Investigation of Chemical Looping Combustion of Coal with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ Oxygen Carrier
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ABSTRACT: Chemical looping combustion (CLC) has great advantages to obtain pure CO$_2$ from coal combustion flue gas at a manageable cost. CuFe$_2$O$_4$ was put forward as a novel oxygen carrier, which integrated Cu and Fe metals into one oxide matrix with superior characteristics over single metal oxide of either CuO or Fe$_2$O$_3$ and had a high potential to be used in CLC. In this study, the reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with two Chinese coals of different ranks [Liu Pan Shui (LPS) sub-bituminous coal and Yang Quang (YQ) anthracite] was performed in a thermogravimetric analyzer (TGA). Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy was used to detect in situ the emitted gases from the TGA. Field scanning electron microscopy/energy-dispersive X-ray spectrometry (FSEM/EDX) was used to study the morphology and elemental compositions present in the solid residues, and the related phases were further identified by X-ray diffraction (XRD). Meanwhile, to explore the reaction mechanisms involved for the reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with coal, a more realistic simulation system with 376 species was designed for thermodynamic analysis. Through all of these measures, it was found that the reaction of LPS lean coal with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ underwent two distinct reaction stages at 300–600 and 600–850 °C, respectively. At these two reaction stages, CuFe$_2$O$_4$ was dominantly reduced into Cu and Fe$_3$O$_4$ by transfer of the lattice oxygen [O] in CuFe$_2$O$_4$, and then the formed Fe$_3$O$_4$ was further reduced into Fe$_{2.956}$O$_4$. However, above 800 °C, CuFeO$_2$ and Cu$_2$O were produced through direct decomposition of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ into CuFeO$_2$ and then further partial decomposition of CuFeO$_2$ into Cu$_2$O. Especially, O$_2$ generated was greatly beneficial to the full conversion of the remaining coal. Different from LPS, the reaction of YQ with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ presented only one discernible reaction stage above 600 °C. Besides Cu and CuFeO$_2$, Fe$_{2.956}$O$_4$ was also generated. Furthermore, four cycles of reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with H$_2$ and then oxidation with air displayed a good reaction stability of synthesized CuFe$_2$O$_4$. However, if coal was used, iron silicates were formed from the interaction of the reduced CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with ash and resulted in the insufficient reoxidation of reduced CuFe$_2$O$_4$. As such, effective separation of coal ash should be included in the CLC process to ensure the full regeneration of reduced CuFe$_2$O$_4$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Anthropogenic CO$_2$ emission from fossil fuel combustion, especially coal, has been considered as one of the main contributors to the rapid increase of the atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration. Effective measures to capture CO$_2$ from fossil fuel combustion should thus be immediately taken in response to the ever-increasing detrimental consequences of the greenhouse effect and global warming. In comparison to all of the other existing techniques, chemical looping combustion (CLC) has instigated great interest for its potential advantages, such as the inherent separation of CO$_2$ without any extra energy consumption and thorough eradication of the formation of thermal NO$_x$. In CLC, coal is first introduced into a fuel reactor (FR) and fully oxidized with an oxygen carrier (OC) instead of air, and then at its full conversion, pure CO$_2$ will be available for sequestration after condensation of the exit gas from the FR; thus, any extra gas separation process is avoided. Finally, the reduced OC is transported back to an air reactor (AR) and oxidized by air for the following cycle of reaction with coal in the FR.

Currently, several investigations on the lab-scaled fluidized facility from different institutions have demonstrated the feasibility of direct use of coal as fuel for CLC application. It was found that the main rate-limiting step involved was actually the gasification of coal, especially the coal residue left after gasification, instead of the reduction of OC with the coal gasification products generated in situ. Meanwhile, Fe$_2$O$_3$ as an OC was also found active enough to react with coal in the real coal-based CLC system. In view of maintaining a sufficient FR temperature for a high gasification rate, CuO as an OC has been valued for its exothermic characteristics in the reduction reaction with coal and extensively studied. Nevertheless, various limitations of CuO discouraged its application as an OC in CLC, such as the low melting point of the reduced counterpart Cu, its high cost, and its harmful impact to both health and the environment. Therefore, a new oxygen carrier, CuFe$_2$O$_4$, was first proposed, which has the exothermic characteristics of CuO as well as the lower cost and lower toxicity of Fe$_2$O$_3$, and thus, it would be of great significance to CLC of coal.
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Table 1. Proximate and Ultimate Analyses of Coal Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>samples</th>
<th>proximate analysis&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (wt %)</th>
<th>ultimate analysis (wt %, db)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>LHV&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (MJ/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&lt;sub&gt;d&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>V&lt;sub&gt;d&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>A&lt;sub&gt;db&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>25.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YQ</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>29.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>M, moisture content; V, volatile matter; A, ash content; FC, fixed carbon; ad, air-dried basis. <sup>b</sup>Dry basis. <sup>c</sup>The O content was determined by difference. <sup>d</sup>Lower heating value.

Table 2. Ash Analysis of Coal Samples (wt %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>samples</th>
<th>SiO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Al&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Fe&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>SO&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>CaO</th>
<th>TiO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>CuO</th>
<th>MgO</th>
<th>Na&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>41.31</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YQ</td>
<td>68.49</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the CLC of coal, it is critical to improve the gasification of coal and ensure its full conversion. Previous studies have addressed this issue at different levels. Using a thermogravimetric analyzer (TGA), Siriwardane et al.,<sup>8</sup> Cao et al.,<sup>10</sup> and Zhao et al.<sup>11</sup> studied the reaction of different coals or chars with various metal oxides. However, because of the complexity of the reaction involved, the reduction mechanisms of the OC with coal are still not completely understood and it is worthwhile to further explore them to maximize the use of coal in the realistic CLC system.

