Mission O_2: A Comprehensive Analysis and Engineering Solution for Selecting the Ideal Adsorbent for the Europa Exploration Mission

I. Strategic Analysis of "Mission O_2": Deconstructing the Engineering Challenge

This report aims to provide a comprehensive and in-depth analysis and solution guide for the "Mission O_2: A Journey to the Ideal Adsorbent for Exploring Europa" coursework, part of the CHEN40461/60461 Advanced Separation Processes module. The task requires an engineering team to design a medical oxygen concentrator for an underground colony on Jupiter's moon, Europa. The core challenge lies in selecting the optimal adsorbent from two candidates ("Romulus" and "Remus") to achieve efficient oxygen separation from Europa's thin nitrogen-oxygen atmosphere.[1]

Mission Background: Oxygen Production via Adsorption Technology

In extraterrestrial environments like Europa, the establishment of life support systems heavily relies on "In-Situ Resource Utilization" (ISRU), which involves using local resources to sustain life and exploration activities.[1] The mission's core is to provide high-purity medical oxygen for the explorers, a factor directly linked to the mission's success and the crew's survival.

Among various gas separation technologies, adsorption separation is an ideal choice for remote or extreme environments due to its lower energy consumption, relatively simple operation, and reusable equipment, making it particularly suitable for the scenario set in this mission.[2] Specifically, the medical oxygen concentrator involved in this task is based on

Pressure Swing Adsorption (PSA). The working principle of a PSA system is to utilize the differential adsorption capacity of a porous solid adsorbent for different components in a gas mixture at a specific pressure. In air separation applications, adsorbents with a stronger affinity for nitrogen are typically chosen. When pressurized air passes through a bed packed with the adsorbent, nitrogen is preferentially adsorbed, while oxygen flows out as the product gas, thus achieving oxygen enrichment.[3]

Core Engineering Problem: Adsorbent Selection and Process Design

The fundamental objective of this coursework is to make a final selection between the two candidate materials, "Romulus" and "Remus," based on a series of scientific evaluations.[1] This decision-making process is not based on a single performance metric but requires a comprehensive, multi-dimensional engineering assessment, reflecting the real-world challenges at the intersection of materials science and process engineering. The evaluation must integrate two key aspects:

1. **Static (Equilibrium) Performance Analysis**: Based on experimentally measured adsorption isotherm data, evaluate each material's adsorption capacity and selectivity for nitrogen at equilibrium.
2. **Dynamic (Process) Performance Analysis**: By developing and solving a mathematical model, simulate the adsorbent's performance under continuous flow conditions, particularly its breakthrough behavior.

Ultimately, all analysis results must be distilled and integrated into a technical note, strictly limited to two pages, for the "Government of Europa." Although the audience for this report is not experts in adsorption, they possess a technical background. Therefore, the report must be scientifically rigorous yet clear and easy to understand, capable of strongly supporting the final decision recommendation.[1]

This task is cleverly designed to guide students through a complete engineering project cycle: from basic property characterization (static analysis) to process simulation and optimization (dynamic analysis), and finally to the reporting of technical findings. It tests not only the students' grasp of adsorption separation theory but also their comprehensive abilities in mathematical modeling, numerical computation, and scientific writing.

The Intrinsic Link Between Static and Dynamic Analysis

The structure of the coursework is explicitly divided into static and dynamic measurement phases, which is not coincidental but follows the standard scientific procedure for characterizing adsorbent performance.[1] Understanding the logical connection between these two phases is key to successfully completing this task.

First, the adsorption isotherms obtained from static measurements define the adsorbent's "potential" at a thermodynamic level. They answer the fundamental questions: "Under ideal conditions of full contact and equilibrium, what is the maximum amount of the target gas this material can adsorb (capacity), and how strong is its preference for the target gas (selectivity)?".[6] These data, such as maximum adsorption capacity and selectivity coefficient, are the primary criteria for evaluating an adsorbent's quality.

However, excellent equilibrium performance alone does not guarantee efficient operation in a real industrial process. Dynamic performance, typically assessed through breakthrough curves, reveals the adsorbent's kinetic behavior and its actual working efficiency under continuous flow conditions.[7] It answers more practical questions: "How fast does the adsorbent capture the target molecules? How does this rate affect the effective utilization of the adsorption bed and the working cycle (i.e., breakthrough time)?"

There is a crucial, inseparable link between these two analysis phases: the adsorption isotherm model and its parameters obtained from the static analysis are necessary inputs for constructing the dynamic process mathematical model. In other words, the equilibrium relationship (e.g., saturation capacity) fitted from the static data will directly determine the prediction results of the dynamic model for the adsorption process.

Therefore, the accuracy of the entire dynamic simulation, and the final adsorbent recommendation based on the simulation results, is founded on the quality of the initial static data analysis. If there are deviations in the isotherm fitting stage, this error will be systematically propagated and amplified in all subsequent dynamic performance predictions. Consequently, this solution will first focus on how to accurately perform the static analysis to lay a solid foundation for the subsequent dynamic modeling.

II. Characterizing Adsorbent Performance: Static Equilibrium Analysis

The core task of the static analysis is to process the discrete experimental data provided in Table 1 of the coursework attachment, select an appropriate adsorption isotherm model, and perform parameter fitting to quantitatively evaluate the equilibrium performance of the two

adsorbents.[1]

Theoretical Basis of Adsorption Isotherms

An adsorption isotherm is a curve that describes the equilibrium relationship between gas pressure (P) and the amount of gas adsorbed per unit mass of adsorbent (q) at a constant temperature.[6] Several mathematical models have been proposed to describe this relationship, with the most classic and commonly used being the Langmuir, Freundlich, and Sips models.

