Model for Computational Analysis of the Solution Temperature during Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore in Oxalic Acid Solution

Chukwuka Ikechukwu Nwoye

Department of Materials and Metallurgical Engineering Federal University of Technology, P.M.B 1526 Owerri, Nigeria. <u>chikeyn@yahoo.com</u>

Abstract: Model for computational analysis of the solution temperature (relative to the final pH of the leaching solution) during leaching of iron oxide ore in oxalic acid solution has been derived. The model;

 $T = e^{(14.9661/p)}$

is dependent depends on the value of the final pH of the leaching solution which varies with leaching time. It was observed that the validity of the model is rooted on the expression $\ln T = K_c/p$ where both sides of the equation are approximately equal to 3. The maximum deviation of the model-predicted solution temperature values from those of the experimental values were found to be less than 9% hence establishing the validity and precision of the model. The correlation between mass of iron oxide ore and solution temperature as well as between final pH of leaching solution and solution temperature as obtained from experiment and derived model (0.9296 and 0.8911 as well as 0.9395 and 0.9988) respectively are quite close, indicating proximate agreement with values from actual experiment. [Journal of American Science 2010;6(6):31-37]. (ISSN: 1545-1003).

Keywords: Model, Solution Temperature, Oxalic Acid, Iron Oxide Ore, Leaching.

1. Introduction

The dissolution of iron oxide is believed to take place through a photo-electro chemical reduction process, involving a complicated mechanism of charge transfer between the predominant oxalate species, namely ferric oxalate $Fe(C_2O_4)_3^{3-}$, ferrous oxalate $Fe(C_2O_4)_2^{2-}$ acting also as an auto catalyst, and the oxalate ligand on the iron oxide surface (Taxiarchour et al, 1997a). The dissolution of iron oxides in oxalic acid was found to be very slow at temperatures within the range 25-60°C, but its rate increases rapidly above 90°C (Lee et al, 2006). The dissolution rate also increases with increasing oxalate concentration at the constant pH values set within the optimum range of pH 2.5-3.0. At this optimum pH, the dissolution of fine pure haematite (Fe₂O₃) (105-140µm) follows a diffusioncontrolled shrinking core model.

The presence of Fe^{2+} was found to significantly enhance the leaching of iron extraction from silica sand at a temperature even as low as 25°C (Taxiarchour et al, 1997b). Ferrous oxalate however is oxidized quickly by air during the dissolution and in general an induction period of a few hours was observed to exist unless a strong acidic environment (<pH 1) or an inert atmosphere is maintained. Maintaining the high level of ferrous oxalate in the leach liquor using inert gas was found to enhance the reaction kinetics.

It has been reported (Lee et al, 1999) that the leaching of 3g/L pure haematite (98.2% purity, 105-140µm size range) using 0.048-0.48M oxalic acid at 80-100^oC passed through a maximum peak at pH 2.5. Dissolution of haematite was found to be

slower than magnetite (FeO.Fe₂O₃) and other hydrated iron oxide such as goethite (α -FeOOH), lapidochrosite (γ -FeOOH) and iron hydroxide (Fe(OH)₃) (Lee et al, 1999).

The mixed potential model of leaching assumes that the charge transfer processes occurring at

the mineral surfaces are those that control the rate of dissolution (Kanevskii et al, 1963).

Model for quantitative analysis of dissolved haematite (relative to the initial solution pH) during leaching of iron oxide ore in oxalic acid solution has been derived by Nwoye et al. (2009). The model;

$$\frac{1}{N_{\rm c}} = \left(\frac{N}{N_{\rm c}} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \right)$$
 (1)

was found to calculate the concentration of dissolved haematite being dependent on the values of the initial leaching solution pH measured during the leaching process. The respective positive and negative deviation of the model-predicted values of %Fe₂O₃ (dissolved) from the corresponding experimental values was found to be less than 11% which is quite within the acceptable range of deviation limit of experimental results. The values of the assumed coefficients of dilution (N) and dissolution of haematite (N_c) in oxalic acid solution were calculated to be 197.7503 and 700.0618 respectively.

