

Assessing the performance of adsorbents for CO2/CH4 separation in pressure swing adsorption units: A review

Luis Paz, Solène Gentil, Vanessa Fierro, Alain Celzard

► To cite this version:

Luis Paz, Solène Gentil, Vanessa Fierro, Alain Celzard. Assessing the performance of adsorbents for CO2/CH4 separation in pressure swing adsorption units: A review. Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering, 2024, 12 (6), pp.114870. 10.1016/j.jece.2024.114870. hal-04960059

HAL Id: hal-04960059 https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-04960059v1

Submitted on 21 Feb 2025

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

| Assessing the Performance of Adsorbents for |
|---|
| CO ₂ /CH ₄ Separation in Pressure Swing |
| Adsorption units: a Review |
| |
| Luis Paz ^a , Solène Gentil ^b , Vanessa Fierro ^{a,*} and Alain Celzard ^{a,c,*} |
| |
| ^a Université de Lorraine, CNRS, IJL, Epinal, F-88000, France |
| ^b Groupe BORDET, Froidvent, F-21290 Leuglay, France |
| ^c Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), F-75231 Paris, France. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

²² Fierro (vanessa.fierro@univ-lorraine.fr), Université de Lorraine.

Assessing the Performance of Adsorbents for CO₂/CH₄ Separation in Pressure Swing Adsorption Units: a Review

26 This review article assesses the performance of various adsorbents for CO₂/CH₄ 27 separation, a critical step in the final phase of a biogas upgrading plant. The focus 28 is particularly on the use of pressure swing adsorption (PSA) units for this 29 purpose. Four types of adsorbents, including activated carbons (ACs), carbon 30 molecular sieves, metal organic frameworks, and zeolites, are thus evaluated 31 based on their selectivity in CO_2/CH_4 separation and PSA working capacity ratio. 32 This selectivity is estimated from pure component isotherms through the Ideal 33 Adsorbed Solution Theory (IAST), and the PSA working capacity ratio is 34 evaluated for a PSA cycle with depressurization at atmospheric and sub-35 atmospheric pressure. The results show that ACs exhibit the lowest selectivity, 36 while zeolites have the highest selectivity and PSA working capacity ratio. The 37 article also includes a review of simulation studies on CO₂/CH₄ separation by 38 PSA. In addition, PSA units are compared based on their productivity, energy 39 consumption, purity, and recovery. To calculate energy consumption and 40 productivity, parameters that are often overlooked, a mass balance is applied to 41 the PSA cycle described in each relevant literature study. Our study suggests that 42 the PSA cycle with pressure equalization and sub-atmospheric pressure 43 depressurization is the most optimal, providing valuable insights into the 44 selection and optimization of adsorbents and PSA units for CO₂/CH₄ separation.

Keywords: biogas upgrading; CO₂/CH₄ separation; adsorption; pressure swing

45

46

adsorption units.

- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50

51

52

53

- - -

55 **1. Introduction**

56 Biogas, a byproduct of the anaerobic decomposition of organic matter, represents a 57 promising strategy for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. It primarily 58 comprises methane (CH₄) and carbon dioxide (CO₂), but can also contain several other impurities, including H₂S, NH₃, water vapor, N₂, H₂, CO, O₂, and siloxanes.^[1] These 59 constituents, although present in significantly lower proportions than CH₄ and CO₂, can 60 61 exert a notable detrimental influence on the final utility of biogas. When upgrading 62 biogas for increased CH₄ purity, the initial focus is typically on eliminating H₂S, given 63 its potential corrosive threat and the need to protect treatment facilities. Subsequently, 64 additional treatment is applied to remove the remaining contaminants in order to obtain 65 a biogas primarily comprising CH₄ and CO₂.

Among the methods available to perform CH₄/CO₂ separation, pressure swing 66 67 adsorption (PSA), which uses adsorbent materials, is gaining in popularity due to its 68 energy efficiency, low operating and installation costs, compact equipment design and user-friendly operation.^[2] CO₂ adsorption has mainly been studied using activated 69 70 carbons (ACs), carbon molecular sieves (CMSs), zeolites and metal-organic 71 frameworks (MOFs). Despite extensive investigation, many adsorbents exhibit limited 72 adsorption capacity or are expensive to produce. Addressing these challenges requires 73 the development of porous materials that are both cost-effective and easy to regenerate, and offer high adsorption capacity and selectivity.^[3] 74

The aim of this study is to identify the most effective adsorbent materials and PSA systems for separating CO_2 from CH_4 . Unlike previous studies that focused on comparing the physicochemical properties, CO_2 and CH_4 uptake, and CO_2/CH_4 selectivity of various adsorbents using manometric equipment at laboratory scale,^[4, 5] this work examines the performance of selected adsorbents tested in PSA conditions. For that purpose, we consider a fundamental operational parameter in PSA systems, adsorption pressure, which is the pressure at which adsorption occurs in the PSA column containing the adsorbent material. Since operating pressure depends on the specific PSA regeneration method, our investigation centers on two distinct adsorption pressures: 5 bar, which is generally the operating pressure for systems undergoing depressurization to atmospheric levels, and 1 bar, representative of the average operating pressure for systems using depressurization to sub-atmospheric levels.

87 In the present study, we use the pure CO₂ and CH₄ adsorption isotherms to conduct 88 simulations and predict their co-adsorption when mixed by employing the IAST (Ideal Adsorbed Solution Theory) method. Then, the estimated amounts of CO₂ and CH₄ 89 90 adsorbed from the gas mixture are used to calculate the equilibrium selectivity and PSA 91 working capacity ratio for each adsorption operating pressure. While existing review 92 articles have already explored the performance of PSA systems for CO₂/CH₄ separation under various operating conditions,^[6-10] our approach transcends the limitations of 93 94 reported data. We employ full mass balances considering flow rates for the inlet, outlet, 95 purge and vent stages. This approach allows us to calculate the CH₄ productivity and the 96 expected energy consumption of the PSA. These two factors are indeed key 97 performance indicators (KPIs) often overlooked by researchers who concentrate solely 98 on assessing the final purity and recovery from the PSA. In this review paper, we will 99 demonstrate that considering these two KPIs, it is possible to select the most optimal 100 operating mode in PSA units.

102 2. Generalities on Biogas Production

103 2.1 Typical Composition and Applications of Biogas

Fossil fuels currently account for over 75% of the world's total energy supply^[11] and 104 105 are the primary source of GHG emissions, the cause of global warming. In order to meet 106 the European Union's (EU) objective of reducing GHG emissions by at least 55% by 2030 and achieving net zero emissions by 2050,^[12] the use of biomethane emerges as a 107 108 promising strategy. Moreover, the EU is currently facing geopolitical challenges 109 associated with natural gas imports, and is striving to reduce its dependence on external 110 suppliers. This underscores the importance of biomethane production, which is 111 anticipated to witness a substantial increase, as shown in Figure 1.

112 [Figure 1 here]

Biomethane is mainly obtained from biogas, from which it needs to be separated. Biogas is a byproduct of the anaerobic decomposition of organic matter, including animal manure, plant debris, food waste, biodegradable parts of municipal waste and sewage sludge. The precise composition of biogas depends on the source of the organic matter undergoing decomposition, as shown in **Table 1**.

118 [**Table 1 here**]

Since CO_2 can account for up to 50 vol.% of biogas composition, and is not combustible, this compound significantly reduces the high heating value (HHV) of biogas (21.5 MJ·Nm⁻³) compared with natural gas (39.8 MJ·Nm⁻³),^[13] which is mainly composed of methane. Upgrading biogas can improve its HHV by up to 30 MJ·Nm⁻³.^[6] Additionally, CO₂ hinders biogas compression, a process commonly employed for its storage.^[14] Other impurities, such as hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) or ammonia (NH_3), can have various adverse effects. H_2S , for instance, is known for its corrosive impact on internal combustion engines, and it can present serious risks to human health. On the other hand, the accumulation of NH_3 is a potential issue in the anaerobic digestion of food waste,^[15] restricting its application in industrial biogas plants. Since a high concentration of NH_3 can lead to a 50% reduction in CH_4 production,^[15] NH_3 is normally treated in the anaerobic digester using nitrification/denitrification techniques.

132 Siloxanes are a common impurity, particularly when biogas is produced from sources 133 such as landfills. When siloxane-containing biogas is burned in an engine, the siloxanes 134 undergo oxidation to form silicon dioxide, which can accumulate on engine components such as spark plugs, valves and turbo compressors.^[16] Finally, the presence of moisture 135 136 can adversely affect the CO₂ adsorption process on zeolites and MOFs during biogas upgrading. However, the influence of moisture on carbon surfaces remains a matter of 137 138 debate, as it has been shown to even improve CO₂ adsorption compared to dry conditions.^[17] Nevertheless, it is crucial to recognize a threshold beyond which the 139 140 presence of water can exert a negative effect on CO₂ adsorption. Studies indicate that when the water content exceeds 1 vol.%,^[18] or relative humidity exceeds 37% in the gas 141 phase,^[19] CO₂ adsorption drops substantially. 142

When biogas is upgraded to a higher CH_4 purity, it is referred to as "renewable natural gas" or "biomethane (Bio- CH_4)" and can be used in a variety of power generation applications, including heat, electricity and fuel, as shown in **Figure 2**. A more detailed comparison of biogas applications can be found elsewhere.^[20, 21] Overall, the conversion of biogas into Bio- CH_4 emerges as a promising route for the production and transportation of sustainable energy, offering a viable alternative to fossil fuels.

149 [Figure 2 here]

150 2.2 Biogas Upgrading

Several methods can be used to upgrade biogas,^[22] and the choice of the method 151 152 depends on several factors, including input composition, desired biogas quality, local 153 market conditions, volume of biogas to be treated, and cost of the upgrading process. 154 Water scrubbing (see Figure 3a) is the most commonly used technology in this respect,^[23] involving around 41% of biogas upgrading plants worldwide.^[22] The process 155 156 involves directing the biogas through a column filled with a water-based scrubbing 157 solution that selectively absorbs impurities. The impure water, containing traces of CH₄, 158 exits the column at the lower end and enters a flash tank whose pressure is lower than 159 the feed pressure, resulting in the release of absorbed impurities. In this tank, the small 160 amount of CH₄ is extracted and reintroduced into the scrubbing column for further 161 purification. The aqueous solution is then directed to a desorption column for 162 regeneration, with continuous recirculation through the column. It is worth noting that 163 water scrubbing requires a large volume of water, a resource that can be scarce in some 164 regions. In addition, the process can produce wastewater, which must be treated before proper disposal. 165

166 An alternative to water scrubbing is chemical absorption (see Figure 3b). Instead of 167 water, a chemical solution such as an amine, is used. The amine solution removes 168 impurities from the biogas, and it becomes saturated at the bottom of the column. After 169 the heat exchanger, the solution passes into the desorption/stripping column, where the 170 temperature is raised to between 100 and 180 °C for regeneration. The solvent saturated 171 with contaminants is then treated to release the absorbed impurities. Besides amines, 172 other alkaline salts such as sodium, potassium and calcium hydroxides can also be used. ^[23] The disadvantages of this method are that, firstly, the solvents used can be toxic to 173 174 humans and the environment and, secondly, a significant amount of energy is required to regenerate the chemical solutions, which can result in an energy expenditure of over
20% of a power plant's total energy production.^[24]

177 Cryogenic separation (see **Figure 3c**) is another technique that involves cooling 178 biogas to very low temperatures to liquefy impurities, enabling their separation from the 179 biogas stream according to their boiling point.^[25] The use of cryogenic separation for 180 biogas upgrading faces several challenges, including high initial investment and 181 operating costs,^[23] which limit the widespread adoption of this technique in industry.

Membrane separation (see **Figure 3d**) is another common method that involves using a semi-permeable membrane, allowing CH_4 to pass through while retaining impurities such as CO_2 and water vapor.^[26] However, this technology has major disadvantages, including the high cost of membranes and their fragility.^[23] Additionally, the economic viability of membrane separation processes has proved difficult for smallscale plants (< 100 Nm³ h⁻¹ biogas flowrate).^[22]

The last method is pressure swing adsorption (PSA) (see **Figure 3e**), which uses adsorbent materials to separate CO_2 and other impurities from the biogas stream. The adsorbent material is regenerated by reducing the pressure, releasing the impurities and leaving a concentrated CH_4 stream.^[6] The popularity of PSA technology in biogas upgrading is growing due to its energy efficiency, low operating and installation costs, compact equipment design and user-friendly operation.^[2]

194 [Figure 3 here]

195 2.3 Use of Sorbents in Biogas Upgrading

196 Nanoporous materials are frequently considered the most suitable for biogas 197 upgrading involving adsorption processes. Research on the removal of H_2S from biogas 198 has primarily concentrated on $ACs^{[27-29]}$ and zeolites.^[30-32] In addition, other adsorbents, including alumina, silica gel, along with ACs^[33–35] and zeolites once more, have been
used to eliminate siloxanes. CO₂, the most common contaminant in biogas streams, has
been mainly studied with ACs, CMSs, MOFs and zeolites (see Tables S1 and S2 in the
Supplementary Information). Table 2 gives an overview of some of the characteristics
of these materials.

ACs are a subject of extensive research due to their remarkable characteristics,
 including a large surface area, high micropore volume and appropriate pore size
 distribution (PSD).^[36] ACs exhibit a relatively low heat of adsorption, translating
 to low energy requirements for regeneration. Additionally, ACs are generally
 cost-effective.^[37]

CMSs, as implied by their name, consist primarily of carbon, and they have demonstrated effectiveness in separating CO₂ from CH₄ due to their small pore size, enabling kinetically preferential adsorption for CO₂. However, their production is expensive, and their performance may be restricted by a low adsorption capacity ^[38] (see Table S2 of the Supplementary Information).

MOFs have recently emerged as a promising class of materials, due to their high surface area and pore volume, which allow efficient gas adsorption and separation. MOFs can be tailored with specific pore sizes and shapes, enabling selective adsorption of CO₂ over CH₄. However, a drawback of MOFs is their relatively low stability under certain conditions, such as high temperatures or humid environments.

Zeolites, as porous crystalline aluminosilicates, exhibit a high selectivity for CO₂
 and possess high CO₂ adsorption capacities (see again Table S2 of the
 Supplementary Information). This can be attributed to their PSD and surface
 chemistry. Additionally, zeolites also have good thermal and chemical stability,

making them durable and suitable for prolonged usage. However, they also have some disadvantages with regard to the substantial adsorption heat of CO_2 , leading to challenges in adsorbent regeneration.^[38]

227 [**Table 2 here**]

228 In the literature, the evaluation of adsorbents typically involves assessing their 229 adsorption equilibrium with pure gases (e.g. CH₄ and CO₂) or conducting breakthrough 230 curve experiments using a synthetic gas mixture that mimics biogas composition (e.g. $CH_4 = 65$ vol. %, $CO_2 = 35\%$ vol. %). When considering the separation of CO_2 and CH_4 231 232 using a PSA process, it is important to consider not only the properties of the adsorbent 233 but also the operational parameters of the PSA unit. Indeed, the adsorption capacity of 234 the adsorbent and the efficiency of the separation process can be influenced by various 235 factors such as feed gas flow rate, pressure, temperature, cycle time, as well as the type 236 and amount of adsorbent used. A recommended approach for selecting an optimal 237 adsorbent/PSA system configuration is to select adsorbents based on equilibrium 238 isotherms and dynamic measurements to identify the most promising candidates. 239 Subsequently, the chosen adsorbent undergoes evaluation in a PSA system to establish a 240 set of baseline performance data. Finally, a reliable numerical model of the PSA process 241 can be validated using experimental PSA data, enabling exploration of additional cycles and operating windows.^[39] 242

243 3. CO₂/CH₄ Separation by Adsorption Processes

244 3.1 Adsorbents for CO₂/CH₄ Separation

The preferential selectivity of the components of a gas mixture for a given adsorbent is the fundamental principle behind adsorption/separation processes. Ideally, a high selectivity is needed, but a large working capacity ratio in the adsorption column is also

desirable as it determines the size and cost of the bed separation system.^[40] In addition 248 249 to the aforementioned selection criteria concerning adsorption and separation 250 performance, various other factors associated with an adsorbent are of significant importance.^[41] These include aspects such as ease of synthesis, density, scalability, 251 252 sustainability, availability, physicochemical stability, cost, hydrophobicity, and toxicity.^[24] The strength of the interaction between adsorbent and adsorbate is 253 254 determined by the adsorption enthalpy. The adsorption enthalpy of CO₂ lies between -25 and -50 kJ mol⁻¹ for physisorption and is below -60 kJ mol⁻¹ for chemisorption. A 255 higher enthalpy in absolute value requires more energy for CO₂ desorption, which 256 increases regeneration costs. However, too low an enthalpy in absolute value results in 257 low CO₂ adsorption capacity.^[41] 258

259 The surface of an adsorbent material attracts gas molecules through a combination of Van der Waals interactions and electrostatic forces from more or less polar or 260 quadrupolar species. CO₂ is a molecule with a quadrupole moment of 13.4×10^{-40} cm², 261 262 whereas CH₄ has no polarity. Due to this significant difference in polarity, the presence 263 of polar functional groups on the adsorbent surface proves highly beneficial in enhancing the selectivity for CO₂.^[42] These interactions vary in strength, enabling 264 265 different substances to be adsorbed to varying extents. Separation of CO₂ based on this kind of electrostatic interactions with the adsorbent is called equilibrium separation.^[41] 266 267 When selectivity results from significant variations in the diffusivity of the different 268 molecules in the micropores, the separation is called kinetic separation.