In addition, after the full reaction of coal with metal OC, the effective separation of the reduced OC from coal ash should be addressed. The interaction between the reduced OC and ash components has been shown to form some inorganic compounds and, thus, deteriorated its reactivity. The melting point of the resulting ash was lowered, and agglomeration of the reduced OC with ash possibly arose, which made it difficult to separate the reduced OC from the resulting coal ash.

Therefore, it is also important to understand the ash effect on the reactivity of OC and the possible interactions involved.

In this study, the reduction of CuFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> OC with two Chinese coals of different ranks was investigated using TGA. The emitted gases were evaluated using Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy coupled with TGA. Thermodynamic simulation of the reduction of CuFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> with coal was further conducted to explore the reaction mechanism involved. Finally, the morphology and chemical properties of the reduced OC products were characterized using Field scanning electron microscopy/energy-dispersive X-ray spectrometry (FSEM/EDX), and their phases were further identified by X-ray diffraction (XRD). Overall, this study could provide useful information for establishing a practical coal-based CLC system through a better understanding of the mechanisms involved.

2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

2.1. Materials and Characterization. Two Chinese coals of different ranks were selected, including Liu Pan Shui sub-bituminous coal and Yang Quang anthracite, hereafter abbreviated as LPS and YQ, respectively. The original samples were first dried at 105 °C overnight, then ground, and sieved to collect the samples in 63–106 μm size range for the ensuing use. The proximate and ultimate analyses of the two prepared coal samples are presented in Table 1. It was found that, with the enhanced rank of LPS coal as compared to YQ coal, the content of volatile matter and the ratio of H/C decreased, while the content of fixed carbon increased. The ash contents of the two coals increased from 25.38% in LPS to 29.24% in YQ, but conversely, the lower heating value (LHV) decreased from 23.49 to 22.7 MJ/kg. Furthermore, the ash components of the two coal samples used were tested using X-ray fluorescence (XRF, Philips, PW 2400, Almelo, The Netherlands), and the results are provided in Table 2. Minerals containing Si, Al, and Fe elements were found to be the three major components, and their total content was more than 80 wt % for both coal ashes.

Besides coal samples, three pure oxides, including CuFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>, CuO, and Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> used in this research, were synthesized by the novel sol–gel combustion synthesis (SGCS) method. The hydrated metal nitrates and urea were used as the precursors. The procedure of SGCS was briefly described below. First, the stoichiometric compositions of metal nitrates (including nitrates of iron and copper) and urea were calculated, and then the accurately weighted nitrates and urea were dissolved in deionized (DI) water sequentially. The mixture was then stirred on a hot plate in air and aged at 75 °C until a viscous colloid was formed. After that, the wet sol was dried at ~135 °C in a desiccator overnight, then transferred to a ceramic dish, and ignited in a preheated muffle furnace at 600 °C for 15 min. Finally, the as-ignited product proceeded to be sintered in the same furnace at 950 °C for 2 h. The detailed procedure of SGCS and the characterization of the formed oxides were elaborated elsewhere.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, after grinding and sieving, the oxides in the range of 63–106 μm were used. Finally, the as-prepared oxides were evenly mixed with coal at the designed mass ratio (as seen below in section 2.2) in a laboratory mortar.

2.2. Determination of the Oxygen Excess Number Φ for Different Coal Samples. The full conversion of coal is dependent upon the availability of oxygen present in the OC. A sufficient supply of the OC is very important to operate the CLC system. The method of coal mass balance<sup>15</sup> was adopted to determine the amount of CuFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> OC to be introduced into the CLC system. According to the results of proximate and ultimate analyses of coal, the weight fractions of hydrogen and oxygen in the moisture were deducted. If 1 kg of coal sample was used, the content of different atoms (including C, H, O, N, and S) contained in the coal samples could be determined and the relative chemical formula was represented as C<sub>r</sub>H<sub>s</sub>S<sub>t</sub>O<sub>u</sub>(N<sub>v</sub>)<sub>w</sub>. For CuFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> supposing the reduced counterpart was Cu and Fe<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub> when the coal was fully converted, the reduced reaction of CuFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> with different coal samples could be depicted as in eq 1.

\[
\text{CuFe}_2\text{O}_4 + 3(\alpha + \beta/4 + \gamma - \delta/2)/2\text{CuFe}_2\text{O}_4 \\
- 3(\alpha + \beta/4 + \gamma - \delta/2)/2\text{Cu} + (\alpha + \beta/4 + \gamma - \delta/2)\text{Fe}_3\text{O}_4 \\
+ \alpha\text{CO}_2(g) + \beta/2\text{H}_2\text{O}(g) + \gamma\text{SO}_2(g) + \nu\text{N}_2(g)
\]

From eq 1, the theoretical stoichiometric oxygen needed for the full conversion of coal is determined as \(3(\alpha + \beta/4 + \gamma - \delta/2)/2\). Supposing the realistic oxygen contained in the OC was \(Y(O)\), then the oxygen excess number \(\Phi\) was defined as follows:

\[
\Phi = Y(O)/[3(\alpha + \beta/4 + \gamma - \delta/2)/2]
\]

In eq 2, a value of \(\Phi = 1\) meant that the CuFe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> OC supplied just met the requirement of the full conversion of coal. According to the aforementioned method, the relative chemical formulas of LPS and YQ
of 1 kg could be depicted as $C_{37.9}H_{14.1}N_{0.66}S_{0.2}O_{13.5}$ and $C_{36.8}H_{10.2}$ $N_{0.6}S_{0.14}O_{13.1}$, respectively. Then, on the basis of eq 2, if $\Phi = 1$, the mass ratios of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ to LPS and YQ were corresponding to 24.1 and 22.8, respectively.

