Integrating Thermal Analysis and Reaction Modeling for Rational Design of Pyrolytic Processes to Remediate Soils Contaminated with Heavy Crude Oil
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ABSTRACT: We developed a novel methodology that combines thermo-analytical measurements and mathematical methods to inform the reliable pyrolytic treatment of specific soil/contaminant systems. Our approach improves upon current “black-box” design methods that may overestimate the required treatment intensity and hinder cost efficacy. We used thermogravimetry and evolved gas analysis to characterize the complex network of soil mineral transformations, contaminant desorption, and pyrolytic reactions occurring when contaminated soils are heated in an anoxic atmosphere. The kinetics of these reactions were quantified using a distributed activation energy (DAE) approach with six pseudo-components and used in a mathematical model for continuous-flow reactors to predict the removal of hydrocarbon contaminants without other fitting parameters. This model was tested with pilot-scale data from pyrolytic treatment of soils contaminated with crude oil and found to be a good predictor of the total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) removal for temperatures between 370 and 470 °C and residence times from 15 to 60 min. The light hydrocarbon fraction desorbed quickly, and over 99.7% removal was achieved at 420 °C and 15 min residence time. However, 95% removal of the heavy hydrocarbon fraction, which is a good proxy for polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), required 470 °C with 15 min residence time. This model can be employed to select operating conditions (e.g., reactor size, treatment time, and temperature) to reliably achieve remediation objectives for specific hydrocarbon/soil mixtures without inflating energy requirements, which would lower operating costs and decrease the process carbon footprint on a system-specific basis.
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INTRODUCTION

There is a pressing need for reliable, broadly applicable, and sustainable remediation of soils impacted by polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and other persistent hydrophobic hazardous pollutants. Whereas numerous site remediation approaches have been developed, many of these technologies are marginally cost effective or unreliable.1–5 For example, bioremediation (including landfarming) is relatively slow, often difficult to accomplish,6–11 and has the potential to generate more toxic PAH byproducts.12

We recently demonstrated that pyrolytic treatment of contaminated soils under carefully selected operating conditions can rapidly and reliably remove heavy hydrocarbons (including PAHs)13,15 and eliminate toxicity to human lung cells14 while preserving the fertility of the soil to facilitate ecosystem restoration and greening efforts.13,14 The advantages of pyrolytic treatment over other thermal treatment methods like incineration include significantly lower energy requirements and preservation of soil fertility, due to retention of some organic carbon and water holding capacity.13–15 More recent studies confirmed the advantages of pyrolytic treatment by demonstrating high hydrocarbon removal efficiencies.16,17 Like other thermal treatment processes, pyrolytic treatment could emit toxic volatile compounds. However, such emissions are mitigated by off-gas collection, reuse, and incineration or adsorption units.18,19

Thermogravimetry and evolved gas analysis (EGA) with online mass spectrometry and infrared analysis revealed that pyrolytic treatment of soils contaminated with petroleum crudes proceeds in two stages.15 The more volatile contaminants...
desorb as the soil is heated to 350 °C. When temperatures rise above 350 °C, however, heavier hydrocarbons (including PAHs) undergo pyrolytic reactions that release hydrogen and C₁–C₄ hydrocarbons as they form a carbonaceous material (coke) that is nontoxic and refractory to further chemical reactions.20–25 Coke formation is usually triggered by heterogeneous catalysis and proceeds via a cascade of reactions that include radical formation via hydrogen abstraction or C–C bond breaking, and propagation via β-scission or cyclization.26–28 PAHs play a big role in this process via the formation of aryl radicals.28 The final product is a 5–10 µm thick coke layer with a polynuclear aromatic character that coats the surface of soil particles, as we demonstrated with X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) and elemental analysis.15

Pyrolytically treated soils exhibit significant differences in fertility, as determined by germination and biomass production metrics.13,14 Our previous studies also revealed potential references in pyrolytic treatment intensity (and associated energy consumption), soil detoxification efficacy, and soil fertility restoration. For one contaminated soil, for example, treatment at 420 °C for 30 min resulted in high contaminant removal efficiencies (99.9% for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) and 94.5% for PAHs) and restored fertility to clean soil levels.14 When the same soil was treated at 470 °C for 15 or 30 min, however, its fertility was reduced to 51 and 39%, respectively, of the clean soil level, which was only marginally better than that of the contaminated soil.14

