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Abstract: Membrane separation technology is applied in natural gas processing, while a high-performance membrane is highly in demand. This paper considers the bright future of functionalized graphene oxide (GO) membranes in acid gas removal from natural gas. By molecular simulations, the adsorption and diffusion behaviors of several unary gases (N₂, CH₄, CO₂, H₂S, and SO₂) are explored in the 1,4-phenylenediamine-2-sulfonate (PDASA)-doped GO channels. Molecular insights show that the multi-layer adsorption of acid gases evaluates well by the Redlich-Peterson model. A tiny amount of PDASA promotes the solubility coefficient of CO₂ and H₂S, respectively, up to 4.5 and 5.3 mmol·g⁻¹·kPa⁻¹, nearly 2.5 times higher than those of a pure GO membrane, which is due to the improved binding affinity, great isosteric heat, and hydrogen bonds, while N₂ and CH₄ only show single-layer adsorption with solubility coefficients lower than 0.002 mmol·g⁻¹·kPa⁻¹, and their weak adsorption is insusceptible to PDASA. Although acid gas diffusivity in GO channels is inhibited below 20 × 10⁻⁶ cm²·s⁻¹ by PDASA, the solubility coefficient of acid gases is certainly high enough to ensure their separation efficiency. As a result, the permeabilities (P) of acid gases and their selectivities (α) over CH₄ are simultaneously improved (P_CO₂ = 7265.5 Barrer, α_{CO₂/CH₄} = 95.7; P_{H₂S+CO₂} = 42075.1 Barrer, α_{H₂S+CO₂/CH₄} = 243.8), which outperforms most of the ever-reported membranes. This theoretical study gives a mechanistic understanding of acid gas separation and provides a unique design strategy to develop high-performance GO membranes toward efficient natural gas processing.
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1. Introduction

Methane (CH₄), as the main constituent of natural gas, is one kind of renewable energy source [1]. The raw natural gas coming from crude oil wells always exists in the form of mixtures, containing other light hydrocarbons, nitrogen (N₂), carbon dioxide (CO₂), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂). Among these impurities, significant amounts of CO₂, H₂S, and SO₂ commonly called acid gases are the most harmful components in raw natural gas, which not only lowers the calorific value of CH₄ but also causes internal corrosion in gas pipelines [2,3]. Therefore, to meet the requirements of end users and the specifications of transportation pipelines, the removal of acid gases is an essential process in natural gas processing [3,4]. Several processes can be adopted to remove acid gases, including pressure swing adsorption, supersonic separation, and membrane separation. In addition, natural gas can also be purified by forming CO₂ hydrates from the gas mixtures [5–7]. The commercialized technology is amine scrubbing [8], which uses plenty of alkanolamine solutions in absorption columns to dissolve acid gases. However, it requires the use of large equipment, rapidly
increasing the operating cost [9], and lots of undesirable liquid wastes produced in this process pose a threat to the environment. Alternatively, with low energy consumption, low pollution and high separation efficiency, membrane gas separation technology is regarded as a potential candidate for acid gas removal [10]. Especially under ordinary operation conditions (i.e., room temperature and low operating pressure), it will achieve better economic benefits in natural gas processing.

Various membrane materials have been developed to address these challenging separations, such as polymer [11,12], metal-organic framework (MOF) [13,14] and graphene [15]. Among them, the polymeric membrane is the most large-scale development for commercial, while its performance is somewhat low primarily due to the trade-off effect. Fortunately, two-dimensional (2D) graphene oxide (GO) membranes with tailorable channels and abundant active sites are emerging candidates for boosting molecular separation performance [15,16]. It is reported that their inherent transport channels can be regulated for selective permeation at the sub-nanometer scale [17]. For instance, by adjusting ultraviolet irradiation, the interlayer spacing of GO membrane was precisely controlled by Zheng et al. to improve the separation efficiency of these two species with a very low molecular weight difference [18]. Our previous work also showed that the 1,4-phenylenediamine-2-sulfonate (PDASA)-functionalized GO channels facilitated the adsorption of the polar molecule (i.e., water), and then largely promoted its permeation [19]. For acid gas removal, the CO$_2$ permeability was successfully enhanced by incorporating GO nanosheets as the filler to create additional gas transport channels in polymers of intrinsic microporosity [20]. Additionally, using the strong affinity between GO and CO$_2$ was a brilliant strategy to enhance the CO$_2$ solubility in polyimide hybrid membranes [21]. After doping GO nanosheets, the CO$_2$/CH$_4$ separation performance of various polymeric membranes was promoted to outperform the 2008 Robeson upper bound [15,22].

