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Development of a combined leaching and ion-exchange system for valorisation of spent potlining waste

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Thomas J. Robshaw, Keith Bonser, Glyn Coxhill, Robert Dawson and Mark D. Ogden

Information on Lanthanum-loaded Puromet™ MTS9501 resin (La-MTS9501)

Figure S1. (a) La-loading mechanism for commercial resin Puromet™ MTS9501 resin, showing chelation of La ion to aminophosphonic acid functionality. (b) Probable mechanisms of aluminium hydroxyfluoride (AHF) uptake by La-MTS9501. Initial strong chemisorption interaction between La centre and aqueous AHF, then complexation with further weakly-bound AHFs (coordinating water ligands are omitted for clarity), accompanied by ligand-exchange reactions, resulting in the dominant bound AHF species having stoichiometry of ~Al(OH)₂F [1, 2].
Figure S2. Conceptual diagram of La-MTS9501 column system for treatment of SPL leachate.

Images of selected SPL samples

Figure S3. Photographs of the three different unprocessed SPL samples selected for leaching trials. Sample A (left), containing a large fraction of cementious and brick material. Sample B (middle), containing visible cementious material. Sample C (right), appearing to be mainly graphitic material.
Dynamic breakthrough models

Dose-response model [3]

\[ \frac{C}{C_i} = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \left( \frac{V_{ef}}{b} \right)^a} \quad (S1) \]

\[ q_0 = \frac{b C_i}{m} \quad (S2) \]

In these equations, \( C \) is the fluoride concentration in the effluent at a given time (mg L\(^{-1}\)), \( C_i \) is the fluoride concentration in the effluent at full breakthrough (mg L\(^{-1}\)), \( V_{ef} \) is the volume of solution eluted from the column (mL), \( a \) and \( b \) are constants of the Dose-Response model, \( q_0 \) is the theoretical maximum uptake capacity of the resin in a dynamic environment (mg g\(^{-1}\)) and \( m \) is the dry mass of resin (g).
Thomas model [4]

\[ \frac{C}{C_i} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\left(\frac{k_{Th}}{Q}\right)(Q_{in} - C_i) \nu_{ef}}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (S3)

where \( k_{Th} \) = Thomas rate constant (mL min\(^{-1}\) mg\(^{-1}\)), \( Q \) = flow rate (mL min\(^{-1}\)). All other terms as previously described.

Yoon-Nelson model [5]

\[ \frac{C}{C_i} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{k_{YN}(t - \tau)}} \] \hspace{1cm} (S4)

where \( k_{YN} \) = Yoon-Nelson rate constant (min\(^{-1}\)), \( t \) = time (min) and \( \tau \) = the time at which \( C/C_i = 0.5 \) (min). All other terms as previously described. It should be noted that the Thomas and Yoon-Nelson models are mathematically analogous. Therefore, their fitting to experimental data using Microsoft SOLVER [6] produces identical \( R^2 \) values.

PXRD spectra of SPL samples at various process stages

![PXRD spectrum](image)

\textbf{Figure S5.} PXRD spectrum of sample A <1.18 mm size fraction as received.
Figure S6. PXRD spectrum of sample A <1.18 mm size fraction after caustic leaching treatment.

Figure S7. PXRD spectrum of sample A <1.18 mm size fraction after full leaching treatment.

Figure S8. PXRD spectrum of sample A 1.18–9.51 mm size fraction as received.
Figure S9. PXRD spectrum of sample A 1.18–9.51 mm size fraction after caustic leaching treatment.

Figure S10. PXRD spectrum of sample A 1.18–9.51 mm size fraction after full leaching treatment.

Figure S11. PXRD spectrum of sample B <1.18 mm size fraction as received.
Figure S12. PXRD spectrum of sample B <1.18 mm size fraction after caustic leaching treatment.

Figure S13. PXRD spectrum of sample B <1.18 mm size fraction after full leaching treatment.