Since different soil/hydrocarbon mixtures may respond differently to pyrolytic treatment, the design and operation of remediation processes should be system specific. A deeper mechanistic understanding of the fundamental pyrolysis processes is necessary to select treatment conditions that achieve multiple objectives like detoxification and soil fertility restoration in addition to contaminant removal. More specifically, we need a better quantitative understanding of the interactions between (a) thermally induced changes to soil components that will affect the fertility of treated soils and (b) contaminant desorption and pyrolysis that will ultimately determine their removal rate and extent. However, the operating conditions for current thermal remediation processes are often selected using empirical approaches that do not address the complexity of the soil/contaminant systems and may exaggerate the required heat treatment intensity. This inflates energy consumption and the associated treatment cost and carbon footprint. Thus, there is a need for comprehensive testing protocols that quantify soil/contaminant interactions and integrate robust data analysis and reactor modeling to inform the selection of cost effective and more sustainable operating conditions for pyrolytic treatment.

To address this need, we present here a novel approach that combines advanced analytical measurements and mathematical methods to inform the pyrolytic treatment of specific soil/contaminant systems without relying on “black-box” methods. We first demonstrate how to use thermogravimetry and evolved gas analysis to (a) model the complex network of decomposition and pyrolysis reactions occurring when contaminated soils are heated in an anoxic atmosphere and (b) quantify the kinetics of these reactions. Using a two-step methodology, we analyze and model the thermal transformations of soil components before characterizing the desorption and pyrolysis of contaminants. We then use the full pyrolysis kinetics to develop a reactor model that can predict the conversion of key contaminants and decomposition of soil components as they are heated in a continuous pyrolysis reactor. We show how this model can be used to select reactor operating conditions that reliably achieve remediation objectives without extreme heat treatment intensities, thus enhancing the cost efficacy and decreasing the associated carbon footprint. Finally, we test this model with pilot-scale results presented earlier14 for pyrolytic treatment of soils contaminated with crude oil.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Contaminated Soil Samples and Pyrolysis Experiments in a Continuous Reactor.

Two contaminated soils and their background (clean) soil were used for this study.14 Both contaminated soils were pyrolytically treated in a pilot-scale rotary kiln reactor (Hazen Research, Golden, CO) at three temperatures (370, 420, and 470 °C) and 15, 30, and 60 min residence times.14 Additional details about the operation of this reactor are provided in the Supporting Information section. Pyrolytically treated soils were analyzed for TPH and PAH content by the Eurofins Lancaster Labs (Lancaster, PA). The TPH concentration was determined by measuring the solvent-extractable hydrocarbons via the gas chromatography-flame ionization detector (GC-FID) according to the EPA 8015M method. The 16 U.S. EPA priority pollutant PAH compounds were analyzed by EPA Method 8270C (SW-846).

#### Evolved Gas Analysis (EGA) of Clean and Contaminated Soils.

Thermogravimetric analysis experiments with online infrared gas analysis (TG-IR) were performed using a thermogravimetric analyzer (TGA) (Q500, TA Instruments, New Castle, DE) connected to a nondispersive infrared (NDIR) gas analyzer (LI-840A, LI-COR, Lincoln, NE). Since all of the gas exiting the TGA flows through its optical path, the online NDIR instrument allows for continuous quantitative measurement of CO₂ and H₂O concentrations in the gaseous stream exiting the thermogravimetric analyzer. For all TG-IR experiments, 50–60 mg of either clean or contaminated soils were placed on a platinum pan and treated in the TGA under high-purity nitrogen flowing at a rate of 100 mL/min. To remove the sample moisture, every run started with a drying stage in which the temperature was raised to 105 °C and held there for 30 min. When the drying stage was complete, the temperature was ramped to a final value of 650 °C at a constant heating rate of 1 °C/min. Every sequence of TG-IR experiments started with two blank runs using the same method but without any samples to flush the air from the system and stabilize the readings of the IR instrument. Data from several thermogravimetric experiments were used to compute the average weight loss of the soil and evolved gas concentrations, all of which were highly reproducible (Figure S1). Note that the relatively slow heating rate of 1 °C/min was used to minimize the temperature lag between measured and actual sample temperature and improve the accuracy of the measurements used for estimating the kinetic parameters of pyrolysis reactions.

