

# Pore geometry and isosteric heat: an analysis for the carbon dioxyde adsorption on activated carbon.

Dominique Levesque, Farida Darkrim Lamari

### ▶ To cite this version:

Dominique Levesque, Farida Darkrim Lamari. Pore geometry and isosteric heat: an analysis for the carbon dioxyde adsorption on activated carbon. Molecular Physics, 2009, 107 (04-06), pp.591-597. 10.1080/00268970902905802. hal-00513287

## HAL Id: hal-00513287 https://hal.science/hal-00513287

Submitted on 1 Sep 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

#### **Molecular Physics**



## Pore geometry and isosteric heat : an analysis for the carbon dioxyde adsorption on activated carbon.

Journal:	Molecular Physics	
Manuscript ID:	TMPH-2008-0446.R1	
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper - Dr. Jean-Jacques Weis	
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Mar-2009	
Complete List of Authors:	Levesque, Dominique; Université de Paris-Sud XI, Laboratoire de Physique Théorique Darkrim Lamari, Farida; University Paris 13, Institut Galilee	
Keywords:	adsorption, isosteric heat	
Note: The following files were submitted by the author for peer review, but cannot be converted to PDF. You must view these files (e.g. movies) online.		

TMPH-2008-0446\_R1.tex



Molecular Physics

art chal

Molecular Physics

Molecular Physics Vol. 00, No. 00, Month 200x, 1–8

#### **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

#### Pore geometry and isosteric heat : an analysis for the carbon dioxyde adsorption on activated carbon

Dominique Levesque a \* and Farida Darkrim Lamari<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> LPT UMR CNRS 8627 Université Paris XI Bâtiment 210, 91405 Orsay, France <sup>b</sup>LIMHP Université Paris XIII, CNRS UPR 1311, Institut Gallilée, 93430 Villetaneuse, France

(Received 00 Month 200x; final version received 00 Month 200x)

The isosteric heat of the carbon dioxide adsorption on activated carbon is determined by grand canonical Monte Carlo simulations. The results, obtained at room temperature and low pressures for an adorbent model with a slit type porosity, show that the isosteric heat depends strongly on the slit width. The maximum of the isosteric heat is reached for a pore with a width such as cooperative effects between the adsorbed molecules enhance the adsorption. The possibility to estimate the isosteric heat of a macroscopic sample, from adsorption isotherms computed for a distribution of slit pores with given sizes, is discussed.

#### Introduction

The isosteric heat is a very important characteristic of the adsorption phenomena. Its value is relevant, in particular for the first stages of the adsorption process, since the released heat increases the delay to achieve an equilibrium state between the adsorbed phase and bulk phase in contact with the porous material. In addition, a large isosteric heat induced by a strong interaction between adsorbed molecules and adsorbing surface can slow the gas desorption. Hence, the determination of the isosteric heat has been studied in many theoretical and experimental works for various adsorbent materials (activated carbons, zeolites, silicalites, ...) and adsorbed gases (cf., for example, some recent publications [1-11]). For a theoretical computation of the isosteric heat, the adsorbents divide into two main categories. The porous materials, as the zeolites, with a crystalline structure have identical pores at the microscopic scale. For these adsorbents, to estimate the isosteric heat for one or few unit cells of the porous crystal is sufficient to have a reliable value of that of the bulk material. For the porous materials with complex pore networks, as the activated carbons, the whole isosteric heat of a material sample depends on the isosteric heat value associated to each pore type. So, the theoretical calculation of the isosteric heat requires to known the pore size distribution which defines the material porosity and the set of isosteric heats which vary with the pore properties.

The changes of the isosteric heat value with the pore size and shape have been studied mainly by numerical simulations or theoretical methods, as the density functional theory [12–14]. Using a theoretical approximate scheme, Schindler and LeVan [15] have shown that the isosteric heat of simple gases Ar, N<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> or CH<sub>4</sub> adsorbed in graphite slit pores has a maximal value when the slit width, defined

ISSN: 0040-5167 print/ISSN 1754-2278 online © 200x Taylor & Francis DOI: 10.1080/0040516YYxxxxxx http://www.informaworld.com

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author. Email: dominique.levesque@th.u-psud.fr

Molecular Physics

art chal

#### Molecular Physics

as the distance between the carbon atoms located inside the slit walls, is of the order of ~ 0.7 nm. In this work, we present the results of a similar calculation for CO<sub>2</sub> performed by using grand canonical Monte-Carlo (GCMC) simulations which allow to take into account the contribution to the adsorption process from important cooperative effects between the CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed molecules. These effects, combined with the modification of the molecule-adsorbent interaction when the slit width varies, lead to large differences between the pore isosteric heats. Such differences imply that an adequate method must be used to determine the isosteric heat of activated carbon samples with various pore size distributions from those computed for a set of slit pores with a given width [16].