2.3. Experimental Methods. The reaction characteristics of the synthesized CuFe$_2$O$_4$ OC with two different coals at the oxygen excess number $\Phi = 1$ were investigated using TGA (TA 2050, TA Instruments, New Castle, DE). The mixture of coal and CuFe$_2$O$_4$ OC was heated from ambient at 150 °C at 10 °C/min and held at this temperature for up to 10 min to fully remove the moisture. Then, it was further heated to 850 °C at 35 °C/min with holding at this temperature for 10 min to ensure the sufficient conversion of coal. A N$_2$ atmosphere was provided, and the flow rate of N$_2$ and the total mass for the mixture of coal and OC were determined at 50 mL/min and ~15 mg after several pre-screening experiments to eliminate the potential impact of mass transfer between gas and solid phases.

The evolved gases from the reaction of coal with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ OC in the TGA were first dried through a portable tubular gas desiccator full of Ca(SO$_4$)$_2$·2H$_2$O, and then detected in situ by a FTIR spectrometer equipped with a deuterated triglycine sulfate (DTGS) detector (BioRad Excalibur Series, model FTS 3000). The scanning range of IR was 4000−500 cm$^{-1}$, and the resolution and sensitivity were preset at 4 cm$^{-1}$ and 1, respectively.

Furthermore, to examine the reaction stability of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ over multicycles of reduction and oxidation, H$_2$ was selected as fuel first, and four cycles of the reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with 50 vol % H$_2$ and then oxidation with air were conducted in the TGA (TA 2050, TA Instruments, New Castle, DE). The total gas flow rate was fixed at 50 mL/min. The detailed experimental procedures were described below. First, 15 mg of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ was heated in N$_2$ at 35 °C/min until the final temperature of 850 °C was reached. Then, the N$_2$ flow was switched to H$_2$ flow, and the reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with H$_2$ was initiated and sustained for 8 min. Hereafter, N$_2$ flow was introduced back again to sweep the remaining H$_2$ away for 2 min to avoid the potential explosion of H$_2$ mixed with air to be used later. Finally, air was introduced to start the oxidation of the reduced CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with air for 3 min. The same processes were repeated 4 times.

Meanwhile, to further investigate the reaction performance of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with coal over many cycles of the redox process, LPS coal was selected as the model fuel and reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with LPS for an extended duration of 30 min and then oxidation with air for 10 min were conducted in the same TGA setup at the heating rate of 35 °C/min. N$_2$ was used as the carrier gas throughout the whole reduction stage of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with LPS, and the final temperature was elevated to 900 °C other than 850 °C to ensure the full conversion of coal. However, it was different from the reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with H$_2$. Redox experiments of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with LPS and then with air were quite difficult, because after each redox reaction, the same amount of coal consumed in the previous redox experiment should be accurately weighed and evenly mixed with the reduced counterpart of CuFe$_2$O$_4$. Therefore, only two cycles of the redox reaction for the reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with LPS and then oxidation with air were conducted, which is similar to the methodology adopted above for the redox reactions of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with H$_2$ and air.

Finally, the morphology and elemental composition of the solid products from the reaction of coal with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ were studied using FSEM (Siron 200, Roosendaal, The Netherlands) coupled with an EDX (Genesis, EDAX, Inc., Mahwah, NJ) at a magnification of 800× and an accumulated voltage of 30 kV. The formed phases were further identified by XRD (X’Pert PRO, Almelo, The Netherlands) with 40 kV and 40 mA Cu Kα ($\lambda = 0.154$ Å) radiation and at the step-scanned range of 10−80°.

2.4. Conversion of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ OC with Coal. The reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ OC with coal was very complicated and consisted of coal pyrolysis and gasification as well as the reactions of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with gaseous products from coal and the remaining char. To illuminate the role of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ in its reaction with coal, several conversion indexes were defined below.

First, CuFe$_2$O$_4$ was reacted with gasification products of coal into CO$_2$ and H$_2$O, and the produced CO and H$_2$ in turn acted as good gasifying agents and promoted the gasification of coal as well as more gasification products of coal to react with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ OC. Thus, to reflect the interaction of coal with the OC, the mixture conversion index of coal with OC, $X_{\text{coal–OC}}$, was defined in eq 3.15,16

$$X_{\text{coal–OC}}(t) = \frac{W_{\text{coal–OC}}(t = 0) - W_{\text{coal–OC}}(t)}{W_{\text{coal}} + x_1AW_{\text{coal}}}$$

$$f = \frac{x_1}{x_2}$$

where $X_{\text{coal–OC}}$ is the mixture conversion index for coal with OC (%), in which LPS and YQ are involved for coal, while three oxides, such as CuFe$_2$O$_4$, CuO, and Fe$_2$O$_3$, are included for OC, $W_{\text{coal–OC}}(t = 0)$ and $W_{\text{coal–OC}}(t)$ are the initial and instantaneous weight losses for the mixture of coal with the OC used (wt %), $x_1$ and $x_2$ are the mass fractions of OC and coal in their mixture (wt %), $f$ is the mass ratio of the OC/c 0al, and $AW_{\text{coal}}$ and $AW_{\text{coal}}$ denote the maximal weight losses of the OC and coal, respectively.