#### DAE Model for Pyrolysis Kinetics.

Thermal analysis experiments (TG-IR and TG-MS) were carried out to characterize the thermal transformations of soil components as well as the desorption and pyrolysis of hydrocarbon contaminants. Using this data, we grouped the numerous species of clean and contaminated soils into a small number of pseudocomponents. Each pseudocomponent consists of a large number of compounds (e.g., clays, minerals, soil organic matter, and different hydrocarbon contaminants) that pyrolyze at their own species-specific rates. To simplify the kinetic analysis, however, we assumed that each pseudocomponent reacts as a
single species but with an activation energy that is distributed according to a Gaussian probability density function.27 This is the core assumption of the distributed activation energy (DAE) approach introduced by Vand28 and used by others to model the pyrolysis kinetics of coal31–34 and lignocellulosic biomass.35–41 To estimate the kinetic parameters of all decomposition reactions, we solved an optimization problem that matched the sum of the pseudocomponent weight losses predicted by the DAE model to the experimental weight losses measured by thermogravimetry.29 The Supporting Information section provides details of the conceptual development and the mathematical formulation of our DAE model. Note that all kinetic parameters of the pyrolysis reactions were obtained from thermogravimetric experiments with clean and contaminated soils.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Kinetics of Clean Soil Pyrolysis. Since 90–95% of the mass of petroleum-contaminated soils consists of soil minerals, thermal transformations of soil components (like clay dehydration or carbonate decomposition) account for a large fraction of the weight losses observed during pyrolysis. Moreover, the temperature ranges of soil mineral transformations overlap with the temperature ranges over which desorption and pyrolysis of contaminants take place.15,29 This overlap necessitates the use of a two-step approach to decouple the kinetics of soil transformations from those of contaminant desorption and pyrolysis. The solid thick lines of Figure 1a,b present the thermogravimetry (TG) and differential thermogravimetry (DTG) curves describing the average weight w(T) and the average weight loss rate dw/dT of the clean soil as it is heated at a constant rate in a thermogravimetric analyzer.15,29 Data from several thermogravimetric experiments were used to compute the average weight loss of our clean soil, which was highly reproducible (Figure S1).

Background soil weight losses (Figure 1a) are primarily due to the release of water and carbon dioxide as various soil components and minerals undergo thermal transformations upon heating.15 Water is released as vapor from the clay components of the soil, which retain substantial amounts of water between their two-dimensional silicate sheets42–44 and are responsible for its fertility.13,14,45 Reversible dehydroxylation occurs at temperatures lower than 500 °C,48,50 while irreversible dehydroxylation may lead to water release at temperatures usually higher than 500 °C through a two-step proton transfer by two hydroxyl groups.47,51–54 Finally, carbon dioxide is released as the small amounts of organic matter (SOM) present in this soil pyrolyze in the nitrogen atmosphere of the TGA.15,53

The observed decomposition rate (Figure 1b) is a convolution or sum of multiple water and carbon dioxide peaks, each one of them coming from different fractions of soil. This overall soil decomposition rate can be deconvolved to determine the kinetics of soil pyrolysis using the DAE methodology.29 First, we use EGA data from TG-IR and TG-MS experiments to group this soil into four pseudocomponents, each of which decomposes to release either water or carbon dioxide. Three pseudocomponents (denoted by \( A_1, A_2, \) and \( A_3 \)) release water and model the dehydration and dehydroxylation of soil minerals (clays). Since the CO2 release pattern had only one broad peak spanning almost the entire temperature range tested, one pseudocomponent (\( A_4 \)) is sufficient to model weight losses associated with the release of carbon dioxide from SOM pyrolysis. These four parallel decomposition reactions follow first-order kinetics and have activation energies distributed according to a Gaussian probability density function.29 The DAE optimization problem was then solved to estimate the relative weight fractions of the four pseudocomponents and the kinetic parameters of their decomposition reactions: the pre-exponential factors, as well as the mean and standard deviation of the Gaussian distributions of their activation energies (Table 1).