In the first part of this work, is described the model considered for studying the  $CO_2$  adsorption in graphitic slit pores. The results of GCMC simulations of this process are presented in the second section. The third section is devoted to the discussion of the simulation results and to their possible use for a comparison with experimental data.

#### Model Description

The  $CO_2$  molecule is modeled as a linear rigid molecule of length equal to 0.232 nm and its molecular interactions are described by Lennard-Jones (LJ) pair potential centers of generic equation  $v_{\rm LI}(r) = 4\epsilon [(\sigma/r)^{12} - (\sigma/r)^6]$ . Two of these potentials correspond to oxygen atoms and are located to the molecule ends. The third potential corresponds to the carbon atom and is located to the middle of the molecule. The LJ parameters of oxygen and carbon potentials are  $\epsilon_0 = 79.0$  K,  $\sigma_0 = 0.305$  nm, and  $\epsilon_C = 27.0$  K,  $\sigma_C = 0.28$  nm, respectively. In addition, the linear quadrupole of the  $CO_2$  molecule is described by a neutral distribution of three charges located at the LJ center positions. The charges on the O atom positions are equal to -0.35 e, that on the C atom position is 0.70 e (e electronic charge). This model of  $CO_2$  interaction has been tested successfully in the literature [17, 18]. The interaction of the carbon atom in a graphite plane is a LJ potential with parameters  $\epsilon_G = 28.0$  K and  $\sigma_G = 0.340$  nm. The cross-interaction between CO<sub>2</sub> molecules and between  $CO_2$  molecules and carbon atoms of the pore walls are derived by using the Berthelot's rule, expressed by the relations :  $\sigma_{\alpha\beta} = 0.5 (\sigma_{\alpha} + \sigma_{\beta})$  and  $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} = \sqrt{\epsilon_{\alpha}\epsilon_{\beta}}$  where the indices  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  refer to the indices O, C or G of the LJ parameters of a  $CO_2$  molecule and carbon atom. Such an effective potential for the graphite carbon atoms and the rule used to compute the gas-graphite interactions have been justified by many studies, cf., for instance, the work on the graphite cohesion energy [19], the text-book [20] and the recent comparison with ab-initio calculations [21].

The activated carbon model supposes that the material pores are mainly slits with different widths [22]. The pore walls are made from a stack of three graphite basal planes. Inside the stack, the distance between the planes is equal to 0.34 nm. The slit width h is defined as the distance between carbon atoms located in the external planes of pore opposite walls. With these characteristics, the specific surface of the material model is ~ 1030 m<sup>2</sup>/gr.

The potential energy of one single  $CO_2$  molecule inside slit pores of the model material is presented in Fig. 1. The energy potential varies strongly with increasing h and molecule orientation. Fig. 1(a) gives the potential energy for a molecule the axis of which is parallel to the pore walls and Fig. 1(b) for a molecule the axis of which is perpendicular. For a given h value, the potential energy of a molecule parallel to the walls is larger than that of a molecule perpendicular to the walls. For  $h \leq 0.5$  nm, the simulations show that in the considered range of pressure at room

#### Molecular Physics

temperature no CO<sub>2</sub> molecule can be adsorbed in pores with such a width. For 0.6 nm  $\leq h \leq 0.8$  nm, the potential energy for a molecule with its axis perpendicular to the walls is strongly positive and is not plotted. For  $h \geq 0.8$  nm, for both molecular axis orientations, the potential has two minima which are located in the wall vicinity.

#### Simulation Results

The GCMC simulations are realized following the procedure described in the litterature [23–25]. The GCMC code developed by us and used in previous works, for instance [26], implement the Metropolis algorithm adapted to the configuration sampling of a GC ensemble in a standard way. Specifically, an initial configuration of adsorbed molecules in the volume filled with the adsorbent is generated. From this initial configuration the new configurations are sampled by iteratively attempting to insert a new molecule at random in the volume, to delete or to displace randomly one of molecules present in the volume chosen at random. These changes are accepted or refused accordingly to the GC Boltzmann weight ratio of the previous and trial configurations. The set of generated configurations allows to compute the average values of quantities as the energy and molecule number.

The simulation cell is parallelepipedic with periodic boundary conditions in the x, y and z directions. It contains two stacks of graphite basal planes. These stacks, constituted of three planes, are positioned perpendicularly to the z axis. The x and y dimensions of planes are chosen identical to those of the simulation cell in order that the hexagonal arrangement of C atoms and the cell boundary conditions are compatible. The two stacks form the pore walls and are placed in such a way to define two slits will same width h taking into account the boundary conditions. The cell size is equal to 8.116 and 4.257 nm in the x and y directions, respectively, and, in the z direction, it varies between 2.537 and 6.339 nm when h varies between 0.6 nm and 2.5 nm. The cell contains 7920 C atoms. For an efficient computation of the molecule energy, a cell linked list algorithm [24] is used by partitioning the simulation volume in parallelepipedic sub-volumes with edge equal to or larger than the interaction range.