However, as mentioned above, the GO nanosheet is mostly dispersed as a filler into mixed matrix membranes or prepared as hybrid membranes to separate CO$_2$/CH$_4$ [15,20,21,23], thus lack of exploration on pure GO membrane especially on its separation mechanism for acid gas removal. Fortunately, a few molecular simulations attempted to explore the CO$_2$/CH$_4$ separation process through pure GO membranes [24,25]. Whereas, for other 2D membranes, most previous simulations demonstrated that there were two main dominated separation mechanisms (i.e., the size-sieving effect and preferential adsorption) in natural gas processing [26–28]. A suitable aperture is key to the high separation performance of CO$_2$/CH$_4$ [26,27]. While in order to further improve the removal efficiency of CO$_2$, the separation mechanism should be governed by preferential adsorption, which helps to improve CO$_2$ separation selectivity [28]. However, until now, there has been no theoretical model established for acid gas separation through GO membranes. Therefore, in order to establish this theoretical model, it is necessary to study the acid gas permeation behavior in GO channels from the perspectives of adsorption and diffusion. Moreover, CO$_2$ and other acid gases (i.e., H$_2$S and SO$_2$) need to be studied at the same time. Furthermore, to improve the removal efficiency, a rational design of a GO membrane at the molecular level is highly in demand. This study aims to theoretically design a high-performance GO membrane toward acid gas removal and explore the separation models.

In this work, GO membranes are functionalized by PDASA (this selection is inspired by our previous experimental work [19]) to examine how it performs in removing acid gases (CO$_2$, H$_2$S, and SO$_2$) from CH$_4$ and N$_2$. By Grand Canonical Monte Carlo (GCMC) simulations, unary isotherms of different gases in GO membranes with variable doping amounts of PDASA are first studied by several adsorption models. To accurately describe the adsorption characteristics of different gases and provide molecular insights, structural and energetic analyses are conducted in GO channels via molecular distribution probability, radial distribution function (RDF), isosteric heat, and hydrogen bonds. The solubility coefficient is calculated to characterize the adsorption ability of different gases. Then gas diffusion behavior is explored by molecular dynamical (MD) simulations. After that, the acid gas separation performance is predicated on the basis of the solution-diffusion
mechanism. Finally, a performance comparison with previous reports is enclosed to demonstrate the potential of the PDASA-doped GO membranes in natural gas processing.

2. Models and Methods

Figure 1 shows the simulation models. First of all, GO nanosheets with the format of $\text{C}_{312}(\text{O})_{65}(\text{OH})_{79}(\text{COOH})_{4}$ were constructed by the Material studio in amorphous cell as per our previous works [16,29–33]. Functional groups were randomly distributed on the sp$^2$-conjugated surface of which the dimensions were $3 \times 3$ nm$^2$, as shown in Figure 1a. The numbers of epoxy, hydroxyl and carboxyl groups were 65, 79, and 4, respectively, similar to our previous experimental reports [19]. As a result, the oxidized ratio that was defined by the total number of oxygen atoms to carbon atoms was about 0.48, which is feasible in membrane process simulation for both gas and liquid separations [16,32,33].

Five gases with variable electronegativities and kinetic diameters were investigated, as shown in Figure 1b. Electrostatic potentials show that the acid gases of CO$_2$, H$_2$S and SO$_2$ exhibit higher electronegativity compared to CH$_4$ and N$_2$. To reveal gas sorption and diffusion behaviors in the lamellar structure of GO membranes, two GO nanosheets were parallelly aligned with interlayer spacing initially set as 0.8 nm (Figure 1c). To increase the affinity between GO membrane and acid gases, interlayer channel was functionalized with PDASA groups (Figure 1f) that have a great affinity to polar molecules [19]. The number of doped PDASA molecules increased from 1 to 5, correspondingly to the doping amounts varying from 1.5 to 7.5 wt%. The atomic positions of GO nanosheets were flexible during simulations. After being loaded with PDASA groups, GO membranes were relaxed well, and then interlayer spacing was slightly enlarged, as shown in Figure 1d,e where the doping amounts are 4.5 wt% and 7.5 wt%, respectively.

![Figure 1. Simulation models. (a) GO nanosheet with the format of $\text{C}_{312}(\text{O})_{65}(\text{OH})_{79}(\text{COOH})_{4}$. (b) Electrostatic potentials and kinetic diameters of gases. Configurations of GO membranes with variable PDASA-doping amounts: (c) 0.0%; (d) 4.5 wt%; (e) 7.5 wt%. (f) Molecular model of PDASA.](image-url)