Figure 1b shows the decomposition rates of the four pseudocomponents as Gaussian distributions (blue and red lines) whose convolution (sum) yields the overall decomposition rate of clean soil. The DAE predictions agree very well with the experimental soil decomposition rate (open circles) measured via thermogravimetry. The total weight loss (solid line of Figure 1a) predicted by the DAE model is also in excellent agreement with the thermogravimetric data (open circles in Figure 1a).

The results of Figure 1 and Table 1 are in good agreement with literature studies on water release from clays. For example, the estimated activation energies of Table 1 are well within the range of values reported in the literature,15,51,56,57 a strong indication that the first two water-releasing pseudocomponents (\( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \)) correspond to clay dehydration processes. Irreversible dehydroxylation is the likely thermal process represented by the \( A_3 \) pseudocomponent.

To investigate how run-to-run variability may affect the kinetics, we also estimated the kinetic parameters by (a) fitting...
termogravimetry data from three TGA runs and (b) fitting the averaged data from these runs. The parameters computed from individual runs were within 2–5% of the values computed from the averaged data.

While a DAE model with four pseudocomponents was accurate enough for the soil considered here, additional pseudocomponents may have to be considered if the soil contains larger amounts of SOM, or if it contains carbonate minerals that decompose when heated to release significant amounts of carbon dioxide.14

**Contaminated Soil Pyrolysis Kinetics Need Two More Pseudocomponents.** Figure 2a presents the decomposition rates (or weight loss rates) for the two contaminated soils with 3 and 5% oil and compares them to the decomposition rate of the clean soil. Weight losses due to hydrocarbon devolatilization and pyrolysis superimpose two additional peaks on the multipeak decomposition rate of the clean soil shown in Figure 1. These hydrocarbon peaks appear in the temperature ranges established in our earlier work,16 namely, 100–300 °C for desorption of light hydrocarbons and 350–450 °C for pyrolysis of heavier hydrocarbons. The height of these peaks is proportional to the crude oil content of the two contaminated soils.

The full pyrolysis kinetics of contaminated soils can therefore be determined using a DAE model with six pseudocomponents and solving an optimization problem to match DAE predictions to thermogravimetric experimental data. The first four pseudocomponents are the same used to describe soil mineral transformations that lead to the release of water and carbon dioxide during pyrolytic treatment of clean soil. A fifth pseudocomponent (A5 or LH) models the desorption of light hydrocarbons from 100 to 350 °C, while the sixth pseudocomponent (A6 or HH) represents heavier hydrocarbons that pyrolyze between 350 and 450 °C. Our analysis assumes that the addition of hydrocarbon contaminants does not alter the overall thermal behavior of the soil, an assumption that is supported by the relatively small amounts of added hydrocarbons (3 and 5% by weight).

The six-component DAE model fit very well the experimental weight vs temperature data for the contaminated soil with 3% crude oil (Figure 2b). Also, the convolution of the weight loss rates for the six pseudocomponents provided very good approximations to the overall weight loss rate of the 3% contaminated soil (Figure 2c). Table 1 provides the kinetic parameters estimated for both contaminated soils. Note that the mass fraction of the heavy hydrocarbon fraction (A6-HH) for the contaminated soil with 5% crude oil is barely higher than that of the soil contaminated with 3% oil (0.20 vs 0.19) and, thus, most of the elevated weight loss of the 5% soil (Figure 2) comes from the light hydrocarbon fraction (A5-LH).

The hydrocarbon devolatilization and pyrolysis patterns of Figure 2b are consistent with those reported for Atabasca sand bitumen that was separated into its maltene and asphaltene fractions and pyrolyzed in a TGA with 1 °C/min heating rate.68 Perhaps one important difference is a slight shift of the conversion rate for our A6-HH heavy hydrocarbon fraction toward lower temperatures, suggesting that soil minerals, like clays, may catalyze some pyrolytic reactions and facilitate coke deposition.59,60 Another possible explanation is that, in our case, hydrocarbons are dispersed as a layer coating the soil particles. Mass transfer in films of heavy hydrocarbons can significantly affect the pyrolysis kinetics and the rate of coke formation.61