For a given pressure P, temperature T and chemical potential  $\mu$ , the total adsorption  $m_a$ , expressed in mol per gram of adsorbent, is given by

$$m_a = \frac{\langle N_a \rangle}{N_C M_C} \tag{1}$$

where  $\langle N_a \rangle = \bar{N}_a$  is the average value of the adsorbed molecule number.  $N_C$  is the number of C atoms in the simulation cell and  $M_C$  the carbon molar mass. The excess adsorption  $m_e$ , obtained in removing the contribution of compression effects to  $m_a$ , is defined by  $m_e = m_a - \rho_b V_f$ .  $\rho_b$  is the density of the gas in the bulk phase in mmol per volume unit and  $V_f$  the free volume accessible to the adsorbed gas per gram of adsorbent. The  $V_f$  values have been computed from the amount of Helium adsorbed  $m_a^{He}$  in the slit pores by GCMC simulation at 653 K and 0.1 MPa. In agreement with the experimental Helium displacement method [27],  $V_f$  is given by  $V_f = m_a^{He} / \rho_b^{He}$  where  $\rho_b^{He}$  is the Helium bulk density at 653 K and 0.1 MPa. The bulk pressure and density associated to the  $\mu$  value used in a simulation run at given T were determined from GCMC simulations performed with a simulation cell containing no adsorbent.

The isosteric heat  $q_i$ , following the definition quoted from refs. [23, 28], is "the differential entropy change in a reversible process where fluid is transferred from

#### Molecular Physics

the porous material at fixed volume and temperature to the bulk phase at fixed temperature and bulk pressure". It is given by

$$q_i = T\left\{ \left(\frac{\partial S_b}{\partial \bar{N}_b}\right)_{T,P} - \left(\frac{\partial S_a}{\partial \bar{N}_a}\right)_{T,V_f} \right\}$$
(2)

where  $S_b$  and  $S_a$  are the entropies and  $\overline{N}_b$  and  $\overline{N}_a$  the molecule numbers of the bulk and adsorbed phases. This expression can be rewritten as

$$q_i = H_b - \left(\frac{\partial U_a}{\partial \bar{N}_a}\right)_{T, V_f} \tag{3}$$

where  $H_b$  is the enthalpy per molecule of the bulk phase and  $\bar{U}_a$  the energy of the adsorbed phase. When  $\partial \bar{U}_a / \partial \bar{N}_a$  is expressed in terms of fluctuations of  $\bar{U}_a$  and  $\bar{N}_a$  in the GC ensemble,  $q_i$  writes

$$q_i = H_b - \frac{\langle U_a N_a \rangle - \langle U_a \rangle \langle N_a \rangle}{\langle N_a^2 \rangle - \langle N_a \rangle^2} , \qquad (4)$$

a formula adapted to the  $q_i$  computation by GCMC simulations. Taking into account the expression of  $H_b$  in terms of the pressure and energy at a fixed temperature, we can write:

$$q_i = P/\rho_b + U_b^c + U_b^i - U_a^c - \frac{\langle U_a^i N_a \rangle - \langle U_a^i \rangle \langle N_a \rangle}{\langle N_a^2 \rangle - \langle N_a \rangle^2}$$
(5)

where  $U_b^c$  and  $U_a^c$ , the average kinetic energies per molecule of the bulk and adsorbed phases, are equal obviously to  $5k_BT/2$  for CO<sub>2</sub> ( $k_B$  Boltzmann constant).  $U_b^i$  is the internal energy per molecule of the bulk phase and  $U_a^i$  that of the adsorbed phase. The hypothesis that the bulk phase is a perfect gas, leads to the approximate formula often used in the literature :

$$q_i = k_B T - \frac{\langle U_a^i N_a \rangle - \langle U_a^i \rangle \langle N_a \rangle}{\langle N_a^2 \rangle - \langle N_a \rangle^2}.$$
 (6)

 $m_a$  and  $q_i$  have been estimated from GCMC runs comprising, at least,  $12 \times 10^6$  MC steps to achieve the equilibium state of adsorbed phases followed by  $48 \times 10^6$  MC steps to compute the average quantities. These numbers of MC steps were sufficient for slit pores with  $h \ge 0.9$  nm to determine  $m_a$  and  $q_i$  with a statistical uncertainty  $\sim 1-2\%$ . For the pores with  $h \le 0.8$  nm, the statistical error on  $m_a$  is similar but the values of  $\langle N_a \rangle^2$  and  $\langle N_a^2 \rangle$  being close,  $\langle N^2 \rangle - \langle N \rangle^2$  is difficult to estimate accurately and the uncertainty on the  $q_i$  values is of the order of  $\sim 5\%$  for h = 0.6 and 0.7 nm and  $\sim 10\%$  for h = 0.8 nm.