Furthermore, to reveal the real limiting step for the reaction of coal with the OC based on the reference cases of coal pyrolysis under N$_2$ and coal combustion under air, the conversion index of the OC alone present in its mixture with coal, $X_{\text{OC}}$, is defined. According to the conservation of the total weight throughout the whole reaction process for the OC with coal, the OC conversion index $X_{\text{OC}}$ could be expressed in eqs 5 and 6 as follows:

$$W_{\text{coal–OC}}(t) = x_1W_{\text{OC}}(t) + x_2W_{\text{coal}}(t)$$

$$X_{\text{OC}} = \frac{W_{\text{coal–OC}}(t) - x_2W_{\text{coal}}(t)}{x_1AW_{\text{OC}}}$$

where $W_{\text{OC}}(t)$, $W_{\text{coal}}(t)$, and $W_{\text{coal–OC}}(t)$ are the instantaneous weight losses for the coal, OC, and their mixture at the time $t$. The meanings of the other characters in eqs 5 and 6 are the same as those in eqs 3 and 4.

2.5. Thermodynamic Simulation of the Reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with Coal. Although thermodynamic equilibrium analysis has great limitations and does not consider kinetic constraints in the real process, such as turbulent mixing and temperature gradients,17 the equilibrium calculation would be a great help to better understand the lattice oxygen transfer and coal evolution. Thus, on the basis of the minimization of the total Gibbs free energy, the reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with coal was further simulated using the HSC Chemistry software, version 4.1. According to the characteristics for two Chinese coals LPS and YQ, including their proximate and ultimate analyses in Table 1 as well as ash analysis in Table 2, a complex reaction system with 376 species in total was established, as shown in Table 3. Noteworthy is that, in this equilibrium simulation, the coal was considered to consist of the main matrix elements (such as C, H, N, S, and O) as well as various minerals. Seven categories of compounds involved for the minerals present in coal were subdivided, such as oxides and various species of hydroxyl-, carbon-, sulfur-, silicon-, aluminum-, and titanium-based compounds. This simulation with seven categories of mineral compounds included was more realistic than other equilibrium simulations, where Siriwardane et al.8 simulated the interaction between the model fly ash (only SiO$_2$ and Al$_2$O$_3$ considered) with different OCs, while Saha and Bhattacharyya18 simulated the reaction of a Victorian brown coal with NiO without considering the effect from the minerals present in that coal.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Baseline Experiment by Coal without OC. To better understand the reaction of coal with CuFe$_2$O$_4$, the baseline tests
of two Chinese coals of different ranks (LPS and YQ) under N2 or air atmosphere were first performed in the TGA at the heating rate of 35 °C/min for reference, with focus on the effect of the coal rank. The results of mass loss [i.e., thermogravimetry (TG) curve] and the corresponding differential mass loss rate [i.e., differential thermogravimetry (DTG) curve] are plotted in panels a and b of Figure 1, respectively.

From Figure 1a, the pyrolysis of LPS was observed to occur around 200–800 °C. After the dehydration below 200 °C, LPS mainly underwent two different pyrolysis stages. The primary pyrolysis fell into 200–630 °C, with the characteristic temperature $T_m$ (i.e., the peak temperature relative to the DTG maximum) residing at 488 °C. Approximately 20% volatile matter was emitted, which was possibly related to the breakage and reuniting of the organic functional groups. The emitted gaseous species were identified as CH4, C2H4, CO2, H2O, etc. by FTIR analysis in Figure 3a. After that, with the temperature elevated further from 630 to 850 °C, another small weight loss occurred at ~686 °C with less than 5 wt % volatile matter emitted, because of the cleavage of the main carbon matrix.

Different from LPS, the pyrolysis of YQ underwent two distinct stages, and the corresponding two characteristic temperatures $T_m$ were increased to 531.5 and 695.9 °C. YQ pyrolysis at the latter stage was responsible for more weight loss than the former stage, which was due to the enhanced coal rank from LPS to YQ and the great decrease of the volatile content from 22.84 to 8.05 wt % (as shown in Table 1). Furthermore, from Figure 1b, for the combustion of LPS and YQ under air at 35 °C/min, either LPS or YQ burned quickly and emitted a large amount of CO2, as evidenced in Figure 3b. The final residual weights left were 33.03 and 32.62 wt %. Both coals presented two-staged combustion, with the first distinct DTG peak approaching 140 wt %/min; however, the second stage was nearly indiscernible, and its DTG peak was as low as 2.8 wt %/min. In addition, the two characteristic temperatures of YQ combustion were 508.3 and 871.1 °C, far bigger than those of LPS, further indicating that the reactivity of YQ was lower than that of LPS.

### Table 3. Species Considered in the HSC Calculation for the Reaction of CuFe2O4 with Coal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coal</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oxides</td>
<td>Fe2O3, Fe3O4, FeO, CuO, Cu2O, CuFe2O4, SiO2, Al2O3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CaO, CaO2, MgO, MgO2, K2O, CaO3, CaO4, CoO, NaO, Na2O2, TiO2, Ti2O3, TiO3, TiO5, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydroxy-based species</td>
<td>Fe(OH)2, Fe(OH)3, Ca(OH)2, Al(OH)3, Ca(OH)2, CO(OH)2, KOH, Mg(OH)2, NaOH, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carbon species</td>
<td>FeC, FeC(A), FeCO3, CuO3, CaC, CaO3, CaC2O4, K2CO3, MgCO3, MgCO3•H2O, Na2CO3, NaHCO3, Na2C2O4, Na2CO3•NaHCO3, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minerals</td>
<td>CuS, CuS2, CuSO3, CuSO4, Fe(SO4)2, FeS2O4, FeS, FeS2, FeS2P, CaS, CaSO3, CaS2O3, CaSO4•K2SO4, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulfur species</td>
<td>FeS, FeS2, FeS3, FeS4, FeS5, FeS6, FeS7, FeS8, FeS9, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silicon species</td>
<td>FeSi, FeSi2, FeSi3, FeSi4, FeSi5, FeSi6, FeSi7, FeSi8, FeSi9, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aluminum species</td>
<td>CuAl2O4, CuAl2O3, CuAl2O5, CuAl2O7, CuAl2O9, CuAl2O11, CuAl2O13, CuAl2O15, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titanium species</td>
<td>FeTi, FeTi2, FeTi3, FeTi4, FeTi5, FeTi6, FeTi7, FeTi8, FeTi9, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxygen carrier</td>
<td>CuFe2O4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaseous species</td>
<td>CH4, C2H4, C2H6, CO, CO2, COS, CN, CN2, CS2, H2, H2O, HCN, H2S, O, O2, NO, NO2, N2O, N2O3, S1–S8, SO, SO2, SO3, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Reaction of two Chinese coals (LPS and YQ) under different atmospheres: (a) N2 and (b) air.