Nwoye (2008) derived a model for evaluating the final pH of the leaching solution during leaching of iron oxide ore in oxalic acid solution. The model evaluates the pH value as the sum of two parts,

involving the % concentrations of Fe and Fe_2O_3 dissolved. The model can be expressed as;

$$\gamma = 0.5 \left(\frac{K_1}{\% Fe} + \frac{K_2}{\% Fe_2O_3} \right)$$
 (2)

Where

 K_1 and K_2 = dissolution constants of Fe and Fe₂O₃ respectively. γ = final pH of leaching solution (after time t).

It was also found that the model (Nwoye, 2008) could predict the concentration of Fe or Fe_2O_3 dissolved in the oxalic acid solution at a particular final solution pH by taking Fe or Fe_2O_3 as the subject formular. The prevailing process conditions under which the model works include: leaching time of 30mins., constant leaching temperature of 30°C, average ore grain size; 150µm and 0.1M oxalic acid.

Nwoye (2009) has reported that the heat absorbed by oxalic acid solution during leaching of iron oxide ore can be predicted using the model he derived which works under the process condition; initial pH 6.9, average ore grain size; 150μ m and leaching temperature; 30° C. The model (Nwoye, 2009) can be stated as

$$Q = K_{N} \left(\frac{\gamma}{\sqrt[6]{6}Fe_{2}O_{3}} \right)$$
(3)

Where

- Q = Quantity of heat absorbed by oxalic acid solution during the leaching process. (J)
- γ = Final pH of the leaching solution (at time t).
- %Fe₂O₃= Concentration of haematite dissolved in oxalic acid solution during the leaching process.
 - $K_N = 4.57$ (Haematite dissolution constant in oxalic acid solution) determined in the experiment (Nwoye, 2008).

Nwoye (2009) carried out further work on the model using the same process conditions and observed that on re-arranging the model as;

$$\%Fe_2O_3 = K_N \left(\frac{\gamma}{Q} \right)$$
(4)

the concentrations of haematite predicted deviated very insignificantly from the corresponding experimental values. In this case, the value of Q was calculated by considering the specific heat capacity of oxalic acid. Values of heat absorbed by the oxalic acid solution during the leaching of iron oxide ore as predicted by the model (Nwoye, 2009) agree with the experimental values that the leaching process is endothermic. This is because all the predicted values of the heat absorbed by the oxalic acid solution were positive. The model shows that the quantity of heat absorbed by oxalic acid solution during the leaching process is directly proportional to the final pH of the solution and inversely proportional to the concentration of haematite dissolved.

Nwoye et al. (2009) derived a model for calculating the concentration of leached iron during leaching of iron oxide ore in sulphuric acid solution. The model is expressed as;

$$\%$$
Fe = e^{-2.0421(lnT)} (5)

The model was found to predict %Fe (leached) very close to the values obtained from the experiment, being dependent on the values of the final leaching solution temperature measured during the leaching process. It was observed that the validity of the model is rooted in the expression ln(%Fe) = N(InT) where both sides of the expression are correspondingly approximately equal. The positive or negative deviation of each of the model-predicted values of %Fe (leached) from those of the experimental values was found to be less than 37%.

Nwoye et al. (2009) derived a model for predicting the initial solution pH at determined final pH and leaching time during leaching of iron oxide ore in hydrogen peroxide solution. It was observed that the validity of the model is rooted in the mathematical expression; $(\ln t)^{1/2} = N(\beta^C/\alpha^C)$ where both sides of the relationship are approximately equal to 2. The model is expressed as;

 $\beta = \text{Antilog}[0.2439\text{Log}(\alpha^{4.1}(\text{lnt})^{1/2}/3.6)]$ (6)

The model shows that the initial solution pH is dependent on the values of the final solution pH and leaching time. The respective positive or negative deviation of the model-predicted final pH from its corresponding experimental value was found to be less than 8%, which is quite within the acceptable deviation limit of experimental results depicting the validity of the model.