Before GCMC simulations, GO membranes and gases were performed with geometry optimization to search for a minimum energy structure. In this process, the convergence thresholds of energy, force and displacement were specified as $10^{-5}$ kcal/mol, $10^{-3}$ kcal/mol/Å and $10^{-5}$ Å, respectively. To calculate adsorption isotherms of gases in flexible GO membranes, the Configurational bias method [34] was performed with $10^7$ equilibration and production steps. The temperature was maintained at 298 K by the algorithm of Nosé-Hoover thermostat [35]. Production frame was output every 10,000 steps. Partial charges were taken from the Compass force field [36], which was also used to describe interatomic interactions among membrane and variable gases. Here, nonbonded interactions were summarized by electrostatic and van der Waals potentials. Long-range electrostatic interactions were handled with the Ewald method [37].
with an accuracy of $10^{-5}$ kcal/mol, whereas van der Waals interaction potentials were
predicated by the atom-based method with a 9.8 Å cut-off distance. Periodic boundary
conditions are applied in all three directions. After adsorption simulations, the lowest
energy configuration returned from the GCMC calculation was used as the initial frame
to explore gas diffusion properties. In MD simulations, there were a total of 50 gas
molecules inserted in GO membranes and they could freely roam in GO interlayers.
The system reached temperature (298 K) equilibrium first in an isothermal-isobaric
ensemble for 1 ns. The pressure was controlled at 1 bar by the Berendsen barostat \cite{38}
with a decay constant of 0.1 ps. Subsequently, the production runs were performed in a
canonical ensemble. The time step was set as 0.5 fs and trajectories were recorded every
2 ps, and the total simulation time was 2 ns. The final results were averaged over three
independent trials.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Adsorption Evaluation

To calculate the adsorption isotherms of different gases in GO membranes, GCMC simu-
lations were performed under low pressures (0.01 KPa–1000 Kpa). The fugacity coefficients of
unary gases (N$_2$, CH$_4$, CO$_2$, H$_2$S and SO$_2$) are close to 1.0 under these pressures by physical
property estimation in Aspen using the Peng-Robinson equation-of-state \cite{39}, indicating that
the gas behavior approximates the ideal gas model. Therefore, the fugacity and pressure
are approximately equal. Figure 2 shows the absolute adsorption isotherms of five gases are
dependent on the absolute pressures in GO membranes with variable doping amounts
of PDASA. The adsorption capacities of CH$_4$ and N$_2$ slowly rise with increasing pressure.
While for acid gases (CO$_2$, H$_2$S and SO$_2$), their isotherms grow rapidly, especially a sudden
increase at relatively low pressures, behaving in a different adsorption mode. As a result,
the adsorption capacities of acid gases in GO membranes are obviously larger than those
of CH$_4$ and N$_2$. In addition, the maximum absorption capacity increases in the order
of N$_2$ < CH$_4$ < CO$_2$ < SO$_2$ < H$_2$S. With increasing the doping amounts of PDASA from 0.0 to
7.5 wt%, the adsorption capacities of three acid gases increase at first and then decrease, as
shown in Figure 1a–f. In view of the low density of adsorbed gases at low pressure and
low temperature, the absolute adsorption capacity ($Q_{ab}$) obtained in our simulations is close
to the excess adsorption capacity ($Q_{ex}$) that is determined in the experiment according to
Equation (1) \cite{40} where $\rho$ is the gas density at simulated pressure and $V_f$ is the free volume
in GO membranes. Therefore, the absolute adsorption isotherms in Figure 1 without further
conversion can be directly described by adsorption models.

$$Q_{ex} = Q_{ab} - \rho V_f$$ \hspace{1cm} (1)

$$S_0 = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{Q_{e}}{P}$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)

$$Q_{ex} = \delta P + \frac{\beta P}{1 + \gamma P^n} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{Q_{ab} P}{1 + \frac{\beta_P}{1 + \gamma P^n}} & \delta = 0; n = 1 \text{ (Langmuir, for CH}_4 \text{ and N}_2) \\
\frac{Q_{ab} P}{1 + \frac{\beta_P}{1 + \gamma P^n}} & \delta = 0; 0 < n < 1 \text{ (Redlich – Peterson, for H}_2\text{S and CO}_2) \\
\delta P + \frac{\beta P}{1 + \gamma P^n} & \delta \neq 0; 0 < n < 1 \text{ (Dual – mode, for SO}_2) 
\end{cases} \hspace{1cm} (3)-(5)$$

$$S_0 = \begin{cases} 
Q_{ab} K_L \text{ (for CH}_4 \text{ and N}_2) & (6) \\
\beta \text{ (for H}_2\text{S and CO}_2) & (7) \\
\delta + \beta \text{ (for SO}_2) & (8) 
\end{cases}$$