To identify the optimum adsorbent for selectively capturing CO_2 from biogas streams, various parameters can be considered, including BET area, micropore volume, adsorbent capacity at different CO_2 partial pressures for biogas upgrading, and CO_2/CH_4 selectivity (see again **Table S1** and **Table S2** in the S.I). Porous materials used in 273 CO_2/CH_4 separation by PSA units can be classified into carbonaceous materials such as 274 ACs and CMSs, or other inorganic or hybrid materials such as zeolites or MOFs, 275 respectively, see **Table 3**.

276 [**Table 3 here**]

277 3.1.1 Carbon Adsorbents for CO₂/CH₄ Separation

ACs can be synthesized from a variety of precursors, including coal, char, peat, 278 petroleum coke, lignite, wood and other biomass materials.^[43] Additionally, industrial 279 280 waste can serve as a viable source, provided it contains a high carbon content and minimal levels of inorganic compounds, commonly referred to as ashes.^[44] The 281 282 preparation of ACs involves enriching the raw material with carbon through heat 283 treatment and developing and opening porosity, which corresponds to the activation 284 process itself. There are two primary activation processes: physical activation, which involves carbon dioxide^[36, 37, 44-46] and/or water vapor^[36] as gasifying agents, and 285 286 chemical activation, which involves the use of substances such as phosphoric acid (H₃PO₄),^[47-49] potassium hydroxide (KOH),^[3, 47, 50-53] or potassium carbonate 287 (K_2CO_3) ,^[49, 54] amongst others. 288

289 Physical activation enhances the textural characteristics of the resulting carbon by 290 creating micropores, thereby increasing its adsorption capacity. Furthermore, physical 291 activation can enlarge existing porosity by making micropores wider and introducing 292 some mesoporosity into the carbon structure, which facilitate molecules diffusion within carbon.^[55] Finally, it also facilitates the emergence of oxygenated functional groups, 293 including phenolic, ketonic, and carboxylic groups,^[43] which may enhance carbon 294 295 surface interaction with molecules. Physical activation processes involve progressive 296 carbon gasification, limiting control over micropore size distribution. In contrast,

297 chemical activation methods offer a good alternative, as they enable porosity 298 development to be precisely controlled and modified. Through well-controlled 299 activation conditions, the porosity characteristics of the carbon material can be significantly altered, leading to tailored and optimized PSDs.^[55] Nevertheless, chemical 300 301 activation is often considered detrimental to the environment, given the use of water to 302 dissolve reagents, extract and wash products, separate mixtures, clean reaction apparatus, and disperse products for practical applications.^[44] It is important to 303 304 recognize, however, that the surface area of chemically and physically activated carbons 305 can be influenced by a variety of factors, including the precursor material and other 306 activation conditions.

307 The incorporation of heteroatoms such as nitrogen, phosphorus, and sulfur has been investigated to further enhance the properties of activated carbons.^[53] Nitrogen-308 309 functionalized ACs, in particular, have shown improved CO₂ adsorption capacity and 310 selectivity through mechanisms such as acid-base interactions and hydrogen bonding.^[24] 311 Incorporating heteroatoms, such as nitrogen, into the carbon framework can 312 significantly enhance adsorption efficiency by improving interactions between gas 313 molecules and carbon. Reported nitrogen-doped activated carbons with very high surface areas, exceeding 1400 $\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$, have confirmed the improvement achieved by this 314 approach.^[24, 56] 315

It is feasible to create carbon adsorbents with tightly controlled PSDs in their porous structures. These materials, known as CMSs, possess narrow, uniformly sized micropores that are able to sieve molecules based on their differences in diffusion rate, size and shape.^[57] The CMS production process can be similar to the preparation of ACs, but with an additional step involving pore shrinkage. This is achieved by controlled deposition of carbon obtained by high-temperature cracking of molecules

such as benzene or acetylene.^[40] CMSs can also be produced by controlled pyrolysis of
synthetic polymers such as polyvinylidene chloride, polyimide and phenolformaldehyde resin.^[58] By carefully adjusting the preparation conditions, a highly
homogeneous PSD can be obtained.^[40]

326 CMSs exhibit uniform, slit-shaped pore openings, similar in size to those of small molecules $(N_2, O_2, CO_2 \text{ or } CH_4)$. It is essential for a CMS to possess pore sizes between 327 3.2 and 3.7 Å to ensure the sieving effect,^[6] which implies that small gas molecules pass 328 329 through the narrow channels and pores more easily than larger molecules. For instance, since the CH₄ molecule (3.8 Å) is larger than that of CO₂ (3.3 Å), the latter is more 330 331 adsorbable. The main difference between ACs and CMSs lies in their PSD. ACs exhibit 332 a disordered and widely distributed range of pore sizes, from 0.4 to 4 nm and often extending far beyond this range. This characteristic renders them unsuitable for the 333 334 kinetic separation of gas mixtures, as their broad PSD hampers their kinetically-based selectivity.^[6] CMSs have the potential to facilitate highly effective kinetic separation, 335 336 relying on differences in sorption rates rather than sorption equilibrium. Nonetheless, 337 CMS synthesis requires the modification of the pores of the carbon precursor, involving 338 energy-intensive and complex techniques such as chemical vapor deposition (CVD). 339 Consequently, conventional CMSs may not be suitable for household biogas upgrading systems due to their cost-effectiveness limitations.^[14] 340

341 If ACs exhibit stronger surface interactions with CO_2 , allowing them to adsorb larger 342 quantities of this gas compared to CH_4 , CMSs are kinetic-based adsorbents. CMSs 343 control the diffusion rate thanks to their narrow micropore size, resulting in greater CO_2 344 retention per unit time.^[59] Due to these kinetics restrictions, CMSs use only a fraction of 345 their total adsorption capacity.

346 3.1.2 Other Adsorbents for CO₂/CH₄ Separation

MOFs are produced by the self-assembly of organic ligands consisting of carboxylate, phosphonate, pyridyl and imidazolate or other azolate functional groups and metal oxide clusters (e.g. Cu^{2+} , Mg^{2+} , Al^{3+} , Cr^{3+} or Zn^{2+}),^[60] resulting in the formation of crystalline structures with exceptionally high surface areas and pore volumes. MOFs have a very regular porous structure with adjustable pore sizes and chemical functionalities that can be customized by modifying the metal groups or organic ligands.^[61]

MOFs typically exhibit surface areas exceeding 4000 m²·g⁻¹,^[62] surpassing those 354 observed in conventional porous materials. Within MOFs, CO₂ adsorption is enhanced 355 356 by the metal sites, capable of inducing local electric field effects, thereby increasing the affinity for CO₂ in comparison to CH₄.^[63] Furthermore, strategic functionalization, such 357 358 as incorporating polyamines to introduce CO₂-binding sites through physical means, or 359 integrating carbon nanotubes and chemically decorating them with amine groups have allowed to further increase CO₂ adsorption selectivity over CH₄.^[63] Thus, CO₂-MOF 360 361 interactions can be adjusted through the use of functionalized ligands. Among the 362 functional groups most commonly incorporated into MOF ligands are thiols, carbonyls, carboxyls, cyano groups and amines.^[60] 363

One of the primary drawbacks of MOFs is their limited stability to water at moderate to high temperature,^[64] which can, however, be improved by both post-synthetic modifications and material compounding.^[63] While MOFs have proven effective, their complex preparation methods often make the process uneconomical. It is therefore necessary to develop new, economically viable compounds that can be synthesized by solvent-free reactions or by simple precipitation reactions under ambient conditions.^[60] 370 Among all the MOFs, the most remarkable and cutting-edge one for CO₂ adsorption 371 is a zinc-based one developed at the University of Calgary, known as CALF-20. This 372 MOF exhibits a high capacity for adsorbing CO₂ while also showcasing selectivity over water. CALF-20 demonstrates competitive separations by favoring CO₂ physisorption at 373 374 relative humidity levels below 40%. Computational modeling supports this observation. 375 CALF-20 imposes a low enthalpic regeneration penalty and demonstrates robustness against steam (> 450,000 cycles) and wet acid gases. Notably, its preparation involves a 376 377 single-step process, enabling formation of composite materials, and its synthesis can be scaled up to produce multikilogram batches.^[65] 378

379 MOFs have attracted attention for their remarkable CO₂ adsorption capacities, reaching values as high as 33.5 mol kg⁻¹ at 35 bar. However, for applications such as 380 381 biogas upgrading, good adsorption capacity is best achieved at lower pressures (< 10 382 bar). Indeed, compression up to 35 bar requires more expensive equipment and 383 increases energy costs. MOFs with high adsorption capacity at high pressures are less 384 suited to the lower pressure ranges (< 5 bar), where zeolites generally have higher adsorption capacities.^[41] One area of ongoing research in MOFs is CO₂ diffusion, which 385 has been reported to be poor,^[66] for instance with MIL-53,^[67] where reduced diffusion 386 387 has been attributed to the presence of hydroxy groups within its structure. On the other 388 hand, in another study, it was reported that in the case of MIL-53 there were no significant mass transfer limitations.^[68] 389

390 Zeolites crystalline, microporous are materials composed of hydrated 391 aluminosilicates with a three-dimensional framework structure. They consist of a 392 network of tetrahedra (aluminum, silicon, and oxygen) that create cavities and channels 393 of a uniform size and shape. These materials possess a high surface area and regularly 394 spaced pores, allowing them to selectively adsorb and desorb molecules based on size

and polarity.^[64] Renowned for their molecular sieving capabilities, zeolites possess 395 396 highly selective properties, effectively excluding molecules beyond a critical size and 397 restraining the diffusion of molecules nearing this threshold. This separation 398 mechanism, commonly referred to as steric separation, along with the effects of kinetic separation, offers reliable and predictable gas separation.^[40] Medium- and large-pore 399 400 zeolites achieve equilibrium separation. On the other hand, the selectivity of the 401 separation process in small-pore zeolites is generally affected by the diffusion rate of 402 adsorbates in the pores. Due to its smaller kinetic diameter than CH₄, CO₂ exhibit 403 higher diffusion rates than CH₄ through several small-pore zeolites. This difference may 404 have an impact diffusion through narrow pores more than on the interaction of the 405 molecules with the zeolite surface, particularly in low-Al zeolites.^[41]

The efficiency of zeolites for CO₂ capture also depends on their chemical 406 composition and charge density.^[64] In general, the separation capability improves as the 407 408 electrostatic field in the zeolite cavities intensifies, which is mainly influenced by the 409 charge of the framework and can be altered by the type of charge-compensating cations or the Al content in the zeolite framework.^[69] Zeolite performance is also adversely 410 411 affected by the presence of moisture, which can significantly decrease the amount of CO_2 adsorbed on the zeolite surface. Indeed, moisture can react with adsorbed CO_2 412 molecules to form an adsorbed layer that prevents access to other CO₂ molecules.^[4] 413

414 SAPO-56 (Silicoaluminophosphate-56), ZSM-5 (Zeolite Socony Mobil-5) and 415 Sodalite-based Zeolites, like Na-X and Na-A, among others, have been studied for their 416 potential in CO_2 separation processes due to their versatile pore structures and 417 adsorption properties. The adsorption capacity of zeolite NaX, also called zeolite X, 418 NaX, Linde X and molecular sieve 13X, is among the highest for zeolites (6.3 mmol·g⁻ 419 ¹), and this can be further improved by ion exchange.^[41] However, zeolite NaX strongly 420 interacts with water molecules, to the extent that it is marketed as a desiccant.^[70] When 421 water is adsorbed close to its saturation point, its CO_2 capacity decreases significantly, 422 being an order of magnitude lower compared to dry material.^[71] The working capacities 423 and CO_2/CH_4 selectivities of some of these zeolites, when used in PSA systems, will be 424 examined in the next section.

425 3.2 CO₂/CH₄ Separation by Pressure Swing Adsorption

426 Several types of PSA cycles with distinct advantages and limitations exist, depending 427 on the specific application and gas separation requirements. Given the potential 428 confusion in the nomenclature of different cycles, such as the Vacuum Swing 429 Adsorption process, commonly referred to as VSA or VPSA, we have used the 430 following nomenclature for PSA cycles in the remainder of this article:

- *PSA*: pressure swing adsorption (Skarstrom cycle)
- *VSA*: vacuum swing adsorption (cycle with sub-atmospheric depressurization
 without pressure equalization)
- *EPSA*: equalization pressure swing adsorption (cycle with pressure equalization,
 without sub-atmospheric depressurization)
- *EVSA*: equalization vacuum swing adsorption (cycle with pressure equalization
 and sub-atmospheric depressurization)

Figure 4 illustrates the conventional cycles involved in PSA and the corresponding pressure variations. Specifically, Figure 4a shows the Skarstrom PSA cycle. In the initial phase, bed 2 is pressurized to the adsorption pressure (P_a) with gas feed (CO₂+CH₄), while bed 1 is blowdown to atmospheric pressure. Subsequently, the highpressure feed then flows through bed 2, where the most strongly adsorbed component is retained in the bed. A gas stream enriched with the least strongly adsorbed component exits as effluent at a pressure slightly below that of the feed. Most of the effluent stream

445 is withdrawn as the product, and a fraction is used to purge bed 1 at low operating 446 pressure. The subsequent two steps follow an identical sequence, but with the 447 interchange of beds. Figure 4b also presents the pressure equalization cycle, wherein 448 bed 2 is initially pressurized with gas sourced from the outlet region of bed 1. Following 449 pressure equalization, the two beds are disconnected, and bed 2 undergoes 450 pressurization with feed gas, while bed 1 is vented to complete blowdown. The 451 subsequent phases of the Skarstrom cycle proceed normally, with the exception that 452 during the regeneration phase, bed 2 undergoes partial depressurization by connecting 453 to the previously depressurized bed 1. It should be noted that the pressure equalization 454 step interrupts the feed, and if a continuous feed is required, two additional beds are 455 needed.

456 [Figure 4 here]

In order to select the most suitable adsorbent for PSA operation, several factors are considered, including its gas separation properties under both equilibrium and dynamic conditions, ease of regenerability and operating costs. Two key properties, namely adsorbent selectivity and PSA working capacity ratio, are analyzed in detail as they significantly influence adsorbent efficiency in the PSA process.

462 *3.2.1 Adsorption Selectivity (dimensionless)*

463 The adsorption selectivity (*S*) is defined as follows:

$$S = \frac{X_{CO_2} \cdot Y_{CH_4}}{X_{CH_4} \cdot Y_{CO_2}}$$
()

464 where *X* refers to the molar fraction of a given compound in the adsorbed state, and *Y* is 465 the molar fraction of this compound in the gas phase. The Ideal Adsorption Solution 466 Theory (IAST), introduced by Myers and Prausnitz,^[72] is a tool utilized to predict the 467 adsorption behavior of individual components in a gas mixture. IAST relies on three 468 fundamental assumptions that enable a simplified and accurate representation of 469 complex adsorption phenomena:^[52] a) thermodynamic inertness of the adsorbent, (b) 470 adsorption of the mixture as an ideal solution under given temperature and pressure 471 conditions, and (c) the equivalence of chemical potential for the adsorbed and gas 472 phases.