**Development and Testing of a Reactor Model to Predict Contaminant Conversions.** The pyrolysis kinetics obtained in the previous section was used to develop a reactor model that can predict the removal of contaminants and the conversion of any other pseudocomponents as they are heated in a continuous pyrolysis reactor. To demonstrate the predictive capability of reactor models based on first principles, we considered the pilot-scale kiln reactor used in our earlier study14 to pyrolyze the two soils contaminated with 3 and 5% crude oil. The temperature in the pyrolysis section of the reactor (Figure S2) was kept within ±5 °C from its setpoint for most of the experiments considered here. Additional details are provided in the Supporting Information section.

As contaminated soil was fed at a constant rate in the reactor and tumbles through it, the six pseudocomponents decomposed in parallel to release gaseous products (water, carbon dioxide, volatile hydrocarbons, or hydrogen) that are swept by a constant stream of nitrogen. Using the decomposition kinetics obtained via thermogravimetry, we developed a finite-stage or mixing-cell model to describe the steady-state operation of our pyrolysis reactor. The use of a mixing-cell model was dictated by the implicit form in which decomposition rates are expressed with the integral expressions of eq 56. It is well known, however, that mixing-cell models can accurately model the operation of tubular flow reactors as long as a sufficiently large number of mixing cells (or finite stages) is used.62–65

The pyrolysis reactor was divided into N compartments of volume ΔV = A cΔx, where Ac is the cross-sectional area of the reactor (Figure 3). Since the overall weight loss is relatively small (5.64 and 7.32 wt %, respectively, for contaminated soils with 3 and 5% crude oil) and since a significant fraction of the hydrocarbons remains in the soil as char, we assumed that the volumetric flow rate was constant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Pseudocomponent</th>
<th>log₁₀ kₜ (min)</th>
<th>Eₜ (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>σ (kJ/mol)</th>
<th>cᵣ</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated soil with 3% oil</td>
<td>A₁-H₂O</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₂-H₂O</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₃-H₂O</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₄-CO₂</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₅-LH</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₆-HH</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated soil with 5% oil</td>
<td>A₁-H₂O</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₂-H₂O</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₃-H₂O</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₄-CO₂</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₅-LH</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A₆-HH</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let now $p_i^j(t)$ be the density of the solid $i$th pseudocomponent in the $j$th compartment and $R_i^j$ be the rate (in kg/s) at which this pseudocomponent decomposes. Then, the transient mass balances for all six pseudocomponents in this compartment yield

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(p_i^j A_z) = Q_s (p_i^{j-1} - p_i^j) - R_i^j,
$$

where $Q_s$ is the total volumetric flow rate of the contaminated soil.

The control system of our reactor kept the pyrolysis temperature within $\pm 5 ^\circ C$ of the setpoint temperature for most experiments. Moreover, samples of treated soil were collected during periods when this constraint was satisfied. Thus, we can assume that the reactor operates isothermally and at steady state, which simplifies eq 1 to

$$
0 = Q_s (p_i^{j-1} - p_i^j) + R_i^j
$$

or

$$
p_i^j = p_i^{j-1} + \frac{R_i^j}{Q_s}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6; \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, N
$$

(2)

After the soil has been exposed to the pyrolysis temperature for a time $t$, the conversion of each pseudocomponent is defined as

$$
x_i(t) = \frac{m_i^0 - m_i(t)}{m_i^0} = 1 - \frac{m_i(t)}{m_i^0}
$$

(3)

where $m_i^0$ is the mass of the $i$th pseudocomponent entering the first compartment and $m_i(t)$ is the mass that remains unreacted. Using the definition of the reaction rate, we finally obtain

$$
R_i^j = \frac{dm_i(t)}{dt} = -m_i^0 \frac{dx_i(t)}{dt}
$$

(4)

Note that when the contaminated soil leaves the $j$th compartment of the isothermal reactor model, it has been exposed to the pyrolysis temperature $T$ for a total time equal to

$$
t_j = \frac{j \Delta z}{v}
$$

(5)

where $v$ is the constant axial velocity of the soil. Equation 2 through eq 4 now yield

$$
p_i^j = p_i^{j-1} - \frac{m_i^0}{Q_s} \frac{dx_i(t)}{dt}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6; \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, N
$$