1. Langmuir Model: This model is based on several idealized assumptions, including that adsorption occurs on a uniform solid surface, all adsorption sites have the same energy, adsorption is a monolayer, and there are no interactions between adsorbed molecules. Its mathematical expression is:

    $$q = \frac{q_{max} b P}{1 + b P}$$

    where q_{max} is the monolayer saturation capacity (mol/kg), and b is the Langmuir constant related to adsorption affinity (Pa^{-1}).[11] As pressure approaches infinity, the adsorption amount approaches a saturation plateau q_{max}.
2. Freundlich Model: This is an empirical model suitable for describing multilayer adsorption on a heterogeneous surface. Its mathematical expression is:

    $$q = K P^{1/n}$$

    where K and n are empirical constants related to the adsorbent's characteristics. A major drawback of this model is that it does not predict adsorption saturation; as pressure increases indefinitely, the adsorbed amount also increases indefinitely, which is physically unrealistic.[6]
3. Sips (Langmuir-Freundlich) Model: This is a three-parameter hybrid model that cleverly combines the advantages of the Langmuir and Freundlich models. It exhibits Freundlich-like behavior at low pressures and, like the Langmuir model, predicts a finite adsorption saturation plateau at high pressures. Its mathematical expression is:

    $$q = q_{max} \frac{(b P)^n}{1 + (b P)^n}$$

    where the physical meanings of q_{max} and b are similar to those in the Langmuir model, and n is a parameter related to surface heterogeneity.[11] The Sips model is widely used to describe real adsorption systems, especially for materials like zeolites commonly used in air separation, due to its flexibility and good fit for heterogeneous

surfaces.[15]

Model Selection and Justification

For this task, the **Sips model is the optimal choice**. First, observing the experimental data in Table 1 reveals that as pressure increases, the rate of increase in adsorption amount q gradually slows down, showing a clear trend towards saturation. This rules out the Freundlich model, which lacks a saturation feature. Second, although the Langmuir model can also describe saturation behavior, it assumes a completely homogeneous surface. For high-performance adsorbents designed for specific separation tasks, it is likely that the surface has active sites with a non-uniform energy distribution. The third parameter n introduced by the Sips model can precisely describe this heterogeneity, thus allowing for a more accurate fit to the experimental data and better reflecting the physical reality of the material.[14]

Practical Guide: Parameter Estimation via Non-Linear Regression

The task requires fitting the discrete experimental data to a continuous isotherm model to obtain the model parameters. Although methods exist to linearize the models (e.g., taking the reciprocal of the Langmuir model), these methods alter the error distribution of the data, leading to statistically biased fitting results. Therefore, **non-linear regression is the recommended method for parameter estimation**.[14]

In Python, non-linear least squares fitting can be easily implemented using the optimize.curve_fit function from the scipy library.[17] The specific steps are as follows:

1. **Import necessary libraries**:
   Python
   ```python
   import numpy as np
   from scipy.optimize import curve_fit
   import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
   ```

2. **Define the Sips model function**:
   Python
   ```python
   def sips_isotherm(P, q_max, b, n):
       """
       Sips isotherm model.
   ```

```python
    P: Pressure (Pa)
    q_max: Maximum adsorption capacity (mol/kg)
    b: Affinity constant (1/Pa)
    n: Heterogeneity parameter (-)
    """
    return q_max * (b * P)**n / (1 + (b * P)**n)
```

3. **Prepare data and perform the fit**: Taking N_2 adsorption on Romulus as an example:
   Python
   ```python
   # Experimental data for N2 on Romulus from Table 1
   P_N2_Romulus = np.array([...]) # Pressure data (Pa)
   q_N2_Romulus = np.array([...]) # Adsorption amount data (mol/kg)

   # Provide initial guesses for the parameters [q_max, b, n]
   initial_guesses = [2.0, 1e-5, 0.9]

   # Perform the curve fit
   params, covariance = curve_fit(sips_isotherm, P_N2_Romulus, q_N2_Romulus,
   p0=initial_guesses)

   # Extract the fitted parameters
   q_max_fit, b_fit, n_fit = params
   print(f"Fitted Parameters for N2 on Romulus:")
   print(f"q_max = {q_max_fit:.4f} mol/kg")
   print(f"b = {b_fit:.4e} 1/Pa")
   print(f"n = {n_fit:.4f}")
   ```

4. **Repeat the process**: The above fitting process needs to be repeated for all four sets of data in Table 1 (N_2 and O_2 on Romulus, N_2 and O_2 on Remus) to obtain their respective Sips model parameters.

Static Performance Evaluation: Adsorption Capacity and Selectivity

Once the model parameters are obtained, a quantitative comparison of the static performance of the two adsorbents can be made.

- **Adsorption Capacity (q_{max})**: This parameter is directly obtained from the Sips model fit and represents the maximum theoretical adsorption capacity of the adsorbent for a specific gas. For N_2/O_2 separation, a higher N_2 adsorption capacity is generally favorable, as it means a unit mass of adsorbent can process more gas.
- Adsorption Selectivity (S_{N_2/O_2}): This is the core metric for evaluating separation

performance, quantifying the adsorbent's ability to preferentially adsorb N_2 over O_2. Selectivity is defined as the ratio of the mole fraction ratio of components in the adsorbed phase to that in the gas phase 18:

$$S_{N_2/O_2} = \frac{x_{N_2}/x_{O_2}}{y_{N_2}/y_{O_2}}$$

where x_i is the mole fraction of component i in the adsorbed phase, and y_i is its mole fraction in the gas phase. At low loadings (linear region) or under ideal adsorption behavior, this formula can be simplified to:

$$S_{N_2/O_2} \approx \frac{q_{N_2}/q_{O_2}}{P_{N_2}/P_{O_2}}$$

To calculate the selectivity under actual operating conditions, the calculation must be based on the operating pressure given in the task. According to Table 2, the total operating pressure is 100 kPa.1 Assuming Europa's atmosphere has a composition similar to Earth's air (approx. 79% N_2 and 21% O_2), the partial pressures of each component can be calculated:

- $P_{N_2} = 100 \text{ kPa} \times 0.79 = 79 \text{ kPa} = 79000 \text{ Pa}$
- $P_{O_2} = 100 \text{ kPa} \times 0.21 = 21 \text{ kPa} = 21000 \text{ Pa}$

By substituting these two partial pressure values into the fitted Sips isotherm equations for N_2 and O_2, the corresponding adsorption amounts q_{N_2} and q_{O_2} can be calculated. Then, the selectivity can be calculated using the simplified formula above. A selectivity value much greater than 1 indicates a strong preferential adsorption of N_2, making it an ideal material for air separation.