473 For calculations with this model, the system of equations includes the relationships
474 linking the behavior of molecules in the gas state with their behavior when adsorbed.
475 The relationship between the pure component adsorption isotherms and of the so-called
476 reduced spreading pressure is defined as: ^[73]

$$\frac{\pi A}{RT} = \int_0^{p_i^0} \frac{n_i^0}{p} \, dp \tag{2}$$

477 where π is the spreading pressure, *A* is the surface area, *i* represents the molecule under 478 consideration and p_i^0 is the is the saturated vapour pressure exerted by component *i* in 479 its pure state at the same temperature and spreading pressure of the adsorbed state. ^[74] 480 The term n_i^0 can be calculated by the appropriate pure component isotherm, in this case 481 the Toth isotherm equation:^[72]

$$n_{i}^{0} = n_{i,max} \cdot \frac{f_{i} \cdot p_{i}}{[1 + (f_{i}, p)^{t}]^{\frac{1}{t}}}$$
(3)

482 $n_i^0 \pmod{\text{kg}^{-1}}$ and $n_{i,max} \pmod{\text{kg}^{-1}}$ represent the adsorption capacity of the adsorbent at 483 equilibrium pressure and the maximum adsorption capacity when the adsorbent is fully 484 saturated, respectively, and p (Pa) is the equilibrium pressure. The parameters f and t are 485 specific to adsorbate-adsorbent pairs. The Toth model proved its effectiveness in fitting 486 the experimental data within the specified operating range for most of adsorbents. In 487 some cases, the dual-site Langmuir adsorption model was applied for a better fit. 488 Nevertheless, it has been concluded that the IAST predictions are unaffected by the 489 specific equation chosen for fitting the pure gas isotherms. The crucial criterion is a 490 high-quality alignment between the experimental data of single gas and those calculated 491 using the selected model.^[36]

492 The relationship between the mole fractions in the gas phase and in the adsorbed493 phase is:

$$Y_i.p = X_i.p_i^o \tag{4}$$

494 where Y_i is the mole fraction of component *i* in the gas phase and X_i is the mole fraction 495 of component i in the adsorbed phase. After solving this system of equations, all the 496 molar fractions within the adsorbed phase are calculated. Using the parameters n_i^0 , 497 which are the adsorbed amounts for the pure components for the same pressure range as 498 in the mixture, the total amount adsorbed is determined by:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{X_i}{n_i^0} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i}$$
(5)

The system of equations is then solved by Newton's method using 3P Sim software. The IAST multicomponent adsorption approach was applied to analyze experimental data from a range of adsorbents documented in the literature (see **Tables S1** and **S2** in the Supporting Information).

503 3.2.2 PSA Working capacity ratio (dimensionless)

The PSA working capacity ratio,^[75, 76] represents the ratio of the amount of gas that can be adsorbed and desorbed during a single adsorption-desorption cycle under specific adsorption and desorption operating pressures at a given temperature. For the gas analyzed, comprising CO_2 and CH_4 at given contents (e.g., 35% CO_2 and 65 % CH_4), the mixture adsorption isotherms must be known to determine the amounts adsorbed at each operating pressure, as expressed by the following equation:

$$PSA working \ capacity \ ratio = \frac{CO_2 \ adsorbed \ @ P_a - CO_2 \ adsorbed \ @ P_d}{CH_4 \ adsorbed \ @ P_a - CH_4 \ adsorbed \ @ P_d}$$
(6)

where P_a is the adsorption pressure and P_d the desorption pressure of the PSA cycle. The working capacity ratio and selectivity of adsorbents are common criteria that determine the capital and operating costs of the biogas upgrading process. For instance, a high adsorption working capacity ratio can reduce the amount of adsorbent required by the PSA system.^[39]

515 Adsorption pressure depends on the cycle applied during the process. VSA cycles generally operate at P_a between 1 and 2 bar, with regeneration taking place under 516 517 vacuum. On the other hand, for PSA cycle or any other cycle with regeneration at 518 atmospheric pressure, P_a is generally between 3 and 7 bar. In order to evaluate the cases 519 for regeneration at atmospheric and sub-atmospheric pressure, two hypothetical 520 scenarios were examined: (1) a PSA cycle with $P_a = 5$ bar and $P_d = 1$ bar, and (2) a 521 VSA cycle with $P_a = 1$ bar and $P_d = 0.2$ bar. For the VSA cycle, pure component 522 isotherms from the literature reporting pressures up to 1 bar were analyzed, while 523 experimental isotherms at higher pressures were studied for both VSA and PSA cycles. 524 Both scenarios were run at an operating temperature of approximately 25 °C. The 525 results are presented in Figure 5.

The adsorption isotherms for the binary gas mixture (e.g. 35% CO₂ and 65% CH₄) are lower than those for the pure components, indicating a significant impact of the gas mixture on adsorption performance. This is primarily due to the reduction in partial pressures of the individual components upon mixing. The presence of CO₂, which has a high adsorption propensity, leads to a significant decrease in the adsorption of CH₄, which is relatively poorly adsorbed.^[36]

532 [Figure 5 here]

533 Clearly, zeolites perform the best under both atmospheric and sub-atmospheric depressurization conditions. Zeolites with precisely determined micropores^[40] are much 534 535 more selective than carbonaceous adsorbents. Moreover, zeolites generate an electrostatic force that enhances CO₂ capture.^[77] Although N-doped ACs provide a 536 considerable improvement over other ACs, such as N-WAPC,^[53] which is the second 537 best-performing AC, they are still far from competitive with zeolites. P-AC^[47] is the AC 538 539 that appears to be highly effective and relatively competitive with zeolites. This AC was 540 derived from coconut shells and subjected to chemical activation by impregnation with 541 a phosphoric acid solution. It was then carbonized at a temperature of 600 °C, resulting in a BET area of 1922 $m^2 \cdot g^{-1}$ and a micropore volume of 0.68 cm³ \cdot g^{-1}, which are 542 543 exceptional characteristics that make it a promising candidate. Surprisingly, despite its 544 impressive performance, to the best of our knowledge, there are no studies exploring its 545 potential as an innovative adsorbent for CO₂/CH₄ separation.

546 Zeolites exhibit the highest performance among materials; however, their high heat 547 of adsorption poses a challenge for regeneration, requiring very low sub-atmospheric 548 pressure and increased energy consumption. This drawback of zeolites may create an 549 opportunity for MOFs, which exhibit superior performance compared with ACs and CMSs. The heat of adsorption for CO₂ in MOFs has been reported at -30 kJ·mol⁻¹,^[61] a 550 value similar to that observed for ACs, of around -28 kJ·mol⁻¹,^[45] and is significantly 551 lower in absolute values than that observed in zeolites, which can vary between -42 and 552 -63 kJ·mol⁻¹.^[78] Although CMSs have low selectivity, comparable to that of ACs, their 553 554 driving force for CO_2/CH_4 separation arises not only from adsorption equilibrium but 555 also from adsorption kinetics. Therefore, their performance in adsorption columns is enhanced and competitive, as will be demonstrated in the next section. The data also 556 557 indicate that lower working pressures result in much higher selectivity and working capacity. This is because, at low pressures, the adsorbent material generally has a large number of unoccupied adsorption sites. As the pressure increases, more and more sites become occupied, and the availability of unoccupied sites decreases. This leads to a lower adsorption rate as pressure increases. Consequently, the PSA process would work best at a P_a of around 1 to 2 bar and, due to regeneration requirements, and optimum desorption conditions for this process would require sub-atmospheric pressure.

564 **4. PSA Units for CO₂/CH₄ Separation**

565 4.1 Parameters for PSA Performance Evaluation

566 Most studies on PSA units primarily focus on final purity and recovery, while little 567 attention is paid to productivity and energy consumption. While ensuring that the 568 separated gas meets the required purity specifications is essential, it is equally important 569 to consider the overall efficiency of the process. The productivity and energy 570 consumption of a PSA unit can significantly impact its economic feasibility and 571 sustainability. Therefore, to ensure that PSA units are both cost-effective and 572 environmentally friendly, it is crucial to optimize parameters such as productivity and 573 energy consumption, in addition to purity and recovery. To this end, it is useful to 574 examine the purity-recovery-productivity and purity-recovery-energy consumption 575 curves when comparing different process cycles and adsorbents. These parameters can 576 be obtained or calculated using the information provided in each paper from the 577 literature, using the following equations:

578 **Purity:**
$$CH_4$$
 Purity (%) = $\frac{CH_4 \text{ recovered in the raffinate}}{Total amount of the produced raffinate} \times 100$ (7)

579 **Recovery:**
$$CH_4 Recovery(\%) = \frac{CH_4 recovered in the raffinate}{Total amount of gas feeding the system} \times 100$$
 (8)

580 **Productivity:**
$$Productivity = \frac{CH_4 \text{ recovered in the raffinate}}{Amount of adsorbent * Cycle time}$$
 (9)

581 *Energy consumption:* Most energy consumption in PSA separation processes takes 582 place during the compression stage and blowdown, particularly in the blower 583 (compressor) and vacuum pump. The work needed for adiabatic gas compression from 584 suction pressure, P_1 , to discharge pressure, P_2 , can be calculated using the following 585 equation: ^[59, 79, 80]

$$W_{s} = \dot{n}.R.T.\left(\frac{k}{k-1}\right).\left(\left(\frac{P_{2}}{P_{1}}\right)^{\frac{k-1}{k}} - 1\right).\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right)$$
(1)

where \dot{n} is the molar flow rate (mol·s⁻¹), *R* is the universal gas constant (J·K⁻¹·mol⁻¹), *T* is the temperature of the gas (K), *k* is the heat capacity ratio ($C_p/C_v \approx 1.3$) of the gas mix, and η represents the mechanical efficiency, which is assumed to be 0.8.^[38, 59]

589 4.2 Simulation of PSA systems

590 Effective modelling and simulation of PSA systems is important for optimizing 591 performance and scaling up industrial applications. This involves a dynamic 592 mathematical model that includes the interaction between fluid flow and mass transfer 593 processes. The simulation repeatedly solves the governing equations using numerical 594 integration to determine the time-dependent behaviour of the variables. The governing 595 equations include: mass balance, energy balance and momentum balance equations, 596 moreover the adsorption onto the adsorbent is described by the adsorption isotherms 597 and kinetics. Table 4 summarizes the mathematical models implemented for the 598 simulation of PSA units for CO₂/CH₄ separation to produce high-purity methane.

- 599 [Table 4 here]
- Mass balance equation

All approaches apply the axially dispersed plug flow (ADPF) model to describe
 the fluid flow as presented in Eq. 11. ^[40]

$$-D_L \frac{\partial^2 c_i}{\partial Z^2} + \frac{\partial}{\partial Z} (vc_i) + \frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} + \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial \overline{q_i}}{\partial t} = 0$$
(11)

603 where D_L is the axial dispersion coefficient, c_i is the concentration of the component *i* in 604 the gas phase, Z is the axial position along the column, v is the gas superficial velocity, tis the time, ε is the bed porosity and \overline{q}_{i} is the average concentration of adsorbed 605 606 component *i*. Fluid flow through a packed bed tends to cause axial mixing, which reduces separation efficiency, making its minimization a key design objective. ^[40] Two 607 608 main mechanisms contribute to axial dispersion: molecular diffusion and turbulent 609 mixing resulting from the splitting and recombination of flows around the adsorbent particles.^[81] The ADPF model combines these mechanisms into a single effective axial 610 611 dispersion coefficient (D_L) . More detailed models, including radial dispersion, are 612 generally unnecessary and when mass transfer resistance is significantly greater than 613 axial dispersion, it can be ignored, assuming ideal plug flow (IPF). This IPF assumption 614 has been applied in some PSA separation processes, such as CH_4 enrichment in CH_4/N_2 mixtures, ^[82] high-purity N₂ production from air, ^[83] and H₂ production by methane 615 steam reforming.^[84] Although in some small-scale lab systems, the axial dispersion of 616 617 the flow can be neglected, when numerically solving the system of partial differential 618 equations, it is easier to use the ADPF model as the inclusion of the axial dispersion 619 term eliminates discontinuities in the slope of the concentration profile.^[40]

The ADPF model is preferred to the ideal plug flow model for its realistic dispersion, its better prediction of the breakthrough curve, its consideration of non-ideal column packing, its accurate resistance to mass transfer, and its suitability to scale up from laboratory to industry. The ADPF model does not take radial variations into account, resulting in a 1-dimensional model, which also facilitates its numerical solution.^[85] For these reasons, the ADPF model has consistently been used for CH_4/CO_2 separation simulation.

• Equilibrium isotherm

In all simulation studies, the multisite Langmuir model (MLM), presented in Eq. 12, which is the simplest model for describing multicomponent adsorption, ^[72] has been used to predict the mixture isotherm. This model is preferred to the IAST equations as it offers explicit expressions for the adsorbed phase concentrations, thus eliminating the need for iteration during simulation. In contrast, the more accurate IAST equations are implicit and require an iterative subroutine to determine the composition of the adsorbed phase at equilibrium, which increases computation time.

$$\frac{q_i}{q_{si}} = \frac{1 + b_i P_i}{1 + b_i P_i + b_j P_j}$$
(12)

where q_i is the amount of component *i* adsorbed per unit mass of adsorbent, q_{si} is the saturation capacity of the adsorbent for component *i*, b_i is the Langmuir adsorption equilibrium constant and P_i is the partial pressure of the component *i* in the gas phase. Additionally, if the MLM does not fit well, as can occur at CO₂ concentrations above 39%,^[86] the Extended Langmuir-Freundlich equation (see Eq. 13)^[81] can be employed as an alternative. This model introduces a power expression, m, making it effective for correlating binary equilibrium data in simulation studies.

$$\frac{q_i}{q_{si}} = \frac{1 + b_i P_i^{m_i}}{1 + b_i P_i^{m_i} + b_j P_j^{m_j}}$$
(13)

642

• Rate of adsorption

Instantaneous equilibrium in an adsorption bed can only be assumed if all mass transfer resistances are negligible. Since this is rarely the case, a specific rate expression must be used to calculate the adsorbed amount (\bar{q}_i). The resistances to adsorption are interparticle transport (external to the particles), which occurs in series with intraparticle transport (within the particles), ^[87] so the mass flow from fluid to solid is modelled requiring a method to determine the mass transfer coefficient. Pore diffusion models have been used to simulate PSA systems, ^[88] but the simpler and faster linear driving
force (LDF) model is more commonly applied, as seen in several cases in this work ^[68, 651]
^{86, 89–93]} and presented in Eq. 14:

$$\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} = k_i (q_i^* - q_i) \tag{14}$$

where k_i is the rate constant for adsorption of component *i*, q_i^* is the amount adsorbed at equilibrium under current conditions and q_i is the amount currently adsorbed.

A bi-LDF model ^[94] has also been proposed to approximate mass transfer resistance in macropores and micropores using linear models. ^[59, 95–97] For macropores, which involve both Knudsen and molecular diffusion, an effective LDF rate constant is employed to combine transport through the external fluid film and within the macropores, as presented in Eq. 15:

$$\mathcal{E}_{p}\frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial t} + \rho_{p}\frac{\partial q_{i}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{E}_{p}\frac{15D_{pa,i}}{\left(R_{p}\right)^{2}} \times \frac{Bi_{i}}{Bi_{i}+1}(C_{i}-c_{i})$$
(15)

where \mathcal{E}_p is the particle porosity, ρ_p is the particle density, $D_{pa,i}$ is the macropore diffusivity of component *i*, Bi_i , is the Biot number of the component *i*, which represents the ratio of the internal resistance of the macropores to the resistance of the external film, C_i is the gas concentration of component *i* and c_i is the average concentration in the macropores for component *i*.

664 In the micropores, the Darken equation is used to account for the concentration 665 dependence of micropore diffusivity.

$$\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} = \frac{15D_{p,i}}{(R_c)^2} \left(q_i^* - q_i \right) \tag{16}$$

where $D_{p,i}$ is the micropore diffusivity of component *i*, also called "crystal diffusivity" in the case of zeolites. ^[94] When separation is governed by equilibrium rather than kinetics, mass transfer resistance does not affect the process significantly and the spread of the mass transfer zone along the adsorption column is mainly due to axial dispersion.