3.2. Investigation of the Reaction of CuFe2O4 OC with Two Chinese Coals. 3.2.1. TGA—FTIR Analysis of the Reduction Reaction of CuFe2O4 with Coal. The reactions of two coals with CuFe2O4 at the oxygen excess number $\Phi = 1$ under N2 atmosphere were performed in the TGA at the same heating rate of 35 °C/min. The results of TG and DTG analyses are shown in Figure 2a, respectively. Meanwhile, for comparison, results for the reactions of these two Chinese coals with Fe3O4 and CuO are also provided in panels c and d of Figure 2, respectively.

From Figure 2a, at 280–850 °C, LPS reacted with CuFe2O4 earlier and achieved a higher weight loss (up to 5 wt %) than YQ. In Figure 2b, two reaction stages at the peak temperatures of 471 and 825 °C were observed for the reaction of LPS with CuFe2O4. Especially, the mass loss rate at the latter stage was 0.5327 wt %/min, much higher than that of the former. Furthermore, judging from
The FTIR analysis shown in Figure 3c, the first stage at 471 °C was attributed to the reaction of CuFe2O4 with LPS by emitting mainly CO2 and water. Meanwhile, a two-dimensional (2D) IR plot of the gaseous products with CO2 for the reaction of LPS with CuFe2O4 in Figure 4c further confirmed this observation, where CO2 resided at the wavenumber around 2380 cm⁻¹ and steam resided at the wavenumbers around both 1600 and 3600 cm⁻¹.

However, different from LPS, the reaction of YQ with CuFe2O4 displayed a single identifiable reaction stage, and the maximum mass loss rate was 0.6950 wt%/min at the peak temperature of 830 °C. Relative to Fe2O3 OC, the reactivity of LPS or YQ with CuFe2O4 OC was improved, and more CO2 would thus be spontaneously generated, which was beneficial to the coal gasification and its further reaction with the CuFe2O4 OC. Furthermore, the increased reactivity would mean a shorter residence time of coal in the FR and, thus, a decrease of the required height of the FR in the CLC system.

3.2.2. Conversions of CuFe2O4 OC. To reveal the interaction between coal and OC based on the TG experimental results for coal pyrolysis and combustion without OC in Figure 1 and for the reaction of coal with different OCs (including CuO, Fe2O3, and CuFe2O4) in Figure 2, two conversion indexes, such as OC conversion alone in its mixture with coal as Xb, and the mixture conversion for the total mixture of coal with OC Xbcoal−OC were calculated using eqs 3 and 6, respectively. The calculated results are presented in Figure 5.

First, from Figure 5a, the initiation reaction time of LPS with CuFe2O4 was around 30 min, far earlier than that of YQ with CuFe2O4 at ~40 min. Meanwhile, such a trend could also be observed for the reaction of LPS with either Fe2O3 in Figure 5b or CuO in Figure 5c, and their initiation reaction times also occurred around 30 min, 5 min earlier than that of YQ. This fact implied that the initiation of coal to react with different OCs was mainly determined by the reactivity of coal in the real CLC system.321−24 Thus, low-rank coal with good reactivity should be preferred.

Furthermore, among all of the mixture conversions Xbcoal+ OC for different OCs (including CuFe2O4, CuO, and Fe2O3) with two Chinese coals, LPS or YQ, CuFe2O4 OC displayed a single identifiable reaction stage, and the real limiting step for the reaction of coal with different OCs is the coal pyrolysis and gasification, instead of its reaction with the OCs. Such a conclusion was in accordance with other findings.2,4,8,10,11,15,23

3.2.3. Multicycle of the Reduction/Oxidation Reaction of CuFe2O4 OC. To examine the reaction stability of CuFe2O4 over multiple cycles of the redox reactions, using the synthesized CuFe2O4 with SGCS as OC, four cycles of TGA experiments on the reduction of CuFe2O4 with H2 and then oxidation with air at 850 °C were first conducted, as shown in Figure 6. Furthermore, because of the difficult TGA experiments for the redox reactions of CuFe2O4 with coal and air as mentioned above, only two cycles of redox reactions of CuFe2O4 with LPS or air in the same TGA setup were further carried out. The related experimental results are shown in Figure 7.

First, from Figure 6a, after each reduction of CuFe2O4 with 50 vol % H2 for 8 min, the residual weight could be stabilized as around 75%, and then after oxidation with air for 5 min, the reduced counterpart of CuFe2O4 would be oxidized and reverted to its original state. Obviously, different from CuO,728 CuFe2O4
synthesized with SGCS had enough reaction stability and good sintering resistance throughout the whole redox reactions because of great intensification of the sintering resistance of Cu by Fe present in the CuFe$_2$O$_4$ matrix. Meanwhile, from Figure 6b, the maximal weight loss rate for each reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with H$_2$ was stabilized as $\sim$26 wt %/min, less than half of the maximal oxidation weight loss rate around 67 wt %/min, which indicated that reduced CuFe$_2$O$_4$ could be easier to regenerate with air than its reduction with 50 vol % H$_2$. Thus, more attention should be paid to the reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$.