The solubility coefficient ($S_0$) of infinite dilution is an important factor in characterizing
membrane separation properties, which is defined as the slope of isotherm at infinite
dilution (Equation (2)) \cite{41-43}. When gas concentration is extremely low, several theoretical
models (Equations (3)–(5)) are applied to fit isotherms to obtain the $S_0$ of gases in GO
membranes, where $P$ is the sorbate pressure, and $\delta$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$ are fitting parameters. After
curve fitting, it shows that the adsorption of CH$_4$ and N$_2$ obey the Langmuir model \cite{44}
(Equation (3)) where \( Q_L \) is the maximal adsorption capacity and \( K_L \) is the adsorption equilibrium constant, indicating a simple adsorption process. While simulation results suggest a three-parameter model (i.e., Redlich-Peterson \[45\], Equation (4)) for \( \text{CO}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \), where \( n \) is the empirical constant. The adsorption behavior for \( \text{SO}_2 \) is a little complex as it needs more variables to fit the isotherm based on the dual-mode sorption model \[46\] as Equation (5). All fitting parameters are presented in Table S1. A high correlation coefficient \((R^2)\) above 0.992 for most systems indicates the reliability of these adopted adsorption models \[45\]. These different theoretical models are ascribed to the variable adsorption mechanism of gases in GO membranes, which will be discussed below. Thereafter, the \( S_0 \) of different gases in GO membranes is accordingly calculated by Equations (6)–(8) \[41–43\].

**Figure 2.** Unary isotherms of different gases in GO membranes with variable doping amounts of PDASA. (a) 0.0 wt\%. (b) 1.5 wt\%. (c) 3.0 wt\%; (d) 4.5 wt\%; (e) 6.0 wt\%; (f) 7.5 wt\%.

### 3.2. Adsorption Insight

To quantitatively evaluate the adsorption ability of different gases in GO membranes and understand the variable adsorption models, Figure 3 presents the calculated \( S_0 \) and the corresponding adsorption behaviors. The \( S_0 \) as a function of variable doping amounts of PDASA is shown in Figure 3a. For \( \text{CH}_4 \) and \( \text{N}_2 \), the \( S_0 \) values in different GO membranes are less than 0.002 mmol\( \cdot \)g\(^{-1}\)\( \cdot \)kPa\(^{-1}\), almost invariable with the doped PDASA. The distribution probability in Figure 3b reveals that the particles of \( \text{CH}_4 \) and \( \text{N}_2 \) are highly concentrated, forming single-layer adsorption. Snapshots in Figure 3c,d provide a visual perspective for these single-adsorbate cases, where \( \text{CH}_4 \) and \( \text{N}_2 \) deposit in the center of GO channels, indicating a weak adsorption ability. That is the reason their adsorption behaviors in GO
membranes can be accurately represented by Langmuir model [44]. On the contrary, CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}S exhibit a strong adsorption ability with the S\textsubscript{0} all above 3.4 mmol·g\textsuperscript{−1}·kPa\textsuperscript{−1}. As seen in Figure 3a, when the PDASA-doping amount is 3.0 wt%, CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}S exhibit the maximum S\textsubscript{0} values of 4.5 and 5.3 mmol·g\textsuperscript{−1}·kPa\textsuperscript{−1}, respectively, almost 2.5 times higher than those values of GO membranes without doping PDASA. Continuously increasing the doping amounts, the S\textsubscript{0} shows a downward trend. The adsorption ability of SO\textsubscript{2} in GO membranes is extremely strong as there is an almost vertical ascent motion at the start point of isotherms (Figure 2). Therefore, the S\textsubscript{0} of SO\textsubscript{2} are all above 80 mmol·g\textsuperscript{−1}·kPa\textsuperscript{−1} and not compared in Figure 3a. Compared to CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}, for acid gases, their maximum distribution probability is not in the center of channels but on either side of the center. By visual of Figure 3e–g, CO\textsubscript{2}, H\textsubscript{2}S and SO\textsubscript{2} present multilayer adsorption in GO channels. In addition, they also have a probability to distribute “outside” channels due to periodic boundary conditions. The above complex adsorption behavior of CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}S indicates a strong adsorption ability, thus deserving the Redlich-Peterson model [45,47].