670 • G

• Gas phase behaviour

671 The behaviour of bulk gas is modelled in most of cases using the ideal gas law, except in the work of De Witte et al.^[92], where the Peng-Robinson equation, was 672 applied and in the study of Grande et al., where experiments at pressures as high as 80 673 bar where conducted. ^[95] In this high-pressure case, the Benedict-Webb-Rubin (BWR) 674 675 equation was employed to account for deviations from ideal gas behaviour. The 676 assumption of the ideal gas law, where the compressibility factor (z) is equal to 1, can 677 lead to inaccuracies in modelling, particularly at high pressures and low temperatures. 678 To illustrate the impact of operating conditions on CO_2/CH_4 separation, Figure 6 shows 679 the variation in the compressibility factor (z) from the ideal gas assumption. In Fig. 6, 1 680 - z, is calculated using the NIST Reference Fluid Thermodynamic and Transport Properties Database (REFPROP-version 10.0).^[98] 681

682 [Figure 6 here]

683 At a common operating pressure of 10 bar and a temperature of 25 °C, the 684 compressibility factor for CO₂ is 0.95, resulting in a delta z of 0.05. For CH₄, z = 0.98, 685 i.e., delta z = 0.02. The impact is greater for CO₂ rather than for CH₄, whose gaseous 686 behaviour is closer to ideal conditions. Even at this moderate pressure (10 bar), 687 neglecting deviations from ideal gas behaviour can lead to inaccuracies in the system 688 model. For example, at 50 bar and 25 °C, the delta z for CO_2 is 0.68, indicating that 689 32% of the value calculated for the bulk gas CO₂ would be incorrect if ideal gas 690 assumptions were used. Due to the exothermic nature of the adsorption process, the temperature can increase by up to 100 °C during the latter part of the adsorption step,^[59] 691 692 but the largest deviations from ideal gas assumptions occur at low temperatures.

693 • Tem

Temperature dependence

The main difference between the models is whether local thermal equilibrium
(LTE) ^[86, 89, 95] is assumed or not (No LTE).^[59, 68, 90, 91, 96, 97] LTE assumes that the gas
and the solid adsorbent temperatures are equal at all points and all times.

697 Assuming that the process is isothermal greatly simplifies the design equations. It 698 eliminates the need for heat balance equations, and removes temperature dependencies for physical properties, fluid velocities and adsorption equilibria.^[72] Except when the 699 700 concentration of the adsorbable component is low and the heat of adsorption is small, 701 which is not the case for CO_2/CH_4 separation, it is often difficult to obtain a very good approximation of isothermal operation, even in a small column.^[40] The model of an 702 703 isothermal particle in which all resistance to mass transfer is due to intraparticle 704 diffusion, while resistance to heat transfer is confined to the external film, therefore appears to be a realistic representation for most conditions of practical importance.^[40] 705

The temperature evolution of the PSA system is obtained by applying an energy balance in the packed-bed column. PSA processes involve cyclic adsorption and desorption, which are exothermic and endothermic, respectively. The energy balance is the rate of change in internal energy of a packed bed element and adsorbent particle over time *t*. Thus, when the process is not considered to be isothermal (no local thermal equilibrium), the heat balance of the fluid phase and the heat transfer rate can be expressed respectively as follows: ^[74]

$$\frac{\partial T_f}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial T_f}{\partial Z} + \frac{c_s}{c_f} \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial T_s}{\partial t} + \frac{\Delta H}{c_f} \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \frac{\partial \overline{q_i}}{\partial t} = 0$$
(15)

$$\frac{\partial T_s}{\partial t} = ha \left(T_f - T_s \right) - \frac{\Delta H}{c_s} \frac{\partial \overline{q_i}}{\partial t}$$
(16)

where $T_{\rm f}$ is the fluid temperature, v is the gas superficial velocity, Z is the axial position along the column, ε is the bed porosity, $T_{\rm s}$ is the solid temperature, $c_{\rm s}$ is the specific heat capacity of the solid, c_f is the specific heat capacity of the fluid, ΔH is the heat of adsorption, \overline{q}_i is the average concentration of adsorbed component *i*, *h* is the heat transfer coefficient between fluid and particle and *a* is specific surface area available for heat transfer.

• Momentum balance

The momentum balance accounts for the forces acting on the fluid as it flows through the packed bed, which include friction between the fluid and the particle surface, as well as resistance caused by bed geometry and voids. This resistance results in a pressure drop, which depends on particle size, fluid velocity and bed dimensions. Pressure drop $\partial P/\partial Z$ in the column is generally modelled using the hydrodynamics of flow in porous media. This is usually described by the Ergun equation, which accounts for non-linear and turbulent flows: ^[74]

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial Z} = 3.5 + 300 \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{Re}\right) \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon^3}\right) \frac{\dot{m}^2}{2d_p \rho}$$
(17)

where *Re* is the Reynold number, \dot{m} is the mass flow rate, d_p is particle diameter and ρ is the fluid density.

• Numerical solution

730 The resulting mathematical model consists of a set of partial differential equations (PDEs), which exhibit steep fronts and non-linear behaviour,^[99] presenting sharp 731 732 changes in solution values that are difficult to predict accurately in numerical 733 simulation. This complex system of mathematical equations is usually solved by commercial software such as Aspen^[90-92] and gPROMS,^[59, 68, 95-97] which incorporate 734 735 numerical solution techniques for spatial discretization methods such as finite differences^[59, 95, 96] or orthogonal collocation.^[68, 86, 97] Finite-difference techniques^[100] 736 737 involve discretization of the spatial and time domain to convert PDEs into a set of linear 738 and nonlinear algebraic equations, which can then be solved by Gaussian elimination for linear algebraic equations and Newton's method for nonlinear algebraic equations. 739

^[40] The orthogonal collocation method approximates the solution using a set of basic 740 741 functions, such as polynomials, evaluated at specific collocation points. This method 742 differs from finite difference methods in that the solution is represented as a continuous or piecewise continuous function.^[101] The orthogonal collocation method significantly 743 744 reduces the number of discretized equations due to the lower number of internal points, resulting in rapid convergence.^[89] One of the limitations of these methods is that solving 745 746 the large set of PDEs does not ensure a real-valued solution, and the Newton solver may fail when confronted with the steep fronts that are typical of PSA separation.^[99] 747

748 One of the normal shortcomings of the simulation process is the difficulty of achieving cycle steady state (CSS), which depends on the convergence towards 749 750 consistent values of performance indicators such as CH₄ purity and recovery. Generally 751 speaking, performance indicators should not vary by more than 1% or, in the most 752 stringent cases, 0.1%. PSA cycles involving additional steps such as the inclusion of 753 pressure equalizers or more than one adsorbent layer in the bed may pose more 754 difficulties in achieving CSS, as there are more interactions, non-linear behaviours and 755 more extensive range of system conditions. A basic Skarstrom cycle with a zeolite as adsorbent was reported to reach CSS after only 5 cycles,^[86] on the other hand, PSA 756 cycles with pressure equalization reach CSS after 70 cycles for a zeolite.^[59, 96] Examples 757 758 of acceleration schemes for CSS iterations are extrapolators in the quasi-linear convergence region and the recursive projection method of Shroff and Keller.^[99] 759

Achieving CSS is important for correctly evaluating the performance of a PSA process, which is essential for optimizing its operating conditions and design parameters. The optimization process can be based on adjusting or improving parameters such as maximizing CH_4 recovery and purity, or reducing energy consumption for a desired CH_4 purity, for instance. The variables modified are normally

765 cycle design, operating conditions and adsorbent properties. The literature describes some optimization methods for PSA systems.^[99, 102–104] In the context of CO₂/CH₄ 766 767 separation, the Response Surface Methodology (RSM) was investigated to achieve maximum CH₄ purity and recovery with MOF Uio-66 as adsorbent.^[91] The results 768 769 showed that the UiO-66 adsorbent achieved optimized CH₄ purity of 99.99%, recovery of 99.99% and productivity of 8.57 mol kg⁻¹ h^{-1} by varying the operating temperature 770 771 and bed length/diameter ratio. In another study, a full factorial design method and 772 analysis of variance (ANOVA) test were used to investigate the effects of various factors on CH₄ purity and recovery.^[75] All factors were shown to significantly influence 773 774 purity, with purge pressure being the most significant factor, followed by vacuum level. 775 For CH₄ recovery, the ANOVA test revealed that feed pressure and adsorption stage 776 duration were the most significant factors, while purge stage duration and vacuum level 777 had less effect.

778 An optimization method was proposed to maximize CH₄ recovery while maintaining a specified CH₄ purity of 99% by adjusting the CH₄ composition in the feed gas.^[105] 779 780 The Sequential Quadratic Programming Descent solver was chosen due to its ability to 781 handle discrete changes in boundaries and equations. The conclusion drawn from the 782 analysis of the impact of feed gas composition is that increasing the CH_4 content in the 783 feed gas improves CH₄ recovery. This result is logical, as a higher CH₄ content 784 simplifies the PSA process, reducing the volume of CO₂ that needs to be separated and 785 purged. This efficiency can reduce energy consumption and improve overall process 786 economics.

787 4.3 PSA Performance Evaluation

Tables 5, 6 and 7 provide information on various operating parameters for different PSA units that have been reported in the literature. **Table 5** focuses specifically on data from single-column studies. Conversely, **Tables 6** and **7** present information related to multi-column systems, where **Table 5** shows experimental data, and **Table 6** presents simulation results.

793 [**Table 5 here**]

794 [**Table 6 here**]

795 [**Table 7 here**]

Concerning the performance of the process, **Figure 7** shows purity-recoveryproductivity-energy consumption plots for CO_2/CH_4 separation by EVSA and VSA. In general, the literature presents numerous examples of processes demonstrating a tradeoff between higher purity and lower recovery, or vice versa. In this work, the data presented from each study were based on the authors' own criteria to select the best result with the aim of achieving the optimum balance between recovery and purity, with an emphasis on purities above 95%.

The presented operating parameters include cycle type, cycle steps, type of adsorbent used, CO_2/CH_4 feed gas ratio, P_a and P_d , CH_4 purity and recovery percentages, productivity in terms of mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹, and energy consumption in kWh mol_{CH4}^{-1} . Using mass balances that consider the gas feed to the PSA system, as well as the separation of CO_2 and CH_4 in the production, purge, and blowdown streams, we conducted calculations to assess the productivity and energy consumption of various studies based on the provided data. For the calculation of the biogas compression stage to reach the feed or adsorption pressure in the PSA (Eq. 10), we assumed that the gas would be available at a pressure of 1 bar, as biogas is usually produced at close to atmospheric pressure from a biogas digester. In addition, the blowdown process was assumed to start at atmospheric pressure and proceed down to the desired subatmospheric pressure. Furthermore, in cases where precise information regarding the quantity of raffinate used to purge the columns was not available, it was assumed that 10% of the overall production was allocated for this purpose.

817 The results of the studies are representative of real-world scenarios where the CO_2 818 content in the feed gas stream can vary from around 20 to 50%. At the laboratory scale, 819 the design of PSA units is highly adaptable, allowing the use of single-column configurations,^[68, 106–109] as presented in **Table 5**. However, the use of a single column 820 821 in the cycle is not an accurate representation of the actual PSA process, as it cannot be continuously fed and sometimes requires purging with pure CH₄.^[59] Although it can still 822 823 serve as a valuable tool for validating numerical models of the PSA process and provide 824 valuable data for exploring alternative cycles, on an industrial scale, the PSA unit 825 comprises multiple columns operating in parallel, including configurations with two, 826 three or more columns. Apart from the fact that the gas feed is not continuous, a single 827 column does not allow incorporation of the pressure equalization step, which was the first improvement to the original Skarstrom's cycle introduced by Berlin in 1967.^[40, 110] 828 829 This pressure equalization step can indeed significantly improve CH₄ recovery.

Generally, the most commonly used adsorbent to capture CO_2 in PSA units is either a CMS,^[79, 111, 112] for which it is worth recalling that its selectivity is mainly driven by kinetic factors, or a zeolite,^[39, 59, 75, 79] whose selectivity is mainly determined by both thermodynamic equilibrium and kinetic aspects. Although ACs and MOFs^[68] are potential adsorbents, they are less frequently used due to their lower selectivity and relatively recent stage of development, as well as high production cost, respectively. While MOFs offer promising opportunities for CO_2 capture, exhibiting higher CO_2/CH_4 selectivity and PSA working capacity ratio, further research is necessary to fully explore their potential in this application.

839 The sub-atmospheric blowdown regeneration method is widely used in most cycles, 840 indicating that adsorbed CO_2 cannot be easily regenerated by simple atmospheric 841 depressurization. However, in the only experimental multi-column example where the columns were regenerated at atmospheric pressure,^[111] a low CH₄ recovery of 71 % was 842 843 achieved, resulting in relatively low productivity. This low recovery can be attributed to 844 a high amount of CH₄ that is part of the raffinate produced and used in the regeneration 845 process as purge. Similarly, the two single-bed studies that used atmospheric pressure depressurization also resulted in very low recoveries and productivities.^[68, 108] Although 846 atmospheric depressurization results in low energy consumption due to the absence of a 847 848 vacuum pump, the normalized energy consumption per amount of CH₄ produced is 849 higher than in many VSA or EVSA studies.

850 [Figure 7 here]

851 The introduction of pressure equalization (see Figure 7a) in the VSA cycle (see 852 Figure 7b) offers significant improvements in recovery, productivity and energy consumption.^[33, 68, 87, 112, 113, 120] For instance, in an EVSA cycle, the optimal PSA-853 854 adsorbent configuration (see green line in Figure 7a) achieved a productivity of 15.6 mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹ with an energy consumption of 0.0039 kWh mol_{CH4} ⁻¹.^[79] Conversely, in 855 856 the VSA cycle, the most favorable scenario (see green line in Figure 7b) achieved a productivity of 12.8 mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹ and an energy consumption of 0.0044 kWh mol_{CH4} 857 1 [39] 858

859 Recovery is improved by ensuring that the adsorption and desorption phases are 860 carried out evenly across all the adsorbent beds, ensuring full utilization of the beds and 861 maximizing the recovery of the target component. Without pressure equalization, gas 862 flow may be unevenly distributed across the adsorbent beds, leading to preferential 863 adsorption and desorption in certain sections of the beds. Moreover, by equalizing the 864 pressure between the two adsorption columns, the energy derived from the compressed 865 gas in the high-pressure bed is used to partially pressurize the low-pressure bed. Due to 866 the partial depletion of the strongly adsorbed species in this gas, the work of separation 867 is conserved, resulting in energy savings. This process effectively reduces blowdown losses by about 50%, thus enhancing the recovery of the raffinate product.^[40] 868 869 Additionally, maximizing the recovery of CH₄ is of highest importance due to its greenhouse effect, which is even more potent than that of CO_2 and contributes to global 870 871 warming. It is indeed remarkable that the warming potential of CH₄ is 21 times greater than that of CO₂.^[59] 872

Typically, the duration of a 2-bed adsorption cycle ranges between 150 s to 400 s.^[38, 39, 75, 79, 86] However, for scenarios involving more than two beds, additional tanks, or simulations of industrial scale systems,^[68, 93, 112] the cycle time can increase significantly, exceeding 1000 s. The duration of the cycle should be sufficient to ensure effective gas adsorption when using adsorbents with high equilibrium adsorption capacity, while fast-adsorbing adsorbents require a shorter cycle time to facilitate fast kinetic adsorption.

Optimum productivity was achieved by maintaining low adsorption pressures, specifically 2 atm or less.^[39, 79] Notably, the most effective desorption pressure for regenerating the bed was 0.1 atm. Although such a minimal desorption pressure requires considerable energy consumption on the part of the vacuum pump, this approach

demonstrates low energy consumption per mole of CH₄ produced. In other words, despite the high energy requirements, the substantial CH₄ production outweighs the energy consumption, making this operational method advantageous. An effective way to further improve the system and reduce energy consumption is to reduce P_a or increase the sub-atmospheric P_d , which is usually 0.1 atm. Increasing P_d to 0.2 or 0.3 atm could result in significant savings.