Furthermore, from Figure 7, for the two cycles of reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with LPS and then oxidation with air, the residual weight for the second reduction was a little increased to 90.76 wt % by 0.42 wt % relative to the final residual weights left after the first reduction, whereas the residual weight for the second oxidation was greatly decreased to 95.06 wt %, with the net decrease of 0.79 wt %. Accompanying the weight loss for the redox reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with LPS or air, from Figure 7b, the

Figure 4. Two-dimensional IR plots for the reactions of LPS with different OCs: (a) LPS + air, (b) LPS + CuO, and (c) LPS + CuFe$_2$O$_4$.

Figure 5. Conversions for the reactions of both coals (LPS and YQ) with different OCs: (a) coal + CuFe$_2$O$_4$, (b) coal + Fe$_2$O$_3$, and (c) coal + CuO.

Figure 6. Four cycles of reduction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with H$_2$ (50 vol %) and then oxidation with air: (a) weight loss (TG) and (b) weight loss rate (DTG).
weight loss rates (DTG) of the reduction of CuFe₂O₄ with LPS for the two cycles were found to present a two-staged reaction and the DTG peaks were stabilized as 0.30 and 0.44 wt %/min, respectively. However, the maximum weight loss rates by oxidation of reduced CuFe₂O₄ with air were changed from ∼0.80 wt %/min at the first oxidation to ∼0.67%/min at the second oxidation, mainly because of the adverse effect from the coal ash left after each redox reaction of CuFe₂O₄ with LPS and air, as discussed in the following section.

3.2.4. Thermodynamic Simulation of the Reduction of CuFe₂O₄ with LPS. To gain a better understanding of both oxygen transfer for CuFe₂O₄, coal conversion, and minerals evolution during the redox reaction of CuFe₂O₄ with coal, LPS was selected as a model fuel in this research and a complex equilibrium system consisting of 376 species was designed, as shown in Table 3. The reaction of CuFe₂O₄ with LPS was simulated using equilibrium software HSC Chemistry, version 4.1, and the simulation results are presented in Figure 8.

In terms of LPS conversion during its reaction with CuFe₂O₄ from Figure 8a, CO₂ was observed to be dominant throughout the whole reaction process of LPS with CuFe₂O₄ and its fraction increased from ∼87 to 93% at 400−800 °C; as followed, when the temperature was further increased to 1100 °C, there was a little drop of the CO₂ fraction from 93 to 92.2%. Meanwhile, the carbon matrix of LPS was quickly disintegrated with a sharp drop of the C content from 12.5% at 400 °C to nearly 0% at 800 °C, but the CO fraction was increased from 0% at 400 °C to 7.85% at 1100 °C, mainly because the lattice oxygen from CuFe₂O₄ transferable to LPS is not sufficient by the formation of inert compounds from the interaction of reduced CuFe₂O₄ with minerals in LPS. This fact will be discussed in more detail later. The predicted variations of CO₂ and CO concentrations with the temperature were in agreement with other experimental observations, although the fuel and OC used differed.

In addition, from the inset of Figure 8a, it would be found out that less than 0.004% of CH₄ was generated from LPS pyrolysis below 700 °C and decreased with the increase of the temperature. However, different from CH₄, the fraction of COS ascended with the temperature above 750 °C, possibly because of some different reaction pathways involved, such as H₂S + CO → H₂ + COS, H₂S + CO₂ → H₂O + COS, and SO₂ + 3CO → COS + 3CO₂. Of course, sulfur species, such as H₂S and SO₂, were also generated, but sulfur evolution for the reaction of LPS with CuFe₂O₄ is not the focus of this research and will be further investigated in the future.

In terms of CuFe₂O₄ evolution and oxygen transfer during its reaction with LPS, according to the distribution of Cu species in Figure 8b and Fe species in Figure 8c, the two dominant species evolved from CuFe₂O₄ were Cu and Fe₃O₄. The amounts of both Cu and Fe₃O₄ decreased throughout the whole temperature history (i.e., 400−1100 °C), mainly because the lattice oxygen from CuFe₂O₄ transferable to LPS is not sufficient by the formation of inert compounds from the interaction of reduced CuFe₂O₄ with minerals in LPS. This fact will be discussed in more detail later. The predicted variations of CO₂ and CO concentrations with the temperature were in agreement with other experimental observations, although the fuel and OC used differed.

Furthermore, from Figure 8c, the fraction of FeO was found to be always increasing from 3.41% at 400 °C to 20.5% at 1100 °C. On the basis of the fact of the increase in the CO fraction in Figure 8a,
the increased CO fraction promoted the further reduction of Fe$_2$O$_3$ to FeO by transferring more lattice oxygen [O] from Fe$_3$O$_4$ to LPS,$^{33}$ as shown in the expression below.

$$\text{Fe}_3\text{O}_4 \rightarrow \text{FeO} + [\text{O}] \quad (8)$$

Meanwhile, during the reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with LPS over 800 °C, as shown in Figure 8b, CuFe$_2$O$_4$ and Cu$_2$O were also found to occur and increase with the temperature, possibly because of the direct decomposition of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ into delafossite CuFeO$_2$, hematite, and oxygen, as shown in eq 9,$^{34-37}$ and then further partial decomposition of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ into cuprite Cu$_2$O and hematite Fe$_2$O$_3$, as shown in eq 10.$^{38,39}$

$$4\text{CuFe}_2\text{O}_4 \rightarrow 4\text{CuFeO}_2 + 2\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3 + \text{O}_2 \quad (9)$$

$$2\text{CuFeO}_2 \rightarrow \text{Cu}_2\text{O} + \text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3 \quad (10)$$

Especially, O$_2$ produced was greatly beneficial to the full conversion of the remaining coal, while the generated Fe$_2$O$_3$ was further reduced into Fe$_3$O$_4$ and other lower valence iron oxides than Fe$_3$O$_4$. In addition, the greater percentages of Fe$_3$O$_4$ and Cu as compared to those of CuFeO$_2$ and FeO shown in panels b and c of Figure 8 clearly indicated that the dominant reaction pathway of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with LPS was eq 7 coupled with eq 8 rather than eqs 9 and 10.

