/L for GSCHGS.
 11 These changes can make great difference in the hydrate formation rate and the CH_4
 12 hydrate capture selectivity. The hydrate formation rate and the CH_4 hydrate capture
 13 selectivity in the $j^{\text{th}} \Delta t$ are great different from those in the $(j-1)^{\text{th}} \Delta t$ in Eq.(46a) while
 14 the hydrate formation rate and the CH_4 hydrate capture selectivity in the $j^{\text{th}} dt$ are almost
 15 the same with those in the $(j-1)^{\text{th}} dt$ in Eq. (46b). It can be seen from Table 5, as the k
 16 decreases, the values of the changes of the variables during each Δt decrease, the
 17 difference between Eq. (46a) and Eq. (46b) has no influence on the calculation results
 18 (x_{CH_4} , y_{CH_4} and GSCHS) when $k \cdot \Delta t$ is below $0.0001 \text{ mol} \cdot \text{mol water}^{-1}$. Though a smaller
 19 k leads to a better accuracy of the numeric calculation by Eq. (46a), it also leads to a
 20 larger number of iterations ($t_{\text{eq}}/\Delta t$) in calculation, especially leads to a huge number of
 21 the iterations in multistage separation. Based on calculations, for all operating
 22 conditions in this study, the influence of the difference between Eq. (46a) and Eq.(46b)
 23 on modeling calculation can be ignored when $k \cdot \Delta t$ is below $0.00008 \text{ mol} \cdot \text{mol water}^{-1}$.
 24 In this study, the hydrate formation rate parameter k was determined as 0.00004
 25 $\text{mol} \cdot \text{mol water}^{-1} \cdot \Delta t^{-1}$.

Average relative deviation (ARD), average relative variance (ARV), maximum relative deviation (MRD) and Goodness of fit (GF) are applied in order to calculate the deviation between model results and experimental data. They are calculated by Eqs. (47a) to (47d).

$$ARD = \frac{\sum_i^n \left| \frac{\text{Experimental value} - \text{Calculated value}}{\text{Experimental value}} \right|}{n} \cdot 100\% \quad (47a)$$

$$ARV = \frac{\sum_i^n \left| \frac{\text{Experimental value} - \text{Calculated value}}{\text{Experimental value}} \right|^2}{n} \quad (47b)$$

$$MRD = \max \left(\left| \frac{\text{Experimental value} - \text{Calculated value}}{\text{Experimental value}} \right| \right) \cdot 100\% \quad (47c)$$

$$GF = \frac{\sum_i^n (\text{Experimental value} - \text{Calculated value})^2}{\sum_i^n (\text{Experimental value} - \sum_i^n \text{Experimental value} / n)^2} \cdot 100\% \quad (47d)$$

where n denotes the number of the total experiments. Smaller ARD, ARV and MRD show better prediction accuracy of the model. The GF is used to present the goodness of the model in showing the effect of each factor on the hydrate based separation and gas storage, GF normally has values between 0 and 1. A value of GF close to 1 means that the model can predict the effect of a factor on hydrate based separation accurately.

3.3 Multistage separation modeling

Since the single stage separation is not sufficient to meet industrial requirements, multistage operation must be carried out if this process is put into practice. Experimental investigation of the multistage operation [24, 77] is complex and difficult to include the circulation of the gas flow with low target component content. For the latter reason, the RF decreases quickly as the number of separation stages increases. For example, in one-way operation, the RF of three-stage separation is only 12.5 mol% for 50% RF in one stage separation. In the work by Wang et al.^[13], the inclusion of the circulation of the gas flow with low target component content makes it necessary to

1 carry out a series of experiments for any adjustment of the operation in order to gain
2 the knowledge of the performance of each operating unit, which makes the simulation
3 inconvenient in application. In this study, a computing method is proposed for the
4 simulation of multistage separation. The model CSG flows into a multistage separation
5 system (Fig. 6) where CH₄ is concentrated to higher than 80 mol% in the high CH₄
6 content gas, and its content in the low CH₄ content gas is reduced to lower than 10
7 mol%. In the process, the final gas with concentrated CH₄ is obtained from the bottom
8 operation stage as the dissociated gas, while the residual gas with low CH₄ content is
9 obtained from the top operation stage (Fig. 6). For the middle stages, the feed includes
10 the dissociated gas from its upper stage and the residual gas from the lower stage, and
11 the separated gases are further separated as the feeds of the upper and lower stages. In
12 the modelling calculation, the performance of each stage is predicted by the single stage
13 separation model..

14 The calculation sequence of the multistage separation is as follows: (1) Stage 1,
15 (2) Stages 2_1 and 2_2; (3) Stages 3_1 and 3_2. Then the calculation is repeated for the
16 next time unit from (1) again. *i* is the number of iteration. In multistage separation, *V* is
17 the volume (273.15 K, 101325 Pa) of the gas flowing into the separation operating unit.
18 *zz* is the component concentration in the gas flowing into the separation operating unit.
19 *x* is the component concentration of the dissociated gas flowing out the separation
20 operating unit. “ratio” is the ratio of the feed gas volume to the TBAB solution volume
21 under 273.15 K, 101325 Pa. And their subscripts are the operating units they belonged
22 and the number of the iteration. When the iteration is at its first loop computation, there
23 is no gas sent back to mixers:

$$24 \quad zz_{CH_4,1,1} = y_{CH_4,CSG} \quad (48a)$$

$$25 \quad V_{1,1} = V_{CSG} \quad (48b)$$

$$1 \quad zz_{CH_4,2,1,1} = y_{CH_4,1,1} \quad (49a)$$

$$2 \quad V_{2,1,1} = V_{r1,1} \quad (49b)$$

$$3 \quad zz_{CH_4,2,2,1} = x_{CH_4,1,1} \quad (50a)$$

$$4 \quad V_{2,2,1} = V_{d1,1} \quad (50b)$$

5 When the iteration goes to the i th loop computation, for Separation stage 1:

$$6 \quad N_{CH_4,1,i} = \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot y_{CH_4}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{CSG} + \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot x_{CH_4}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{d2,1,i-1} + \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot y_{CH_4}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{r2,2,i-1} \quad (51a)$$

$$7 \quad N_{N_2,1,i} = \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot y_{N_2}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{CSG} + \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot x_{N_2}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{d2,1,i-1} + \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot y_{N_2}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{r2,2,i-1} \quad (51b)$$

$$8 \quad zz_{CH_4,1,i} = N_{CH_4,1,i} / (N_{CH_4,1,i} + N_{N_2,1,i}) \quad (51c)$$

$$9 \quad V_{1,i} = \left(\frac{(N_{CH_4,1,i} + N_{N_2,1,i}) \cdot Z \cdot R \cdot T}{P}\right)_{stp} \quad (51d)$$

$$10 \quad V_{sol1,i} = V_{1,i} / ratio_1 \quad (51e)$$

11 For separation stage 2_1:

$$12 \quad N_{CH_4,2,1,i} = \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot y_{CH_4}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{r1,i} + \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot x_{CH_4}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{d3,1,i-1} \quad (52a)$$

$$13 \quad N_{N_2,2,1,i} = \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot y_{N_2}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{r1,i} + \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot x_{N_2}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{d3,1,i-1} \quad (52b)$$

$$14 \quad zz_{CH_4,2,1,i} = N_{CH_4,2,1,i} / (N_{CH_4,2,1,i} + N_{N_2,2,1,i}) \quad (52c)$$

$$15 \quad V_{2,1,i} = \left(\frac{(N_{CH_4,2,1,i} + N_{N_2,2,1,i}) \cdot Z \cdot R \cdot T}{P}\right)_{stp} \quad (52d)$$

$$16 \quad V_{sol2,1,i} = V_{2,1,i} / ratio_{2,1} \quad (52e)$$

17 For separation stage 2_2:

$$18 \quad N_{CH_4,2,2,i} = \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot x_{CH_4}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{d1,i} + \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot y_{CH_4}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{r3,2,i-1} \quad (53a)$$

$$19 \quad N_{N_2,2,2,i} = \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot x_{N_2}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{d1,i} + \left(\frac{P \cdot V \cdot y_{N_2}}{R \cdot Z \cdot T}\right)_{r3,2,i-1} \quad (53b)$$

$$20 \quad zz_{CH_4,2,2,i} = N_{CH_4,2,2,i} / (N_{CH_4,2,2,i} + N_{N_2,2,2,i}) \quad (53c)$$

$$21 \quad V_{2,2,i} = \left(\frac{(N_{CH_4,2,2,i} + N_{N_2,2,2,i}) \cdot Z \cdot R \cdot T}{P}\right)_{stp} \quad (53d)$$

$$22 \quad V_{sol2,2,i} = V_{2,2,i} / ratio_{2,2} \quad (53e)$$

1 For separation stage 3_1:

2 $zz_{CH_4,3_1,i} = y_{CH_4,2_1,i}$ (54a)

3 $V_{3_1,i} = V_{r2_1,i}$ (54b)