890 Remarkably, different performances can be achieved within the same family of 891 materials, even if the corresponding materials exhibit similar selectivity and PSA working capacity ratio properties. For instance, NaUSY zeolite,^[79] which demonstrated 892 893 the highest productivity and lowest energy consumption (see the green line "best" in 894 Figure 7a), was used in a purge-free EVSA cycle and exhibited a selectivity and PSA working capacity ratio of 50 and 30, respectively. In contrast, zeolite 13X^[59] was 895 896 employed in an EVSA cycle with purge and exhibited a selectivity and PSA working 897 capacity ratio of 58 and 26, respectively. Both cycles achieved purities in excess of 898 99%, but the EVSA cycle without purge resulted in more than doubling the productivity 899 and a reduction in energy consumption to less than half. Consequently, it would be 900 advantageous to eliminate purging by regenerating the bed at very low vacuum pressure 901 (0.1 atm).

The performance evaluation of the MOF MIL- $53^{[68]}$ as an adsorbent for CO₂/CH₄ separation differs from other cases because the objective is to produce both CH₄ and CO₂ at high purity. It has been found that achieving these levels of purity and recovery comes at the expense of high energy consumption. This high energy consumption arises from the fact that an additional step is required to pressurize and adsorb the effluent from column regeneration. Moreover, the productivity in terms of CH₄ production was observed to be very low (2.1 mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹). This low productivity could be attributed

909 to the adsorbent's low CO₂/CH₄ selectivity of 4 at 4 bar, which is significantly lower 910 than the selectivity of zeolites, typically around 50. Nevertheless, a new process 911 configuration has been proposed, ^[115] using zeolite 5A with two PSA units, each 912 containing four beds. In this setup, the second unit processes the off-gas from the first 913 unit, which has separated the CO_2 from the residual gas stream. The residual stream is 914 then recycled back to the first unit, improving CH₄ recovery. Final results showed CH₄ purity and recovery of 99.4% and 99.0%, respectively, with modest energy consumption 915 of 0.0056 kWh mol_{CH4}^{-1} and productivity of 8.2 mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹. In addition, the system 916 917 produced CO₂ with a purity of 99.1%. This process represents a promising alternative 918 for achieving high CH₄ recovery and purity, while also producing high-purity CO₂.

919 CMSs enable faster diffusion of CO₂, reducing adsorption time and increasing 920 productivity. However, CMSs have a significantly lower PSA working capacity ratio 921 than zeolites. Furthermore, the use of CMSs involves the utilization of only a fraction of the overall equilibrium capacity, leading to a reduction in productivity.^[109] Zeolites 922 923 possess steeper isotherms and high CO₂ adsorption enthalpy, necessitating high vacuum 924 conditions for bed regeneration. Conversely, CO₂ isotherms in CMSs are less steep, allowing vacuum desorption at relatively higher pressures.^[38] Although column 925 regeneration at atmospheric pressure has been achieved for CMSs,^[111] it resulted in 926 927 lower recovery and productivity. Despite this, CMS regeneration has been carried out at low vacuum pressures of 0.1-0.3 atm.^[87, 109, 120] Among these processes, the EVSA 928 process without purge^[79] stands out as the most optimal for CMS, offering a 929 productivity of 11.3 mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹. This value is slightly lower than the productivity of 930 the best zeolite system, which is 15.6 mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹, indicating that the higher working 931 932 capacity ratio of PSA in zeolites may be more advantageous than the fast diffusion 933 process of CMSs. Additionally, the energy consumption of the two systems is similar,

0.0038 and 0.0039 kWh mol_{CH4}^{-1} , respectively. Overall, CMSs can offer comparable 934 935 performance to zeolites. To address the issue of low utilization of equilibrium capacity in kinetic-selective adsorbents, Grande and Rodrigues^[38] introduced a mixed layer of 936 937 CMS and zeolite at the end of the column. By implementing this approach, they were 938 able to achieve a substantial increase in productivity compared with a process relying 939 solely on CMSs as adsorbent. This improvement was mainly attributed to the ability to 940 process a larger amount of feed, as the column retained more CO₂ while retaining the 941 same dimensions.

942 Most studies do not consider the use of ACs, due to their perceived lack of CO₂/CH₄ 943 selectivity. Nevertheless, these materials offer several potential advantages, including a 944 reduced environmental impact and uncontrolled waste disposal, lower emissions during 945 their production and the possibility of establishing a circular economy and achieving lower carbon emissions compared with other CO₂ capture methods.^[108] Unfortunately, 946 947 to our knowledge, there are no multi-column experimental studies on ACs. 948 Furthermore, none of the AC producers offers a commercially available AC specifically 949 designed for CO_2/CH_4 gas separation.

950 To design an efficient adsorbent/pressure swing adsorption (PSA) system for gas 951 separation, the first priority is to select a material with high CO₂/CH₄ selectivity. 952 Ideally, selectivity should be over 50 at a pressure of 1 bar, unless the material operates 953 on a kinetic basis, such as CMS. The PSA working capacity ratio, based on expected 954 operating pressures, should ideally also be greater than 50. When tested in lab-scale PSA systems, at the desired CH₄ purity, productivity in excess of 8 mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹ is 955 956 generally acceptable, with the best-performing systems in the literature reporting values above 11 mol_{CH4} kg⁻¹ h⁻¹. In terms of energy efficiency, an energy consumption of 957 958 0.0060 kWh mol⁻¹ CH₄ represents an upper limit for acceptable operation, while the

959 optimum range is typically between 0.0030 and 0.0040 kWh mol⁻¹ CH₄. These 960 benchmarks are essential to ensure that the PSA system is not only productive, but also 961 energy-efficient, balancing both performance and sustainability.

962 **5. Conclusions**

963 In this comprehensive review, various adsorbents were compared based on their 964 selectivity for CO₂/CH₄ adsorption and their working capacity ratio in pressure swing 965 adsorption (PSA) for biogas upgrading. Zeolites exhibit significantly higher equilibrium 966 selectivity, making them favorable for PSA units. While metal-organic frameworks 967 (MOFs) may be an alternative, further research is needed for practical PSA application. 968 Carbon molecular sieves (CMSs), despite lacking high equilibrium selectivity, are 969 excellent PSA candidates due to exceptional kinetic selectivity, comparable to zeolites. 970 Activated carbons (ACs), with lower selectivity, offer sustainability and cost-971 effectiveness. Despite extensive research, integrating results into real multi-column PSA 972 systems is lacking. To foster global research efforts, the development of highly selective 973 materials for CO₂ over CH₄ is crucial for global PSA process optimization.

974 The simulation of PSA systems was examined by comparing dynamic modeling 975 from literature. All the studies utilize the axially dispersed plug flow model for 976 describing fluid flow and they use the Multicomponent Langmuir isotherm and the 977 Linear Driving Force model for equilibrium and mass transfer kinetics. Ideal gas 978 behavior is assumed, although deviations at high pressures are accounted with equations 979 of state. Achieving cycle steady state is essential for evaluating PSA performance, with 980 optimization methods often focusing on maximizing CH_4 recovery and purity or 981 reducing energy consumption.

982 A comparative analysis of PSA unit operations was conducted, integrating various 983 performance parameters such as purity, recovery, productivity, and energy 984 consumption. The study revealed that, while obtaining high-purity CH₄ was relatively 985 straightforward using various adsorbents or cycles, it is crucial to consider productivity 986 and energy consumption, as these factors have a direct impact on the competitiveness 987 and sustainability of the process. According to these results, we can assert that the most 988 optimal approach for achieving high purity and productivity with low energy 989 consumption is the cycle involving pressure equalization and sub-atmospheric 990 regeneration with either zeolites or CMSs.

991 **6. Funding details**

992 This research was funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR) through

993 the "CarBioLab" project, as part of the LabCom "Joint Laboratories" program, 2021

edition. This work has also been partially supported by project no ANR-22-PESP-0007,

995 CATALPA project as part of the PEPR SPLEEN, from the French National Research

996 Agency (ANR) (France 2030).

997 7. Disclosure statement

998 The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

999 8. References

- 1000 [1] Chen, X. Y.; Vinh-Thang, H.; Ramirez, A. A.; Rodrigue, D.; Kaliaguine, S.
 1001 Membrane Gas Separation Technologies for Biogas Upgrading. *RSC Adv.*, 2015, 5
 1002 (31), 24399–24448. https://doi.org/10.1039/C5RA00666J.
- Abd, A. A.; Othman, M. R.; Shabbani, H. J. K.; Helwani, Z. Biomethane
 Upgrading to Transportation Fuel Quality Using Spent Coffee for Carbon Dioxide
 Capture in Pressure Swing Adsorption. *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*, 2022, *10* (2), 107169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2022.107169.

- [3] Zhang, Y.; Zhang, P.; Yu, W.; Wang, J.; Deng, Q.; Yang, J.; Zeng, Z.; Xu, M.;
 Deng, S. Facile and Controllable Preparation of Ultramicroporous BiomassDerived Carbons and Application on Selective Adsorption of Gas-Mixtures. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2018, 57 (42), 14191–14201.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jecr.8b02139
- 1011 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.8b02139.
- [4] Abd, A. A.; Naji, S. Z.; Hashim, A. S.; Othman, M. R. Carbon Dioxide Removal through Physical Adsorption Using Carbonaceous and Non-Carbonaceous Adsorbents: A Review. *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*, 2020, 8
- 1015 (5), 104142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2020.104142.
- 1016 [5] Aghel, B.; Behaein, S.; Alobaid, F. CO2 Capture from Biogas by Biomass-Based
 1017 Adsorbents: A Review. *Fuel*, 2022, 328, 125276.
- 1018 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2022.125276.
- 1019 [6] Bahrun, M. H. V.; Bono, A.; Othman, N.; Zaini, M. A. A. Carbon Dioxide
 1020 Removal from Biogas through Pressure Swing Adsorption A Review. *Chemical*1021 *Engineering Research and Design*, 2022, 183, 285–306.
 1022 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2022.05.012.
- 1023 [7] Abd, A. A.; Othman, M. R.; Naji, S. Z.; Hashim, A. S. Methane Enrichment in 1024 Biogas Mixture Using Pressure Swing Adsorption: Process Fundamental and 1025 Design Parameters. *Materials Today Sustainability*, **2021**, *11–12*, 100063.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtsust.2021.100063.
- 1027 [8] Shah, G.; Ahmad, E.; Pant, K. K.; Vijay, V. K. Comprehending the Contemporary
 1028 State of Art in Biogas Enrichment and CO2 Capture Technologies via Swing
 1029 Adsorption. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2021, 46 (9), 6588–6612.
 1030 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2020.11.116.
- 1031 [9] Grande, C. A. Biogas Upgrading by Pressure Swing Adsorption. In *Biofuel's Engineering Process Technology*; 2011.
- [10] Hosseini, S. S.; Denayer, J. F. M. Biogas Upgrading by Adsorption Processes:
 Mathematical Modeling, Simulation and Optimization Approach A Review. *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*, 2022, *10* (3), 107483.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2022.107483.
- 1037 [11] INTERNATIONAL ENERGY AGENCY. *Key World Energy Statistics 2021*;
 1038 Statistics; 2021; p 6.
- 1039 [12] A European Green Deal https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and 1040 policy/priorities-2019-2024/european-green-deal_en (accessed Dec 13, 2022).
- 1041 [13] How much energy in biogas Inoplex https://inoplex.com.au/information/how-1042 much-energy-is-in-biogas/ (accessed Dec 13, 2022).
- [14] Seo, D.-J.; Gou, Z.; Fujita, H.; Fujii, T.; Sakoda, A. Simple Fabrication of
 Molecular Sieving Carbon for Biogas Upgrading via a Temperature Controlled
 Carbonization of Phyllostachys Pubescens. *Renewable Energy*, 2016, 86, 693–702.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2015.09.006.
- [15] Sheng, K.; Chen, X.; Pan, J.; Kloss, R.; Wei, Y.; Ying, Y. Effect of Ammonia and
 Nitrate on Biogas Production from Food Waste via Anaerobic Digestion. *Biosystems Engineering*, 2013, *116* (2), 205–212.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2013.08.005.
- 1051 [16] Nyamukamba, P.; Mukumba, P.; Chikukwa, E. S.; Makaka, G. Biogas Upgrading
 1052 Approaches with Special Focus on Siloxane Removal—A Review. *Energies*,
 1053 2020, 13 (22), 6088. https://doi.org/10.3390/en13226088.
- [17] Wang, X.; Wang, D.; Song, M.; Xin, C.; Zeng, W. TetraethylenepentamineModified Activated Semicoke for CO ₂ Capture from Flue Gas. *Energy Fuels*, **2017**, *31* (3), 3055–3061. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.energyfuels.6b03177.

- 1057 [18] Irani, M.; Jacobson, A. T.; Gasem, K. A. M.; Fan, M. Modified Carbon
 1058 Nanotubes/Tetraethylenepentamine for CO2 Capture. *Fuel*, 2017, 206, 10–18.
 1059 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.05.087.
- [19] Liu, Y.; Lin, X.; Wu, X.; Liu, M.; Shi, R.; Yu, X. Pentaethylenehexamine Loaded
 SBA-16 for CO 2 Capture from Simulated Flue Gas. *Powder Technology*, 2017,
 318, 186–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2017.06.002.
- [20] Kadam, R.; Panwar, N. L. Recent Advancement in Biogas Enrichment and Its
 Applications. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 2017, 73, 892–903.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.167.
- 1066 [21] Kabeyi, M. J. B.; Olanrewaju, O. A. Technologies for Biogas to Electricity
 1067 Conversion. *Energy Reports*, 2022, 8, 774–786.
 1068 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2022.11.007.
- [22] Khan, M. U.; Lee, J. T. E.; Bashir, M. A.; Dissanayake, P. D.; Ok, Y. S.; Tong, Y.
 W.; Shariati, M. A.; Wu, S.; Ahring, B. K. Current Status of Biogas Upgrading for
 Direct Biomethane Use: A Review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*,
 2021, 149, 111343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2021.111343.
- 1073 [23] Angelidaki, I.; Treu, L.; Tsapekos, P.; Luo, G.; Campanaro, S.; Wenzel, H.;
 1074 Kougias, P. G. Biogas Upgrading and Utilization: Current Status and Perspectives.
 1075 *Biotechnology Advances*, 2018, *36* (2), 452–466.
 1076 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2018.01.011.
- 1077 [24] Yuan, B.; Wang, J.; Chen, Y.; Wu, X.; Luo, H.; Deng, S. Unprecedented 1078 Performance of N-Doped Activated Hydrothermal Carbon towards C $_2$ H $_6$ /CH $_4$, 1079 CO $_2$ /CH $_4$, and CO $_2$ /H $_2$ Separation. J. Mater. Chem. A, **2016**, 4 (6), 2263–2276. 1080 https://doi.org/10.1039/C5TA08436A.
- 1081 [25] Song, C.; Liu, Q.; Deng, S.; Li, H.; Kitamura, Y. Cryogenic-Based CO2 Capture
 1082 Technologies: State-of-the-Art Developments and Current Challenges. *Renewable*1083 and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 2019, 101, 265–278.
 1084 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.11.018.
- 1084 Intps://doi.org/10.1010/j.isei.2018.11.018.
 1085 [26] Baena-Moreno, F. M.; le Saché, E.; Pastor-Pérez, L.; Reina, T. R. Membrane1086 Based Technologies for Biogas Upgrading: A Review. *Environ Chem Lett*, **2020**,
- 1087 *18* (5), 1649–1658. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10311-020-01036-3.
- 1088 [27] Bagreev, A.; Bandosz, T. J. A Role of Sodium Hydroxide in the Process of
 1089 Hydrogen Sulfide Adsorption/Oxidation on Caustic-Impregnated Activated
 1090 Carbons. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2002, 41 (4), 672–679.
 1091 https://doi.org/10.1021/ie010599r.
- [28] Guo, J.; Luo, Y.; Lua, A. C.; Chi, R.; Chen, Y.; Bao, X.; Xiang, S. Adsorption of
 Hydrogen Sulphide (H2S) by Activated Carbons Derived from Oil-Palm Shell. *Carbon*, 2007, 45 (2), 330–336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbon.2006.09.016.
- 1095 [29] Yan, R.; Liang, D. T.; Tsen, L.; Tay, J. H. Kinetics and Mechanisms of H₂ S
 1096 Adsorption by Alkaline Activated Carbon. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2002, 36 (20),
 1097 4460–4466. https://doi.org/10.1021/es0205840.
- 1098 [30] Sigot, L.; Ducom, G.; Benadda, B.; Labouré, C. Comparison of Adsorbents for H₂
 1099 S and D4 Removal for Biogas Conversion in a Solid Oxide Fuel Cell.
 1100 *Environmental Technology*, 2016, *37* (1), 86–95.
 1101 https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2015.1063707.
- 1101 https://doi.org/10.1080/09593330.2015.1063/0/.
- [31] Cruz, A. J.; Pires, J.; Carvalho, A. P.; De Carvalho, M. B. Physical Adsorption of
 H2S Related to the Conservation of Works of Art: The Role of the Pore Structure
 at Low Relative Pressure. *Adsorption*, 2005, *11* (5–6), 569–576.
- 1105 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10450-005-5614-3.