Figure S14. PXRD spectrum of sample B 1.18-9.51 mm size fraction as received.
Figure S15. PXRD spectrum of sample B 1.1–9.51 mm size fraction after caustic leaching treatment.

Figure S16. PXRD spectrum of sample B 1.18–9.51 mm size fraction after full leaching treatment.

Figure S17. PXRD spectrum of sample C <1.18 mm size fraction as received.
Figure S18. PXRD spectrum of sample C <1.18 mm size fraction after caustic leaching treatment.

Figure S19. PXRD spectrum of sample C <1.18 mm size fraction after full leaching treatment.

Figure S20. PXRD spectrum of sample C 1.18–9.51 mm size fraction as received.
Figure S21. PXRD spectrum of sample C 1.18–9.51 mm size fraction after caustic leaching treatment.

Figure S22. PXRD spectrum of sample C 1.18–9.51 mm size fraction after full leaching treatment.

Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) images

Figure S23. SEM images of sample A <1.18 mm size fraction before (left) and after (right) full leaching treatment.
Figure S24. SEM images of sample B <1.18 mm size fraction before (left) and after (right) full leaching treatment.

Figure S25. SEM images of sample C <1.18 mm size fraction before (left) and after (right) full leaching treatment.

Energy-dispersive X-ray (EDX) spectra from point analysis (performed in conjunction with SEM imaging)

Figure S26. EDX spectrum for point α (cementious particle) in sample A <1.18 mm size fraction.
Figure S27. EDX spectrum for point β (graphite particle) in sample A <1.18 mm size fraction.

Figure S28. EDX spectrum for point γ (crystalline region) in sample C <1.18 mm size fraction. Peaks labelled in red were manually assigned.

Additional ICP-MS analysis of SPL leachate

Table S1. Quantities of minor chemical species leached from each SPL sample, determined by ICP-MS.

| Leaching treatment | Sample          | Ni  | Ba  | Be  | Cr  | Sr  | Li  | V   | Mn  | Y   | Zn  |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| caustic            | A <1.18 mm      | < 5 | 0.480 | 0.960 | 21.6 | 1.44 | 18.2 | 16.3 | 0.480 | < 5 | 77.8 |
| caustic            | A 1.18-9.51 mm  | < 5 | 2.46 | <0.5 | 6.57 | 0.821 | 45.6 | 7.39 | 1.64 | < 5 | 60.4 |
| caustic            | B <1.18 mm      | < 5 | 0.468 | 1.87  | 8.89 | 1.40 | 34.6 | 12.6 | 0.468 | < 5 | 67.4 |
| caustic            | B 1.18-9.51 mm  | < 5 | 0.414 | 3.31  | 3.31 | 0.827 | 26.5 | 12.8 | 0.414 | < 5 | 50.9 |
| caustic            | C <1.18 mm      | < 5 | 3.92 | 4.90  | 20.1 | 3.43 | 27.9 | 7.84 | 0.490 | < 5 | 67.6 |
| caustic            | C 1.18-9.51 mm  | < 5 | 1.30 | 2.61  | 6.08 | 2.61 | 24.8 | 3.91 | 0.434 | < 5 | 44.7 |
| average            |                 | < 5 | 1.51 | 2.36  | 11.1 | 1.76 | 29.6 | 10.2 | 0.655 | < 5 | 61.5 |
| Standard deviation |                 |     | 1.42 | 1.61  | 7.78 | 1.05 | 9.44 | 4.54 | 0.485 |     | 12.1 |
| acidic             | A <1.18 mm      | 46.3 | 9.84 | 3.60 | 90.0 | 57.8 | 34.8 | 5.28 | 133.7 | 6.24 | 85.2 |
| acidic             | A 1.18-9.51 mm  | 9.45 | 7.46 | 3.23 | 14.9 | 64.7 | 32.1 | 8.71 | 42.5  | 7.71 | 162 |
| acidic             | B <1.18 mm      | 17.2 | 5.23 | 5.65 | 24.1 | 62.4 | 32.0 | 2.51 | 58.0  | 4.61 | 48.4 |
| acidic             | B 1.18-9.51 mm  | 8.02 | 4.86 | 2.67 | 15.8 | 33.0 | 16.5 | 0.729 | 18.7  | 2.43 | 52.7 |
| acidic             | C <1.18 mm      | 28.1 | 2.14 | 4.07 | 37.9 | 75.9 | 19.5 | 3.43 | 106   | 2.36 | 30.2 |
| acidic             | C 1.18 mm-9.51 mm | 13.6 | 2.12 | 6.58 | 13.4 | 55.0 | 21.5 | 1.91 | 47.8  | 1.91 | 17.4 |
| average            |                 | 20.4 | 5.28 | 4.30 | 32.7 | 58.1 | 26.1 | 3.76 | 67.2  | 4.21 | 66.1 |
| Standard deviation |                 | 14.6 | 3.02 | 1.51 | 29.5 | 14.3 | 7.79 | 2.87 | 43.2  | 2.38 | 52.5 |
Other SPL leaching treatments described in the literature