Physical Meaning of the Sips Heterogeneity Parameter n

The parameter n, which the Sips model has in addition to the Langmuir model, is not merely a mathematical fitting parameter; it has profound physical meaning. When $n=1$, the Sips model degenerates completely into the Langmuir model, corresponding to an energetically homogeneous adsorption surface.[15] However, in real materials, especially crystalline materials like zeolites or metal-organic frameworks (MOFs) obtained through complex synthesis, the chemical environment, pore structure, or cation distribution on the surface may lead to adsorption sites at different locations having different adsorption energies, meaning the surface is "heterogeneous".[11]

The Sips parameter n (also written as $1/n$ in some literature) is a measure of this surface energy heterogeneity. The closer the value of n is to 1, the more homogeneous the adsorbent surface is; the more n deviates from 1 (usually less than 1), the higher the degree

of surface heterogeneity.

When analyzing Romulus and Remus, comparing their respective n values for N_2 and O_2 adsorption can provide deeper insights beyond a simple capacity comparison. For example, if Romulus is found to have an n value for N_2 adsorption closer to 1 than Remus, it might suggest that Romulus has a more regular and uniform surface structure or active site distribution. This analysis can link abstract mathematical model parameters to the potential microscopic physicochemical properties of the adsorbent, thereby demonstrating a more nuanced understanding of the adsorption phenomenon in the final technical report.

To clearly present all the results of the static analysis, the following table is recommended:

Table 1: Sips Isotherm Fitted Parameters and Performance Metrics for Romulus and Remus Adsorbents at 303 K

Adsorbent	Gas	qmax (mol/kg)	b (Pa−1)	n (−)	R2	N_2/O_2 Selectivity*
Romulus	N_2					
	O_2					
Remus	N_2					
	O_2					

Note: N_2/O_2 selectivity is calculated at a total pressure of 100 kPa with a gas composition of 79% N_2 / 21% O_2.

This table centralizes all key findings from the static analysis—maximum capacity, affinity, surface heterogeneity, goodness of fit, and most importantly, selectivity—providing solid data support for the first stage of decision-making.

III. Predicting Dynamic Behavior: Mathematical Modeling of the Adsorption Column

After analyzing the static equilibrium characteristics of the adsorbents, the next step is to

develop a mathematical model that can predict their dynamic behavior under actual continuous flow conditions. The coursework provides a set of partial differential equations describing the mass transfer process within the adsorption column. This section will provide a detailed analysis of these equations and explain how to solve the model using numerical methods.[1]

Analysis of Adsorption Dynamics Governing Equations

The model provided in the coursework is a classic one-dimensional, non-ideal, isothermal packed-bed adsorption model. It considers convection, axial dispersion, and a finite mass transfer rate, making it a common tool for describing real adsorption processes.[22]

Component Mass Balance Equation (Eq. 1)

$$\frac{\partial y_{i}}{\partial t} = D_{L}\frac{\partial^{2}y_{i}}{\partial z^{2}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(y_{i}v) - \frac{RT}{P}\frac{\rho_{s}(1-\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\frac{\partial q_{i}}{\partial t}$$

This equation describes the change in the mole fraction y_i of component i in the gas phase with respect to time and spatial position. The physical meaning of each term is as follows:

- $\frac{\partial y_{i}}{\partial t}$ **(Accumulation Term)**: Represents the instantaneous rate of change of the concentration of component i in the gas phase within a differential volume element.
- $D_{L}\frac{\partial^{2}y_{i}}{\partial z^{2}}$ **(Axial Dispersion Term)**: Describes the back-mixing along the flow direction (z-axis) due to molecular diffusion and eddy mixing of the fluid between the packed particles. D_L is the axial dispersion coefficient (given by Eq. 2). The presence of this term distinguishes the model from an ideal "plug flow" model, making it a "non-ideal" model.[22]
- $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}(y_{i}v)$ **(Convection Term)**: Describes the transport of component i with the bulk gas flow at velocity v, which is the primary mode of mass transfer.
- $\frac{RT}{P}\frac{\rho_{s}(1-\epsilon)}{\epsilon}\frac{\partial q_{i}}{\partial t}$ **(Interphase Mass Transfer Term)**: This is the bridge connecting the gas and solid phases. It represents the amount of component i removed from the gas phase per unit time due to adsorption onto the solid particles. This term couples the gas phase mass

balance (Eq. 1) with the solid phase mass balance (Eq. 5).

Solid Phase Mass Balance Equation (Eq. 5)

$$\frac{\partial q_{i}}{\partial t} = k_{i}(q_{i}^{*} - q_{i})$$

This equation is known as the **Linear Driving Force (LDF) model**. It is a simplified kinetic model used to describe the rate at which gas molecules are transferred from the bulk gas phase to the interior of the adsorbent and are adsorbed.[25] Its core idea is that the rate of adsorption ($\frac{\partial q_{i}}{\partial t}$) is proportional to a "driving force," which is the difference between the equilibrium adsorption amount corresponding to the current gas phase concentration (q_i^*) and the actual average adsorbed amount within the particle (q_i).

- **q_i^* (Equilibrium Adsorption Amount)**: This is the amount of adsorbate that would be on the adsorbent particle if it were in equilibrium with the gas at the current location (partial pressure $P_i = y_i P$). This value is calculated using the **Sips isotherm model** fitted in Section II, i.e., $q_i^* = f(P_i)$.
- **k_i (Overall Mass Transfer Coefficient)**: This is a key kinetic parameter (unit: s^{-1}) that lumps together the effects of all mass transfer resistances, including external film mass transfer (from the bulk fluid to the particle surface) and internal diffusion (within the particle pores). A larger value of k_i indicates a faster mass transfer rate, and the adsorption process is closer to equilibrium.

Numerical Solution Strategy: Method of Lines (MOL) with Finite Differences

Eq. 1 is a partial differential equation (PDE) because it contains partial derivatives with respect to both time t and space z. For such complex, non-linear, coupled equation systems, an analytical solution is generally not available, and numerical methods must be used.[28]

The **Method of Lines (MOL)** is an efficient numerical technique. Its core idea is to discretize the spatial domain, transforming one (or a set of) partial differential equation(s) into a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs), which can then be solved using mature ODE solvers.[25]

1. **Spatial Discretization**: The length of the adsorption column L is divided into $N+1$ discrete grid points (nodes), numbered from $j=0$ (inlet) to $j=N$ (outlet). The distance between adjacent nodes is $\Delta z = L/N$.