The time derivative of conversion can now be obtained from eq S6 to yield

Figure 2. Addition of two pseudocomponents describing the desorption and pyrolysis of hydrocarbons allows the DAE model to accurately match the experimental decomposition rates of the contaminated soil with 3% crude oil. Panel (a): weight loss or decomposition rates for the clean soil (solid line), the contaminated soil with 3 wt % oil (dotted line), and the contaminated soil with 5 wt % oil. All lines are obtained from the averages of three TGA experiments. Panel (b): total unreacted fraction computed by the six-component DAE model for the 3% contaminated soil (solid line) and measured by thermogravimetry (symbols). The thermogravimetric data were the average of three TGA runs. RMSE = 0.0025. Panel (c): the decomposition rate computed by the six-component DAE model for the 3% contaminated soil (solid black line), the rate of the light hydrocarbon ($A_5$ or LH) fraction (red dashed line), and the rate of the heavy hydrocarbon ($A_6$ or HH) fraction (red dashed-dotted line).

Figure 3. Model predictions using eq 8 (light gray bars) are in good agreement with the experimentally measured TPH removal percentages (dark gray bars). Differences between model predictions and measured TPH removal range from $-2.4$ to $5.5\%$ for the soils treated at $370 ^\circ C$ and are less than $0.9\%$ for the soils treated at $420 ^\circ C$. Actual differences may be even smaller if we consider possible deviations from reactor isothermality. Note that one TPH measurement per sample was performed. The bars for the model predictions indicate the range of conversions obtained by varying the isothermal reactor temperature by $\pm 5 ^\circ C$. 
\[ \rho_i^j = \rho_i^{j-1} - \frac{m_0^j}{Q_{k}} \int_0^\infty k_{i,0} \exp\left(-\frac{E_i}{RT} - \int_0^{t_i} k_{i,0} e^{-E_i/RT} dt\right) f_i(E) dE, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6 \]

where \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, N, k_{i,0} \) are the pre-exponential reaction rate factors and \( f_i(E) \) are the probability density functions for the activation energies of the pseudocomponents \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6 \).

The total density \( \rho_{tot}^j \) of the six reacting pseudocomponents can similarly be obtained as

\[ \rho_{tot}^j = \rho_{tot}^{j-1} - \frac{1}{Q_{e}} \sum_{i=1}^6 c_i m_0^j \int_0^\infty k_{i,0} \exp\left(-\frac{E_i}{RT} - \int_0^{t_i} k_{i,0} e^{-E_i/RT} dt\right) f_i(E) dE, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6 \]

for all \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, N \). Equation 6 can now be used to compute the densities or conversions of the pseudocomponents along the length of the isothermal reactor. Once the pyrolysis temperature, the volumetric flow rate of contaminated soil, and the reactor dimensions have been specified, eq 6 provides the conversions of the six pseudocomponents at every axial position inside the isothermal reactor. All of the other model parameters needed for these computations (i.e., the reaction rate coefficients \( k_{i,0} \), the mean \( E_{i,0} \) and variance \( \sigma_{i,0}^2 \) of the activation energy distributions, and mass fractions \( c_i \) of the six pseudocomponents) have been previously obtained by the DAE model (Table 1).

We conducted a systematic study to determine the value of compartments that will give us accurate predictions of conversions for each set of operating conditions and soil type. As expected, the total and axial conversions converge for all conditions. However, the number of compartments required to achieve convergence as \( N \to \infty \) varies with the kinetic parameters. When the 3% contaminated soil is treated at 470 °C with 30 min residence time, for example, the overall (exit) conversion of pseudocomponent \( A_2 \cdot H_2O \) converges with fewer than 100 compartments, while \( A_3 \cdot H_2O \) requires about 5,000 to converge. The exit conversions of the hydrogen-carbon-related pseudocomponents \( (A_2 \cdot LH, A_3 \cdot HH) \) also converge for \( N \) between 1000 and 5000. To ensure accuracy for all components, typical runs use 5000 compartments and require around 15 min of CPU time on a personal computer with a 2.50 GHz Intel Core i7 processor.