To reveal the positive effect of PDASA on acid gas adsorption in GO membranes, RDF, isosteric heat and hydrogen bonds are analyzed in Figure 4 to provide molecular insight into the adsorption process. The dynamic binding process between gases and PDASA is evaluated with RDF graph g(r) based on Equation (9) [33], where r is the distance from species i to j, N\textsubscript{i} represents the number of species i, N\textsubscript{ij}(r, r + \Delta r) is the number of i around j within a shell and V is the volume. The RDF value is a measure of binding affinity, whereas a high RDF value means a strong affinity of PDASA to gases. As seen in Figure 4a, the affinity increases following the sequence of N\textsubscript{2} ≈ CH\textsubscript{4} < CO\textsubscript{2} < H\textsubscript{2}S < SO\textsubscript{2}. The high affinity of PDASA to acid gases is the primary reason for its positive effect on acid gas adsorption, while the weak guest-membrane affinities lead to the weak adsorption of CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2} in GO channels. Isosteric heat, a decisive factor of adsorption strength, is analyzed in Figure 4b. Obviously, the isosteric heats of five gases in GO membranes increase in the order of N\textsubscript{2} < CH\textsubscript{4} < CO\textsubscript{2} < H\textsubscript{2}S ≈ SO\textsubscript{2}, confirming the strong adsorption strength of acid gases in GO membranes, especially for SO\textsubscript{2}. Besides the binding affinity and isosteric heat, the strong adsorption of acid gases is also related to hydrogen bonds. Based on these two geometrical criteria [16], (1) r(H···O) ≤ 0.35 nm; (2) \(\alpha(O-H\cdots O) \leq 30^\circ\), hydrogen bonds in acid gases adsorption process are pictured in Figure 4c–e. A great number of hydrogen bonds are formed between GO membranes and acid gases. In addition, the doped PDASA also contributes to the formation of hydrogen bonds, as shown in Figure 4f, which further
helps GO membranes to capture H$_2$S. The above effects synergistically promote acid gas adsorption, while large doping amounts will decrease the effective adsorption sites and reduce the packing efficiency of acid gases in GO channels due to the narrowing of the passage, which will be discussed below.

\[
g_{ij}(r) = \frac{N_{ij}(r, r + \Delta r) V}{4\pi r^2 \Delta r N_i N_j}
\]  

Figure 4. Adsorption Insights. (a) RDF of the doped PDASA to various gases. (b) Isosteric heats. Hydrogen bonds formed in the adsorption process of acid gases. (c) CO$_2$. (d) SO$_2$. (e) H$_2$S. (f) Hydrogen bonds around PDASA.

3.3. Diffusion Evaluation

Dynamical properties of gases in GO channels are evaluated by mean square displacement (MSD) according to Equation (10) [32,33] in which the N refers to the total number of particles and \( r_i(t) - r_i(t_0) \) is the displacement distance of particle i from the initial state \( t_0 \) to the final state \( t \). As shown in Figure 5, the gas mobility in GO channels with variable doping amounts of PDASA follows the sequence of N$_2$ ≈ CH$_4$ > H$_2$S > CO$_2$ > SO$_2$, which means the diffusion process is not governed by the size-sieving effect. The large mobilities of CH$_4$ and N$_2$ in GO channels are attributed to their weak interactions with GO membranes, thus resulting in low mass-transfer resistance. Although with smaller molecular size, acid gases exhibit slow mobility in that the strong interactions generate a large transport resistance [16]. After doping the PDASA into GO channels, the mobilities of all gases slow down. Diffusion coefficient (D) is another key role in determining separation performance, which is calculated by the linear slope of MSD based on Equation (11) [32,33]. Taking the cases in pure GO membrane as examples, the logarithmic form shown in Figure S1 can be fitted linearly from 100 to 1000 ps with slopes larger than 0.94, indicating that the gas diffusion tends to stabilize and approach to a normal diffusion state [48]. Then the D can be obtained from this region in MSD curves. To uncover the diffusion mechanism of gases in GO channels, the quantitative diffusivity, accessible free volume (AFV) [49] and effective transport channels are analyzed in Figure 6. Figure 6a illustrates that the diffusion coefficient generally shows a decreasing trend with the increase in the PDASA-doping amount. For N$_2$ and CH$_4$, both have diffusion coefficients larger than 240 × 10$^{-7}$ cm$^2$·s$^{-1}$ due to the low transfer resistance, which agrees well with previous work [25], demonstrating the reliability of our calculations. In contrast, for
acid gases, their diffusivities in GO channels are relatively low. Especially for SO2, its dynamic motion is severely restricted with diffusion coefficients lower than 80 × 10−7 cm−2·s−1. The AFV in variable GO membranes as a function of probe radius is shown in Figure 6b based on Equation (12) where $V_f$ and $V_o$ denote the free and occupied volumes, respectively. It shows that the AFV is sensitive to the probe radius. In addition, when the probe radius is larger than the molecular sizes of acid gases, the AFV nearly declines with the increase in the PDASA-doping amounts (Figure 6c). Figure 6d–i show the visualization of free volume. Apparently, the PDASA severed as barriers in GO channels to block the passage of gases (green region). With increasing the doping amounts, the effective passage is narrowed especially in GO-7.5 wt% PDASA (Figure 6i). That is the reason molecular diffusion is severely inhibited by doping PDASA in GO channels. This confirms that doping PDASA into GO channels brings a change not only in their adsorption but also in their diffusion. However, in this condition, diffusion is not supposed to govern the separation process of acid gases through the PDASA-doped GO membranes.