2. **Derivative Approximation**: The **Finite Difference Method (FDM)** is used to approximate the spatial derivatives ($\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}$) at each internal node j with algebraic expressions.
   - First-order derivative (convection term): The central difference scheme is typically used due to its second-order accuracy:

     $$\left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial z}\right)_j \approx \frac{y_{j+1} - y_{j-1}}{2\Delta z}$$
     30

   - Second-order derivative (diffusion term): The central difference scheme is also used:
     $$\left(\frac{\partial^2 y}{\partial z^2}\right)j \approx \frac{y_{j+1} - 2y_j + y_{j-1}}{(\Delta z)^2}$$

     30

By substituting these algebraic approximations into the PDE (Eq. 1) at each internal node ($j=1, 2,..., N-1$), the original single PDE is transformed into $N-1$ ordinary differential equations (ODEs) of the form $\frac{dy_j}{dt} = f(y_{j-1}, y_j, y_{j+1})$. This ODE system can be coupled with the solid-phase LDF equations (one for each node) and then solved by time integration using a standard ODE solver in Python, such as scipy.integrate.solve_ivp.

Implementation of Boundary Conditions (BCs): Danckwerts Boundary Conditions

The boundary conditions given in the coursework (Eq. 3 and Eq. 4) are not simple fixed-value conditions (Dirichlet conditions) but are flux-type conditions (Robin conditions), known in reaction engineering as **Danckwerts boundary conditions**. This set of boundary conditions is physically more realistic because it enforces flux conservation at the inlet and assumes that the concentration gradient will vanish far downstream in a sufficiently long reactor.[32]

- Inlet Boundary Condition (z=0, Eq. 3):

  $$y_{i}(z=0) = y_{i,feed} + \frac{D_{L}}{v}\frac{\partial y_{i}}{\partial z}\biggl|_{z=0}$$

  At the inlet node $j=0$, the central difference cannot be used because it requires a non-existent "ghost" node $j=-1$. The correct approach is to use a one-sided difference scheme. Here, a forward difference is used to approximate the first derivative:

  $$\left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial z}\right)_0 \approx \frac{y_1 - y_0}{\Delta z}$$

  Substituting this into Eq. 3 yields an algebraic equation for y_0 that relates the

concentration at the inlet node to the adjacent internal node y_1 and the feed concentration y_{feed}.

- Outlet Boundary Condition (z=L, Eq. 4):

$$\frac{\partial y_{i}}{\partial z}\biggl|_{z=L} = 0$$

Similarly, at the outlet node $j=N$, the central difference cannot be used. Here, a backward difference is used to approximate the first derivative:

$$\left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial z}\right)_N \approx \frac{y_N - y_{N-1}}{\Delta z}$$

Substituting this into Eq. 4 gives $\frac{y_N - y_{N-1}}{\Delta z} = 0$, which simplifies to $y_N = y_{N-1}$.

When constructing the ODE system, the equations for the internal nodes ($j=1$ to $N-1$) use central differences, while the values of the boundary nodes y_0 and y_N are determined by the algebraic relationships derived from the boundary conditions above. This forms a closed and solvable system of differential-algebraic equations.

The Key "Open-Ended" Challenge: Missing Parameters and Model Simplification

A careful review of the course materials reveals a critical point: Table 2 provides most of the parameters required for the model, but it **lacks the overall mass transfer coefficient k_i for the LDF model**.[1] This is not an oversight but a core part of the project's "open-ended" design.

The LDF coefficient k_i is a kinetic parameter that determines the speed at which the adsorption process approaches equilibrium, directly affecting the shape (steepness) of the breakthrough curve. A larger k_i means faster kinetics and a steeper breakthrough curve (closer to an ideal step change); a smaller k_i means slower kinetics, greater mass transfer resistance, and a more gradual breakthrough curve with a wider Mass Transfer Zone (MTZ).[23]

The course description explicitly states: "The problem is open-ended, allowing for a range of approaches. As long as you provide clear justifications and thorough scientific analysis grounded in the concepts covered in the module, your work will be assessed favorably".[1] This strongly implies that students need to identify the missing k_i parameter and assign a value to it through literature research or reasonable assumptions.

Therefore, a complete solution must include the following steps:

1. **Explicitly state that k_i is not provided**.
2. **Make a reasonable assumption and provide justification**. A reasonable approach is to **assume that the mass transfer coefficient for N_2, k_{N_2}, is the same for both materials** to fairly compare the impact of their equilibrium properties on the dynamic process. A literature review shows that the LDF mass transfer coefficient for N_2 on zeolite-type adsorbents is typically in the range of 10^{-3} to $10^{-1} s^{-1}$.[23] A value within this range can be chosen as the basis for the simulation.
3. **Clearly state this assumption in the "Methodology" section of the technical report**, as this is an explicit requirement in the grading criteria.[1]

Furthermore, the task requires simulating the breakthrough of "pure N_2" through a column pre-saturated with "pure O_2." This is a simplified scenario. In actual multi-component adsorption, competitive adsorption effects would exist. However, the provided LDF model (Eq. 5) is in a single-component form. This means the simulation should focus on the transport and adsorption of N_2, with O_2 being treated as a carrier gas initially present in the column but not strongly adsorbed itself. When calculating the driving force term q_i^* in the LDF model, the Sips isotherm for N_2 and the partial pressure of N_2 at any position in the column should be used.

IV. Simulating Breakthrough Scenarios and Performance Evaluation

After establishing and preparing the numerical solution, the next step is to run the simulation program, generate breakthrough curves, and validate and interpret the results. This is the crucial step of translating the theoretical model into concrete performance predictions.

Simulating the Breakthrough Curve

- **Set Initial and Feed Conditions**: According to the task description, a specific operational scenario is to be simulated:
  - **Initial Condition (t=0)**: The entire adsorption column (both gas and solid phases) is saturated with pure O_2. This means that at all spatial positions z, the initial gas-phase mole fraction and solid-phase adsorbed amount of N_2 are zero. That is: $y_{N_2}(z, t=0) = 0$ and $q_{N_2}(z, t=0) = 0$.
  - **Feed Condition (z=0, t>0)**: From time $t=0$, pure N_2 is fed into the column inlet.