Model for predictive analysis of the concentration of dissolved iron during leaching of iron oxide ore in sulphuric acid solution was derived by Nwoye et al. (2009). The model expressed as;

%Fe =
$$0.987(\mu/T)$$
 (7)

was found to predict %Fe dissolved with high degree of precision being dependent on the values of the leaching temperature and weight of iron oxide ore added. It was observed that the validity of the model is rooted in the expression %Fe = $N(\mu/T)$ where both sides of the relationship are correspondingly approximately equal. The positive or negative deviation of each of the model-predicted values of %Fe (dissolved) from those of the

experimental values was found to be less than 19% which is quite within the acceptable range of deviation limit for experimental results, hence depicting the usefulness of the model as a tool for predictive analysis of the dissolved iron during the process.

Model for calculating the solution pH during hydrogen peroxide leaching of iron oxide ore has also been derived by Nwoye et al. (2009). It was observed that the validity of the model is rooted in the expression $\ln\gamma = K_C[(\%Fe_2O_3/\%Fe)^N]$ where both sides of the equation are correspondingly approximately equal to 2. The model expressed as;

$$\gamma = \exp\left[K_{C}[(\%Fe_{2}O_{3}/\%Fe)^{N}]\right]$$
 (8)

The final solution pH was found to depend on the values of the % concentrations of dissolved iron and haematite from experiment. The respective deviation of the model-predicted pH values from the corresponding experimental values was found to be less than 20% which is quite within the acceptable range of deviation limit of experimental results.

Model for evaluation of the concentration of dissolved phosphorus (relative to the final pH of the leaching solution) during leaching of iron oxide ore in oxalic acid solution has been derived by Nwoye (2009). The model is expressed as;

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{e}^{(12.25/\alpha)} \tag{9}$$

Where

P = Concentration of phosphorus removed during

the leaching process (mg/Kg)

- N = 12.25; (pH coefficient for phosphorus dissolution in oxalic acid solution) determined in the experiment (Nwoye, 2003).
- α = Final pH of the leaching solution at the time t when the concentration of dissolved phosphorus is evaluated.

It was observed that the validity of the model is rooted in the relationship $\ln P = N/\alpha$ where both sides of the expression are approximately equal to 4. The model depends on the value of the final pH of the leaching solution which varies with leaching time. In all, the positive or negative deviation of the model-predicted phosphorus concentration from its corresponding value obtained from the experiment was found to be less than 22%, which is quite within the acceptable deviation limit of experimental results hence establishing the validity and precision of the model.

Nwoye et al. (2008) derived a model for evaluation of the concentration of dissolved iron (relative to the final solution pH and temperature) during leaching of iron oxide ore in sulphuric acid solution. It was observed that the validity of the model was rooted in expression $(\% Fe/N)^{1/3} = \alpha/T$ where both sides of the expression are approximately equal to 0.2. The model is expressed as;

$$\% Fe = 0.35 (\alpha/T)^3$$
 (10)

Where

- T = Solution temperature at the time t when the concentration of dissolved iron is evaluated. (^{0}C)
- N= 0.35(pH coefficient for sulphuric acid solution during leaching of iron oxide ore) determined in the experiment (Nwoye, 2007).
- α = Final pH of the leaching solution at the time t when the concentration of dissolved iron is evaluated.

The aim of this work is to derive a model for computational analysis of the solution temperature relative to the final pH of the solution during leaching of Itakpe (Nigerian) iron oxide ore using oxalic acid solution.

2. Model

The solid phase (ore) is assumed to be stationary, contains the un-leached iron remaining in the ore. Hydrogen ions from the oxalic acid attack the ore within the liquid phase in the presence of oxygen.

2.1 Model Formulation

Experimental data obtained from research work (Nwoye, 2005) carried out at SynchroWell Research Laboratory, Enugu were used for this work.

Results of the experiment as presented in report (Nwoye, 2005) and used for the model formulation are as shown in Table 1.