- [32] Bak, C.; Lim, C.-J.; Kim, Y.-D.; Kim, W.-S. Multi-Stage Adsorptive Purification
 Process for Improving Desulfurization Performance of Biogas. *Separation and Purification Technology*, 2019, 227, 115702.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2019.115702.
- [33] Gong, H.; Chen, Z.; Fan, Y.; Zhang, M.; Wu, W.; Wang, W. Surface Modification
 of Activated Carbon for Siloxane Adsorption. *Renewable Energy*, 2015, 83, 144–
 150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2015.04.004.
- [34] Tran, V. T. L.; Gélin, P.; Ferronato, C.; Mascunan, P.; Rac, V.; Chovelon, J.-M.;
 Postole, G. Siloxane Adsorption on Activated Carbons: Role of the Surface
 Chemistry on Sorption Properties in Humid Atmosphere and Regenerability
 Issues. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2019, 371, 821–832.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2019.04.087.
- [35] Tran, V. T. L.; Gélin, P.; Ferronato, C.; Chovelon, J.; Fine, L.; Postole, G.
 Adsorption of Linear and Cyclic Siloxanes on Activated Carbons for Biogas
 Purification: Sorbents Regenerability. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2019, 378,
 121 120152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2019.122152.
- [36] Álvarez-Gutiérrez, N.; Gil, M. V.; Rubiera, F.; Pevida, C. Adsorption Performance
 Indicators for the CO2/CH4 Separation: Application to Biomass-Based Activated
 Carbons. *Fuel Processing Technology*, **2016**, *142*, 361–369.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuproc.2015.10.038.
- [37] Vilella, P. C.; Lira, J. A.; Azevedo, D. C. S.; Bastos-Neto, M.; Stefanutti, R.
 Preparation of Biomass-Based Activated Carbons and Their Evaluation for Biogas
 Upgrading Purposes. *Industrial Crops and Products*, **2017**, *109*, 134–140.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2017.08.017.
- [38] Grande, C. A.; Rodrigues, A. E. Layered Vacuum Pressure-Swing Adsorption for
 Biogas Upgrading. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2007, 46 (23), 7844–7848.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/ie070942d.
- [39] Jiang, Y.; Ling, J.; Xiao, P.; He, Y.; Zhao, Q.; Chu, Z.; Liu, Y.; Li, Z.; Webley, P.
 A. Simultaneous Biogas Purification and CO2 Capture by Vacuum Swing
 Adsorption Using Zeolite NaUSY. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2018, 334,
 2593–2602. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2017.11.090.
- [40] Ruthven, Douglas M; Farooq, Shamsuzzaman; Knaebel, Kent S. *Pressure Swing Adsorption*; VCH Publishers, Inc, 1994.
- [41] Boer, D. G.; Langerak, J.; Pescarmona, P. P. Zeolites as Selective Adsorbents for CO₂ Separation. *ACS Appl. Energy Mater.*, **2023**, *6* (5), 2634–2656.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/acsaem.2c03605.
- [42] Greco, G.; Canevesi, R. L. S.; Di Stasi, C.; Celzard, A.; Fierro, V.; Manyà, J. J.
 Biomass-Derived Carbons Physically Activated in One or Two Steps for
 CH4/CO2 Separation. *Renewable Energy*, 2022, 191, 122–133.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.04.035.
- [43] Abd, A. A.; Othman, M. R.; Kim, J. A Review on Application of Activated
 Carbons for Carbon Dioxide Capture: Present Performance, Preparation, and
 Surface Modification for Further Improvement. *Environ Sci Pollut Res*, 2021, 28
 (32), 43329–43364. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-15121-9.
- [44] Abdeljaoued, A.; Querejeta, N.; Durán, I.; Álvarez-Gutiérrez, N.; Pevida, C.;
 Chahbani, M. Preparation and Evaluation of a Coconut Shell-Based Activated
 Carbon for CO2/CH4 Separation. *Energies*, 2018, *11* (7), 1748.
 https://doi.org/10.3390/en11071748.
- [45] Vivo-Vilches, J. F.; Pérez-Cadenas, A. F.; Maldonado-Hódar, F. J.; CarrascoMarín, F.; Faria, R. P. V.; Ribeiro, A. M.; Ferreira, A. F. P.; Rodrigues, A. E.

| 1156 | | Biogas Upgrading by Selective Adsorption onto CO2 Activated Carbon from |
|------|-----------|--|
| 1157 | | Wood Pellets. Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering, 2017, 5 (2), |
| 1158 | | 1386–1393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2017.02.015. |
| 1159 | [46] | Surra, E.; Ribeiro, R. P. P. L.; Santos, T.; Bernardo, M.; Mota, J. P. B.; Lapa, N.; |
| 1160 | | Esteves, I. A. A. C. Evaluation of Activated Carbons Produced from Maize Cob |
| 1161 | | Waste for Adsorption-Based CO2 Separation and Biogas Upgrading. Journal of |
| 1162 | | Environmental Chemical Engineering, 2022, 10 (1), 107065. |
| 1163 | | https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2021.107065. |
| 1164 | [47] | Yang, H.; Gong, M.; Chen, Y. Preparation of Activated Carbons and Their |
| 1165 | r . 1 | Adsorption Properties for Greenhouse Gases: CH4 and CO2. Journal of Natural |
| 1166 | | Gas Chemistry, 2011, 20 (5), 460–464, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1003- |
| 1167 | | 9953(10)60232-0. |
| 1168 | [48] | Munusamy, K.: Somani, R. S.: Baiai, H. C. Breakthrough Adsorption Studies of |
| 1169 | [] | Mixed Gases on Mango (Mangifera IndicaL.) Seed Shell Derived Activated |
| 1170 | | Carbon Extrudes, Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering, 2015 , 3 (4). |
| 1171 | | 2750–2759. https://doi.org/10.1016/i.iece.2015.05.010. |
| 1172 | [49] | Sun, Y.: Webley, P. A. Preparation of Activated Carbons with Large Specific |
| 1173 | [· · /] | Surface Areas from Biomass Corncob and Their Adsorption Equilibrium for |
| 1174 | | Methane, Carbon Dioxide, Nitrogen, and Hydrogen, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 2011. |
| 1175 | [50] | Rattanaphan, S.: Rungrotmongkol, T.: Kongsune, P. Biogas Improving by |
| 1176 | [••] | Adsorption of CO2 on Modified Waste Tea Activated Carbon. <i>Renewable Energy</i> . |
| 1177 | | 2020 . 145, 622–631. https://doi.org/10.1016/i.renene.2019.05.104. |
| 1178 | [51] | Yang, F.: Wang, J.: Liu, L.: Zhang, P.: Yu, W.: Deng, O.: Zeng, Z.: Deng, S. |
| 1179 | [] | Synthesis of Porous Carbons with High N Content from Shrimp Shells for |
| 1180 | | Efficient CO2 Capture and Gas Separation. |
| 1181 | [52] | Ahmadi, R.: Ardimand, M.: Rashidi, A.: Rafizadeh, M. High Performance Novel |
| 1182 | [] | Nanoadsorbents Derived - Natural Cellulose Fibers for Superior CO2 Adsorption |
| 1183 | | and CO2 / CH4 Separation. Energy Sources. Part A: Recovery. Utilization. and |
| 1184 | | Environmental Effects. 2020 . 0 (0). 1–19. |
| 1185 | | https://doi.org/10.1080/15567036.2020.1845878. |
| 1186 | [53] | Li, Y.; Xu, R.; Wang, B.; Wei, J.; Wang, L.; Shen, M.; Yang, J. Enhanced N- |
| 1187 | | Doped Porous Carbon Derived from KOH-Activated Waste Wool: A Promising |
| 1188 | | Material for Selective Adsorption of CO2/CH4 and CH4/N2. <i>Nanomaterials</i> . |
| 1189 | | 2019 , 9 (2), 266. https://doi.org/10.3390/nano9020266. |
| 1190 | [54] | Saadi, W.: Rodríguez-Sánchez, S.: Ruiz, B.: Najar-Souissi, S.: Ouederni, A.: |
| 1191 | | Fuente, E. From Pomegranate Peels Waste to One-Step Alkaline Carbonate |
| 1192 | | Activated Carbons. Prospect as Sustainable Adsorbent for the Renewable Energy |
| 1193 | | Production. Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering, 2022 , 10 (1), |
| 1194 | | 107010. https://doi.org/10.1016/i.jece.2021.107010. |
| 1195 | [55] | Marsh, H.; Rodríguez-Reinoso, F. Activated Carbon, 1st ed.; Elsevier: |
| 1196 | r 1 | Amsterdam : Boston, 2006. |
| 1197 | [56] | Arami-Niva, A.: Rufford, T. E.: Zhu, Z. Nitrogen-Doped Carbon Foams |
| 1198 | [] | Synthesized from Banana Peel and Zinc Complex Template for Adsorption of CO |
| 1199 | | 2. CH ₄ , and N ₂ . Energy Fuels. 2016 . 30 (9), 7298–7309. |
| 1200 | | https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.energyfuels.6b00971. |
| 1201 | [57] | Masruroh, K.; Cahvono, R. B.; Prasetvo, I.: Arivanto, T. The Effect of Amine |
| 1202 | r- ,] | Types on Breakthrough Separation of Methane on Biogas. <i>LIRED</i> . 2021. 10 (2). |
| 1203 | | 149–155. https://doi.org/10.14710/iired.2021.33514. |
| | | |

- [58] Prasetyo, I.; Rochmadi, R.; Wahyono, E.; Ariyanto, T. Controlling Synthesis of
 Polymer-Derived Carbon Molecular Sieve and Its Performance for CO2/CH4
 Separation. *EJ*, **2017**, *21* (4), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.4186/ej.2017.21.4.83.
- [59] Santos, M. P. S.; Grande, C. A.; Rodrigues, A. E. Pressure Swing Adsorption for
 Biogas Upgrading. Effect of Recycling Streams in Pressure Swing Adsorption
 Design. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2011, 50 (2), 974–985.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/ie100757u.
- [60] Khan, A.; Qyyum, M. A.; Saulat, H.; Ahmad, R.; Peng, X.; Lee, M. Metal–
 Organic Frameworks for Biogas Upgrading: Recent Advancements, Challenges,
 and Future Recommendations. *Applied Materials Today*, 2021, 22, 100925.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmt.2020.100925.
- 1215 [61] Liang, Z.; Marshall, M.; Chaffee, A. L. CO ₂ Adsorption-Based Separation by
 1216 Metal Organic Framework (Cu-BTC) versus Zeolite (13X). *Energy Fuels*, 2009,
 1217 23 (5), 2785–2789. https://doi.org/10.1021/ef800938e.
- [62] Kim, J.; Lee, Y.-R.; Ahn, W.-S. Dry-Gel Conversion Synthesis of Cr-MIL-101
 Aided by Grinding: High Surface Area and High Yield Synthesis with Minimum
 Purification. *Chem. Commun.*, **2013**, *49* (69), 7647.
 https://doi.org/10.1039/c3cc44559c.
- 1222[63] Shen, J.; Wang, X.; Chen, Y. Adsorbents for Adsorption Separation of CO $_2$ and1223CH $_4$: A Literature Review. Can J Chem Eng, 2023, 101 (12), 7115–7133.1224https://doi.org/10.1002/cjce.24942.
- [64] Sharma, H.; Dhir, A. Capture of Carbon Dioxide Using Solid Carbonaceous and Non-Carbonaceous Adsorbents: A Review. *Environ Chem Lett*, 2021, *19* (2), 851– 873. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10311-020-01118-2.
- [65] Lin, J.-B.; Nguyen, T. T. T.; Vaidhyanathan, R.; Burner, J.; Taylor, J. M.;
 Durekova, H.; Akhtar, F.; Mah, R. K.; Ghaffari-Nik, O.; Marx, S.; et al. A
 Scalable Metal-Organic Framework as a Durable Physisorbent for Carbon Dioxide
 Capture. *Science*, 2021, *374* (6574), 1464–1469.
 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abi7281
- 1232 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abi7281.
- [66] Fujiki, J.; Kajiro, H.; Takakura, Y.; Yajima, T.; Kawajiri, Y. Breakthrough
 Analysis for Parameter Estimation of CO2 Adsorption on Pelletized Flexible
 Metal–Organic Framework. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2023, 460, 141781.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2023.141781.
- [67] Salles, F.; Jobic, H.; Ghoufi, A.; Llewellyn, P. L.; Serre, C.; Bourrelly, S.; FØrey,
 Gø.; Maurin, G. Transport Diffusivity of CO2 in the Highly Flexible Metal–
 Organic Framework MIL-53(Cr)*. *Angew. Chem.*, 2009.
- [68] Ferreira, A. F. P.; Ribeiro, A. M.; Kulaç, S.; Rodrigues, A. E. Methane Purification
 by Adsorptive Processes on MIL-53(Al). *Chemical Engineering Science*, 2015, *124*, 79–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2014.06.014.
- [69] Palomino, M.; Corma, A.; Rey, F.; Valencia, S. New Insights on CO₂ –Methane
 Separation Using LTA Zeolites with Different Si/Al Ratios and a First Comparison
 with MOFs. *Langmuir*, **2010**, *26* (3), 1910–1917.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/la9026656.
- 1247 [70] Hou, Y.; Vidu, R.; Stroeve, P. Solar Energy Storage Methods. *Ind. Eng. Chem.* 1248 *Res.*, 2011, 50 (15), 8954–8964. https://doi.org/10.1021/ie2003413.
- [71] Wang, Y.; LeVan, M. D. Adsorption Equilibrium of Binary Mixtures of Carbon
 Dioxide and Water Vapor on Zeolites 5A and 13X. J. Chem. Eng. Data, 2010, 55
 (9), 3189–3195. https://doi.org/10.1021/je100053g.
- [72] Do, D. D. Adsorption Analysis: Equilibria and Kinetics; Imperial College Press:
 Queensland, Australia, 1998.