**Our Reactor Model Accurately Predicts Contaminant Conversions.** For all pyrolysis experiments, hydrocarbon conversions were obtained by measuring the total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) of the treated soil exiting the reactor. TPH quantifies the total amount of volatile and extractable hydrocarbons in the \( C_{20} \sim C_{45} \) range remaining in the treated soil, as determined with various methods that involve solvent extraction and chromatographic analysis. Since TPH content is a universal standard for regulatory compliance, we tested the ability of our model to predict contaminant removal levels that are comparable to the measured TPH values for the same pyrolysis conditions. The metric used was the weighted average of the conversion of the two hydrocarbon fractions at the reactor exit

\[ HC_{tot} = c_5 x_5(\tau) + c_6 x_6(\tau) \]

where \( \tau \) is the residence time in the isothermal reactor, and \( c_5 \) and \( c_6 \) are the mass fractions of LH and HH hydrocarbon fractions in the contaminated soils, and \( x_5(\tau) \) and \( x_6(\tau) \) are the LH and HH conversions at the reactor exit.

The experimental measurements showed complete TPH removal for all residence times when the pyrolysis temperature was 470 °C. Close agreement was observed between the measured TPH removal level and the hydrocarbon conversions predicted by eq 8 when the 3% contaminated soil was pyrolytically treated at 420 °C (Figure 3). The agreement was not as good for treatment at 370 °C. However, the fact that TPH removal efficiency for 370 °C did not increase monotonically with increasing residence time (as dictated by chemical reaction dynamics and predicted by the model) reflects large sample-to-sample variability for these measurements. Note also that the residual TPH measured value strongly depends on the solubility of the remaining hydrocarbons in the solvent used for extraction and does not correspond directly to the remaining amount of the LH and HH fractions used by our reactor model. Despite these limitations, the predicted conversion from eq 8 (using independently obtained rather than fitting parameters) was a good predictor for the widely used TPH metric (Figure 3), particularly since pilot-scale and commercial reactors may deviate from an isothermal operation.

Pyrolytic treatment of the 5% contaminated soil also achieved very high levels of TPH removal at all temperatures. After 30 min at 370 °C, 97.9% TPH removal was observed for the 5% contaminated soil, which was higher than the removal level measured for the 3% contaminated oil at the same conditions. Almost complete (99.8% or higher) removal was achieved after treatment at 420 and 470 °C. The hydrocarbon conversions predicted by the model and eq 8 were very similar to those reported in Figure 3 for the 3% contaminated soil. This is expected because the two contaminated soils have very similar weight fractions of the heavy hydrocarbon pseudocomponent (Table 1) and light hydrocarbon fractions require much lower temperatures for effective removal (Figure 5).

These results also suggest that TPH and hydrocarbon conversions exhibit a stronger dependence on pyrolysis temperature than on residence time. While the complexity of our model prevents us from coming up with an explicit relation of conversion as a function of temperature \( T \) and residence time \( \tau \), the simple case of an isothermal plug flow reactor (PFR) can provide a valuable insight on the relative importance of these operating parameters. When a single reaction with first-order kinetics takes place in an isothermal PFR, the overall conversion \( \chi(T, \tau) \) of a reactant is given by

\[ \chi = 1 - \exp\left(-k_0 e^{E/RT} \cdot \tau\right) \]

where \( k_0 \) and \( E \) are the pre-exponential rate constant and the activation energy of the reaction, respectively, while \( R \) is the ideal gas constant. We can then use eq 9 as a rule-of-thumb to estimate the relative effect of pyrolysis temperature and residence time on contaminant conversion. For example, the least reacting contaminant (HH hydrocarbon fraction) will exponentially approach full conversion with increasing values of the dimensionless heat treatment intensity metric \( I(T, \tau) \) defined as

\[ I(T, \tau) = k_0 e^{E/RT} \cdot \tau \]

where

\[ R = \frac{E}{RT} \]

and

\[ \tau = \frac{1}{k_0} \cdot \frac{1}{e^{RT/E}} \]
where $k_{0.6}$ and $E_{0.6}$ are the pre-exponential reaction rate constant and the mean activation energy of the HH fraction. Note that for continuous reactors, the residence time $\tau$ is defined as the ratio of the reactor volume over the volumetric flow rate of the contaminated soil ($\tau = V/Q$).