This means the mole fraction of N_2 in the feed stream is 1, i.e., $y_{N_2, feed} = 1$.

- **Run the Simulation**: Use a Python ODE solver (e.g., scipy.integrate.solve_ivp) with the initial conditions, the ODE system constructed in Section III (including the discretized main equation and boundary conditions), and all known parameters (Table 2 physical properties, Section II fitted Sips isotherm parameters, and the assumed mass transfer coefficient k_i) as inputs to solve over a specified time range.
- **Result Analysis and Interpretation**: The core output of the simulation is the change in the mole fraction of N_2, y_{N_2}, at the column outlet ($z=L$, i.e., the last grid node $j=N$) over time t. Plotting the ratio of the outlet concentration to the inlet concentration (C/C_0, which is $y_{N_2}(L, t) / y_{N_2, feed}$) against time t yields the **breakthrough curve**.
  - **Breakthrough Time (t_b)**: Typically defined as the time required for the outlet concentration to reach a small value (e.g., 5% or 10% of the inlet concentration). **A longer breakthrough time indicates better dynamic performance of the adsorbent**, as it can process more feed gas before reaching saturation "breakthrough," implying a longer working cycle.
  - **Curve Shape**: The steepness of the breakthrough curve reflects the length of the Mass Transfer Zone (MTZ). **A steeper curve, closer to an S-shape, indicates a shorter MTZ and higher utilization efficiency of the adsorption bed**, which is a more desirable characteristic in practical applications.[7]

Validation via Comparison with Equilibrium Theory

Equilibrium Theory is an idealized model that neglects all kinetic limitations (i.e., assumes an infinite mass transfer rate, $k_i \to \infty$) and macroscopic mixing effects (i.e., assumes zero axial dispersion, $D_L = 0$). In this theoretical framework, the adsorbent and fluid instantaneously reach local equilibrium at any point within the column.[9] For a step change in feed concentration, its propagation through the column takes the form of a constant-velocity, infinitely steep **shock wave**.

- Calculating the Ideal Breakthrough Time: The propagation velocity of this shock wave, u_{shock}, can be derived directly from a material balance and the isotherm relationship 37:
$$ u_{shock} = \frac{u_{in}}{1 + \frac{\rho_s (1-\epsilon)}{\epsilon} \frac{\Delta q}{\Delta y} \frac{RT}{P}} $$
where:
  - u_{in} is the interstitial gas velocity within the bed (calculated from the inlet superficial velocity and bed void fraction in Table 2).
  - Δq is the change in solid-phase adsorbed amount across the shock wave. For this case, it's a step from $y_{N_2}=0$ to $y_{N_2}=1$, so $\Delta q =$

$q_{N_2}(@y_{N_2}=1) - q_{N_2}(@y_{N_2}=0)$. This is exactly equal to the saturation capacity of N_2, q_{max}, obtained from the Sips model.

- ○ Δy is the change in gas-phase mole fraction across the shock wave, i.e., $\Delta y = 1 - 0 = 1$.
- ○ The remaining parameters ($\rho_s, \epsilon, R, T, P$) are all given in Table 2.[1]

After calculating the shock wave velocity, the ideal breakthrough time (the time for the shock wave to reach the column outlet) is simply:
$$t_{ideal} = \frac{L}{u_{shock}}$$

- **Validation Step**: This is a **mandatory** validation step in the coursework ("Comparison with equilibrium theory").[1] Compare the breakthrough time obtained from the full numerical simulation with the t_{ideal} calculated from equilibrium theory. In a real (or more realistic model) system that includes mass transfer resistance and axial dispersion, the concentration front will broaden, causing N_2 molecules to reach the outlet **earlier** than the ideal shock wave. Therefore, a correct numerical simulation result should satisfy: **the simulated breakthrough time t_b is less than or equal to the ideal breakthrough time t_{ideal}**. This comparison not only fulfills the assignment requirement but also serves as a powerful sanity check for the correctness of the numerical model.

Intrinsic Relationship Between Breakthrough Curve Shape and Model Parameters

The shape of the breakthrough curve is not random but is precisely controlled by the physical parameters in the model. A deep understanding of this relationship can provide rich content for the results discussion section.

1. **The "Position" of the Curve**: The overall position of the breakthrough curve on the time axis, i.e., the length of the breakthrough time, is primarily determined by the adsorbent's **equilibrium adsorption capacity (q_{max})**. A higher q_{max} means the adsorption bed takes longer to become saturated, thus shifting the entire curve to the right, i.e., extending the breakthrough time. This is the core information that equilibrium theory can capture.
2. **The "Shape" of the Curve**: The steepness of the breakthrough curve is determined by both **kinetic and dispersion parameters**.
   - ○ **Mass Transfer Coefficient (k_i)**: The larger the k_i, the faster the adsorption rate, the closer the system is to equilibrium, and the steeper the breakthrough curve.
   - ○ **Axial Dispersion Coefficient (D_L)**: The smaller the D_L, the lower the degree of gas back-mixing, the weaker the broadening effect of the concentration front, and the steeper the breakthrough curve.

Therefore, when comparing the simulated breakthrough curves of Romulus and Remus, a

deeper analysis can be performed. The difference in their breakthrough **times** can be attributed to the difference in their N_2 adsorption capacities, q_{max}, calculated in Section II. At the same time, it can be discussed that even if the capacities of the two materials are similar, differences in their kinetic properties (i.e., the assumed k_i value) or bed packing characteristics (affecting D_L) can lead to differences in the **shape** of the breakthrough curves, thereby affecting the utilization efficiency of the adsorption bed and the overall performance of the separation process. This analysis closely links the abstract mathematical model with concrete physical phenomena, demonstrating a profound understanding of the entire adsorption process.

V. Optimizing the Oxygen Concentrator Design

This section aims to guide the completion of the open-ended design task in the coursework, which involves using the validated mathematical model as a predictive tool to perform parameter sensitivity analysis and provide a basis for optimizing the design of the oxygen concentrator.

Sensitivity Analysis of Operational and Design Parameters

The coursework requires a study to guide the selection of optimal operating conditions (e.g., feed velocity) and adsorption column dimensions (e.g., column length) to maximize performance.[1] This is essentially a classic parameter sensitivity analysis.