Finally, from the insets in panels b and c of Figure 8, it could be found that Cu in CuFe$_2$O$_4$ tended to react with various sulfur species emitted from LPS coal to form Cu$_2$S$^{30}$ but Fe in CuFe$_2$O$_4$ was preferred to react with minerals in LPS, especially SiO$_2$ under a reducing condition, to form both Fe$_2$SiO$_4$ and FeSiO$_3$. It was considered that both the interactions of some reduced CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with minerals present in LPS and partial decomposition of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ into CuFeO$_2$ and Cu$_2$O meant that the amount of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ was not sufficient for the full oxidation of LPS. Overall, equilibrium simulation is helpful to better understand the mechanisms involved for the reaction of LPS with CuFe$_2$O$_4$.

### 3.3. Chemical and Microstructural Analysis

To further clarify the reaction mechanisms involved and help understand the issue of ash separation from the reaction of coal with OC, the morphology and elemental composition of both residues from the reactions of LPS and YQ with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ were characterized using FSEM/EDX, as shown in Figure 9. Meanwhile, FSEM/EDX analyses of LPS and YQ pyrolysis residues under N$_2$ atmosphere are also provided in Figure 9 for references. The elemental compositions for the optionally selected spots on the FSEM image were calculated using the ZAF correction method and listed in Table 4. Furthermore, the detailed phases contained for the reaction of CuFe$_2$O$_4$ with these two Chinese coals were identified using XRD analysis, and the results are provided in Figure 10.

First, from Figure 9a, for the pyrolysis of LPS, the residues of LPS in the SEM pattern were observed to mainly consist of the relatively dark bulk material in spot 1 and the fragmentary discrete particles in spot 2. From the EDX analysis, the atomic fraction of C in spot 1 was 42.57%, higher than that in spot 2, possibly resulting from the main carbon matrix not completely disintegrated during LPS pyrolysis, while spot 2 was identified as minerals inherent in the carbon matrix, mainly composed of Si, Al, and O. Furthermore, as shown in Figure 10a, XRD analysis of the residue from LPS pyrolysis indicated that both SiO$_2$ and silicates, such as CaAl$_2$Si$_2$O$_8$, Ca$_2$Si$_2$O$_6$, and KFe$_2$Si$_3$O$_8$, were the main mineral compositions. In addition, although most of the residue should be ascribed to the carbon matrix by EDX analysis, it could not be detected in XRD analysis, mainly because of the amorphous characteristics of the derived carbon from LPS pyrolysis.$^{32,41}$

Similar to LPS pyrolysis, as shown in Figure 9c, the SEM/EDX pattern of YQ pyrolysis revealed that the residues left were also made up of the main carbon matrix with C atomic fraction of 80.8% in spot 1 and some discrete minerals in either smooth particles in spot 2 or scaled bars by appearance in spot 3. These mineral particles were further identified by XRD analysis as SiO$_2$ and some different silicates from that of LPS, such as Ca$_3$Fe$_2$-(SiO$_4$)$_3$ and Mg$_3$Al$_2$Si$_3$O$_12$.

Furthermore, from the SEM pattern in Figure 9b for the reaction of LPS with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ or Figure 9d for YQ with CuFe$_2$O$_4$, it could be observed that the residues were evenly distributed without discernible agglomeration or sintering and the atomic fractions of Cu, Fe, and O by EDX analysis in the optionally selected spots 1 or 2 were uniformly distributed around 16, 27, and 50%, respectively. Meanwhile, from Table 4, the atomic fraction of C for LPS with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ was below 1.6% and that for YQ with CuFe$_2$O$_4$ was less than 4%, far lower than those left after LPS and YQ pyrolysis, mainly because of the
su
ffi
cient oxidation of C present in LPS or YQ by CuFe2O4. Of course, the catalytic function of reduced CuFe2O4 to gasification of the remaining carbon with steam should also be kept in mind.31 Meanwhile, from XRD analysis of the reaction residues of CuFe2O4 with LPS or YQ in curves b and g of Figure 10, the reduced counterparts of CuFe2O4 with LPS were Cu, CuFeO2, and Fe2.962O4 but the reduced counterparts of CuFe2O4 with YQ were Cu, CuFeO2, and Fe2.957O4. According to the thermodynamic simulation in section 3.2.4, Cu was possibly derived from the reduction of CuFe2O4 throughout the whole reaction process at 400–1100 °C by eq 7, while CuFeO2 was produced by the direct decomposition of CuFe2O4 at a temperature over 800 °C by eq 9, which was in accordance with the thermodynamic simulation above. However, oxygen-deficient iron oxides, such as Fe2.962O4 and Fe2.957O4, detected from XRD analysis were different from the predicted Fe species from thermodynamic simulation shown in Figure 8c. The disparity mainly resulted from the limited Fe species available in the HSC software library relative to those of XRD analysis. However, at least, the decrease of the Fe3O4 fraction together with the increase of the FeO fraction with the temperature from thermodynamic simulation in Figure 8c clearly revealed that the further reduction of Fe3O4 really occurred.

