# [Mansoura Engineering Journal](https://mej.researchcommons.org/home)

[Volume 32](https://mej.researchcommons.org/home/vol32) | [Issue 2](https://mej.researchcommons.org/home/vol32/iss2) Article 19

12-8-2020

# Stripping of Fe (III) from D2EHPA Using Sulphuric Acid, Hydrochloric Acid, and Reductive Stripping in Vacuum.

Seham Nagib Academy of Specific Studies, Worker University, Cairo, Egypt, seham67@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: [https://mej.researchcommons.org/home](https://mej.researchcommons.org/home?utm_source=mej.researchcommons.org%2Fhome%2Fvol32%2Fiss2%2F19&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

### Recommended Citation

Nagib, Seham (2020) "Stripping of Fe (III) from D2EHPA Using Sulphuric Acid, Hydrochloric Acid, and Reductive Stripping in Vacuum.," Mansoura Engineering Journal: Vol. 32 : Iss. 2, Article 19. Available at:<https://doi.org/10.21608/bfemu.2020.128556>

This Original Study is brought to you for free and open access by Mansoura Engineering Journal. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mansoura Engineering Journal by an authorized editor of Mansoura Engineering Journal. For more information, please contact [mej@mans.edu.eg](mailto:mej@mans.edu.eg).

### Stripping of Fe (III) from D2EHPA Using Sulphuric Acid, Hydrochloric Acid, and Reductive Stripping in Vacuum

### إسترجاع الحديد الثلاثي (Fe (HI) - من D2EHPA - باستخدام حمض الكبر يتبك وجمض الهيدروكلوريك وكذلك الإسترجاع تحت تأثير الضغط المنخفض في وجود مادة مختزلة Seham Navib

Academy of Specific Studies, Worker University, Cairo, Egypt

### الملخص

من المعر وف ان ابون الحديد الثلاثي (III) Fe بِسهل استخلاصه باستخدام \_ D2EHPA ولكن من الصبعب إستر جاعه. ومن المعرِّ وف أن الحديد الشَّاني (Fe (II) - اسهل في الإستر جاع من الحديد الثلاثي Fe (III) .Fe لذلك إختر ال الحديد الثلاثي إلى الثنائي بمكن ان يحل المشكلة. تم در اسة نائبر الأحماض مثل H2SO و HCI وكذلك وجود آيون الزَّنك (II) Zn كمـادة مختزلـة تحت ضغط منخفض على الإسترجاع ابون الحديد الثلاثي (Fe(III. وقد أوضحت النتائج أن استرجاع (III) Fe يزداد مع زيادة تركيز الحمض حتى 10N لحمض الكبر يتيك، 5N لحمض الهيدر وكلور يك ِ أما بالنسبة للاستر جاع بالاختز ال فقد وصلت النسبة إلى ٩٠% في خطوة واحدة وذلك اعتمادا على نسبة A/O عند ضغط 60 kPa.

### **Abstract**

Whereas, Fe (III) is easily extracted using di (2-ethylliexyl) phosphoric acid (D2EHPA), it is hard to strip it from the organic phase. It is well known that Fe (II) is readily stripped from D2EHPA, so a reduction of ferric to ferrous iron could be away to solve this problem. In this work, the conventional way of stripping using acidic solutions such as  $H_2SO<sub>a</sub>$ and HCl has been studied. Fe (III) stripping was found to increase with increasing acid concentration. The optimum acid concentration required is 10 N and 5 N for  $H_2SO_4$  and HCl, respectively. Also, reductive stripping in vacuum has been studied by using SHG zinc powder as reducing agent. The optimisation of operating conditions, such as degree of vacuum, acid concentration and quantity of added zinc, has been made. The experiments showed that a stripping yield greater than 90% in only one stage can be achieved, depending on A/O ratio, at 60 kPa of pressure. from reduction and stripping have been done simultaneously.