- **Varying Inlet Velocity (u_{in})**:
  - **Procedure**: Using the inlet velocity given in Table 2 as the baseline (1x), re-run the dynamic simulations for both adsorbents at 0.5 times (0.5x) and 2 times (2x) this velocity. Plot the breakthrough curves for the same adsorbent at different velocities on the same graph for comparison.
  - **Expected Results and Analysis**:
    - Increasing the inlet velocity will significantly **shorten the breakthrough time**. This is because a faster velocity means the gas has a shorter residence time in the adsorption column, and the adsorbent needs to handle more N_2 molecules per unit time, thus reaching saturation faster.
    - Increasing the velocity usually makes the breakthrough curve **more gradual** (i.e., the mass transfer zone becomes wider). This is because at high velocities, the limitations of mass transfer kinetics become more prominent. Gas molecules do not have enough time to diffuse from the bulk gas phase to the active sites of the

adsorbent, leading to N_2 "leaking" out at the back of the bed before the adsorbent at the front is fully saturated.[35]

- **Design Implications**: When designing an oxygen concentrator, a trade-off must be made between throughput (proportional to velocity) and separation efficiency (related to the width of the mass transfer zone). An excessively high velocity, while increasing the oxygen production rate per unit time, may reduce the utilization of the adsorption bed and may require more frequent regeneration cycles.

- **Varying Column Length (L)**:
  - **Procedure**: Using the column length given in Table 2 as the baseline (1x), re-run the simulations at 0.5 times and 2 times this length.
  - **Expected Results and Analysis**:
    - Increasing the column length will approximately **proportionally extend the breakthrough time**. This is because the total adsorption capacity of the bed is proportional to the column length (i.e., the total amount of adsorbent).
    - The analysis should focus on whether the **shape** of the breakthrough curve changes with column length. In the ideal case (constant pattern breakthrough), once the mass transfer zone is fully formed within the adsorption column, its shape and length will remain constant, merely translating forward through the column. If the simulation results show that the S-shaped part of the breakthrough curve becomes longer with a longer column, it may indicate that the mass transfer zone was not fully developed in the shorter column.
    - **Design Implications**: Column length is a key factor determining the size and cost of the equipment. Simulations can determine how long the adsorption column needs to be to achieve a target working cycle (i.e., the required breakthrough time) under given operating conditions. This provides a direct basis for the compact design of the equipment.

Final Adsorbent Selection and Engineering Justification

This is the final decision-making stage of the entire project. The recommendation must be based on a comprehensive analysis of all results and supported by sufficient engineering reasoning.

1. **Static Performance Criteria**: Review the analysis results from Section II. Which adsorbent has a higher N_2 saturation capacity (q_{max})? More importantly, which adsorbent exhibits higher N_2/O_2 selectivity under the simulated conditions? High selectivity is a prerequisite for achieving high-purity separation.
2. **Dynamic Performance Criteria**: Review the simulation results under baseline conditions from Section IV. Which adsorbent provides a longer breakthrough time? This is directly

related to the continuous operating time of the oxygen concentrator.

3. **Optimization and Robustness Criteria**: Combine the sensitivity analysis from this section.
   - How sensitive are the performances of the two adsorbents to changes in operating conditions (e.g., velocity)? Is there an adsorbent whose performance degrades less with changes in velocity, i.e., has better **robustness**?
   - To achieve the same breakthrough time, which adsorbent requires a shorter column length? This relates to the **production intensity** (throughput per unit volume of adsorbent per unit time) and compactness of the equipment.

The final choice may not be immediately obvious. For example, one adsorbent might have a slightly lower static capacity but excellent kinetic performance (assuming a large k_i value), resulting in a very steep breakthrough curve and a short mass transfer zone. In a Pressure Swing Adsorption (PSA) process that requires rapid cycling, this characteristic might be more advantageous than simply high capacity. Therefore, when making a recommendation, the **justification process is more important than the final choice itself**. It is essential to clearly state the metrics on which the decision is based and explain how these metrics relate to the final performance goals of the oxygen concentrator (e.g., oxygen purity, recovery, energy consumption, equipment size).

To concisely present the dynamic analysis results in the technical report, the following table is recommended:

Table 2: Summary of Dynamic Simulation and Sensitivity Analysis Results

Adsorbent	Parameter	Baseline (1x L, 1x u)	High Velocity (1x L, 2x u)	Long Column (2x L, 1x u)
Romulus	Breakthrough Time* (s)			
	MTZ Length** (m)			
Remus	Breakthrough Time* (s)			
	MTZ Length** (m)			

Note: Breakthrough time is defined as the time when the outlet N_2 concentration reaches 5%

of the inlet concentration ($C/C_0=0.05$).[7]
*Note: Mass Transfer Zone (MTZ) length can be estimated from the breakthrough time ($t_{0.05}$) and saturation time ($t_{0.95}$).
This table intuitively summarizes the dynamic responses of the two adsorbents under different design and operating conditions, providing a quantitative basis for the discussion in the "Results" section and the final engineering decision.

VI. Writing the Technical Note for the Government of Europa

The final deliverable of the project is a highly condensed two-page technical note. This section will provide a detailed writing guide to help distill the complex analysis process and results from the previous sections into a professional and persuasive report that meets the requirements.

Structure and Layout of the Two-Page Technical Note

The structure suggested in the coursework must be strictly followed: Introduction, Methodology, Results, Limitation.[1]

- **Introduction**
  - **Objective**: Quickly establish the context, and state the purpose and importance of the study.
  - **Content**:
    - First paragraph: Briefly introduce the background of "Mission O_2," i.e., the critical need to produce medical-grade oxygen from the local atmosphere on the Europa colony using adsorption technology.
    - Second paragraph: Clearly state that the core task of this study is to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of two candidate adsorbents (Romulus and Remus) to select the optimal material. Emphasize that the evaluation will combine static equilibrium measurements and dynamic process simulations to ensure the scientific rigor and comprehensiveness of the decision.
- **Methodology**
  - **Objective**: Describe the analytical methods and models used in a concise and professional manner, and state all key assumptions.
  - **Content**:

- ■ **Static Analysis**: State that the Sips adsorption isotherm model was used to fit the experimental data, and the model parameters were estimated using a non-linear regression algorithm (e.g., Levenberg-Marquardt).
- ■ **Dynamic Modeling**: Mention that the mathematical model used to simulate the dynamic adsorption process is a one-dimensional axial dispersion model, and cite the equation numbers from the course material (e.g., Eq. 1-5). State that the model considers convection, axial dispersion, and a finite mass transfer rate (via the LDF model).
- ■ **Numerical Solution**: Briefly state that the system of partial differential equations was solved numerically using the Method of Lines (MOL) combined with the Finite Difference Method (FDM).
- ■ **Operating Conditions and Assumptions**: List the key operating conditions used in the simulations (temperature, pressure, inlet velocity, etc., can refer to Table 2). **Crucially, all key assumptions made must be clearly stated here**, especially the assumption regarding the value of the unknown LDF mass transfer coefficient k_i.
- ● **Results**
  - ○ **Objective**: Present the core findings, conduct a comparative analysis, and give the final recommendation. This section must be supported by the single allowed figure.
  - ○ **Content**:
    - ■ **Static Performance Comparison**: Discuss the results of the isotherm fitting. Compare the N_2 saturation capacity (q_{max}) and N_2/O_2 selectivity of the two adsorbents. Clearly state which material has a more advantageous equilibrium characteristic.
    - ■ **Dynamic Performance Comparison**: Referring to the breakthrough curves in the figure, discuss the dynamic performance of the two adsorbents under baseline conditions. Compare their breakthrough times and analyze the shape of the curves, linking it to the utilization efficiency of the adsorption bed.
    - ■ **Sensitivity Analysis and Design Guidance**: Briefly summarize the impact of changing velocity and column length on system performance. Explain how these results can guide the optimal design of the oxygen concentrator (e.g., the trade-off between throughput and efficiency).
    - ■ **Final Recommendation**: Based on all the static and dynamic analyses above, clearly recommend the selection of either Romulus or Remus as the final adsorbent, and summarize the core reasons for this recommendation in one or two sentences.
- ● **Limitation**
  - ○ **Objective**: Demonstrate critical thinking, acknowledge the limitations of the current model, and point out directions for future improvements.
  - ○ **Content**:
    - ■ **Model Limitations**: Discuss the main simplifying assumptions in the model, such as:
      1. **Isothermal Assumption**: The actual adsorption process is exothermic, and

temperature changes can affect adsorption equilibrium and rates, which this model neglects.[7]

2. **LDF Model Simplification**: The LDF model is a lumped-parameter approximation of the complex internal mass transfer process. More accurate models would require solving the pore diffusion equations within the particles.[26]

3. **Ideal Gas and Constant Velocity**: The model assumes ideal gas behavior and does not account for changes in velocity due to the change in the total amount of gas caused by adsorption.[35]

- ■ **Avenues for Improvement**: Based on the above limitations, propose future research work that could be undertaken:
  1. **Non-isothermal Model**: Add an energy balance equation to the model to account for the heat of adsorption effects.
  2. **Kinetic Parameter Determination**: Conduct dedicated kinetic experiments to accurately determine the mass transfer coefficient k_i, rather than relying on assumptions.
  3. **Competitive Adsorption Model**: Use an extended isotherm model (e.g., extended Sips model) to more realistically describe the competitive adsorption behavior between N_2 and O_2.

Designing the Single Figure for Maximum Information Content

Due to the one-figure limitation (maximum size 7 in. x 5 in.), its design must be efficient and information-rich.[1] A **multi-panel composite figure** is recommended:

- ● **Figure 1: Comparison of Static Adsorption Performance and Dynamic Breakthrough Behavior of Romulus and Remus**
  - ○ **Left Panel (a)**: Plot the **adsorption isotherms**. Represent the four sets of experimental data points (Romulus-N_2, Romulus-O_2, Remus-N_2, Remus-O_2) with different symbols and colors. Then, overlay the corresponding Sips model fitting curves as solid lines in the same colors. This panel visually demonstrates the quality of the static data, the accuracy of the model fit, and the difference in affinity for N_2 and O_2 between the two materials.
  - ○ **Right Panel (b)**: Plot the **simulated breakthrough curves**. Plot the N_2 breakthrough curves (C/C_0 vs. time) for Romulus and Remus under baseline operating conditions on the same axes. This panel directly compares the dynamic performance of the two materials, including the length of the breakthrough time and the width of the mass transfer zone.

Such a composite figure design can systematically present the complete logical chain from

basic property characterization to process performance prediction within a limited space, providing strong visual support for the discussion in the "Results" section.

Conclusion

This report provides a systematic analytical framework and a detailed technical execution path for completing the "Mission O_2" coursework. By following this guide, students can not only solve the specific engineering problems posed in the assignment but also gain a deep understanding of the theoretical foundations, mathematical modeling methods, and engineering design principles of adsorption separation processes. The key to success lies in combining the precision of static equilibrium analysis, the rigor of dynamic simulation, and a critical perspective on the model's limitations. The final technical note should clearly and concisely convey this series of complex analytical processes and conclusions, thereby providing the fictional "Government of Europa" with a data-driven, well-justified recommendation for adsorbent selection, successfully completing this engineering task of "A Journey to the Ideal Adsorbent."

引用的著作

1. Coursework_ASP_2025_2026.pdf
2. Adsorption separation of O2/N2 by Li-RHO zeolite with high oxygen selectivity, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367034698_Adsorption_separation_of_O2N2_by_Li-RHO_zeolite_with_high_oxygen_selectivity
3. A review of air separation technologies and their integration with energy conversion processes, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://netl.doe.gov/sites/default/files/2023-08/Smith%202001%20Review%20of%20Air%20Separation%20Technologies.pdf
4. Air Separation: Materials, Methods, Principles and Applications - An Overview, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://chesci.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/V6i22_33_CS222048031_Gobi_864-873.pdf
5. Equilibrium Adsorption Isotherms of Pure N2 and O2 and Their Binary Mixtures on LiLSX Zeolite: Experimental Data and Thermodynamic Analysis | Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research - ACS Publications, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/ie500268s
6. Surfactant Adsorption Isotherms: A Review - PMC - NIH, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8655760/
7. Adsorption Basics: Part 1 - AIChE, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.aiche.org/sites/default/files/docs/pages/adsorption_basics_part_1.pdf
8. Determination of Breakthrough Curves and Effective Gas Sorption Capacities, 访