In addition, as shown in the curves b and g of Figure 10, Fe2SiO4 was also detected by XRD analysis in the samples of both LPS and YQ that had been reduced by CuFe2O4. Detected Fe2SiO4 mainly resulted from the interaction between FeO obtained from reduced CuFe2O4, as shown in eq 8, and SiO2 contained in the LPS or YQ samples under the local reducing atmosphere.12 Formed Fe2SiO4 not only lowered the melting point of the OC but also deteriorated the reactivity of the OC. Further research should be performed on this issue.

Finally, the reoxidation of reduced CuFe2O4 with air after its reduction with coal is also a great concern. According to XRD analysis, relative to fresh CuFe2O4 synthesized by SGCS in Figure 10d, reduced CuFe2O4 with the model coal LPS could be oxidized back to CuFe2O4 with a little CuO left. The reoxidized CuFe2O4 fraction could be estimated as 87.13% by the index $R_{CuFe_2O_4}$ below25,28,42

$$R_{CuFe_2O_4} = \frac{I_{CuFe_2O_4}}{I_{CuFe_2O_4} + I_{CuO}}$$

where $I_{CuFe_2O_4}$ and $I_{CuO}$ are the majority XRD peaks of CuFe2O4 and CuO in Figure 10c, respectively. The reason for the presence of CuO was possibly that, during the reduction of CuFe2O4 with LPS, some reduced iron fractions in CuFe2O4 interacted with minerals (especially SiO2) in LPS to form inactive compounds, such as Fe2SiO4, as discussed above, and resulted in insufficient Fe3O4 to combine with CuO and be reoxidized back into CuFe2O4. Therefore, great attention should be paid to the evolution of the minerals in CLC of coal, and measures should be taken to separate effectively the ash produced from reduced CuFe2O4.

Table 4. Elemental Analysis (Atomic %) of the Reaction of LPS and YQ with CuFe2O4 by FSEM/EDX, Applying the ZAF Correction Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>samples</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Cu</th>
<th>Al</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>Ca</th>
<th>Mg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPS pyrolysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 1</td>
<td>42.57</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 2</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS + CuFe2O4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>42.89</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 2</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 1</td>
<td>80.80</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YQ pyrolysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 2</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 3</td>
<td>63.28</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 1</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>58.61</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YQ + CuFe2O4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot 2</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>52.96</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. XRD study of the solid products of coals with CuFe2O4. In this figure, 1, quartz (SiO2); 2, calcium aluminum silicate (CaAl2SiO6); 3, hedenbergite (CaFeSi2O6); 4, potassium iron silicate (KFeSi3O8); 5, magnetite (Fe2.962O4); 6, copper (Cu); 7, copper iron oxide (CuFeO2); 8, fayalite (Fe2SiO4); 9, ferrosilite (FeSiO3); 10, copper ferrite (CuFe2O4); 11, copper oxide (CuO); 12, iron ringwoodite (Fe2SiO4); 13, andradite [Ca3Fe2(SiO4)3]; 14, magnesium aluminum silicate (Mg2Al2-Si3O12); 15, magnetite (Fe2.957O4); and 16, calcium aluminum silicate (CaAl2SiO6).
4. CONCLUSION

CuFe₂O₄, as a novel OC, was put forward in this research. The reaction of CuFe₂O₄ with two Chinese coals of different ranks was performed in TGA and then systematically investigated using both thermodynamic simulation and different experimental means, including FTIR, FSEM/EDX, and XRD. Relevant conclusions were reached as follows: (1) TGA experiments for the reaction of LPS or YQ with CuFe₂O₄ were conducted. The results demonstrated that the reaction for LPS with CuFe₂O₄ underwent two distinct reaction stages at 300—600 and 600—850 °C but the reaction of YQ with CuFe₂O₄ displayed a single reaction stage above 600 °C. Meanwhile, for the reduction of CuFe₂O₄ with two Chinese coals, the maximum mass loss rates above 600 °C were more pronounced. (2) Two conversion indexes were established for the reduction of different OCs (CuFe₂O₄, Fe₂O₃, and CuO) with two Chinese coals, LPS and YQ. The OC conversion indices (i.e., $X_{\text{OC}}$ (coal)) of three OCs in their mixtures with different coals were always bigger than their mixture conversion indices (i.e., $X_{\text{coal}} + X_{\text{OC}}$) for the three OCs with two Chinese coals, clearly indicating that the real limiting step for the reaction of coal with OCs is pyrolysis and gasification of coal instead of the reaction of coal with OCs. (3) Mechanisms involved for the reaction of CuFe₂O₄ with coal were explored using thermodynamic simulation. Reduction of CuFe₂O₄ into Cu and Fe₂O₃ (as shown in eq 7) was dominated by transfer of the lattice oxygen in CuFe₂O₄ to LPS throughout the whole reaction at 400—1100 °C. However, above 800 °C, direct decomposition of CuFe₂O₄ into CuFe₂O₄ by eq 9 and then further partial decomposition of CuFe₂O₄ into Cu₂O were commenced by eq 10. Meanwhile, Fe₂O₃ formed in eqs 9 and 10 would be further reduced. (4) Finally, FSEM/EDX and XRD analysis of the solid reduced residues of CuFe₂O₄ with LPS and YQ indicated that, besides Cu and CuFe₂O₄, oxygen-deficient iron oxides, such as Fe₂962O₄ for LPS or Fe₂957O₄ for YQ, were also generated.
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