Computational analysis of the experimental data (Nwoye, 2005) shown in Table 1, resulted to Table 2 which indicate that;

 $\ln T = K_c$ (approximately) (11)

$$T = e^{Kc/p}$$
(12)

Introducing the value of K_c into equation (12)

$$T = e^{(14.9661/p)}$$
(13)

Where

- T = Solution temperature during leaching of iron oxide ore using oxalic acid (^{0}C)
- K_c = 14.9661; (pH coefficient for oxalic acid solution during leaching of iron oxide ore) determined in the experiment.(Nwoye, 2005)
- p = Final pH of the leaching solution at the time t when the solution temperature is evaluated. Equation (13) is the derived model.

Table1: Variation of final pH of solution with solution temperature. (Nwoye,2005)

| | M (g) | р | $T_{exp}(^{0}C)$ | | | |
|--|-------|------|------------------|--|--|--|
| | 2 | 4.88 | 23.5 | | | |
| | 4 | 4.73 | 23.9 | | | |
| | 6 | 4.69 | 24.1 | | | |
| | 8 | 4.63 | 25.0 | | | |
| | 10 | 4.61 | 25.1 | | | |
| | 14 | 4.60 | 25.2 | | | |
| | 16 | 4.58 | 25.4 | | | |

Where M = Mass of iron oxide ore used for the leaching process (g).

3. Boundary and Initial Condition

Consider iron ore in cylindrical flask 30cm high containing leaching solution of oxalic acid. The leaching solution is stationary i.e (non-flowing). The flask is assumed to be initially free of attach bacteria. Initially, atmospheric levels of oxygen are assumed. Varying weights (2-16g) of iron oxide ore were used as outlined in Table 1. The initial pH of leaching solution; 4.85 and leaching time of 30 minutes was used for all samples.

A constant leaching temperature of 25° C was used. Ore grain size; 150μ m, volume of leaching solution; 0.11 tre and oxalic acid concentration; 0.1 mol/litre were used. These and other process conditions are as stated in the experimental technique (Nwoye, 2005).

The boundary conditions are: atmospheric levels of oxygen (since the cylinder was open at the top) at the top and bottom of the ore particles in the liquid and gas phases respectively. At the bottom of the particles, a zero gradient for the liquid scalar are assumed and also for the gas phase at the top of the particles. The leaching solution is stationary. The sides of the particles are taken to be symmetries.

4. Model Validation

The formulated model was validated by direct analysis and comparison of T values from model data and those from the experimental data for equality or near equality. Analysis and comparison between these data reveal deviations of model data from experimental data. This is believed to be due to the fact that the surface properties of the ore and the physiochemical interactions between the ore and leaching solution which were found to have played vital roles during the leaching process (Nwoye, 2005) were not considered during the model formulation. This necessitated the introduction of correction factor, to bring the model data to that of the experimental values. (Table 3) Deviation (Dv) of model T values from experimental T values is given by

$$Dv = \left(\frac{Dp - DE}{DE}\right) \times 100 \tag{14}$$

Where Dp = Predicted data from modelDE = Experimental data

Correction factor (Cf) is the negative of the deviation i.e $% \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) = 0$

$$Cf = -Dv \tag{15}$$

Therefore

$$Cf = -100 \left(\frac{Dp - DE}{DE} \right)$$
(16)

Introduction of the corresponding values of Cf from equation (16) into the model gives exactly the corresponding experimental T values. (Nwoye, 2005)

5. Results and Discussion

The derived model is equation (13).

Computational analysis of values in Table 1 resulted to Table 2.

Table 2: Variation of lnT with K_c/p

| M (g) | р | lnT | K _c /p |
|-------|------|--------|-------------------|
| 2 | 4.88 | 3.1570 | 3.0668 |
| 4 | 4.73 | 3.1739 | 3.1641 |
| 6 | 4.69 | 3.1822 | 3.1911 |
| 8 | 4.63 | 3.2189 | 3.2324 |
| 10 | 4.61 | 3.2229 | 3.2464 |
| 14 | 4.60 | 3.2268 | 3.2535 |
| 16 | 4.58 | 3.2347 | 3.2677 |