- [73] Ruthven, D. M. *Principles of Adsorption and Adsorption Processes*, A Wiley Interscience publication.; JOHN WILEY & SONS: United States, 1984.
- [74] Crittenden, Ba.; Thomas, J. *Adsorption Technology and Design*; Butterworth and
 Heinemann: Great Britain, 1998.
- [75] Chen, Y.-F.; Lin, P.-W.; Chen, W.-H.; Yen, F.-Y.; Yang, H.-S.; Chou, C.-T.
 Biogas Upgrading by Pressure Swing Adsorption with Design of Experiments. *Processes*, 2021, 9 (8), 1325. https://doi.org/10.3390/pr9081325.
- [76] Saha, D.; Bao, Z.; Jia, F.; Deng, S. Adsorption of CO₂, CH₄, N₂O, and N₂ on MOF-5, MOF-177, and Zeolite 5A. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **2010**, *44* (5), 1820– 1826. https://doi.org/10.1021/es9032309.
- [77] Rainone, F.; D'Agostino, O.; Erto, A.; Balsamo, M.; Lancia, A. Biogas Upgrading
 by Adsorption onto Activated Carbon and Carbon Molecular Sieves: Experimental
 and Modelling Study in Binary CO2/CH4 Mixture. *Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering*, 2021, 9 (5), 106256.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/i.jaga.2021.106256.
- 1268 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2021.106256.
- [78] Li, Y.; Yi, H.; Tang, X.; Li, F.; Yuan, Q. Adsorption Separation of CO2/CH4 Gas
 Mixture on the Commercial Zeolites at Atmospheric Pressure. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, **2013**, 229, 50–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2013.05.101.
- [79] Arya, A.; Divekar, S.; Rawat, R.; Gupta, P.; Garg, M. O.; Dasgupta, S.; Nanoti, A.;
 Singh, R.; Xiao, P.; Webley, P. A. Upgrading Biogas at Low Pressure by Vacuum
 Swing Adsorption. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2015, 54 (1), 404–413.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/ie503243f.
- 1276 [80] Park, J.-H.; Beum, H.-T.; Kim, J.-N.; Cho, S.-H. Numerical Analysis on the Power
 1277 Consumption of the PSA Process for Recovering CO ₂ from Flue Gas. *Ind. Eng.*1278 *Chem. Res.*, **2002**, *41* (16), 4122–4131. https://doi.org/10.1021/ie010716i.
- [81] Ruthven, D. M. *Principles of Adsorption and Adsorption Processes*; A Wiley Interscience Publication: United States of America, 1984.
- [82] Hu, G.; Guo, Y.; Luo, J.; Xiao, G. A Numerical Comparison of Heavy-Purge and Dual-Reflux Strategies in Pressure Swing Adsorption for Methane Enrichment.
 AIChE J., **2024**. https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.18573.
- [83] Kim, J.-N.; Chue, K.-T.; Cho, S.-H.; Kim, J.-D. Production of High-Purity
 Nitrogen from Air by Pressure Swing Adsorption on Zeolite X. *Separation Science and Technology*, **1995**, *30* (3), 347–368.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/01496399508013876.
- [84] Li, H.; Liao, Z.; Sun, J.; Jiang, B.; Wang, J.; Yang, Y. Modelling and Simulation of Two-Bed PSA Process for Separating H2 from Methane Steam Reforming. *Chinese Journal of Chemical Engineering*, **2019**, *27* (8), 1870–1878.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjche.2018.11.022.
- [85] Paz, L.; Grekov, D. I.; Pré, P. Dynamics of Hydrogen Storage through Adsorption:
 Process Simulation and Energy Analysis. *Processes*, 2023, *11* (10), 2940.
 https://doi.org/10.3390/pr11102940.
- [86] Delgado, J. A.; Uguina, M. A.; Sotelo, J. L.; Ruíz, B.; Gómez, J. M. Fixed-Bed
 Adsorption of Carbon Dioxide/Methane Mixtures on Silicalite Pellets. *Adsorption*,
 2006, *12* (1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10450-006-0134-3.
- [87] Thomas, W. J.; Crittenden, B. D. *Adsorption Technology and Design*;
 Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford ; Boston, 1998.
- [88] Khalighi, M.; Farooq, S.; Karimi, I. A. Nonisothermal Pore Diffusion Model for a
 Kinetically Controlled Pressure Swing Adsorption Process. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **2012**, *51* (32), 10659–10670. https://doi.org/10.1021/ie3004539.

- 1303 [89] Fakhroleslam, M.; Fatemi, S. Comparative Simulation Study of PSA, VSA, and 1304 TSA Processes for Purification of Methane from CO₂ via SAPO-34 Core-Shell 1305 Adsorbent. Separation Science and Technology, 2016, 51 (14), 2326–2338. 1306 https://doi.org/10.1080/01496395.2016.1210640.
- [90] Ali Abd, A.; Roslee Othman, M. Biogas Upgrading to Fuel Grade Methane Using 1307 1308 Pressure Swing Adsorption: Parametric Sensitivity Analysis on an Industrial Scale. 1309 Fuel, 2022, 308, 121986. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2021.121986.
- 1310 [91] Abd, A. A.; Othman, M. R.; Shamsudin, I. K.; Helwani, Z.; Idris, I. Biogas Upgrading to Natural Gas Pipeline Quality Using Pressure Swing Adsorption for 1311 1312 CO2 Separation over UiO-66: Experimental and Dynamic Modelling Assessment. 1313 Chemical Engineering Journal, 2023, 453, 139774. 1314 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2022.139774.
- 1315 [92] De Witte, N.; Denayer, J. F. M.; Van Assche, T. R. C. Effect of Adsorption 1316 Duration and Purge Flowrate on Pressure Swing Adsorption Performance. Ind. 1317 Eng. Chem. Res., 2021, 60 (37), 13684–13691. 1318 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.1c02291.
- 1319
- [93] Chouikhi, N.; Brandani, F.; Pullumbi, P.; Perre, P.; Puel, F. Biomethane 1320 Production by Adsorption Technology: New Cycle Development, Adsorbent 1321 Selection and Process Optimization. Adsorption, 2020, 26 (8), 1275–1289. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10450-020-00250-3. 1322
- 1323 [94] Grande, C. A.; Rodrigues, A. E. Propane/Propylene Separation by Pressure Swing 1324 Adsorption Using Zeolite 4A. Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 2005, 44 (23), 8815–8829. 1325 https://doi.org/10.1021/ie050671b.
- [95] Grande, C. A.; Blom, R.; Möller, A.; Möllmer, J. High-Pressure Separation of 1326 1327 CH4/CO2 Using Activated Carbon. Chemical Engineering Science, 2013, 89, 10-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2012.11.024. 1328
- 1329 [96] Santos, M. S.; Grande, C. A.; Rodrigues, A. E. New Cycle Configuration to 1330 Enhance Performance of Kinetic PSA Processes. Chemical Engineering Science, 1331 2011, 66 (8), 1590–1599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2010.12.032.
- 1332 [97] Cavenati, S.; Grande, C. A.; Rodrigues, A. E. Separation of CH 4 / CO 2 / N 2 1333 Mixtures by Layered Pressure Swing Adsorption for Upgrade of Natural Gas. Chemical Engineering Science, 2006, 61 (12), 3893–3906. 1334 1335 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2006.01.023.
- 1336 [98] Lemmon, E. W.; Huber, M. L.; McLinden, M. O. NIST Standard Reference 1337 Database 23: Reference Fluid Thermodynamic and Transport Properties-1338 **REFPROP**, 2018.
- 1339 [99] Biegler, L. T.; Jiang, L.; Fox, V. G. Recent Advances in Simulation and Optimal 1340 Design of Pressure Swing Adsorption Systems. Separation & Purification 1341 Reviews, 2005, 33 (1), 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1081/SPM-120039562.
- [100] Liu, Y.; Delgado, J.; Ritter, J. A. Comparison of Finite Difference Techniques 1342 1343 for Simulating Pressure Swing Adsorption. 1998.
- 1344 [101] Young, L. C. Orthogonal Collocation Revisited. Computer Methods in Applied 1345 Mechanics and Engineering, 2019, 345, 1033–1076. 1346 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cma.2018.10.019.
- [102] Khajuria, H.; Pistikopoulos, E. N. Dynamic Modeling and Explicit/Multi-1347 1348 Parametric MPC Control of Pressure Swing Adsorption Systems. Journal of 1349 Process Control, 2011, 21 (1), 151–163.
- 1350 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jprocont.2010.10.021.

1351 [103] Zhang, R.; Shen, Y.; Tang, Z.; Li, W.; Zhang, D. A Review of Numerical 1352 Research on the Pressure Swing Adsorption Process. Processes, 2022, 10 (5), 812. 1353 https://doi.org/10.3390/pr10050812. [104] Kadam, R. S.; Yadav, G. D. Pressure Swing Distillation: Heat Integration and 1354 1355 Economics. Separation & Purification Reviews, 2024, 1–27. 1356 https://doi.org/10.1080/15422119.2024.2306595. 1357 [105] Kim S.; Ko D.; Moon I. Dynamic Optimization of Ch4/Co2 Separating Operation Using Pressure Swing Adsorption Process with Feed Composition 1358 Varies. Chemical Engineering Transactions, 2015, 45, 853–858. 1359 1360 https://doi.org/10.3303/CET1545143. [106] Kapoor, A.; Yang, R. T. Kinetic Separation of Methane—Carbon Dioxide 1361 Mixture by Adsorption on Molecular Sieve Carbon. *Chemical Engineering* 1362 Science, 1989, 44 (8), 1723–1733. https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509(89)80014-4. 1363 [107] Cavenati, S.; Grande, C. A.; Rodrigues, A. E. Upgrade of Methane from Landfill 1364 1365 Gas by Pressure Swing Adsorption. Energy Fuels, 2005, 19 (6), 2545–2555. 1366 https://doi.org/10.1021/ef050072h. [108] Durán, I.; Rubiera, F.; Pevida, C. Modeling a Biogas Upgrading PSA Unit with 1367 1368 a Sustainable Activated Carbon Derived from Pine Sawdust. Sensitivity Analysis 1369 on the Adsorption of CO2 and CH4 Mixtures. Chemical Engineering Journal, 1370 **2022**, 428, 132564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2021.132564. 1371 [109] Grande, C. A.; Rodrigues, A. E. Biogas to Fuel by Vacuum Pressure Swing 1372 Adsorption I. Behavior of Equilibrium and Kinetic-Based Adsorbents. Ind. Eng. 1373 Chem. Res., 2007, 46 (13), 4595-4605. https://doi.org/10.1021/ie061341+. 1374 [110] Berlin, N. H. Vacuum Cycle Adsorption. 3,313,091, April 11, 1967. 1375 [111] Kim, M.-B.; Bae, Y.-S.; Choi, D.-K.; Lee, C.-H. Kinetic Separation of Landfill 1376 Gas by a Two-Bed Pressure Swing Adsorption Process Packed with Carbon 1377 Molecular Sieve: Nonisothermal Operation. Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 2006, 45 (14), 5050-5058. https://doi.org/10.1021/ie0511074. 1378 1379 [112] Canevesi, R. L. S.; Andreassen, K. A.; Silva, E. A.; Borba, C. E.; Grande, C. A. 1380 Evaluation of Simplified Pressure Swing Adsorption Cycles for Bio-Methane 1381 Production. Adsorption, 2019, 25 (4), 783-793. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10450-1382 019-00049-x. 1383 [113] Shen, Y.; Shi, W.; Zhang, D.; Na, P.; Fu, B. The Removal and Capture of CO2 1384 from Biogas by Vacuum Pressure Swing Process Using Silica Gel. Journal of CO2 Utilization, 2018, 27, 259–271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcou.2018.08.001. 1385 [114] Vilardi, G.; Bassano, C.; Deiana, P.; Verdone, N. Exergy and Energy Analysis 1386 1387 of Biogas Upgrading by Pressure Swing Adsorption: Dynamic Analysis of the 1388 Process. Energy Conversion and Management, 2020, 226, 113482. 1389 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2020.113482. 1390 [115] Augelletti, R.; Conti, M.; Annesini, M. C. Pressure Swing Adsorption for Biogas 1391 Upgrading. A New Process Configuration for the Separation of Biomethane and 1392 Carbon Dioxide. Journal of Cleaner Production, 2017, 140, 1390–1398. 1393 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.013. 1394 [116] Moseley, P. T.; Rand, D. A. J.; Davidson, A.; Monahov, B. Understanding the 1395 Functions of Carbon in the Negative Active-Mass of the Lead-Acid Battery: A 1396 Review of Progress. Journal of Energy Storage, 2018, 19, 272–290. 1397 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.est.2018.08.003. 1398 [117] Cosey, W. K.; Balkus, K. J.; Ferraris, J. P.; Musselman, I. H. Reduced Aging in 1399 Carbon Molecular Sieve Membranes Derived from PIM-1 and MOP-18. Ind. Eng. 1400 Chem. Res., 2021, 60 (27), 9962–9970. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.1c01727.

- 1401 [118] León, M.; Silva, J.; Carrasco, S.; Barrientos, N. Design, Cost Estimation and 1402 Sensitivity Analysis for a Production Process of Activated Carbon from Waste 1403 Nutshells by Physical Activation. Processes, 2020, 8 (8), 945. 1404 https://doi.org/10.3390/pr8080945.
- [119] Peng, P.; Anastasopoulou, A.; Brooks, K.; Furukawa, H.; Bowden, M. E.; Long, 1405 1406 J. R.; Autrey, T.; Breunig, H. Cost and Potential of Metal-Organic Frameworks 1407 for Hydrogen Back-up Power Supply. Nat Energy, 2022, 7 (5), 448–458. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-022-01013-w. 1408
- [120] DeSantis, D.; Mason, J. A.; James, B. D.; Houchins, C.; Long, J. R. Techno-1409 1410 Economic Analysis of Metal-Organic Frameworks for Hydro- Gen and Natural Gas Storage. Energy & Fuels, 2017, 31, 2024–2032. 1411
- 1412 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.energyfuels.6b02510.
- 1413 [121] Abdalla, Nabil; Bürck, Silvana; Fehrenbach, Horst; Köpen, Susanne; Staigl, Tim 1414 Janosch. Biomethane in Europe; Prepared on behalf of the European Climate 1415 Foundation; ifeu: Heidelberg, 2022.
- [122] Alberici, Sacha; Grimme, Wouter; Toop, Gemma. Biomethane Production 1416 Potentials in the EU - Feasibility of REPowerEU 2030 Targets, Production 1417 1418 Potentials in the Member States and Outlook to 2050; A gas for climate report; 1419 Guidehouse, 2022.
- [123] Álvarez-Gutiérrez, N. Towards Bio-Upgrading of Biogas: Biomass Waste-Based 1420 Adsorbents. Energy Procedia, 2014, No. 63, 6527–6533. 1421 1422 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.11.688.
- 1423 [124] Gil, M. V.; Álvarez-Gutiérrez, N.; Martínez, M.; Rubiera, F.; Pevida, C.; Morán, A. Carbon Adsorbents for CO2 Capture from Bio-Hydrogen and Biogas Streams: 1424 1425 Breakthrough Adsorption Study. Chemical Engineering Journal, 2015, 269, 148– 1426 158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2015.01.100.
- 1427 [125] Liu, F.; Zhang, Y.; Zhang, P.; Xu, M.; Tan, T.; Wang, J.; Deng, Q.; Zhang, L.; 1428 Wan, Y.; Deng, S. Facile Preparation of N and O-Rich Porous Carbon from Palm 1429 Sheath for Highly Selective Separation of CO2/CH4/N2 Gas-Mixture. Chemical 1430 Engineering Journal, 2020, 399, 125812. 1431
 - https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2020.125812.
- [126] Prasetyo, I.; Mukti, N. I. F.; Cahyono, R. B.; Prasetya, A.; Ariyanto, T. 1432 1433 Nanoporous Carbon Prepared from Palm Kernel Shell for CO2/CH4 Separation. 1434 Waste Biomass Valor, 2020, 11 (10), 5599-5606. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12649-020-01006-4. 1435
- 1436 [127] Rocha, L. A. M.; Andreassen, K. A.; Grande, C. A. Separation of CO 2 /CH 4 1437 Using Carbon Molecular Sieve (CMS) at Low and High Pressure. Chemical 1438 Engineering Science, 2017, 164, 148–157. 1439 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2017.01.071.
- 1440 [128] Kim, Y. J.; Nam, Y. S.; Kang, Y. T. Study on a Numerical Model and PSA 1441 (Pressure Swing Adsorption) Process Experiment for CH4/CO2 Separation from 1442 Biogas. Energy, 2015, 91, 732–741. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2015.08.086.
- [129] Cavenati, S.; Grande, C. A.; Rodrigues, A. E.; Kiener, C.; Müller, U. Metal 1443 1444 Organic Framework Adsorbent for Biogas Upgrading. Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 2008, 1445 47 (16), 6333–6335, https://doi.org/10.1021/ie8005269,
- [130] Hamon, L.; Heymans, N.; Llewellyn, P. L.; Guillerm, V.; Ghoufi, A.; Vaesen, 1446 1447 S.; Maurin, G.; Serre, C.; De Weireld, G.; Pirngruber, G. D. Separation of CO2-1448 CH4 Mixtures in the Mesoporous MIL-100(Cr) MOF: Experimental and
- 1449 Modelling Approaches. Dalton Trans., 2012, 41 (14), 4052.
- 1450 https://doi.org/10.1039/c2dt12102f.