4 $V_{sol3_1,i} = V_{3_1,i}/ratio_{3_1}$ (54c)

5 For separation stage 3_2:

6 $zz_{CH_4,3_2,i} = x_{CH_4,2_2,i}$ (55a)

7 $V_{3_2,i} = V_{d2_2,i}$ (55b)

8 $V_{sol3_2,i} = V_{3_2,i}/ratio_{3_2}$ (55c)

9 Since the multistage separation system will finally reach dynamically stable, there
10 is a mass balance between the gas flowing in and the gas flowing out after it reaches
11 dynamically stable:

12 $N_{CSG} = N_{r3_1} + N_{d3_2}$ (56)

13 $N_{CSG} \cdot y_{CH_4,CSG} = N_{r3_1} \cdot y_{CH_4,3_1} + N_{d3_2} \cdot x_{CH_4,3_2}$ (57)

14 $Erro = N_{CSG} \cdot y_{CH_4,CSG} - N_{r3_1} \cdot y_{CH_4,3_1} - N_{d3_2} \cdot x_{CH_4,3_2}$ (58)

15 $Rec = V_1/V_{CSG}$ (59)

16 $Ref = (V_{back}/V_{in}) \times 100\%$ (60)

17 Recycle ratio(Rec) is the efficiency of the multistage separation, and large recycle
18 ratio means that the moles of the CSG meeting the demand after multistage separation
19 is much smaller than the moles of gas recycled in the system. Reflex ratio(Ref) is the
20 efficiency of the operating unit, and large reflex ratio leads to the low efficiency of the
21 operating unit. V_{back} is the volume of the gas flowing out of the operating unit to the
22 previous stage. V_{in} is the volume of the gas flowing into the operating unit. The
23 multistage separation calculation flow chart is shown in Fig. 7.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 The viscosity of TBAB solution and the interfacial tension between the TBAB solution and CSG

As described in the Introduction section, the addition of additives into water phase can affect gas hydrate formation in different ways. On one hand, an additive may affect the equilibrium distribution of gas species in gas and liquid phases. On the other hand, it may affect the mass transfer between the two phases or in the liquid phase by changing the interfacial tension between the two phases or affecting viscosity of the liquid phase. Knowledge on the viscosity and interfacial tension of the solutions is beneficial to the better understanding of the hydrate formation and separation mechanisms. Tables 6 and 7 present the viscosity of the TBAB solutions and their interfacial tension with CSG gas.

As shown in Table 6, the viscosity of pure water is consistent with the data reported in the literature.^[78] The addition of TBAB solution increases the viscosity of the liquid phase; the viscosity of the liquid phase increases with the increase of TBAB concentration in the solution and decreases with the increase in temperature. The results agree with those obtained by Sinha^[79]. From kinetics, this increased viscosity is not favorable to the mass transfer of gas species in the liquid phase.

According to Table 7, the addition of TBAB into water decreases the interfacial tension between the CSG of 34.6 mol% CH₄ and the liquid phase, and the interfacial tension decreases with the increase in the TBAB concentration in the solution and with

the increase in pressure. These trends agree with the changes of interfacial tension between CO₂+N₂ and TBAB solution obtained by Akiba^[80]. This means that addition of TBAB into water favors the mass transfer of gas species from CSG into liquid phase.

4.2 Single stage separation of CSG by hydrate formation

4.2.1 Effect of CSG/liquid ratio on the separation of CSG

The CSG/liquid ratio is expressed as the ratio of the volume of CSG (273.15 K, 101325 Pa) to the volume of TBAB solution at the beginning of separation (CL). The effect of CL on the performance of the CH₄ recovery by hydrate formation was carried out at 281.15 K and 2.5 MPa with 0.901 mol% TBAB solution. The experimental results are presented in Fig. 8. It can be seen from Fig. 8a, both SF and RF of CH₄ decrease as CL increases, which is in agreement with the results of Wang et al.^[13] in CSTR operation. From Fig. 8b, x_{CH_4} increases from 47.0 (± 0.3) mol% with CL at 20 NL/L to 53.7 (± 0.3) mol% with CL at 60 NL/L, which is a significant enrichment from 34.6 mol%. y_{CH_4} increases from 20.3 (± 0.2) mol% to 29.3 (± 0.2) mol% with the increase of CL. Due to the reduction of SF, y_{CH_4} increases with the increase in CL. x_{CH_4} depends on the CH₄ capture selectivity of the hydrate ($\theta_{CH_4}/\theta_{N_2}$). Under constant operating pressure, the increase in y_{CH_4} leads to an increase in $\theta_{CH_4}/\theta_{N_2}$ and increase in x_{CH_4} .

GSCHS increases from 10.7 (± 0.2) NL/L with CL at 20 NL/L to 13.2 (± 0.2) NL/L with CL at 60 NL/L. This trend agrees with the findings of Wang et al.^[13] in CSTR operation and Cai et al.^[9] in semi batch operation. Since CH₄ is more easily captured into hydrate than N₂, the increase in θ_{CH_4} overrides the decrease of θ_{N_2} with the increase of y_{CH_4} , leading to the increases in $\theta_{CH_4}+\theta_{N_2}$ and so GSCHS.

Fig. 8b also present the modeling results under corresponding conditions. The

1 simulation of the separation process predicts well on the effect of CL on the
2 compositions of dissociated gas and residual gas. The predicted effect of CL on GCSHS
3 is milder than that experimentally measured. The ARD, ARV and MRD of all data in
4 Fig. 8b are 4.12%, 0.0308 and 11.00%, respectively. The GF is 0.90 for x_{CH_4} , 0.83 for
5 y_{CH_4} and 0.34 for GCSHS. The higher deviation of GCSHS may be because in model
6 calculation, the interaction between TBAB in basic cavity and the gas molecules in
7 linked cavity (A_{CH_4} and A_{N_2}) is constant and not influenced by the concentrations of
8 CH_4 and N_2 in hydrate, but in actual process of the TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate
9 formation, the change of the interaction cannot be ignored. In order to improve the GF
10 in GCSHS prediction, the optimization of A_{CH_4} and A_{N_2} and a larger experiment
11 database can be considered in the future work.

12 Since liquid cooling is the most energy demanding in hydrate separation, a higher
13 CL reduces the amount of TBAB solution used, which results in lower energy
14 consumption on cooling TBAB solution. On the other hand, the capacity of hydrate
15 based separation is limited by the amount of TBAB solution used. Too high CL reduces
16 the separation factor (SF) and the recovery rate of CH_4 (RF). When the separation
17 efficiency and the recovery rate of CH_4 are too low to meet the industry requirements,
18 more separation stages are demanded. Comprehensive consideration is needed to
19 determine an optimum CL for the recovery of CH_4 .

20 In the CL range in Fig. 8, the CH_4 concentration was increased by 12.4 – 19.1
21 mol%. To concentrate CH_4 from 34.6 mol% to 80 mol% would need a three-stage
22 separation process, by which the average increase of x_{CH_4} in each separation stage is
23 about 15 mol%. Taking the separation efficiency and recovery rate into consideration,
24 30 NL/L was chosen as the CL in the following experiments.

4.2.2 Effect of TBAB concentration on the separation of CSG

The effect of the initial TBAB concentration in the solution on the performance of the separation was examined at 281.15 K and 2.5 MPa with CL at 30 NL/L. The experimental results with corresponding modeling results are presented in Fig. 9. GSCHS increases from 7.5 (± 0.2) NL/L at 0.617 mol% TBAB to 13.9 (± 0.2) NL/L at 1.052 mol% TBAB. Because the increase in the initial concentration of the TBAB in the solution leads to an increase in the driving force of the hydrate formation, which results in the increase in the moles of hydrate. Correspondingly, the RF increases with the increase in TBAB concentration. Preferential CH₄ capture in the hydrate slurry ($\theta_{CH_4}/\theta_{N_2} > y_{CH_4}/y_{N_2}$) results in the decrease in y_{CH_4} . The larger moles of the hydrate form, the greater the decrease in the y_{CH_4} . y_{CH_4} decreases from 28.1 (± 0.2) mol% at 0.617 mol% TBAB to 22.7 (± 0.1) mol% at 1.052 mol% TBAB. Under the reduced y_{CH_4} condition, the gas capture selectivity of hydrate ($\theta_{CH_4}/\theta_{N_2}$) decreases, more N₂ is also captured in the hydrate, causing reduction of x_{CH_4} . x_{CH_4} decreases from 53.9 (± 0.2) mol% to 48.4 (± 0.3) mol%.

SF increases with the increase in TBAB concentration at first and then decreases, which agrees with the findings of Wang et al. ^[13] in CSTR operation and Zhong et al. ^[11] in semi batch operation. In the range of low TBAB concentration, the selectivity of CH₄ capture in hydrate is high, resulting in higher SF with increasing TBAB concentration. However, in the range of high TBAB concentration, the selectivity of CH₄ capture decreases due to the significant decrease of y_{CH_4} , resulting in decrease of SF with the increase in the TBAB in solution. A peak SF is formed at TBAB concentration about 0.9 mol%. This TBAB concentration of peak SF is expected to become higher at higher CL, which can be confirmed in more detailed modeling work in the future.