The derived model is equation (13). An ideal comparison of the T values as obtained from experiment (Nwoye, 2005) and as predicted by the model for the purpose of testing the validity of the model is achieved by considering the R^2 values (coefficient of determination). The values of the correlation coefficient, R calculated from the equation;

$$\mathbf{R} = \sqrt{\mathbf{R}^2} \tag{17}$$

using the r-squared values (coefficient of determination) from Comparison between Figures 1-4 show that the correlation between mass of iron oxide ore and solution temperature as well as between final pH of leaching solution and solution temperature as obtained from experiment (Nwoye, 2005) and derived model; (0.9296 and 0.8911) as well as (0.9395 and 0.9988) respectively are quite close indicating proximate agreement with values from actual experiment.



Figure 1- Effect of mass of iron oxide ore added on the solution temperature as obtained from the experiment (Nwoye, 2005)



Figure 2- Effect of mass of iron oxide ore added on the solution temperature as obtained from derived model



Figure 3- Effect of final pH of solution on the solution temperature as obtained from the experiment (Nwoye, 2005)



Figure 4- Effect of final pH on the solution temperature as obtained from derived model

Figures 5 and 6 show very close alignment of the curves from model-predicted values of T (MoD) and that from the corresponding experimental values (ExD). The degree of alignment of these curves is indicative of the proximate agreement between both experimental and model-predicted values T.



Figure 5- Comparison of solution temperatures resulting from the addition of iron oxide ore as obtained from experiment (Nwoye, 2005) and derived model



Figure 6- Comparison of solution temperatures relative to the final pH as obtained from experiment (Nwoye, 2005) and derived model

Table 3 shows that the maximum deviation of the model-predicted values of Т from the corresponding experimental values (Nwoye, 2005) is less than 9% which is quite very insignificant and within the acceptable range of deviation limit of experimental results hence depicting the reliability and validity of the model. The validity of the model is believed to be rooted on equation (11) where both sides of the equation are approximately equal to 3. Table 2 also agrees with equation (11) following the values of $\ln T$ and K_c/p evaluated from Table 1 as a result of computational and statistical analysis.

The least and highest magnitude of deviation of the model-predicted T (from the corresponding experimental values) are + 0.01% and - 8.64% which correspond to solution temperature 25.34 and 21.47 respectively. Table 3 indicates that a correction factor of - 0.01% and + 8.64% make up for the least and highest deviation of + 0.01% and - 8.64% resulting from final pH of 4.63 and 4.88 due to addition of 8 and 2g of iron oxide ore

respectively. It is pertinent to state that the actual deviations are just the modulus of the values. The role of the sign attached to the values is just to show when the deviation is surplus or deficit.

Table:3 Variation of model-predicted solution temperature with the associated deviation and correction factors

| $T_M(^0C)$ | Dv (%) | Cf (%) |
|------------|--------|--------|
| 21.47 | -8.64 | +8.64 |
| 23.67 | -0.96 | +0.96 |
| 24.31 | +0.87 | -0.87 |
| 25.34 | +0.01 | -0.01 |
| 25.70 | +0.02 | -0.02 |
| 25.88 | +0.03 | -0.03 |
| 26.25 | +0.03 | -0.03 |

 $T_M = T$ values predicted by model.

6. Conclusion

The model computes the solution temperature relative to the final solution temperature during leaching of Itakpe iron oxide ore. The validity of the model is believed to be rooted on the expression $\ln T = K_c$ where both sides of the expression are approximately equal to 3. The maximum deviation of the model-predicted values of T from the corresponding experimental values is less than 9% which is quite very insignificant and within the acceptable range of deviation limit of experimental results.

Further works should incorporate more process parameters into the model with the aim of reducing the deviations of the model data from that of the experimental.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank Dr. Ekeme Udoh, a modelling expert at Linkwell Modelling Centre Calabar for his technical inputs. The management of SynchroWell Nig. Ltd. Enugu is also appreciated for permitting and providing the experimental data used in this work.