**Key words:** Iron stripping, D2EHPA, galvanic stripping, reductive stripping.

#### M. 46 Seham Nagib

### 1- Introduction

Several investigations have been performed to strip Fe (III) from D2EHPA. The common way to extract iron from the organic solvent is by using concentrated acidic solutions, such as H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and HCl [Sahu and Das, 1997, Hirato et al, 1992, Yu Shugiu and Chen Jiayong. 19891. The stripping of Fe (III) has been found to increase with increasing  $H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>$  acid concentration

To increase the Fe (III) stripping from D2EHPA, NH<sub>4</sub>HF<sub>2</sub> solution has been used, but the whole process appears to involve many operational steps [Watanabe et al. 1986]. An attempt has also been made to add another organic tributyl reagent. such  $25$ phosphate (TBP) [Sahu and Das. 1997], trialkyl phosphine oxide (TRPO) and primary amine N-1923, to the organic phase for the purpose of improving the Fe (III) stripping operation [ Chen et al. 1992].

The reductive stripping of Fe (III) is achieved by gaseous reductants, such as SO<sub>2</sub> [Majima] et al, 1985] and  $H_2$  [ Demopoulos and Gefvert, 1984], but these methods have some feasibility problems due to the high pressure and temperature used.

Over the past few years, galvanic stripping has been studied: this method is based on the ability of a solid metal (Zn or Fe) to directly reduce ferric iron to the ferrous state in an organic medium [Lupi and Pilone, 2000, Chia et al, 1994, Belew et al, 1993, and Moats and O'keefe. 1996]; some tests have been carried out by using nitrogen, either bubbled through the liquid or introduced above the liquid level in the vessel [Belew et al, 1993, Lupi and Pilone, 2000].

In this work, the ferric ion stripping from D2EHPA was carried out using acidic solutions such as HCl and H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, and by galvanic stripping using  $Z_{n}$ powder as the reducing agent in vacuum. The redox reaction in the organic phase and the stripping were simultaneously performed in a stirred flask at different degrees of vacuum.

### 2- Experimental

### 2.1 Reagents

Highly purified D2EHPA was donated by Daihachi kindly Chemical Co. Ltd. and was used as received without any further purification. Reagent grade kerosene was used as a diluent. The D2EHPA concentration was measured by means of acid- base titration method using KOH dissolved in ethanol as a base reagent.

#### $2.2$ Method

### 2.2.1 Loading

A 26 mM solution of D2EHPA in kerosene was used. The Fe (III)loaded D2EHPA was obtained by mixing  $(A/O=1$ , [Fe[=0.4 Kg/ m<sup>3</sup> the organic solution with reagent grade FeCl<sub>1</sub> aqueous solution. The concentration of the metal

ion in the organic phase was calculated from the difference between the metal ion concentration in the agreeous phase before and after loading.

#### $2.2.2$ **Stripping**

In the case of stripping using acidic solution the loaded organic was contacted for 5 min at room temperature with  $H_2SO_4/$ HCl solutions and the strip solution was diluted to the required level for iron analysis.

On the other hand, in the case of galvanic stripping, carried out at room temperature, a vacuum flask was used: the vacuum was achieved using a water ejector joined to the flask by a vacuum pipe, with a pressure gauge to measure the degree of vacuum.

At the beginning of each galvanic stripping experiment, the two phases. the Fe (III)-loaded D2EHPA (50  $mL$ ) and the  $H_2SO_4$ aqueous solution (50 mL), were put into the flask; subsequently, a weighed amounts of SHG zinc powder was added as the reducing agent and the flask was sealed with a rubber band. The mixture was continuously stirred by a magnetic stirrer. At the end of each experiment, the vacuum was maintained until the two phases had become separated.

After each test, the aqueous was analysed by AAS.