1 It can be seen from Fig. 9b that the modeling results of the separation performance
2 at different TBAB concentrations match the experimental results very well. The ARD,
3 ARV and MRD of all data in Fig. 9b are 2.61%, 0.0109 and 5.95%, respectively. The
4 GF is 0.61 for x_{CH_4} , 0.81 for y_{CH_4} and 0.98 for GSCHS. The goodness of fit of x_{CH_4} is
5 slightly lower than that of GSCHS and y_{CH_4} , and the effect of $x_{TBAB,0}$ on x_{CH_4} predicted
6 by modeling is not as strong as that in experiments.

7 There are three physical resistances for the gas species to be captured in gas
8 hydrate: diffusion in the gas phase, cross the gas-liquid interface and in the liquid to
9 reach basic hydrate grain surface. As presented in section 4.1, increasing TBAB
10 concentration in solution causes a decrease in the interfacial tension but increase in
11 solution viscosity, which decreases the diffusion resistance of the gas species cross the
12 interface but increases the diffusion resistance in solution. The good fitting of the
13 modeling results with experimental data in the separation performance shows that
14 above diffusion processes did not affect the hydrate formation significantly, and the
15 assumption of adsorption equilibrium of CH_4 and N_2 in hydrate is acceptable. The
16 phenomenon of lower CH_4 concentration near the hydrate than that in the bulk phase
17 [81, 82] is not obvious in this work

18 Practical application of the CSG separation via hydrate formation requires that the
19 TBAB solution has high GSCHS provided that the SF and RF satisfy definite
20 specification. Thus, the high GSCHS at a high initial TBAB concentration in the
21 solution is beneficial to achieving a high CH_4 recovery. However, x_{CH_4} decreases along
22 with the reduction of y_{CH_4} with the increase of TBAB concentration. Increasing CL
23 simultaneously helps to maintain a high x_{CH_4} but this will increase y_{CH_4} and decrease
24 RF. So, to achieve high CH_4 recovery and high x_{CH_4} , multistage separation is necessary.
25 Using the CL at 30 NL/L in this series of experiments, the highest SF is achieved when

the initial concentration of the TBAB in the solution is 0.901 mol%, and x_{CH_4} is expected to meet the demand by three-stage separation. Taking the separation efficiency and recovery rate into consideration, 0.901 mol% was chosen as the initial TBAB concentration in the following experiments.

4.2.3 Effect of temperature on the separation of CSG

Operating temperature affects not only the formation of basic hydrate, but also the adsorption of CH_4 and N_2 in the hydrate cavities. The effect of temperature on the performance of separation was examined at 2.5 MPa with CL at 30 NL/L and TBAB concentration at 0.901 mol% TBAB. The experimental results and modeling data are presented in Fig. 10. The separation performance is very sensitive to the change of temperature. GSCHS decreases from 13.1 (± 0.3) NL/L at 280.15 K to 9.9 (± 0.2) NL/L at 283.15 K. The increase in operating temperature leads to the decrease of the occupation fraction of the linked cavities ($\theta_{CH_4} + \theta_{N_2}$), so the moles of gas captured by per mole hydrate decreases, which results in the decrease in the GSCHS. The increase in operating temperature leads to the decrease in the moles of hydrate, which also leads to the decrease in the GSCHS. Caused by the preferential CH_4 capture in the hydrate slurry, smaller GSCHS leads to smaller decrease in the concentration of the CH_4 in the gas phase. So y_{CH_4} increases from 22.8 (± 0.2) mol% to 26.1 (± 0.3) mol% with the increase of the operating temperature. x_{CH_4} increases from 49.8 (± 0.3) mol% to 52.1 (± 0.2) mol%, correspondingly. These changes caused significant decrease in RF and SF as the operating temperature increases.

As it can be seen from Fig. 10b, the experimental and modeling results match well. The ARD, ARV and MRD are 2.27%, 0.0101, and 6.40%, respectively. The GF is 0.57 for x_{CH_4} , 0.51 for y_{CH_4} and 0.89 for GSCHS. The goodness of fit of gas compositions

1 is not as good as those of the CSGHS.

2 It is well known that temperature is a major factor affecting the thermodynamics
3 and kinetics of chemical reactions. Decreasing temperature favors formation of more
4 basic hydrate and adsorption of more gases in unit amount of basic hydrate, which is
5 consistent with the experimental data and modeling prediction. At a low temperature,
6 the diffusion of gas species and hydrate formation are slower than at a higher
7 temperature, but according to Fig. 10b, the experimentally achieved separation
8 performance at low temperature is better than that predicted by process simulation. It
9 illustrates that the kinetics of gas hydrate including mass transfer of gas species from
10 gas to liquid phase is not the controlling stage in the separation process. The rate of gas
11 hydrate formation is determined by that of formation of basic hydrate. In order to ensure
12 the increase in the x_{CH_4} meets the demand of the three- stage separation, 281.15 K was
13 chosen as the operating temperature in the following experiments.

14 **4.2.4 Effect of pressure on the separation of CSG**

15 The effect of operating pressure on the performance of the separation by hydrate
16 formation was carried out at 281.15 K with CL at 30 NL/L and 0.901 mol% TBAB in
17 solution. The experimental and modelling results are presented in Fig. 11. GSCHS
18 increases from 3.1 (± 0.1) NL/L under 1 MPa to 14.4 (± 0.3) NL/L under 3.5 MPa. The
19 increase in operating pressure leads to the increase of the occupation fraction of the
20 linked cavities ($\theta_{CH_4} + \theta_{N_2}$), so the moles of gas captured by per mole hydrate increases,
21 which results in the decrease in the GSCHS. The increase in operating pressure leads
22 to the increase in the moles of hydrate, which also leads to the increase in the GSCHS.
23 Larger GSCHS leads to greater decrease in the concentration of the CH_4 in the gas
24 phase. y_{CH_4} decreases from 32.3 (± 0.1) mol% to 21.4 (± 0.2) mol%. x_{CH_4} also decreases

1 from 54.7 (± 0.1) mol% to 48.9 (± 0.3) mol% due to the decrease in the selectivity
2 ($\theta_{CH_4}/\theta_{N_2}$) caused by the decrease of y_{CH_4} . RF increases as the operating pressure
3 increases due to the increased GSCHS. SF increases as the operating pressure increases,
4 and reaches the peak at 3 Mpa then shows a tendency of decrease when the pressure
5 increases further. The decrease in y_{CH_4} leads to the increase in SF while the decrease in
6 x_{CH_4} leads to the decrease in SF. When operating pressure is higher than a specific value,
7 the increase in operating pressure has a greater effect on the decrease in x_{CH_4} than on
8 the decrease in y_{CH_4} which leads to the decrease in SF.

9 As it can be seen from Fig. 11b, the experimental and modeling results are pretty
10 close. The ARD, ARV and MRD are 2.65%, 0.0195 and 9.28%, respectively. The GF is
11 0.73 for x_{CH_4} , 0.97 for y_{CH_4} and 0.99 for GSCHS. High operating pressure leads to
12 formation of more hydrate and high CH_4 recovery. On the other hand, it also leads to
13 decreased x_{CH_4} and may cause decrease in SF due to the decrease in the selectivity of
14 CH_4 capture in hydrate. In addition, high operating pressure may lead to higher energy
15 consumption and higher capital and operation costs. The optimal operating pressure
16 needs careful examination of the whole process from different aspects. 2.5 MPa was
17 chosen as the operating pressure to ensure the increase in the x_{CH_4} meets the demand of
18 the three- stage separation.

19 **4.2.5 Effect of CSG concentration on the separation** 20 **performance**

21 The effect of CH_4 content on the separation was examined at 281.15 K with CL at
22 30 NL/L and 0.901 mol% TBAB solution. The operating pressure was also changed in
23 some experiments to better understand the separation performance. The experimental

1 results and corresponding modeling results are compared in Table 8.

2 As shown in Table 8, the composition of the model CSG in E2 (50.9 mol%CH₄)
3 is the same as that of the dissociated gas in E1, and the composition of the model CSG
4 in E3, E4, E5 and E6 (65.9 mol% CH₄) is very close to that of the dissociated gas in E2
5 (65.8 mol% CH₄). The results experimental confirm that the concentration of the CH₄
6 can be enhanced from 34.6 mol% to 81.3 (± 0.1) mol% after three stage separation. The
7 composition of the model CSG in E7 (23.7 mol%) is the same as that of the residual
8 gas in E1 and the composition of the model CSG in E8(13.3 mol%) is equal to that of
9 the residual gas in E7. So, the concentration of CH₄ of a model CSG containing 34.6
10 mol% CH₄ can be reduced to 7.2 (± 0.1) mol% in the residual gas after three stage
11 separation. It is noted that a higher CH₄ concentration is obtained in the dissociated gas
12 when the operating pressure is lower, while a higher operating pressure was chosen in
13 experiments E7 and E8 to maximize CH₄ recovery. Table 8 also shows that the predicted
14 results show good agreement with the experimental values in each experiment.