Table S2. Comparison of SPL leaching treatments previously reported.

| SPL cut                      | Number of stages | Lixiviant(s)                                      | Length of treatment (hr) | Leaching temperature (°C) | Reference |
|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| Mixed                        | 2                | 1 M NaOH (with H₂O₂), 0.5 M H₂SO₄               | 3 (x 2)) + 2             | 20                        | This study |
| First                        | 1                | Concentrated chromic acid                        | < 0.3                    | 100                       | [7]       |
| Not stated (presumed mixed)  | 4                | Water, HF, H₂SiF₆, water                         | Not stated               | 60 - 90                   | [8]       |
| Second                       | 1                | 0.01 M NaOH                                      | 18                       | 23                        | [9]       |
| Not stated (presumed first)  | 2                | 2.5 M NaOH, 9.7 M HCl                           | 3 (x 2)                  | 100                       | [10]      |
| First                        | 2                | Water, 0.36 M Al(NO₃)₃                           | 4 + 24                   | 25                        | [11]      |
| First                        | 2                | Water, Al anodizing wastewater / 0.7 M H₂SO₄    | 4 (x 2)                  | 25 - 60                   | [12]      |
| First                        | 1                | NaOH (ultrasound-assisted)                       | 0.67                     | 70                        | [13]      |
| Not stated (presumed first)  | 2                | Water, Al anodizing wastewater / 1.77 M H₂SO₄   | 3 (x 2)                  | 80                        | [14]      |

Table S3. Composition of SPL from different common smelter cell types [15].

| Chemical species (mass %) | Cell type (mass %) |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
|                          | A type prebake     | B type prebake     | Söderberg |
| Fluorides                | 10.9               | 15.5               | 18        |
| Cyanides (mg kg⁻¹)       | 680                | 4480               | 1040      |
| Total aluminium          | 13.6               | 11                 | 12.5      |
| Metallic aluminium      | 1                  | 1                  | 1.9       |
| Carbon                   | 50.2               | 45.5               | 38.4      |
| Sodium                   | 12.5               | 16.3               | 14.3      |
| Calcium                  | 1.3                | 2.4                | 2.4       |
| Iron                     | 2.9                | 3.1                | 4.3       |
| Lithium                  | 0.03               | 0.03               | 0.6       |
| Titanium                 | 0.23               | 0.24               | 0.15      |
| Magnesium                | 0.23               | 0.09               | 0.2       |

Mixing of caustic and acidic leachates and precipitation

Table S4. Masses of precipitate attained from combination of 25 mL caustic leachate and 25 mL acidic leachate, maintaining pH of ~ 3.

| Sample       | Precipitate mass (g) |
|--------------|----------------------|
| A <1.18 mm   | 0.1039               |
| A 1.18–9.51 mm | 0.0993              |
| B <1.18 mm   | 0.0661               |
| B 1.18–9.51 mm | 0.0929              |
| C <1.18 mm   | 0.0748               |
| C 1.18–9.51 mm | 0.0759              |
Figure S29. PXRD spectrum of precipitate obtained by mixing caustic and acidic leachates from treatment of sample A, 1.18–9.51 mm fraction.