#### $3-$ **Results and Discussion**  $3.1$ **Iron Extraction**

the extraction  $Fix - 1$  shows isotherm  $for$  $Fe(III)$ with D<sub>2</sub>EHPA

## 3.2 Acidic stripping

Sufficient quantity of the loaded organic with  $0.40 \text{ kg/m}^3$  of iron was prepared under the above conditions and iron stripping was studied using both  $H_2SO_4$  and HCI (of different concentrations). From Fig.2, it can be observed that in both cases, stripping increase up to a certain level and then decreases. The decrease in stripping is more pronounced in case of HCl. About 88 and 99 % iron stripping takes place with 10  $H_2SO_4$  and 5 N HCl. N respectively in a single stage at the A/O phase ratio of 1:1. But, the use of a concentrated acidic solution such as 6 M HCl can degrade the organic phase [Sahu and Das, 1997. Hirato et al.  $1992$ .

#### $3.3$ **Galvanic stripping**

## 3.3.1 Effect of time

Testing of the required time to reach the maximum yield of iron stripping in vacuum was carried out. These experiments were performed using A/O phase ratio of 1:1 of the aqueous containing  $0.045$  M  $H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>$ . The reducing agent was Zn powder, whose quantity was four times the stoichiometric one, to promote the Fe (III) ion reduction. A pressure of 15 kPa was chosen in vacuum tests  $\mathfrak{t}$ ensure  $\mathbf{a}$ 

#### M. 48 Seham Nagib

sufficiently low  $Po_2$ ; this value is compromise between two  $a$ opposite needs: to avoid iron reoxidation and to have low energy consumption.

Fig. 3 shows the stripping vields as a function of operating time. The stripping vield in vacuum rapidly rises in the first 10 min. reaches the maximum value at 40 min and remains constant for longer times. The subsequent tests were therefore carried out in vacuum with a fixed 40 min contact time.

### 3.3.2 Effect of Zn amount

In Fig. 4 the iron stripping  $(\% )$  is reported as a function of the percent Zn excess (E):

 $E = [(Zn_u - Zn_{st})/Zn_{st}]$  100

Where  $Zn_{u}$  is the zinc amount used and  $Zn_{st}$  (0.15 g) is the stoichiometric amount.

It can be seen that the amount of stripped Fe increases up to  $E =$ 250 %, after this value, it shows no variations. In this test, the amounts of Zn in both organic and aqueous phase were measured (Table 1).

Table 1 highlight that the dissolved zinc in the organic higher phase becomes on increasing the added powder amount, although the Fe (III) initial concentration in this phase is the same. Observing the data of Fig. 4 and Table 1, it is evident that the zinc in the organic phase is always higher than the

stoichiometric amount needed for the redox reaction:

 $2 R_3Fe_{(org)} + Zn_{(met)}^0 = 2 R_2Fe$  $(\text{org})$  + R<sub>2</sub> Zn<sub>(org)</sub>  $(1)$ 

It can be said that by adding fhan four times more the stoichiometric quantity of Zn, the stripping yield remains iron almost constant although the Zn dissolved in the organic phase observation increases. This suggests that a part of zinc powder dissolves in the organic phase since the aqueous phase equilibrium  $pH$  (about 1) is too low to have a considerable extraction of Zn by D2EHPA. As can be observed in Table 1, the Zn concentration in the aqueous solution is practically constant, whatever the Zn powder amount may be.

In the following experiments, the excess of Zn powder added was maintained at 250 %.

#### stripping  $3.3.3$ Effect  $of$ solution acidity

To establish the influence of the stripping solution acidity on the iron stripping yield, the concentration of  $H_2SO_4$ was varied in the range  $0.045 - 0.25$ M, maintaining the pressure at 15 kPa; Fig. 5 shows the results obtained during these experiments. The iron extraction yield increases with increasing  $H_2SO_4$  concentration up to 0.12 M, and then, no significant of extraction are increases

observed. The dissolved Zn, that is about 45 % of the added metallic nowder.  $is$ shared between the aqueous and organic phases. depending  $_{\text{on}}$ acid concentration. The  $Z_{11}$ concentration in the aqueous phase increases with increasing solution acidity, while the Zu present in the organic phase shows an opposite trend. On the basis of the data reported in Fig. 5, it is possible to observe that the Zn dissolved is around 60 % higher than the stoichiometric amount required for the iron reduction, showing once again that another reaction is involved. In order to perform in the same operation, both iron reduction and stripping with high extraction yield, the 0.1 M H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> aqueous solution has been used, thus, minimizing the Zn losses in the aqueous phase. The Zn dissolved in the organic phase can be subsequently recovered in the stripping stage.