15 Overall, the ARD of all of the modeling data with the experimental data is 2.83%;
16 the MRD is 11.20%, and ARV is 0.1044. They show an improvement from those in
17 previous researches. In previous researches, [49, 50] trial-and-error method is used to
18 predict the performance of hydrate based separation. The relationship between the final
19 compositions of residual gas and dissociated gas are directly determined by Langmuir
20 adsorption theory (Eqs. 16a and 16b). In real hydrate formation process, the existing
21 hydrate is covered by new formed hydrate during hydrate forming, so the gas molecules
22 captured by hydrate is encapsulated. As a result, the hydrate cavities inner of a hydrate
23 grain can neither release nor intake gas species during the following separation period.
24 In this work, the equilibrium of Langmuir adsorption is assumed between the new
25 formed hydrate and the gas phase at every moment during the hydrate formation, and

the part of hydrate does not change its composition during the extended period of separation. Thus, the composition of gas phase changes continuously and so does the hydrate formed. When the separation reaches thermodynamic equilibrium, the final compositions of the residual gas and the dissociated gas are not in equilibrium following the Langmuir adsorption theory. This may be why in Ref. [49], the ARD of residual gas composition is 10% and that of dissociated gas is even higher. In addition, the larger the amount of hydrate forms the larger the change of gas phase composition is, and the larger the error can be in the prediction of the dissociated gas composition. In Ref. [50], the convergence condition is the equilibrium among L-V-H three-phases as given in Ref. [83]. Since the equilibrium condition is used for hydrate dissociation near critical point of the hydrate formation, its scope of application is limited near the critical point of the hydrate formation. In this work, the operating conditions are not subject to the limitation because it considers the separation as a dynamic process, and the change of the chemical potential is considered as the driving force for hydrate formation.

4.3 Prediction of the separation performance by multistage separation modelling

Based on the single stage separation model, a multistage separation model was established to predict the separation performance. Based on the previous experimental results, lower operating pressure, higher temperature and lower initial concentration of the TBAB in the solution lead to a greater increment of x_{CH_4} , but a smaller decrement of y_{CH_4} . Since enhancing the x_{CH_4} and reducing the y_{CH_4} have opposite requirements on the initial concentration of TBAB in solution, the concentrations of TBAB in solutions in all of stages were set at 0.901 mol% so that the system only needed one liquid storage

1 tank. The initial gas/liquid ratio was set at 30 NL/L, and the volume of the model CSG
2 flowing into the multistage separation system was set at 10 NL.

3 First, the operating temperatures of all operating units were set at 281.15 K in
4 order to investigate the effect of the operating pressures in five operating units on the
5 multistage separation. Several combinations of the operating pressure were tried. The
6 predicted separation performance is presented in Table 9. When the operating pressures
7 of all operating units are the same, the recycle ratio of gas is normally smaller than
8 when the operating pressures are different, but CH₄ is not efficiently concentrated.
9 When the pressures of all operating units are the same and decreased from 3.5 MPa to
10 2.5 MPa, the SF decreases from 52.4 to 22.9, and the RF decreases from 92.8 mol% to
11 67.8 mol%. The CH₄ concentration in the final dissociated gas increases from 70.1 mol%
12 to 81.0 mol%, and that in the final residual gas increases from 4.5 mol% to 15.7 mol%.

13 To enhance x_{CH_4} needs low operating pressure while to reduce y_{CH_4} needs high
14 operating pressure. In order to enhance the separation efficiency, operating pressures of
15 operating units S2_1 and S3_1 were increased and that of S3_2 was reduced. Based on
16 the separation efficiency (high SF), the concentration demand (CH₄ content > 80 mol%)
17 and the recovery rate (high RF), it can be seen that best separation results was achieved
18 when S3_2 was set at 1 MPa and the other operating units were set at 3.5 MPa. For this
19 reason, the S3_2 was set at 1 MPa and the other operating unit were set at 3.5 MPa in
20 the following modeling to determine the operating temperature.

21 Several combinations of the operating temperature were tried, and the results are
22 presented in Table 10. When the temperatures of all operating units are the same, the
23 SF and RF increase with the decrease of the operating temperatures, but the
24 concentrations of CH₄ decrease at the same time. It can be seen that the SF and RF
25 under different combinations of the operating temperatures have not much difference.

1 In order to avoid the energy consumption on warming and cooling, the operating
2 temperatures of all separation stages were set at 280.15 K. The major operating
3 conditions of the multistage separation system are summarized in Table 11.

4 It can be seen from Table 11 that the volume of the gas flowing into unit S1 (33.6
5 NL) is more than three times the volume of the model CSG (10 NL) which is caused
6 by the gas streams returned from S2_1 (9.9 NL) and S2_2 (13.7 NL). The volume of
7 the gas returned from S2_2 alone is larger than that of the model CSG. The
8 concentration of CH₄ in the gas flowing into unit S1 (38.6 mol%) is higher than that in
9 model CSG (34.6 mol%). This is also caused by the gas streams which flow back from
10 the S2_1 (35.4 mol%) and S2_2 (43.9 mol%). The amount of the gas flowing into S2_2
11 (31.5 NL) is as large as that of S1 (31.6 NL). Because the reflux ratio of the S3_2 is as
12 high as 78.4 %, only 21.6% of the inlet gas is output as dissociated gas satisfying the
13 CH₄ content requirement. In order to achieve a high content CH₄, the operating pressure
14 of the S3_2 was set very low (1 MPa). This means that the SF of S3_2 (2.35) is the
15 lowest while its reflux ratio (78.4 %) is the highest among all the operating units. After
16 multistage separation, the concentration of CH₄ is enhanced to 81.0 mol% in the final
17 dissociated gas and the CH₄ content in the final residual gas is reduced to 5.5 mol%.
18 The recovery rate of CH₄ is 90.1% and the separation factor is 73.0.1.

19 **5. Conclusions**

20 The separation of CH₄ from CSG was investigated experimentally, and a model
21 was established to predict the CSG separation performance by hydrate formation using
22 TBAB aqueous solution. The effects of different influential factors on the separation
23 were examined. Low operating temperature, high operating pressure and high
24 concentration of TBAB in solution favors high CH₄ recovery rate, but results in low

CH₄ capture selectivity in the hydrate slurry. High CSG to liquid volumetric ratio is helpful to increasing the CH₄ concentration in the dissociated gas, but reduces the recovery of CH₄, leaving residual gas with a high CH₄ content. The results show that a single stage separation process is incapable of separating CH₄ from CSG with satisfactory CH₄ concentration and recovery, and a multistage separation process is necessary. Experimental simulation of a three-stage separation shows that CH₄ can be concentrated to 81.3 mol% in the final dissociated gas, and its content in the residual gas can be reduced to 7.12 mol%.

The established hydrate separation model was used to simulate the experimental data, and the predicted results match the experimental results satisfactorily. The average relative deviation (ARD) of all the results in this study is 2.83 %, with the maximum relative deviation (MRD) being 11.20 %, and the average relative variance (ARV) being 0.1044.

The modeling method was applied to predict the performance of multistage separation process. In a three-stage separation model to separate a model CSG containing 34.6 mol% CH₄, the concentration of the CH₄ is enhanced to 81.0 mol% in the final dissociated gas and is reduced to 5.5 mol% in the final residual gas. The recovery rate of CH₄ is 90.1% and the separation factor is 73.0.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by Research Foundation of China University of Petroleum-Beijing at Karamay (RCYJ2017A-02-001, RCYJ2017A-03-001), Science Foundation of China University of Petroleum, Beijing (YJRC-2013-09), and National Natural Science Foundation of China (21306226), which are greatly acknowledged.