Figure S30. PXRD spectrum of precipitate obtained by mixing caustic and acidic leachates from treatment of sample B, <1.18 mm fraction.
**Figure S31.** PXRD spectrum of precipitate obtained by mixing caustic and acidic leachates from treatment of sample C, <1.18 mm fraction.

**Figure S32.** Literature PXRD spectrum of cryolite from the ICDD for comparison [16].

**Fixed-bed fluoride column-loading studies and fitting to dynamic models**

**Figure S33.** Raw breakthrough data for loading of La-MTS9501 resin column from combined leachate of SPL sample A, 1.18–9.51 mm size fraction. Column volume = 5.50 mL. Resin mass = 1.792 g. Flow rate = 0.50 BV hr⁻¹. T = 20°C.
Figure S34. Modelling of first breakthrough region for the above data.

Figure S35. Modelling of second breakthrough region for the above data.
Table S5. Extracted parameters from modelling of breakthrough behaviour for leachates of sample A <1.18 mm and sample A 1.18–9.51 mm. For definition of model parameters, see p3.

| Model       | Parameter | Breakthrough region | Leachate Sample A < 1.18 mm | Sample A 1.18–9.51 mm |
|-------------|-----------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Dose-Response | a         | first               | 5.50 ± 0.60                | 6.60 ± 0.67           |
|             | b         | first               | 74.9 ± 1.7                 | 58.5 ± 1.0            |
|             | q₀        | first               | 5.01 ± 0.11                | 4.23 ± 0.07           |
|             | R²        | first               | 0.983                      | 0.969                 |
|             | a         | second              | 5.45 ± 0.47                | 4.57 ± 0.48           |
|             | b         | second              | 262 ± 4                    | 186 ± 4               |
|             | q₀        | second              | 26.7 ± 0.4                 | 33.4 ± 0.7            |
|             | R²        | second              | 0.960                      | 0.947                 |
|             |           | both*               | 0.932                      | 0.959                 |
| Thomas      | kₜh       | first               | 5.78 ± 0.86 (x 10⁻³)       | 7.60 ± 1.0 (x 10⁻³)   |
|             | q₀        | first               | 5.10 ± 0.15                | 4.28 ± 0.09           |
|             | R²        | first               | 0.971                      | 0.950                 |
|             | kₜh       | second              | 1.02 ± 0.12 (x 10⁻³)       | 7.00 ± 0.98 (x 10⁻³)  |
|             | q₀        | second              | 27.1 ± 0.5                 | 34.0 ± 0.9            |
|             | R²        | second              | 0.937                      | 0.921                 |
|             |           | both*               | 0.942                      | 0.971                 |
| Yoon-Nelson | kₛ        | first               | 7.56 ± 1.1 (x 10⁻²)        | 0.107 ± 0.015         |
|             | T₅₀       | first               | 76.2 ± 2.2                 | 59.2 ± 1.3            |
|             | R²        | first               | 0.971                      | 0.950                 |
|             | kₛ        | second              | 2.03 ± 0.23 (x 10⁻²)       | 2.47 ± 0.35 (x 10⁻²)  |
|             | T₅₀       | second              | 286 ± 5                    | 186 ± 5               |
|             | R²        | second              | 0.937                      | 0.921                 |
|             |           | both*               | 0.942                      | 0.971                 |

* The R² values for both breakthrough regions are derived from an attempt to fit a single breakthrough curve to the whole dataset.
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