$$\text{MSD}(t) = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{N} [r_i(t) - r_i(t_0)]^2 \right\rangle \quad (10)$$

$$D = \frac{1}{6t} \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{d\text{MSD}}{dt} \quad (11)$$

$$\text{AFV} = \frac{V_f}{V_f + V_o} × 100\% \quad (12)$$

![Figure 5](image-url)

**Figure 5.** Mobility of gases in GO channels with variable doping amount of PDASA. (a) 0.0 wt%. (b) 1.5 wt%. (c) 3.0 wt%; (d) 4.5 wt%; (e) 6.0 wt%; (f) 7.5 wt%. 
3.4. Separation Performance Prediction

The permeability coefficient, $P_i$, with a typically reported unit of Barrer is determined on the basis of the solution-diffusion model in Equation (13), where the corresponding $S_i$ and $D_i$ have a unit of cm$^3$(STP)·cm$^{-3}$·mmHg and 10$^{-7}$ cm$^2$·s$^{-1}$, respectively, which are included in Table S2. The ideal gas selectivity, $\alpha_{i/j}$, is defined as the ratio of permeabilities of $i$ and $j$ by Equation (14). The separation performance of acid gases (CO$_2$ and H$_2$S) through PDASA-doped GO membranes is predicated in Figure 7. For CH$_4$ and N$_2$, their permeabilities are relatively low, as shown in Figure 7a; in contrast, acid gases exhibit high permeabilities thanks to their extraordinarily high $S_0$ in GO membranes, which indicates that this permeation process is governed by preferential adsorption. Doping a tiny amount of PDASA into GO channels helps to promote the permeability of CO$_2$ and H$_2$S by 21% and 18%, respectively. Figure 7b shows the ideal selectivities of CO$_2$/CH$_4$, CO$_2$/N$_2$, H$_2$S/CH$_4$ and H$_2$S/N$_2$. Apparently, the selectivities of the above four gas pairs also increase first and then decrease with the increase of PDASA-doping amounts, and their highest selectivities can be up to 95.7, 290.3, 200.8, and 608.2, respectively. The predicted separation performance is compared with experimental results. As shown in Figure 7c,d, the separation performance for both CO$_2$/CH$_4$ and (CO$_2$ + H$_2$S)/CH$_4$ of the PDASA-doped GO membranes were several orders of magnitude greater than most of the ever-reported membranes (Table S3) and far exceed the 2008 Robeson upper bound [22], suggesting the promising potential of the adsorption-dominated separation in acid gas treatment.

\[
P_i = S_iD_i \quad (13)
\]

\[
\alpha_{i/j} = \frac{P_i}{P_j} = \frac{S_iD_i}{S_jD_j} \quad (14)
\]
4. Conclusions

In summary, molecular simulations are performed to investigate the adsorption and diffusion behaviors of several gases in the PDASA-doped GO membranes. Doping a tiny amount (3.0 wt%) of PDASA into GO channels effectively promotes the adsorption ability of acid gases, with the solubility coefficient of H₂S and CO₂ improving almost 2.5 times, while the adsorption abilities of CH₄ and N₂ are almost invariable with the doped PDASA. Theoretical analysis demonstrates that the isotherms of CH₄ and N₂ show weak adsorption, following the Langmuir model, while acid gases exhibit multilayer adsorption in GO membranes, which is relatively complex and described by the Redlich-Peterson model. Molecular insights reveal that the strong adsorption of acid gases in GO membranes is ascribed to their high isosteric heat, great binding affinity and hydrogen bonds. While their diffusion in GO channels is restrained by doping PDASA due to the narrowing of the passage. Even so, the permeability of acid gases and their ideal selectivities over CH₄ are greatly enhanced over Robeson upper bound by doping a tiny amount of PDASA, which suggests that this removal process of acid gases is primarily dominated by preferential adsorption. From the bottom-up, this molecular understanding provides a strategy to develop high-performance GO membranes toward acid gas treatment. Such fundamental insights show the great potential of 2D membranes in the practical application of natural gas processing.
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**Nomenclature**

| Symbols | Description |
|---------|-------------|
| Qex, Qab | excess, absolute adsorption capacity (mmol·g⁻¹) |
| ρg | gas density (mmol·cm⁻³) |
| Vf, Vo | free, occupied volumes (cm³·g⁻¹) per unit mass |
| δ, β and γ | fitting parameters in the adsorption model |
| QL | maximal adsorption capacity in the Langmuir model |
| KL | adsorption equilibrium constant in the Langmuir model |
| n | empirical constant in the Redlich-Peterson model |
| R² | correlation coefficient |
| g(r) | radial distribution function (RDF) |
| MSD | mean square displacement (nm²) |
| AFV | accessible free volume (%) |
| Si | solubility coefficient (cm³(STP)·cm⁻³·mmHg⁻¹) |
| Dj | diffusion coefficient (10⁻⁷ cm²·s⁻¹) |
| Pi | permeability coefficient (Barrer) |
| αi/j | gas selectivity of species i over j |