The authors wish to gratefully acknowledge the help of Dr. Madeleine Strong

1 Cincotta and Mr. Hemeng Bi in the final language editing of this paper.

2 **Nomenclature**

3 **Abbreviation**

4 ARD Average relative deviation

5 ARV Average relative variance

6 CSG Coal seam gas

7 GF Goodness of fit

8 GSCHS Gas storage capacity of the hydrate slurry

9 CL Volumetric CSG/liquid ratio (ratio of the model CSG volume at
10 273.15 K, 101325 Pa to the volume of TBAB solution at the
11 beginning of experiment)

12 MRD Maximum relative deviation

13 Rec Recycle ratio

14 Ref Reflex ratio

15 RF Recovery fraction

16 SF Separation factor

17 TBAB Tetra butyl ammonium bromide

18 **Symbols**

19 λ_1 Ratio of the number of linked cavities to water molecules in a
20 basic hydrate unit

21 λ_2 Ratio of the number of TBAB molecules to water molecules in a

1		basic hydrate unit
2	θ	The fraction of the linked cavities filled by gas molecules
3	μ_B^0	Chemical potential of basic TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate
4	μ_{TBAB}^0	Chemical potential of TBAB under standard condition (273.15 K,
5		101325 Pa)
6	μ_{H_2O}	Chemical potential of water
7	μ_{TBAB}	Chemical potential of TBAB
8	μ_B	Chemical potential of the final hydrate
9	ν	Kinematic viscosity of TBAB solution
10	σ	Interfacial tension between TBAB solution and CSG
11	γ	Activity coefficient
12	$\Delta\mu$	The difference between final chemical potential and initial
13		chemical potential
14	ρ_{sol}	Density of TBAB solution
15	α	Structural parameter, $\alpha = \lambda_1/\lambda_2$
16	β	Structural parameter, $\beta = 3.5$ K/bar for type B TBAB hydrate and
17		2.8 K/bar for type A
18	α_{H_2O}	Activity of the water in the TBAB solution
19	A_{CH_4}	Corrected coefficients between CH_4 and TBAB
20	A_{N_2}	Corrected coefficients between N_2 and TBAB
21	A'	Antoine constants for calculating $f_T^0(T)$
22	B'	Antoine constants for calculating $f_T^0(T)$

1	C'	Antoine constants for calculating $f_T^0(T)$
2	C	Langmuir constant
3	f^0	Fugacity of TBAB in the unfilled basic hydrate
4	f	Fugacity of gas species and TBAB
5	g	Empirical constants for calculating ρ_{sol}
6	h	The change of the moles of substance during Δt
7	H_g	The moles of gas in the hydrate phase
8	k	Parameter of the hydrate forming rate
9	M	Molecular weight
10	m	Mass
11	N	Moles of substances
12	n	Number of experimental data points
13	N_g	The moles of gas in the gas phase in the crystallizer
14	O	Empirical constants for calculating ρ_{sol}
15	P	Pressure
16	P_{TBAB}^{sat}	Saturated vapor pressure of TBAB
17	q	Empirical constants for calculating ρ_{sol}
18	r	Gas capture rate
19	ratio	Ratio of gas volume to TBAB solution volume under 273.15 K,
20		101325 Pa
21	s	Empirical constants for calculating ρ_{sol}
22	t_{eq}	Time when the separation reaches steady
23	V	Volume

1	V_{TBAB}^L	Molar volume of TBAB in the solution
2	w_{TBAB}	Mass fraction of TBAB in the solution.
3	x	Concentration of gas species in the dissociated gas
4	x_{TBAB}	Mole fraction of the TBAB in the liquid phase
5	X^*	Antoine constant for calculating Langmuir constant
6	y	Concentration of gas species in the residual gas
7	Y^*	Antoine constant for calculating Langmuir constant
8	Z^*	Antoine constant for calculating Langmuir constant
9	Z	Compressibility factor
10	z_z	Concentration of gas species in feed gas of different operating
11		units in multistage separation

12 **Subscript**

13	“A”_“B”	The separation stage “A”, No. “B” operating unit
14	back	The gas flowing out of the operating unit to the above stage
15	cal	Calculation result
16	d	Dissociated gas
17	exp	Experimental result
18	i	Number of iterations in multistage separation
19	in	The gas flowing into the operating unit
20	j	Number of iterations in single stage separation
21	jjj	Sequence number for the repeated experiments

1	r	Residual gas
2	sol	TBAB solution
3	stp	Under 273.15 K, 101325 Pa

4 REFERENCES

- 5 [1] Sarhosis V, Jaya AA, Thomas HR. Economic modelling for coal bed methane
6 production and electricity generation from deep virgin coal seams. *Energy* 2016;
7 107: 580-594.
- 8 [2] Zhong DL, Ding K, Lu YY, Yan J, Zhao WL. Methane recovery from coal mine
9 gas using hydrate formation in water-in-oil emulsions. *Appl Energy* 2016; 162:
10 1619-1626.
- 11 [3] Yang ZQ, Grace JR, Lim CJ, Zhang L. Combustion of low-concentration coal bed
12 Methane in a fluidized bed. *Energy Fuel* 2011; 5: 975–980.
- 13 [4] Huang Y, Zheng QP, Fan N, Aminian K. Optimal scheduling for enhanced coal bed
14 methane production through CO₂ injection. *Appl Energy* 2014; 113: 1475–1483.
- 15 [5] Su S, Beath A, Guo H, Mallett C. An assessment of mine methane mitigation and
16 utilization technologies. *Prog Energ Combust* 2005; 31: 123–170.
- 17 [6] Peng XQ, Zhang BS, Chu WT, Liu LL. Benefit assessment on CSG development
18 in China. *Nat Gas Ind* 2008; 28: 124–126.
- 19 [7] Yang M. Climate change and energy policies, coal and coalmine methane in China.
20 *Energ Policy* 2009; 37: 2858–2869.
- 21 [8] Berntsen TK, Fuglestvedt JS, Joshi MM, ShineKP, Stuber N, Ponater M, Sausen R,
22 Hauglustaine DA, Li L. Climate response to regional emissions of ozone precursors;
23 sensitivities and warming potentials. *Tellus B* 2005; 4: 283–304.

- 1 [9] Cai J, Xu CG, Xia ZM, Chen ZY, Li XS. Hydrate-based methane separation from
2 coal mine methane gas mixture by bubbling using the scale-up equipment. *Applied*
3 *Energy* 2017.
- 4 [10] Olajosy A, Gawdzik A, Budner Z, Dula J. Methane separation from coal mine
5 methane gas by vacuum pressure swing adsorption. *Chem Eng Res Des* 2003; 81:
6 474–482.
- 7 [11] Zhong D, Englezos P. Methane separation from coal mine methane gas by tetra-n-
8 butyl ammonium bromide semiclathrate hydrate formation. *Energy Fuel* 2012;
9 26(4): 2098-2106.
- 10 [12] Zhong DL, Daraboina N, Englezos P. Coal Mine Methane Gas Recovery by
11 Hydrate Formation in a Fixed Bed of Silica Sand Particles. *Energy Fuel* 2013; 27:
12 4581–4588.
- 13 [13] Wang YW, Du M, Guo XQ, Sun Q, Liu AX, Chen B, Chen GJ, Sun CY, Yang LY.
14 Experiments and simulations for continuous recovery of methane from coal seam
15 gas (CSG) utilizing hydrate formation. *Energy* 2017; 129: 28-41.
- 16 [14] Sloan ED, Koh CA. Clathrate hydrates of natural gases. 3rd ed. Boca Raton:
17 CRC/Taylor & Francis; 2008.
- 18 [15] Sloan ED. Fundamental principles and applications of natural gas hydrates. *Nature*
19 2003; 426: 353–363.
- 20 [16] Lee H, Lee JW, Kim DY, Park J, Seo YT, Zeng H, Moudrakovski IL, Ratcliffe CI,
21 Ripmeester JA. Tuning clathrate hydrates for hydrogen storage. *Nature* 2005; 434:
22 743-746.
- 23 [17] Pivezhani F, Roosta H, Dashti A, Mazloumi SH. Investigation of CO₂ hydrate
24 formation conditions for determining the optimum CO₂ storage rate and energy:
25 Modeling and experimental study. *Energy* 2016; 113: 215-226.

- 1 [18] Lee Y, Kim Y, Lee J, Lee H, Seo Y. CH₄ recovery and CO₂ sequestration using flue
2 gas in natural gas hydrates as revealed by a micro-differential scanning calorimeter.
3 Appl Energy 2015; 150: 120–127.
- 4 [19] Babu P, Linga P, Kumar R, Englezos P. A review of the hydrate based gas separation
5 (HBGS) process for carbon dioxide precombustion capture. Energy 2015; 85: 261–
6 279.
- 7 [20] Wang Y, Lang X, Fan SS. Hydrate capture CO₂ from shifted synthesis gas, flue gas
8 and sour natural gas or biogas. J Energy Chem 2013; 22: 39–47.
- 9 [21] Chong ZR, Yang SHB, Babu P, Linga P, Li XS. Review of natural gas hydrates as
10 an energy resource: Prospects and challenges. Appl Energy 2016; 106: 1633–1652.
- 11 [22] Feng JC, Wang Y, Li XS. Energy and entropy analyses of hydrate dissociation in
12 different scales of hydrate simulator. Energy 2016; 102: 176–186.
- 13 [23] Feng JC, Wang Y, Li XS. Entropy generation analysis of hydrate dissociation by
14 depressurization with horizontal well in different scales of hydrate reservoirs.
15 Energy 2017; 125: 62–71.
- 16 [24] Wang F, Fu SF, Guo G, Jia ZZ, Luo SJ, Guo RB. Experimental study on hydrate-
17 based CO₂ removal from CH₄/CO₂ mixture. Energy 2016; 104: 76–84.
- 18 [25] Yang M, Jing W, Zhao J, Ling Z, Song YC. Promotion of hydrate-based CO₂
19 capture from flue gas by additive mixtures (THF (tetrahydrofuran)+ TBAB (tetra-
20 n-butyl ammonium bromide)). Energy 2016; 106: 546–553.
- 21 [26] Veluswamy HP, Kumar A, Premasinghe K, Linga P. Effect of guest gas on the
22 mixed tetrahydrofuran hydrate kinetics in a quiescent system. Applied Energy 2017.
- 23 [27] Veluswamy HP, Ang WJ, Zhao D, Linga P. Influence of cationic and non-ionic
24 surfactants on the kinetics of mixed hydrogen/tetrahydrofuran hydrates. Chem Eng
25 Sci 2015; 132: 186–199.