Correspondence to:

Chukwuka Ikechukwu Nwoye Department of Materials and Metallurgical Engineering, Federal University of Technology, P.M.B 1526 Owerri. Imo State, Nigeria. Cellular phone: 0803 800 6092 Email: <u>chikeyn@yahoo.com</u>

References

[1]Taxiarchour M, Panias D, Doumi I, Paspaliaris I, Kontopoulos A. Removal of iron from Silica Sand by Leaching with Oxalic Acid, Hydrometallurgy 1997a: 46: 215-227.

[2] Lee SO, Tran T, Park YY, Kim SJ, and Kim MJ. Study on the Kinetics of Iron Leaching by

Oxalic Acid. Int. J. Miner process, 2006: 80:144-152. [3]Taxiarchou M, Parnias D, Douni I, Paspaliaris I, and Kontopoulous A. Dissolution of Haematite in Acidic Oxalate Solutions. Hydrometallurgy 1997b:287-299.

[4]Lee SO, Oh JK, Shin BS. Dissolution of Iron Rust Materials using Oxalic Acid. J. Min. Metall. Inst. Jpn. 1999: 115: 815-819.

[5] Kanevskii EA, and Filippov AP. Influence of the Ionic Composition of Solutions of Fe(iii) on the Solution of Uranium Dioxide. Soviet Radiochemistry (Eng. Trans. Of Radiokhimiya) 1963: 3-5.

[6]Nwoye CI, Agu PC, Nwakwuo CC, Obasi GC and Nlebedim C. Model for Quantitative Analysis of Dissolved Haematite Relative to the Initial Solution pH during Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore in Oxalic Acid Res. J. 2009: 1(4):7-14.

[7]Nwoye CI. Model for Quantitative Analysis of Dissolved Iron in Oxalic Acid Solution during

Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore, Inter. Res. J. Eng. Sc. Tech., 2008: 5(1):37-41.

[8] Nwoye CI. Model for Computational Analysis of Dissolved Haematite and Heat Absorbed by

Oxalic Acid Solution during Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore, J. Eng.& App. Sc., 2008: 4:22-25.

[9]Nwoye CI. SynchroWell Research Work Report, DFM Unit, No 24871002, 2008: 30-42.

[10]Nwoye CI, Obasi GC, Mark U, Inyama S, Nwakwuo CC. Model for Calculating the Concentration of Leached Iron Relative to the Final Solution Temperature during Sulphuric Acid Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore New York Sc. Journal 2009: 2(3):49-54.

[11]Nwoye CI, Agu PC, Onukwuli OD, Borode JO, Mbah CN. Model for Predicting the Initial Solution pH at Assumed Final pH and Leaching Time during Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore in Hydrogen Peroxide Solution. New York Sc. Journal 2009: 2(3):43-48[12]Nwoye CI, Ofoegbu SU, Obi M, Nwakwuo CC. Model for Predictive Analysis of the Concentration of Dissolved Iron Relative to the Weight Input of Iron Oxide Ore and Leaching Temperature during Sulphuric Acid Leaching. Nat. & Sc. J. 2009: 7(3): 41-47.

[13]Nwoye CI, Ejimofor RA, Nlebedim C, Nwoye UC, Obi M, Obasi GC, Agu PC. Model for Calculating the Solution pH during Hydrogen Peroxide Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore. Nat. & Sc. 2009: 7(3) :

48-54.

[14]Nwoye CI. Model for Evaluation of the Concentration of Dissolved Phosphorus during Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore in Oxalic Acid Solution. JMMCE 2009: 8(3):181-188.

[15] Nwoye CI. SynchroWell Research Work Report, DFM Unit, No 2031196, 2003: 26-60.

[16] Nwoye CI, Amara GN, and Onyemaobi OO. Model for Evaluation of the Concentration of Dissolved Iron during Leaching of Iron Oxide Ore in Sulphuric Acid Solution. Int. J. Nat. Appl. Sc. 2008: 4(2): 209-211.

[17]Nwoye CI. SynchroWell Research Work Report DFMUnit, No. 2051198, 2007: 76-83.

[18]Nwoye CI. SynchroWell Research Work Report, DFM Unit, No 2441162, 2005: 60-69.