- [131] Chen, R.; Yao, J.; Gu, Q.; Smeets, S.; Baerlocher, C.; Gu, H.; Zhu, D.; Morris,
 W.; Yaghi, O. M.; Wang, H. A Two-Dimensional Zeolitic Imidazolate Framework
 with a Cushion-Shaped Cavity for CO2 Adsorption. *Chem. Commun.*, 2013, 49
 (82), 9500. https://doi.org/10.1039/c3cc44342f.
 [132] Abid, H. R.; Pham, G. H.; Ang, H.-M.; Tade, M. O.; Wang, S. Adsorption of
- 1456 CH4 and CO2 on Zr-Metal Organic Frameworks. *Journal of Colloid and Interface*1457 *Science*, 2012, 366 (1), 120–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2011.09.060.
- 1458

| Components | Agricultural waste | Landfill gas | Industrial waste |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Methane, CH ₄ | 50 - 80 | 50 - 80 | 50 – 70 |
| Carbon dioxide, CO ₂ | 30 - 50 | 20 – 50 | 30 -50 |
| Hydrogen sulfide, H_2S | 0.70 | 0.10 | 0.80 |
| Hydrogen, H ₂ | 0 – 2 | 0 – 5 | 0 – 2 |
| Nitrogen, N_2 | 0-1 | 0 - 3 | 0-1 |
| Oxygen, O ₂ | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 |
| Carbon monoxide, CO | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 |
| Ammonia, NH ₃ | Traces | Traces | Traces |
| Siloxanes | Traces | Traces | Traces |
| Water, H ₂ O | Saturation | Saturation | Saturation |

Table 1. Typical biogas composition (%).^[1]

Table 2. Comparison of the properties of activated carbons, carbon molecular sieves,
metal organic frameworks and zeolites. AC and CMS images were taken with
permission from ^[116] and ^[117].

| | Activated carbon | Carbon molecular sieve | Metal organic framework | Zeolite |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Nature | Carbonaceous | Carbonaceous | Organic ligands and metal ions | Crystalline aluminosilicates |
| Pore size distribution (PSD) | Wide PSD: micropores (<2 nm) and mesopores (2-50 nm) | Narrow PSD (<1 nm) | Tailorable PSD | Uniform and narrow PSD (<1 nm) |
| Adsorption mechanism | Presence of micropores and active sites | Well-defined micropores | Well-defined micropores | Well-defined micropores |
| Surface area | High due to micropores and mesopores | High due to micropores | High due to micropores | High due to micropores |

| | Activated carbon | Carbon molecular sieve | Metal organic framework | Zeolite |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| CO ₂ adsorption capacity | High | Medium | Medium | High |
| CH₄ adsorption capacity | High | Medium | Low | Low |
| CO ₂ /CH ₄ equilibrium selectivity | Low | Low | Medium | High |
| CO₂/CH₄ kinetic selectivity | Low | High | Medium | High |
| PSA regeneration | Feasible | Feasible | Not documented | Feasible at P <p<sub>tar</p<sub> |
| Cost (USD kg ⁻¹) | 0.6 - 2.4 [118] | 6.0 - 15.0 | 10.0 - 7 0.0 ^[119, 120] | 0.6 – 5.0 |

Table 3. Main properties of adsorbents for CO₂/CH₄ separation.

| 2bed - Silicalite | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS -3. BD - 4.PG | ADPF | MLM | LDF | Ideal | LTE | PDECOL software using orthogonal collocation on finite elements | [86] |
|--|---|------|-----|--------|--------------------|--------|--|------|
| 2bed - Zeolite 13X | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PG - 6. PPE | ADPF | MLM | bi-LDF | Ideal | No LTE | gPROMS software using centered finite difference of second order over a grid of 250 intervals | [59] |
| 4bed - MOF MIL 53 | 1. Product/PR - 2. ADS - 3. Rinse - 4. BD - 5. PG | ADPF | MLM | LDF | Ideal | No LTE | gPROMS software using orthogonal collocation on finite elements with second order polynomials and 50 intervals | [68] |
| 2bed - Zeolite SAPO 34 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PG - 6. PPE | ADPF | MLM | LDF | Ideal | LTE | Orthogonal collocation and method of lines | [89] |
| 1bed - Zeolite and CMS | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS -3. BD - 4.PG | - | MLM | LDF | - | No LTE | Aspen Adsorption TM version 10 | [90] |
| 1bed - Activated carbon | - | ADPF | MLM | bi-LDF | BWR correlation | LTE | gPROMS software using centered finite difference of second order over a grid of 400 intervals | [95] |
| 4bed - Zeolite 13X and CMS 3K | 1. Product/PR - 2. Product and production - 3. ADS - 4. ADS - 5. ADS - 6. DPE - 7. BD - 8. PG - 9. PPE | ADPF | MLM | bi-LDF | Ideal | No LTE | gPROMS software using centered finite difference over a grid of 200 intervals | [96] |
| 1bed - Zeolite 13X + CMS 3K | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS -3. BD - 4.PG | ADPF | MLM | bi-LDF | - | No LTE | gPROMS software using orthogonal collocation on finite elements | [97] |
| 2bed - Uio66 MOF | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS -3. BD - 4.PG | ADPF | MLM | LDF | Ideal | No LTE | Aspen Adsorption using as finite difference method, the upwind | [91] |

Ref.

| | | | | | | | differencing scheme with 20 nodes | |
|---------------------------------|--|------|-----|--------|-------------------------------|--------|---|------|
| 2bed – FAU Zeolite 13X | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PG - 6. PPE | ADPF | MLM | LDF | Peng- Robinson equation | No LTE | Aspen Adsorption V9 | [92] |
| 5bed - CMS | 1. Feed/PR – 2. ADS – 3.ADS/reflux – 4. DPE – 5. PG – 6. DPE – 7. BD – 8. BD/Reflux – 9. PPE – 10. Idle – 11. PPE | ADPF | MLM | bi-LDF | Ideal | No LTE | FORTRAN using the finite difference method | [93] |

Table 5. Single-bed PSA technologies for CO₂/CH₄ separation.

| Cycle - time (s) | Cycle steps | Adsorbent | CO₂/CH₄ | P _a – P _d (atm) | CH₄ Purity (%) - CH₄ Recovery (%) | Productivity (mol _{CH4} kg ⁻¹ h ⁻¹) - Energy consumption (KWh mol _{CH4} ⁻¹) | Ref. |
|------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---------|--|---|--|-------|
| VSA - | 1. Feed/PR - 2. | CMS Bergbau Forschung | 50/50 | 3.7 - 0.3 | 95.0 - 58.0 | 1.7 ^ª - 0.0050 ^ª | [106] |
| 120 | ADS -3. BD - 4.PG | Zeolite 5A | | 2.0 - 0.3 | 75.9 - 86.4 | 0.8 ^ª - 0.0031 ^ª | |
| VSA - 370 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. BD - 4. PG | CMS 3K | 45/55 | 3.2 - 0.1 | 97.1 - 79.4 | 3.2 ^ª - 0.0068 ^ª | [107] |
| VSA - 425 | 1. Product/PR - 2. ADS - 3. Intermediate DP - 4. BD - 5. PG | CMS 3K | 55/45 | 7.9 - | 97.3 - 85.6 | 4.3 - 0.0153 ^a | [109] |
| VSA - 470 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. Intermediate DP - 4. BD - 5. PG | 2. DP - Zeolite 13X | | 0.1 | 97.1 - 60.7 | 4.4 - 0.0190 ^a | |
| PSA - 1200 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. BD - 4.PG | MIL-53 | 40/60 | 4.0 - 1.0 | 94.4 - 35.5 | 2.5 - 0.0128ª | [68] |
| PSA - 1680 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. BD, He regeneration - 4. PG | Sawdust Activated Carbon | 50/50 | 4.0 - 1.0 | 97.0 - 60.0 | 2.8 ^a - 0.0047 ^a | [108] |

^a Calculated in this work

| Cycle - time (s) | Cycle steps | Adsorbent | CO ₂ /CH ₄ | P _a – P _d (atm) | CH₄ Purity (%) - CH₄ Recovery (%) | Productivity (mol _{CH4} kg ⁻¹ h ⁻¹) - Energy consumption (KWh mol _{CH4} ⁻¹) | Ref. |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|-------|
| 2bed EPSA - 480 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PG - 6. PPE | CMS Takeda 3A | 50/50 | 4.0 - 1.0 | 95.8 - 71.2 | 5.8 - 0.0056 ^a | [111] |
| 2bed EVSA - 362 | | 13X Zeolite Z10-04 | | | 90.2 - 92.7 | 14.1 - 0.0033 ^a | |
| 2bed EVSA - 182 | 1.Feed/PR -2. | Zeolite KZ10-04 | | | 91.2 - 83.7 | 11.9 - 0.0039 ^a | [79] |
| 2bed EVSA - 336 | ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PPE. | Zeolite NaUSY | 42/58 | 1.5 - 0.1 | 99.3 - 85.9 | 15.6 - 0.0039 ^a | [, 3] |
| 2bed EVSA - 290 | | CMS 3K | | | 96.9 - 86.9 | 11.3 - 0.0038 ^a | |
| 2bed VSA - 140 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PPE | Zeolite NaUSY | 50/50 | 2.0 - 0.1 | 99.0 - 73.0 | 12.8 ^a - 0.0044 ^a | [39] |
| 4bed EVSA - 600 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE1 - 4. IDLE - 5. DPE2 - 6. BD - 7. PG - 8. PPE1 - 9. PPE2 | Silica gel | 45/55 | 4.0 - 0.3 | 98.3 - 73.1 | 2.9 ^ª - 0.0036 | [113] |
| 2bed- 1tank EVSA - 1800 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PG - 6. PPE | | | | 97.9 - 91.0 | 3.8 - 0.0085 ^ª | |
| 3bed- 1tank EVSA - 1560 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. Idle - 4. DPE1 and DPE2 - 5. BD - 6. PPE1 and PPE2. | СМЅ КР 407 | 40/60 | 1.5 - 0.1 | 98.4 - 92.1 | 2.6 - 0.0084 ^ª | [112] |
| 2bed EVSA - 336 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. AD - 3. DPE - 4. DP - 5. BD - 6. PPE | COSMO Zeolite 13X | 36/64 | 4.0 - 0.1 | 95.5 - 91.3 | 3.3 ^ª - 0.0072 ^ª | [75] |

Table 6. Multi-bed PSA technologies for CO₂/CH₄ separation - experimental studies.

^a Calculated in this work.

| Cycle - time (s) | Cycle steps | Adsorbent | CO₂/CH₄ | P _A - P _D (atm) | CH ₄ Purity (%) - CH ₄ Recovery (%) | Productivity (mol _{CH4} kg ⁻¹ h ⁻¹) - Energy consumption (KWh mol _{CH4} ⁻¹) | Ref. |
|---|---|---|---------|--|---|--|-------|
| 2bed VSA - 80 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. BD - 4. PG | Silicalite | 38/62 | 1.0 - 0.1 | 97.8 - 58.5 | 8.6 - | [86] |
| 2bed VSA - 400 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. Intermediate depressurization - 4. BD - 5. PG | 2 layers: CMS-3K and Zeolite 13X | 45/55 | 7.9 - 0.1 | 98.0 - 80.3 | 7.7 - 0.0069 ^a | [38] |
| 2bed EVSA - 850 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PG - 6. PPE | Zeolite 13 X | 33/67 | 4.0 - 0.3 | 99.2 - 85.0 | 5.9 - 0.0086 ^ª | [59] |
| 4bed VSAm ^c – 1080 ^b | 1. Product/PR - 2. ADS - 3. Rinse - 4. BD - 5. PG | MIL-53 | 40/60 | 4.0 - 0.1 | 99.4 - 92.8 | 2.1 - 0.0170 | [68] |
| 2bed EVSA – 850 ^b | 1. Feed/PR - 2. AD - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PG - 6. PPE | COSMO Zeolite 13X | 36/64 | 4.5 - 0.1 | 97.0 - 95.4 | 12.8 ^ª - 0.0076 ^ª | [75] |
| 2bed PSA - | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. BD - 4. PG | Spent coffee | 32/68 | 2.0 - 1.0 | 97.0 - 95.4 | - | [2] |
| 4bed EVSA - 520 (2 systems) ^b | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. DPE - 4. BD - 5. PG - 6. PPE (each system) | Zeolite 5A | 37/63 | 6.2-0.2 | 99.4 - 99.0 | 8.2 [°] – 0.0056 | [115] |
| 6bed VSA - 240 | 1. Feed/PR - 2. ADS - 3. BD - 4. PG | CMS-3K | 45/55 | 6.5-0.3 | 97.1 - 93.4 | 8.9 - 0.0058 | [114] |
| 5bed EVSA – 725 ^b | 1. Feed/PR – 2. ADS – 3.ADS/reflux – 4. DPE – 5. PG – 6. DPE – 7. BD – 8. BD/Reflux – 9. PPE – 10. Idle – 11.PPE | CMS | 40/60 | 8.0 <i>-</i> 0.5 | 97.0 - 87.3 | 1.2 - 0.0093 | [93] |

1479 **Table 7.** Multi-bed PSA technologies for CO_2/CH_4 separation - simulation studies.

^a Calculated by this work ^b Industrial scale-up ^c VSAm: VSA cycle modified.

- 1480 1481 1482 1483 1483



Figure 1. Current^[121] and potential production in 2030 and 2050^[122] of biomethane per
country from anaerobic digestion in Europe, expressed in billion cubic meters (bcm).
NB: the natural gas consumption in the UE in 2020 was 400 bcm.^[122]

- 100 I.D.



Figure 2. Biomethane production and its applications.



Figure 3. Schematic diagrams of biogas upgrading methods: a) water scrubbing; b)
chemical scrubbing (amine scrubbing); c) cryogenic distillation; d) membrane
separation; e) pressure swing adsorption.



Figure 4. Sequence steps for: a) basic Skarstrom PSA cycle; and b) EPSA cycle. *Product/PR*: pressurization with product; *ADS*: adsorption; *BD*: blowdown; *PG*: purge; *Intermediate DP*: intermediate depressurization; *DPE*: Depressurization pressure
equalization; *PPE*: pressurization pressure equalization; *IDEL*: standby.







Figure 5. Comparison of CO₂/CH₄ equilibrium selectivity and PSA working capacity ratio for various adsorbents at a gas composition of CO₂ = vol. 35% and CH₄ = vol. 65%. a) Selectivity at 5 bar, b) PSA working capacity ratio at: $P_a = 5$ bar, $P_d = 1$ bar. c)

1511 Selectivity at 1 bar, d) PSA working capacity ratio at: $P_a = 1$ bar, $P_d = 0.2$ bar. – CNS^[44], P-1512 AC, PINPEL20 ^[45], CS ^[37], Commercial WV1050 ^[37], CS-CO2 ^[36], CK-800 ^[49], OS ^[123], No2OS-1000 ^[124], Commercial calgon BPL ^[124], Commercial Norit C ^[124], MSS-AC Extrudates ^[48], Organosorb 10-CO ^[77], 1S-1 ^[42], 1513 2S-3 ^[42], OTS-1-550 ^[3], MCW(PA)3h ^[46], PS-1-550 ^[125], SA-1-700 ^[51], N-WAPC ^[53], J-AC ^[52], MSC CT-1514 350(Carbotech) [77], CMS-240(Xintao) [77], PKS Carbon 800 [126], CMS-3K [107], CMS KP 407 [127], CMS-FB [128], 1515 1516 MOF-5 ^[76], Cu-BTC ^[61], Cu-MOF extrudates ^[129], MIL100 ^[130], ZIF-L ^[131], Zr-MOF NH4 ^[132], Zeolite 13X ^[61], Zeolite 5A ^[76], Zeolite NaX ^[78], Zeolite CaX ^[78], Zeolite NaA ^[78], Zeolite CaA ^[78], Commercial Z10-04 ^[79]. Note 1517 1518 that zeolites NaX and 13X are the same, as are zeolites 5A and CaA, but we have left the original names 1519 as given in the bibliographical sources, these sources giving slightly different results, as shown in the 1520 graphs.

- 1521
- 1522
- 1523



1524 1525 **Figure 6.** 1-z (1-Compressibility factor) for CO₂ and CH₄ as a function of temperature

- and pressure.
- 1527





1529 Figure 7. Purity, recovery, productivity and energy consumption plots for CO₂/CH₄

- 1530 separation by EVSA and VSA: a) EVSA cycle, b) VSA cycle Full symbols represent
- 1531 productivity and empty symbols represent energy consumption •: 2-bed Zeolite^{[39, 59,}
- 1532 $^{75, 79]}$ \square : 2-bed CMS^[79, 111] \blacktriangle : 3-bed + 1tank CMS^[112] \blacktriangle : 5-bed CMS^[93] \square : 4-bed
- 1533 Zeolite ^[115] \bigstar : 2-bed Zeolite + CMS^[38] \checkmark : 4-bed MOF + CO₂ production.^[68] \triangleright :
- 1534 6-bed CMS^[114] Best PSA-adsorbent configuration.