- 1 [28]Kim S, Lee SH, Kang YT. Characteristics of CO₂ hydrate formation/dissociation
2 in H₂O + THF aqueous solution and estimation of CO₂ emission reduction by
3 district cooling application. *Energy* 2017; 120: 362-373.
- 4 [29]Wang X, Dennis M. An experimental study on the formation behavior of single and
5 binary hydrates of TBAB, TBAF and TBPB for cold storage air conditioning
6 applications. *Chem Eng Sci* 2015; 137: 938-946.
- 7 [30]Renault-Crispo JS, Coulombe S, Servio P. Kinetics of carbon dioxide gas hydrates
8 with tetrabutylammonium bromide and functionalized multi-walled carbon
9 nanotube. *Energy* 2017; 128: 414-420.
- 10 [31]Cai J, Xu CG, Lin FH, Yu HZ, Li XS. A novel method for evaluating effects of
11 promoters on hydrate formation. *Energy* 2016; 102: 567-575.
- 12 [32]Kim S, Choi SD, Seo Y. CO₂ capture from flue gas using clathrate formation in the
13 presence of thermodynamic promoters. *Energy* 2017; 118: 950-956.
- 14 [33]Veluswamy HP, Chen JY, Linga P. Surfactant effect on the kinetics of mixed
15 hydrogen/propane hydrate formation for hydrogen storage as clathrates. *Chem Eng*
16 *Sci* 2015; 126: 488–499.
- 17 [34]Wang F, Jia ZZ, Luo SJ, Fu SF, Wang L, Shi XS, Wang CS, Guo RB. Effects of
18 different anionic surfactants on methane hydrate formation. *Chem Eng Sci* 2015;
19 137: 896–903.
- 20 [35]Veluswamy HP, Kumar A, Kumar R, Linga P. An innovative approach to enhance
21 methane hydrate formation kinetics with leucine for energy storage application.
22 *Appl Energy* 2017;188: 190–199.
- 23 [36]Zhou MZ, Xia GD, Li J, Chai L, Zhou L. Analysis of factors influencing thermal
24 conductivity and viscosity in different kinds of surfactant solutions. *Experimental*
25 *Thermal and Fluid Science* 2012; 36: 22-29.

- 1 [37] Martinov M, Gancel F, Jacques P, Nikov I, Vlaev S. Surfactant effects on aeration
2 performance of stirred tank reactors. *Chemical engineering & technology* 2008;
3 31(10): 1494-1500.
- 4 [38] Ding YL, Xu CG, Yu YS, Li XS. Methane recovery from natural gas hydrate with
5 simulated IGCC syngas. *Energy* 2017; 120: 192-198.
- 6 [39] Xia ZM, Li XS, Chen ZY, Li G, Yan KF, Xu CG, Lv QN, Cai J. Hydrate-based CO₂
7 capture and CH₄ purification from simulated biogas with synergic additives based
8 on gas solvent. *Appl Energy* 2016; 162: 1153–1159.
- 9 [40] Zheng J, Zhang P, Linga P. Semiclathrate hydrate process for pre-combustion
10 capture of CO₂ at near ambient temperatures. *Applied Energy* 2017; 194: 267-278.
- 11 [41] Xu CG, Zhang SH, Cai J, Chen ZY, Li XS. CO₂ (carbon dioxide) separation from
12 CO₂–H₂ (hydrogen) gas mixtures by gas hydrates in TBAB (tetra-n-187 butyl
13 ammonium bromide) solution and Raman spectroscopic analysis. *Energy* 2013; 59:
14 719–725.
- 15 [42] Hashimoto H, Yamaguchi T, Kinoshita T, Muromachi S. Gas separation of flue gas
16 by tetra-n-butylammonium bromide hydrates under moderate pressure conditions.
17 *Energy* 2017; 129: 292-298.
- 18 [43] Song WJ, Xiao R, Huang C, He SH, Dong KJ, Feng ZP. Experimental investigation
19 on TBAB clathrate hydrate slurry flows in a horizontal tube: Forced convective
20 heat transfer behaviors. *Int J Refrig* 2009; 32: 1801–1807.
- 21 [44] Chen GJ, Guo TM. A new approach to gas hydrate modelling. *Chem Eng J* 1998;
22 71: 145–151.
- 23 [45] Chen GJ, Guo TM. Thermodynamic modeling of hydrate formation based on new
24 concepts. *Fluid Phase Equilib* 1996; 122: 43-65.
- 25 [46] Zhou H, de Sera IE, Infante Ferreira CA. Modelling and experimental validation

- 1 of a fluidized bed based CO₂ hydrate cold storage system. Appl Energy 2015; 15:
2 433–445.
- 3 [47]Liao ZX, Guo XQ, Li Q, Sun Q, Li J, Yang LY, Liu AX, Chen GJ, Zuo JY.
4 Experimental and modeling study on the phase equilibria for hydrates of gas
5 mixtures in TBAB solution. Chem Eng Sci 2015; 137: 656–664.
- 6 [48]Liao ZX, Guo XQ, Zhao YY, Wang YW, Sun Q, Liu AX, Sun CY, Chen GJ.
7 Experimental and modeling study on phase equilibria of semiclathrate hydrates of
8 tetra-n-butyl ammonium bromide + CH₄, CO₂, N₂, or Gas Mixtures. Ind Eng Chem
9 Res 2013; 52: 18440–18446.
- 10 [49]Ma QL, Qi LJ, Chen GJ, Sun CY. Modeling study on phase equilibria of
11 emiclathrate hydrates of pure gases and gas mixtures in aqueous solutions of TBAB
12 and TBAF. Fluid Phase Equilib 2016; 430: 178-187.
- 13 [50]Fukumoto A, Paulo L, Silva S, Paricaud P, Dalmazzone D, Furst W. Modeling of
14 the dissociation conditions of H₂ + CO₂ semiclathrate hydrate formed with TBAB,
15 TBAC, TBAF, TBPB, and TBNO₃ salts. Application to CO₂ capture from syngas.
16 Int J Hydrogen Energy 2015; 40: 9254 - 9266.
- 17 [51]Tumba K, Mohammadi AH, Naidoo, Ramjugernath D. Assessing hydrate
18 formation as a separation process for mixtures of close-boiling point compounds:
19 A modelling study. J Nat Gas Sci Eng 2016; 35: 1405-1415.
- 20 [52]Zhong DL, Lu YY, Sun DJ, Zhao WL, Li Z. Performance evaluation of methane
21 separation from coal mine gas by gas hydrate formation in a stirred reactor and in
22 a fixed bed of silica sand. Fuel 2015; 143: 586–594.
- 23 [53]Kang SP, Lee H, Lee CS, Sung WM. Hydrate phase equilibria of the guest mixtures
24 containing CO₂, N₂ and tetrahydrofuran. Fluid Phase Equilibria 2001; 185(1): 101-
25 109.

- 1 [54]Qin HB, Sun CY, Sun ZF, Liu B, Chen GJ. Relationship between the interfacial
2 tension and inhibition performance of hydrate inhibitors. Chemical Engineering
3 Science 2016; 148: 182-189.
- 4 [55]Sun CY, Chen GJ, Yang LY. Interfacial tension of methane+ water with surfactant
5 near the hydrate formation conditions. Journal of Chemical & Engineering Data
6 2004; 49(4): 1023-1025.
- 7 [56]Patel NC, Teja AS. A new cubic equation of state for fluids and fluid mixtures.
8 Chem Eng Sci 1982; 37: 463–473.
- 9 [57]Li XS, Xu CG, Chen Y, Wu HJ. Tetra-n-butyl ammonium bromide semi-clathrate
10 hydrate process for post-combustion capture of carbon dioxide in the presence of
11 dodecyl trimethyl ammonium chloride. Energy 2010; 35: 3902-3908.
- 12 [58]Seo Y, Kang SP. Enhancing CO₂ separation for pre-combustion capture with
13 hydrate formation in silica gel pore structure. Chem Eng J 2010; 161: 308–312.
- 14 [59]Xia ZM, Li XS, Chen ZY, Yan KF, Xu CG, Cai J. Hydrate-based hydrogen
15 purification from simulated syngas with synergic additives. Int J Hydrogen Energy
16 2016; 41: 2649-2659.
- 17 [60]Lee HJ, Lee JD, Linga P, Englezos P, Kim YS, Lee MS, Kim YD. Gas hydrate
18 formation process for pre-combustion capture of carbon dioxide. Energy 2010; 35:
19 2729-33.
- 20 [61]Hu J, Li SJ, Wang YH, Lang XM, Li QP, Fan SS. Kinetic hydrate inhibitor
21 performance of new copolymer poly(N-vinyl-2-pyrrolidone-co-2-vinyl pyridine)s
22 with TBAB. J Nat Gas Chem 2012; 21: 126-131.
- 23 [62]Nguyen NN, Nguyen AV, Nguyen KT, Rintoul L, Dang LX. Unexpected inhibition
24 of CO₂ gas hydrate formation in dilute TBAB solutions and the critical role of
25 interfacial water structure. Fuel 2016; 185: 517–523.