**References**

1. Plant, G.; Kort, E.A.; Brandt, A.R.; Chen, Y.; Fordice, G.; Negron, A.M.G.; Schwietzke, S.; Smith, M.; Zavala-Araiza, D. Inefficient and unlit natural gas flares both emit large quantities of methane. *Science* **2022**, *377*, 1566–1571. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
2. Anyanwu, J.-T.; Wang, Y.; Yang, R.T. CO₂ capture (including direct air capture) and natural gas desulfurization of amine-grafted hierarchical bimodal silica. *Chem. Eng. J.* **2021**, *427*, 131561. [CrossRef]
3. Park, J.; Yoon, S.; Oh, S.-Y.; Kim, Y.; Kim, J.-K. Improving energy efficiency for a low-temperature CO₂ separation process in natural gas processing. *Energy* **2020**, *214*, 118844. [CrossRef]
4. Behmadi, R.; Mokhtarian, M.; Davoodi, A.; Hosseinpour, S. Desulfurization of natural gas condensate using polyethylene glycol and water intercalated activated γ-bauxite. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2022**, *376*, 134230. [CrossRef]
5. He, Z.; Gupta, K.M.; Linga, P.; Jiang, J. Molecular Insights into the Nucleation and Growth of CH₄ and CO₂ Mixed Hydrates from Microsecond Simulations. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **2016**, *120*, 25225–25236. [CrossRef]
6. He, Z.; Mi, F.; Ning, F. Molecular insights into CO₂ hydrate formation in the presence of hydrophilic and hydrophobic solid surfaces. *Energy* **2021**, *234*, 121260. [CrossRef]
7. He, Z.; Linga, P.; Jiang, J. What are the key factors governing the nucleation of CO₂ hydrate? *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *19*, 15657–15661. [CrossRef]
8. Cavaignac, R.S.; Ferreira, N.L.; Guardani, R. Techno-economic and environmental process evaluation of biogas upgrading via amine scrubbing. *Renew. Energy* **2021**, *171*, 868–880. [CrossRef]
38. Lin, Y.; Pan, D.; Li, J.; Zhang, L.; Shao, X. Application of Berendsen barostat in dissipative particle dynamics for nonequilibrium dynamic simulation. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2017, 146, 124108. [CrossRef]

39. Lopez-Echeverry, J.S.; Reif-Acherman, S.; Araujo-Lopez, E. Peng-Robinson equation of state: 40 years through cubics. *Fluid Phase Equilib.* 2017, 447, 39–71. [CrossRef]

40. Chen, L.; Liu, K.; Jiang, S.; Huang, H.; Tan, J.; Zuo, L. Effect of adsorbed phase density on the correction of methane excess adsorption to absolute adsorption in shale. *Chem. Eng. J.* 2021, 420, 127678. [CrossRef]

41. De Lorenzo, L.; Tocci, E.; Gugliuzza, A.; Drioli, E. Pure and modified co-polyamide-12-b-ethylene oxide) membranes for gas separation studied by molecular investigations. *Membranes* 2012, 2, 346–366. [CrossRef]

42. Zhou, J.; Zhu, X.; Hu, J.; Liu, H.; Hu, Y.; Jiang, J. Mechanistic insight into highly efficient gas permeation and separation in a shape-persistent ladder polymer membrane. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 2014, 16, 6075–6083. [CrossRef]

43. Tocci, E.; Gugliuzza, A.; De Lorenzo, L.; Macchione, M.; De Luca, G.; Drioli, E. Transport properties of a co-polyamide-12-b-ethylene oxide) membrane: A comparative study between experimental and molecular modelling results. *J. Membr. Sci.* 2008, 323, 316–327. [CrossRef]

44. Alafnan, S.; Awotunde, A.; Glatz, G.; Adjei, S.; Alrumaih, I.; Gowida, A. Langmuir adsorption isotherm in unconventional resources: Applicability and limitations. *J. Pet. Sci. Eng.* 2021, 207, 109172. [CrossRef]

45. Liu, Q.; Guo, H.; Shan, Y. Adsorption of fluoride on synthetic siderite from aqueous solution. *J. Fluor. Chem.* 2010, 131, 635–641. [CrossRef]