#### Effect of pressure  $3.3.4$

The influence of pressure on the process was investigated at fixed reaction time.  $Z<sub>11</sub>$ powder amount. and  $H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>$ concentration.

In Fig. 6 the iron stripping yield and the Zn dissolved in both phases are reported as a function of the pressure.

Fig. 6 shows that iron extraction yield remains constant from 15 to 75 kPa and rapidly decreases at near atmospheric pressure: this

result indicates that the reduction of Fe (III) and the consequent stripping of Fe (II) are favoured when the pressure is lower than atmospheric. To obtain an iron stripping yield greater than 90 %, a pressure no higher than 75 kPa is required.

The Zn in both phases could be considered constant up to 60 kPa, thus, indicating the same trend of iron<sup>-</sup> with the pressure increasing, the Zn dissolved in the organic and aqueous phase rises slightly. This behaviour can be explained, considering that when the  $Po_2$  rises, the following reaction is involved:

 $2R_2Fe_{(org)} + 2RH_{(org)} + \frac{1}{2}O_2 =$ 2 R<sub>3</sub>Fc (org) + H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>(iii)</sub>  $(2)$ 

But up to 75 kPa, the reduced iron remains the same and this means that larger amounts of Zn are engaged in the reduction (reaction)  $(1)$ : above this. pressure, reaction (2) prevails over reaction (1). The Zn in the aqueous phase increases with pressure because Zn dissolution is favoured by  $Po<sub>2</sub>$  increase, but it cannot be extracted that at low pH, Zn could be partially stripped from organic phase.

In all the experiments the Zn amount in the D2EHPA was noticed to be greater than the quantity required to reduce iron, so another reaction occurs as previously said, probably the direct dissolution of the solid Zn

#### Seham Nagib M: 50

in the organic phase, according to the reaction:

 $Zn^{\circ}_{(s)}$  + 2RH (org)  $= R_2 Zn$  $_{(org)}$  +  $H_{2 (gas)}$  $(3)$ 

Rather than:

 $Zn_{(s)}^{\circ}$  + H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> =  $ZnSO_4$  $\ddot{}$  $(4)$  $H_{2(gas)}$ 

 $ZnSO_4$  + 2RH (org) = R<sub>2</sub>Z<sub>11</sub> (org)  $+ H_2SO_4$  $(5)$ 

Though the Zn is one of the most extractable metals by D2EHPA. reaction  $(5)$ cannot occur significantly at the considered pH.

### **Conclusions** 1. Acidic stripping

Stripping studies of iron loaded on to D2EHPA  $(-0.40 \text{ kg/m}^3)$ was carried out using  $H_2SO_4$  and HCl. It is observed that stripping increases with increasing acid concentration up to 5 N HCl and 10 N  $H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>$  and then decreases with further increases in acid concentration. However, the decreasing is more with HCl.

### 2. Vacuum stripping

The stripping behaviour of Fe (III) from D2EHPA at various degrees of vacuum, with an  $H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>$  aqueous solution adding metallic zinc powder as reductant, was studied. Several tests were performed in order to

investigate the effect of contact time, added quantity of Zn powder, H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> concentration in aqueous solution, and vacuum degree on iron stripping yield.

The results showed that:

• Contact time of 40 min is required to reach the maximum vield:

 $\bullet$  A Zn excess of  $250%$ compared with the stoichiometric gives satisfactory quantity results:

Though the acidity οf aqueous solution improves the iron stripping, high  $H_2SO_4$ concentration could not be used because of large Zn losses:

75 kPa pressure allows us to  $\bullet$ obtain the same iron extraction yield achieved at lower pressure, but the Zn dissolved at 75 kPa is higher than that dissolved at 60 kPa.

### **References**

Bart, H.J., Koncar, M. and Marr, R., 1987. TITLE?CHISA' 87, Czechoslovak Acad, Sciences.