- 1 [63] Wang YW, Deng Y, Guo XQ, Sun Q, Liu AX, Chen GJ, Sun CY, Yang LY. The use
2 of hydrate formation for the continuous recovery of ethylene and hydrogen from
3 fluid catalytic cracking dry gas. *Sep Purif Technol* 2017; 187: 162-172.
- 4 [64] Long JP, Sloan Jr ED, Quantized water clusters around apolar Molecules. *Mol*
5 *Simul* 1993; 11: 145-161.
- 6 [65] Yusuke J, Masato K, Jiro N. Phase Equilibrium condition for clathrate hydrates of
7 tetra-n-butyl ammonium bromide (TBAB) and xenon. *J Chem Eng Data* 2012; 57:
8 1829-1833.
- 9 [66] Ohmura R, Takeya S, Uchida T, Ebinuma T. Clathrate hydrate formed with
10 methane and 2-propanol: Confirmation of structure II hydrate formation. *Ind Eng*
11 *Chem Res* 2004; 43: 4964–4966.
- 12 [67] Chen GJ, Sun CY, Ma QL. Science and technology of gas hydrate, 1st ed.,
13 Chemical Industry Press, Beijing, 2008.
- 14 [68] Belandria V, Eslamimanesh A, Mohammadi AH, Theveneau P, Legendre H, Richon
15 D. Compositional analysis and hydrate dissociation conditions measurements for
16 carbon dioxide + methane + water system. *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2011; 50: 5783–5794.
- 17 [69] Belandria V, Eslamimanesh A, Mohammadi A H, Richon D. Gas hydrate formation
18 in carbon dioxide+ nitrogen+ water system: Compositional analysis of equilibrium
19 phases. *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2011; 50(8): 4722-4730.
- 20 [70] Poling BE, Prausnitz JM, O’Connell JP. The Properties of Gases and Liquids.
21 McGraw-Hill, New York, 2001.
- 22 [71] Lindenbaum S, Boyd GE. Osmotic and activity coefficients for the symmetrical
23 tetra alkyl ammonium halides in aqueous solution at 25°C. *J Phys Chem* 1964; 68:
24 911–917.
- 25 [72] Amado GE, Blanco LH. Isopiestic determination of the osmotic and activity

- coefficients of dilute aqueous solutions of symmetrical and unsymmetrical quaternary ammonium bromides with a new isopiestic cell at 298.15 K. *Fluid Phase Equilib* 2005; 233: 230–233.
- [73] Söhnel O, Novotny P. Densities of aqueous solutions of inorganic substances. Elsevier Science Pub.Co: Amsterdam, 1985.
- [74] Belandria V, Mohammadi AH, Richon D. Volumetric properties of the (tetrahydrofuran + water) and (tetra-n-butyl ammonium bromide + water) systems: experimental measurements and correlations. *J Chem Thermodyn* 2009; 41: 1382–1386.
- [75] Chen LF, Soriano AN, Li MH. Vapor pressures and densities of the mixed-solvent desiccants (glycols + water + salts). *J Chem Thermodyn* 2009; 41: 724–730.
- [76] Wang YW, Zhang JH, Guo XQ, Chen B, Sun Q, Liu AX, Sun CY, Chen GJ, Yang LY. Experiments and modeling for recovery of hydrogen and ethylene from fluid catalytic cracking (FCC) dry gas utilizing hydrate formation. *Fuel* 2017; 209: 473–489.
- [77] Akatsu S, Tomita S, Mori YH, Ohmura R. Thermodynamic simulations of hydrate-based removal of carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulfide from low-quality natural gas. *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2013; 52(43): 15165–15176.
- [78] Yao YY, Chen CG, Chai CJ. Chemical Engineering, 3rd ed., Tianjin university press, Tianjin, 2010.
- [79] Sinha B, Sarkar BK, Roy MN. Apparent molar volumes and viscosity B-coefficients of nicotinamide in aqueous tetrabutylammonium bromide solutions at $T = (298.15, 308.15, \text{ and } 318.15) \text{ K}$. *The Journal of Chemical Thermodynamics* 2008; 40(3): 394–400.
- [80] Akiba H, Ohmura R. Interfacial tension between ($\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2$) gas and

- 1 tetrabutylammonium bromide aqueous solution. The Journal of Chemical
2 Thermodynamics 2016; 97: 83–87.
- 3 [81]Bi Y, Chen J, Miao Z. Thermodynamic optimization for dissociation process of gas
4 hydrates. Energy 2016; 106: 270-276.
- 5 [82]ZareNezhad B, Mottahedin M, Varaminian F. A new approach for determination of
6 single component gas hydrate formation kinetics in the absence or presence of
7 kinetic promoters. Chemical Engineering Science 2015; 137: 447-457.
- 8 [83]Paricaud P. Modeling the dissociation conditions of salt hydrates and gas
9 semiclathrate hydrates: application to lithium bromide, hydrogen iodide, and tetra-
10 n-butylammonium bromide+ carbon dioxide systems. The Journal of Physical
11 Chemistry B 2010; 115(2): 288-299.

Table 1 The operating experimental conditions of present study in comparison with those in literatures

Study	Feed gas CH ₄ /N ₂ , mol ratio	Temperature (constant, K)	Pressure (MPa)	Promoter	Reactor
Cai et al. [9]	50.0/50.0	277.15	Constant at 1.5	1 mol% THF	Bubble column (Semi-batch)
Zhong et al. [11]	30.0/70.0	276.15, 277.15 280.15	Constant at 4.2, 3.9 and 3.8	0.17 mol%, 0.29 mol% and 0.62 mol% TBAB	Semi-batch
		277.15	Initial (maximum) 3.9	0.29 mol% TBAB	Batch (fixed volume)
Zhong et al. [12]	30.0/70.0	273.65 276.05	Initial (maximum) 9, 10, 3.4	1 mol% THF	Batch (fixed volume)
		276.05	Initial (maximum) 3.4	1 mol% THF + Silica sand particles	
Wang et al. [13]	34.6/65.4	280.15 281.15 282.15 283.15 284.15	Constant at 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5 and 4	0.617 mol%, 0.756 mol% and 0.901 mol% TBAB	Continuous stirred-tank reactor
This study	34.6/65.4	280.15 281.15 282.15 283.15	Constant at 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3 and 3.5	0.617 mol%, 0.756 mol%, 0.901 mol% and 1.052 mol% TBAB	Batch (variable volume)

1

Table 2 Antoine parameters used for the calculation of Langmuir constant C

Gas	X/Pa ⁻¹	Y/K	Z/K
N ₂	4.2725×10 ¹⁵	4972.37	0.64
CH ₄	2.8754×10 ¹²	2452.29	29.01

2

3

Table 3 Antoine parameters for the calculation of $f_i^0(T)$ [47, 48]

Structure of TBAB semi-clathrate hydrate	A/10 ²³ (bar)	B(K)	C(K)
A	6.3491	-26596	-111
B	3.2498	-18620	5.43

4

5

Table 4 Values of parameters used for the calculation of O_i [47, 48]

s1/10 ⁻⁸	s2/10 ⁻⁶	s3	g1/10 ⁻⁶	g2/10 ⁻⁶	g3/10 ⁻⁸	q1/10 ⁻⁴	q2/10 ⁻⁴	q3/10 ⁻⁴
-1.707	4.570	0	5.693	-3.099	4.088	4.549	5.304	-7.091

6

Table 5 The effect of $k \cdot \Delta t$ on the calculation results

$k \cdot \Delta t$ (mol·mol water ⁻¹)	x _{CH4} (mol%)	y _{CH4} (mol%)	GSCHS (NL/L)	teq/ Δt	x _{CH4,j} - x _{CH4,j-1} _{max} (mol%)	y _{CH4,j} - y _{CH4,j-1} _{max} (mol%)	GSCHS _j -GSCHS _{j-1} _{max} (NL/L)
0.10000	51.32	23.73	11.84	31	1.686	3.799	4.715
0.01000	50.22	24.50	11.80	168	0.158	0.325	0.471
0.00100	50.14	24.57	11.79	1622	0.016	0.032	0.047
0.00010	50.13	24.57	11.79	14747	0.002	0.003	0.005
0.00008	50.13	24.57	11.79	18248	0.001	0.003	0.004
0.00004	50.13	24.57	11.79	35336	0.001	0.001	0.002

7

1

2

Table 6 The viscosity (ν , mm^2s^{-1}) of the TBAB solution under atmosphere pressure