46. Tocci, E.; De Lorenzo, L.; Bernardo, P.; Clarizia, G.; Bazzarelli, F.; Mckeown, N.B.; Carta, M.; Malpass-Evans, R.; Friess, K.; Pilenček, K.; et al. Molecular Modeling and Gas Permeation Properties of a Polymer of Intrinsically Microporous Composed of Ethanoantracene and Tröger’s Base Units. *Macromolecules* 2014, 47, 7900–7916. [CrossRef]

47. Kalam, S.; Abu-Khamsin, S.A.; Kamal, M.S.; Patil, S. Surfactant adsorption isotherms: A review. *ACS Omega* 2021, 6, 32342–32348. [CrossRef]

48. Javanainen, M.; Hammaren, H.; Monticelli, L.; Jeon, J.-H.; Miettinen, M.S.; Martinez-Seara, H.; Metzler, R.; Vattulainen, I. Anomalous and normal diffusion of proteins and lipids in crowded lipid membranes. *Faraday Discuss.* 2012, 161, 397–417. [CrossRef]

49. Mazo, M.; Khudobin, R.; Balabaev, N.; Belov, N.; Ryzhikh, V.; Nikiforov, R.; Chatterjee, R.; Banerjee, S. Structure and free volume of fluorine-containing polyetherimides with Pendant di-tert-butyl groups investigated by molecular dynamics simulation. *Polymer* 2022, 14, 125318. [CrossRef]

50. Qian, Q.; Wright, A.M.; Lee, H.; Dincă, M.; Smith, Z.P. Low-temperature H2S/CO2/CH4 separation in mixed-matrix membranes containing MFU-4. *Chem. Mater.* 2021, 33, 6825–6831. [CrossRef]

51. Liu, G.; Cadiau, A.; Liu, Y.; Adil, K.; Chernikova, V.; Carja, I.-D.; Belmakhout, Y.; Karunakaran, M.; Shekhhah, O.; Zhang, C.; et al. Enabling fluorinated MOF-based membranes for simultaneous removal of H2S and CO2 from natural gas. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2018, 57, 14811–14816. [CrossRef]

52. Ahmad, M.Z.; Peters, T.A.; Konnertz, N.M.; Visser, T.; Téllez, C.; Coronas, J.; Fila, V.; de Vos, W.M.; Benes, N.E. High-pressure CO2/CH4 separation of Zr-MOFs based mixed matrix membranes. *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 2020, 230, 115858. [CrossRef]

53. Yahaya, G.O.; Hayek, A.; Alsamah, A.; Shalabi, Y.A.; Ben Sultan, M.M.; Alhajry, R.H. Copolyimide membranes with improved H2S/CH4 selectivity for high-pressure sour mixed-gas separation. *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 2021, 272, 118897. [CrossRef]

54. Hayek, A.; Alsamah, A.; Alaslai, N.; Maab, H.; Qasem, E.A.; Alhajry, R.H.; Alyami, N.M. Unprecedented Sour Mixed-Gas Permeation Properties of Fluorinated Polyazole-Based Membranes. *ACS Appl. Polym. Mater.* 2020, 2, 2199–2210. [CrossRef]

55. Hayek, A.; Yahaya, G.O.; Alasamah, A.; Ghannam, A.A.; Jutaily, S.A.; Mokhtari, I. Pure- and sour mixed-gas transport properties of 4,4′-methylenebis(2,6-diethylaniline)-based copolyimide membranes. *Polymer* 2019, 166, 184–195. [CrossRef]

56. Hayek, A.; Alsamah, A.; Yahaya, G.O.; Qasem, E.A.; Alhajry, R.H. Post-synthetic modification of CARDO-based materials: Application in sour natural gas separation. *J. Mater. Chem. A* 2020, 8, 23354–23367. [CrossRef]

57. Ghannam, A.A.; Yahaya, G.O.; Hayek, A.; Mokhtari, I.; Saleem, Q.; Sewdan, D.A.; Bahamdan, A.A. High pressure pure- and mixed sour gas transport properties of Cardo-type block co-polyimide membranes. *J. Membr. Sci.* 2018, 553, 32–42. [CrossRef]

58. Liu, Y.; Liu, Z.; Liu, G.; Qiu, W.; Bhuwania, N.; Chinn, D.; Koros, W.J. Surprising plasticization benefits in natural gas upgrading using polyimide membranes. *J. Membr. Sci.* 2020, 593, 117430. [CrossRef]

59. Liu, G.; Chernikova, V.; Liu, Y.; Zhang, K.; Belmakhout, Y.; Shekhhah, O.; Zhang, C.; Yi, S.; Eddaoudi, M.; Koros, W.J. Mixed matrix formulations with MOF molecular sieving for key energy-intensive separations. *Nat. Mater.* 2018, 17, 283–289. [CrossRef]