问时间为 十一月 3, 2025,
https://www.dynamicsorption.com/determination-of-breakthrough-curves-and-effective-gas-sorption-capacities/

9. Prediction of adsorption isotherms from breakthrough curves - TU Delft Repository, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://repository.tudelft.nl/file/File_c81230ad-89df-4721-acb1-efe68ceaf26f

10. Surfactant Adsorption Isotherms: A Review | ACS Omega, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acsomega.1c04661

11. Langmuir, Freundlich and Sips isotherm models for adsorption of caffeine. - ResearchGate, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Langmuir-Freundlich-and-Sips-isotherm-models-for-adsorption-of-caffeine_fig5_355580415

12. Equations and Models Describing Adsorption Processes in Soils - USDA ARS, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.ars.usda.gov/arsuserfiles/20360500/pdf_pubs/P1721.pdf

13. Langmuir adsorption model - Wikipedia, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Langmuir_adsorption_model

14. The Sips isotherm equation: Often used and sometimes misused-Bohrium, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.bohrium.com/paper-details/the-sips-isotherm-equation-often-used-and-sometimes-misused/828313067178688513-4515

15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01496395.2023.2167662 Separation Science and Technology The Sips isotherm equation: often used and s - Zenodo, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://zenodo.org/record/7593259/files/Briao2023.pdf

16. Estimation of Langmuir and Sips Models Adsorption Parameters for NaX and NaY FAU Zeolites | Request PDF - ResearchGate, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283198923_Estimation_of_Langmuir_and_Sips_Models_Adsorption_Parameters_for_NaX_and_NaY_FAU_Zeolites

17. How to fit non-linear data's in python - matplotlib - Stack Overflow, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://stackoverflow.com/questions/31943169/how-to-fit-non-linear-datas-in-python

18. Elucidation of Selectivity Reversals for Binary Mixture Adsorption in Microporous Adsorbents - PMC - NIH, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7178797/

19. How i can calculate the selectivity of CO2/N2 from a mixture of 15:85(CO2/N2), form pure component isotherm data? | ResearchGate, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/post/How-i-can-calculate-the-selectivity-of-CO2-N2-from-a-mixture-of-1585CO2-N2-form-pure-component-isotherm-data

20. Adsorption of CO2, CO, H2, and N2 on Zeolites, Activated Carbons, and Metal-Organic Frameworks with Different Surface Nonuniformities - MDPI, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/15/11574

21. Model Analysis of Equilibrium Adsorption Isotherms of Pure N 2 , O 2 , and Their Binary Mixtures on LiLSX Zeolite - ResearchGate, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272128383_Model_Analysis_of_Equilibrium_Adsorption_Isotherms_of_Pure_N_2_O_2_and_Their_Binary_Mixtures_on_LiLSX_Zeolite

22. Prediction of adsorption isotherms from breakthrough curves - UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository), 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/46628878/1_s2.0_S1387181118305705_main.pdf

23. Limitations of Breakthrough Curve Analysis in Fixed-Bed Adsorption - ACS Publications, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.iecr.6b00516

24. Mathematical modeling and numerical simulation of sulfamethoxazole adsorption onto sugarcane bagasse in a fixed-bed column - Repositorio Institucional Universidad de Cuenca, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://dspace.ucuenca.edu.ec/bitstreams/df039b00-0dfa-4481-ae7c-5c720d8efa09/download

25. Mathematical Modeling of Fixed Bed Adsorption: Breakthrough Curve - ResearchGate, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361525448_Mathematical_Modeling_of_Fixed_Bed_Adsorption_Breakthrough_Curve

26. Modelling and Simulation of Twin-Bed Pressure Swing Adsorption Plants for the Generation of High-Purity Nitrogen - Uni-DUE, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.uni-due.de/imperia/md/content/verfahrenstechnik/dissertation_marcinek.pdf

27. Pilot-scale experiments for nitrogen separation from air by pressure swing adsorption - Sabinet African Journals, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://journals.co.za/doi/pdf/10.10520/EJC164547

28. Lecture Notes on Finite Element Methods for Partial Differential Equations - People, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/suli/fem.pdf

29. Introductory Finite Difference Methods for PDEs - Department of Computer Science, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.cs.man.ac.uk/~fumie/tmp/introductory-finite-difference-methods-for-pdes.pdf

30. Finite Difference Method: Mathematical Modeling in Chemical Engineering | PDF - Scribd, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.scribd.com/document/574068599/Lecture-10-FDM

31. Finite difference method for solving Advection-Diffusion Problem in 1D - UTEP, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://utminers.utep.edu/oktweneboah/files/talk.pdf

32. Alternative Boundary Conditions | Fundamentals of Fluid Flow in Porous Media - PERM Inc., 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://perminc.com/resources/fundamentals-of-fluid-flow-in-porous-media/chapter-5-miscible-displacement/equation-continuity-porous-media/solutions-one-dimensional-convection-dispersion-model/alternative-boundary-conditions/

33. Discussion : "On Danckwerts' boundary conditions for the plug-flow with dispersion/reaction model" - ResearchGate, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350566654_Discussion_On_Danckwerts'_boundary_conditions_for_the_plug-flow_with_dispersionreaction_model

34. (PDF) On Danckwerts' Boundary Conditions for the Plug-Flow with Dispersion/Reaction Model - ResearchGate, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271667252_On_Danckwerts'_Boundary_Conditions_for_the_Plug-Flow_with_DispersionReaction_Model

35. Continuous Fixed Bed CO 2 Adsorption: Breakthrough, Column Efficiency, Mass Transfer Zone - MDPI, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9717/8/10/1233

36. Analysis of Adsorption Breakthrough and Desorption Elution Curves, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://www.ni.com/pdf/academic/us/journals/lv02_30.pdf

37. Analysis Of Adsorption Breakthrough And Desorption Elution Curves - ASEE PEER, 访问时间为 十一月 3, 2025, https://peer.asee.org/fundamentals-of-fixed-bed-adsorption-processes-analysis-of-adsorption-breakthrough-and-desorption-elution-curves.pdf