T (K)	1.052 mol% TBAB		0.901 mol% TBAB		0.617 mol% TBAB		0.232 mol% TBAB		Pure water		
	ν	Uncertainty	ν	Uncertainty	ν	Uncertainty	ν	Uncertainty	ν	Uncertainty	Literature ^[78]
280.15	3.069	0.006	2.759	0.003	2.335	0.003	1.694	0.003	1.428	0.005	1.428
283.15	2.718	0.002	2.418	0.006	1.998	0.003	1.507	0.004	1.307	0.003	1.308
286.15	2.437	0.007	2.213	0.008	1.810	0.004	1.418	0.005	1.202	0.004	1.203
289.15	2.176	0.002	2.013	0.006	1.684	0.006	1.305	0.006	1.107	0.004	1.111

Table 7 The interfacial tension (σ , $\text{mN}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}$) between the TBAB solution and CSG under 283.15K

P (MPa)	1.052 mol% TBAB		0.617 mol% TBAB		0.232 mol% TBAB		Pure water	
	σ	Uncertainty	σ	Uncertainty	σ	Uncertainty	σ	Uncertainty
0.1	51.36	0.11	52.14	0.34	59.38	0.32	74.89	0.20
0.6	49.84	0.67	51.68	0.43	58.16	0.49	73.16	0.31
1.1	48.61	0.56	50.73	0.54	57.12	0.37	71.05	0.32

1

2

Table 8 The separation with different TBAB content

Number	CSG (CH ₄ mol%)	P (Mpa)	The CH ₄ content (mol%)						GSCHS (NL/L)			SF		RF (%)	
			The dissociated gas			The residual gas			Exp.	Uncertainty	Cal.	Exp.	Uncertainty	Exp.	Uncertainty
			Exp.	Uncertainty	Cal.	Exp.	Uncertainty	Cal.							
E1	34.6	2.5	50.9	0.2	50.1	23.7	0.2	24.6	12.1	0.3	11.8	3.3	0.02	59.1	1.1
E2	50.9	2.5	65.8	0.4	65.1	39.3	0.2	40.0	13.1	0.3	13.1	3.0	0.03	56.6	1.2
E3	65.9	2.5	78.3	0.2	76.6	55.5	0.2	56.5	13.7	0.3	14.1	2.9	0.01	54.3	1.3
E4	65.9	2.0	79.4	0.3	77.5	56.8	0.3	58.1	12.0	0.3	12.1	2.9	0.07	48.4	1.0
E5	65.9	1.5	80.1	0.1	78.4	59.8	0.2	60.2	9.0	0.3	9.5	2.7	0.03	36.4	1.0
E6	65.9	1.0	81.3	0.1	79.6	62.4	0.1	62.8	5.6	0.1	5.6	2.6	0.01	23.0	0.5
E7	23.7	3.5	35.7	0.2	36.8	13.3	0.1	12.7	13.9	0.2	13.7	3.6	0.02	70.0	0.5
E8	13.3	3.5	23.2	0.1	22.9	7.2	0.1	6.4	11.4	0.1	12.5	3.9	0.04	66.6	0.7

1

Table 9 The multistage separation under different operating pressures

S1 (MPa)	S22 (MPa)	S32 (MPa)	S21 (MPa)	S31 (MPa)	The high CH ₄ content gas		The low CH ₄ content gas		Rec	SF	RF (%)
					Volume (NL)	CH ₄ content (mol%)	Volume (NL)	CH ₄ content (mol%)			
3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	71.1	5.5	4.5	2.5	52.4	92.8
3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.8	76.3	6.2	8.8	2.5	33.3	84.2
2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.9	81.0	7.1	15.7	2.4	22.9	67.8
3.5	2.0	2.0	3.5	3.5	3.6	82.0	6.4	7.8	3.4	53.7	85.5
3.5	2.0	2.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	82.0	6.5	8.9	3.3	46.4	83.2
3.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	82.4	6.5	9.4	3.2	44.9	82.1
3.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.3	82.3	6.6	10.6	3.1	39.3	79.6
<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>84.1</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>7.6</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>64.5</u>	<u>85.7</u>
3.5	3.0	1.0	3.5	3.5	3.4	85.3	6.6	8.6	3.6	61.7	83.4
3.5	2.0	1.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	88.2	7.0	12.1	4.3	54.1	75.2
3.5	1.0	1.0	3.5	3.5	1.9	91.9	8.1	21.5	6.0	41.5	49.5
3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.4	72.3	5.6	4.6	2.5	54.5	92.6
3.5	3.5	2.0	3.5	3.5	4.2	76.0	5.8	5.0	2.7	60.2	91.5
3.5	3.5	1.5	3.5	3.5	3.9	79.1	6.1	5.6	2.9	63.5	90.1
2.5	3.5	1.0	3.5	3.5	3.1	86.3	6.9	11.6	3.4	48.2	76.8
2.0	3.5	1.0	3.5	3.5	2.7	87.6	7.3	14.6	3.4	41.2	69.2

2

3

1

Table 10 The multistage separation under different operating temperatures

S1 (K)	S22 (K)	S32 (K)	S21 (K)	S31 (K)	The high CH ₄ content gas		The low CH ₄ content gas		Rec	SF	RF (%)
					Volume (NL)	CH ₄ content (mol%)	Volume (NL)	CH ₄ content (mol%)			
281.15	281.15	281.15	281.15	281.15	3.5	84.1	6.5	7.6	3.4	64.5	85.7
<u>280.15</u>	<u>280.15</u>	<u>280.15</u>	<u>280.15</u>	<u>280.15</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>81.0</u>	<u>6.1</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>73.0</u>	<u>90.1</u>
280.15	280.15	281.15	280.15	280.15	3.8	82.3	6.2	5.9	3.5	74.2	89.3
280.15	280.15	282.15	280.15	280.15	3.5	85.5	6.5	7.6	3.9	71.1	85.5
281.15	280.15	280.15	280.15	280.15	3.8	81.2	6.2	5.7	3.3	71.3	89.7
280.15	281.15	280.15	280.15	280.15	3.8	81.1	6.2	5.5	3.4	74.3	90.2
280.15	280.15	280.15	281.15	280.15	3.8	80.7	6.2	5.7	3.2	69.0	89.7
280.15	280.15	280.15	280.15	281.15	3.9	80.5	6.1	5.6	3.2	69.1	90.0

2

3

1

2

Table 12 The major operating conditions of the multistage separation system with temperature fixed at 280.15 K

Stage	Pressure (MPa)	SF	Ref (%)	TBAB solution (L)	From	Inlet gas Volume (NL)	CH ₄ content (mol%)	To	Outlet gas Volume (NL)	CH ₄ content (mol%)
S 1	3.5	3.5	-	1.1	Mixer 1	33.6	38.6	Mixer 2_1	16.0	23.9
S 2_1	3.5	4.0	47.5%	0.7	Mixer 2_1	20.8	23.1	Mixer 2_2	17.5	52.1
S 2_2	3.5	2.8	43.4%	1.1	Mixer 2_2	31.5	58.0	S 3_1	10.9	12.0
S 3_1	3.5	4.4	43.6%	0.4	S 3_1	10.9	12.0	Mix 1	9.9	35.4
S 3_2	1.0	2.3	78.4%	0.6	S 3_2	17.9	68.7	Mix 1	13.7	43.9
Mixer 1	-	-	-	-	CSG	10.0	34.6	S 3_2	17.9	68.7
Mixer 2_1	-	-	-	-	S 2_1	9.9	35.4	Outlet	6.1	5.5
Mixer 2_2	-	-	-	-	S 2_2	13.7	43.9	Mix 2_1	4.8	20.4
					S 1	16.0	23.9	Mix 2_2	14.0	65.4
					S 3_1	4.8	20.4	Outlet	3.9	81.0
					S 1	17.5	52.1			
					S 3_2	14.0	65.4			

3

1

2

3 Fig. 1. Schematic of experimental apparatus for the hydrate based CH₄ separation.

4

5

6 Fig. 2. Schematic of experimental procedure.

7

8

Fig. 3. Operating conditions and the equilibrium hydrate formation conditions for the CSG obtained in pure water and in TBAB solutions [13]

Fig. 4. The conceptual model of the hydrate-based gas separation.

1

2

3

Fig. 5. The procedure of single stage separation calculation.

1

2

3

Fig. 6. Schematic diagram of the multistage separation system

4

Fig. 7. The flow chart of the simulation calculation of multistage separation.

1

Fig. 8. Effect of CL on the performance of hydrate based CSG separation. (a) SF and RF; (b) gas compositions and GSCHS.

Fig. 9. Effect of TBAB concentration on the performance of hydrate based CSG separation. (a) SF and RF; (b) gas compositions and GSCHS.

1

3

(a)

(b)

4

Fig. 10. Effect of operating temperature on the performance of hydrate based CSG separation. (a) SF and RF; (b) Gas compositions and GSCHS.

5

6

8

(a)

(b)

9

Fig. 11 Effect of operating pressure on the performance of hydrate based CSG separation. (a) SF and RF; (b) Gas compositions and the GSCHS.

10

11