Belew, B., Harlamovs, J.R., O'Keefe, T. 1993. Reductive stripping of Fe (III) from D2EHPA. in: J.B. Hiskey, G.W. Warren (Eds.), Hydrometallurgy fundamentals; Technology and Innovation, AIME, Littleton. (CO), pp. 817-830.

Chen, J., Yu, S., Liu, H., 1992. New mixed solvent systems for the extraction and separation of

Fe (III) in sulphate solutions, Hydrometallurgy 30, 401-416.

Chia, L.M., Neira, M.P., Flores, C., 1994. Overview of galvanic stripping of organic solvents in waste materials treatment, in: J. Hager.  $\mathbf{B}$ . Hansen  $(Eds.)$ Extraction and processing for the treatment and minimization of wastes, TMS, Warrendale (PA). pp. 279-291.

Demopoulos, G.P. and Gefvert, D.L., 1984. Iron III removal from base metal electrolyte solutions solvent by extraction. Hydrometallurgy 12, 299-315.

Gole, K., Stephan, H., Heitzsch, O., Braun, H. and Kind, T., 1993. Hydreometall. Proc. Milton E. Wadsworth Int. Symp., 4th, 845-59.

Gordon, A.R., 1977. Improved Use of Raw Material, Human and Energy Resources The in Extraction of Zn. Adv. Extr. Metall., Int. Symp., 3<sup>rd</sup>, 153-60 (Eng.) Edited by Jones, M.J., Inst. Min. Metall., London, Engl.,  $IMM$ , London, p. 153.

Hirato, T., Wu, Z., Yamada, Y. et al., 1992. Improvement of the stripping characteristics of Fe (III) utilizing a mixture of D2EHPAand TBP. Hydrometallurgy 28, 81-93.

Lupi, C. and Pilone, D., 2000. Reductive stripping in vacuum of  $Fe$  (III) from D2EHPA. Hydrometalluggy 57, 201-207.

Maiima, H., Izaki, T., and Sanuki, S., 1985. Stripping of Fe (III) loaded D2EHPA with the ameous solutions containing sulphur dioxide. Metall. Trans. B 16B, 187194.

Moats, M.S. and O'Keefe, T.J. 1996. Optimization of ferric ion reduction in D2EHPA  $\mathbf{b}$ separate galvanic stripping, in: V. Ramachandran,  $C.C.$ Nesbitt Second  $(Eds.)$ . international symposium on extraction and processing for the treatment and minimization of wastes, TMS. Warrendale (PA), pp. 673-684.

Sahu, K.K., Das, R.P., 1997. Synergistic extraction of Fe (III) at high concentrations in D2EHPA-TBP mixed solvent systems. Metall. Mater., Trans. B 28B, 181-189.

Sato, T., Nakamura, T. and Oishi, H., 1984. Solv. Extr. Ion Exch., 2, 45-60.

Watanabe, T., Hoshino,  $M_{\cdot}$ Uchino, K., 1986. A new recovery process for stainless steel pickling waste liquor with an iron removal process using solvent extraction.  $In:$ J.E. Dutrizac, A.J. Monhemius (Eds.), from Control in Hydrometallurgy, Ellis Horwood, Chichester, UK, pp. 549-570.

M. 52 Seham Nagib

Yu Shuqiu, Chen Jiayong, 1989. Stripping of Fe (III) extracted by D2EHPA from sulphate solutions with sulphuric acid. Hydrometallurgy 22, 267-272.

Table 1: The relation between the amounts of add Zn powder and Zn distribution into the two phases. tine urbanism's

**SCHOOL** 





 $[H_2SO_4]$  or [HCl], N

Fig. 2: Effect of H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and HCl normality on iron stripping from loaded D2EHPA.







15 kPa, 0.045 MH2SO4

Fig. 4: Effect of E% on iron stripping percentage.



SulphuricAcid Concentration (M)

Fig. 5: Iron stripping yield and amount of zinc dissolved vs. acidity of stripping solution.





Fig. 6: Effect of pressure on iron stripping and dissolved zinc.

M. 55