The remaining concentrations of the 16 priority PAH pollutants were measured for four of the treated soils. Pyrolytic treatment was very effective in removing PAHs from these contaminated soils as shown in Table 2. The model predicted high conversions of the heavy hydrocarbon HH fraction (Table 2) and is comparable to the experimental PAH measurements, which infers that HH conversion is a good proxy for estimating PAH removal levels at different operating conditions.

**Table 2. Measured PAH and Model Predicted HH Conversions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contaminated soil</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Residence time (min)</th>
<th>Measured PAH conversion (%)</th>
<th>Model predicted HH conversion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3% oil</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>91 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% oil</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>&gt;99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% oil</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>93 ± 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% oil</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>&gt;99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.** Reactor model can identify combinations of pyrolysis temperatures and residence times that achieve the required contaminant removal efficiency. Solid black lines present the average contaminant conversion vs pyrolysis temperature when the contaminated soil with 3% crude oil was treated for the indicated residence time. All kinetic constants are obtained from Table 1.

Reliable and predictive reactor models allow a design engineer to quickly determine a set of candidate $(T, \tau)$ pairs that will give the contaminant removal level required for regulatory compliance. How these choices affect the overall energy requirements or the economics of the process depends on several additional parameters that can only be explored with a process model that includes, in addition to the pyrolysis reactor, all of the equipment used for the transportation and comminution of the contaminated soil, the feeding of the reactor, the type of heating fuel used, the energy efficiency of the reactor, the filter used to remove the fines from the exhaust gas, etc. Yet, a good reactor model is an essential part of this process. In many cases, the minimum pyrolysis temperature yielding the desired conversion turns out to be a “good candidate” for minimizing energy use, primarily because of the large amount of energy required to raise the temperature of the soil to the pyrolysis temperature and the relatively small energy requirements of decomposition reactions.

The reactor model can also provide conversion profiles of all of the pseudocomponents along the entire length of the reactor so that we can quickly explore the effects of alternative sets of parameters on reactor performance; Figure 5 shows the conversions of light hydrocarbon (LH) and heavy hydrocarbon (HH) fractions achieved for three different temperatures and a 15 min residence time in the pilot-scale reactor presented in the previous sections. As expected, the LH hydrocarbon fraction desorbs very quickly and more than 95% conversion is achieved in the first half of the reactor at either 420 or 470 °C. A 95% conversion of the HH fraction, however, can be achieved in the first 75% of the reactor but only at 470 °C. Alternatively, we can use a pyrolysis temperature between 420 and 470 °C and the full length of the reactor, or set the pyrolysis temperature at 420 °C and increase the residence time. These and many more alternatives can be easily explored by multiple runs of the reactor model. In general, lower energy costs can be achieved by lowering the pyrolysis temperature, but the time required to treat a site (and all its associated costs) will increase if we increase the reactor residence time or, equivalently, decrease the solid feed rate to the reactor.

**Workflow for Selecting Pyrolytic Treatment Conditions for Specific Soil/Contaminant Mixtures.** By integrating thermal analysis methods and reactor modeling, the novel framework presented here outlines a systematic workflow for designing pyrolytic remediation processes considering multiple objectives, such as energy requirements and soil fertility recovery in addition to soil detoxification. This workflow, which improves upon current “black-box” approaches, has the following steps:

1. A sequence of thermal analysis tests (TG-IR, TG-MS) that (a) identify the temperatures where key soil mineral and contaminant transformations occur and (b) quantify the products of these transformations.
2. A distributed activation energy (DAE) methodology for deconvolving the multipeak decomposition patterns of contaminated soils to obtain the full pyrolysis kinetics.

3. A reactor model that can identify the operating conditions (pyrolysis temperature, residence time) that achieve the required contaminant conversion while avoiding high energy use or irreversible loss of soil fertility.

Since the reactor is the critical component of pyrolytic remediation systems, our novel framework represents a useful tool for remediation professionals to select appropriate cost-effective treatment conditions that are conducive to rapid, efficient, and more sustainable soil remediation, including technological decarbonization through lower energy requirements.
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