The excess adsorption isotherms and  $q_i$  values at T = 293 K between 0.01 and 0.20 MPa for slit pores with increasing widths are presented in Fig. 2 and 3. For pores with  $h \ge 0.9$  nm, the excess adsorption  $m_e$  varies monotically and this variation is almost proportional to that of the pressure. By contrast, for h = 0.8 nm,  $m_e$  remains quasi constant between 0.02 and 0.2 MPa, a behavior which results from the tight stack of the adsorbed molecules for this pore size. A snapshot of the molecule arrangement is given in Fig. 5; it shows that molecules are in average slightly tilted with respect to the orientation where they would be perpendicular to the the pore walls. In such configurations, where the contribution to  $U_a$  and  $q_i$  from the molecule-molecule interaction  $U_a^m$  and molecule-adsorbent interaction

#### Molecular Physics

 $U_a^G$  are almost equal, the cooperative effects between molecules have an important role in the adsorption process. For h = 0.7 nm, these effects remain important since  $U_a^G/5 < U_a^m < U_a^G/2$  in the pressure range 0.01-0.2 MPa. At h = 0.6 nm, the confinement involves that the molecules are parallel to the pore walls and from the disorder of the bidimensional molecular arrangement inside the slit (cf. snapshot in Fig. 5), it results that  $U_a^m$  is of the order of  $U_a^G/15$  at 0.01 MPa and  $U_a^G/7$  at 0.2 MPa. For the size h = 2.5 nm,  $U_a^m$  varies from ~ 0.0 at 0.01 MPa to  $U_a^G/15$  at 0.2 MPa.

These data and the modification of the molecule-adsorbent interactions when hincreases (cf. Fig. 1) help to the interpretation of the variation of  $q_i$  with those of P and h. When the interaction between molecules is negligible or weak in the adsorbed phase, to a good approximation  $q_i$  has a value determined by the only interaction of one molecule with the adsorbent surface implying that  $\langle U_a^i N_a \rangle$  $- \langle U_a^i \rangle \langle N_a \rangle$  is almost proportional to  $\langle N_a^2 \rangle - \langle N_a \rangle^2$ . In this case and when, for h sufficiently large, the molecule-adsorbent interaction has no more variation with h,  $q_i$  depends little on P and h, as it is found by simulation for the adsorption in pores with h > 1.2 nm. For h between 0.9 nm and 1.2 nm, to the strong increase of  $m_e$  with the pressure corresponds an increase of the  $U_a^m$ contribution to  $U_a$  from 2% up to 30% while the  $U_a^G$  contribution per molecule remains constant. As a consequence of the variation of  $U_a^m$  and  $\langle N_a^2 \rangle - \langle N_a \rangle^2$ when the molecule density in the pores increases,  $q_i$  varies by 30 % in the considered pressure range. In the narrow pores, in particular for 0.8 nm,  $m_e$  is close to  $m_a$ and varies only by 10-20% between 0.01 and 0.2 MPa. Due to the packing of the molecules  $\langle N_a^2 \rangle - \langle N_a \rangle^2$ , which has a value much smaller than its perfect gas value equal to  $\langle N \rangle$ ,  $U_a$  and  $\langle U_a N_a \rangle - \langle U_a N_a \rangle$  vary little and  $q_i$  remains quasi constant between 0.01 and 0.2 MPa.

Similarly to the results obtained in [15],  $m_e$  and  $q_i$  present a maximum for a pore with a width of  $h \simeq 0.8$  nm. But the maximum values of  $q_i$  are larger by a factor of  $\sim 2$  as a consequence of the strong contribution of the intermolecular interactions in the adsorbed phase and  $m_e$  and  $q_i$  have almost achieved at 0.1 MPa their maximal values.

#### **Discussions and Conclusions**

For the considered temperature and pressure domain, the strong variations of  $m_e$ and  $q_i$  with the pore size give a typical example of the difficulty to compare the simulation results with experimental data for CO<sub>2</sub> adsorbed on activated carbons. Only, in the cases where the material porosity is very homogeneous or corresponds to slit widths larger than 1.6 nm, such a comparison can be easily performed, since all pores contribute almost similarly to the excess adsorption. When the activated carbon pore network comprises slits with widths smaller than 1.0 nm, the excess adsorption of the material need to be estimated from an average where the excess adsorptions computed for each slit type is weighted in agreement with the pore size distibution [6, 16, 29]. Supposing that the pores differ only in width,  $m_e$  the excess adsorption per gram of adsorbent is given by

$$m_e = \int m_a^h v(h) dh - \rho_b V_f \tag{7}$$

where  $m_a^h$  is the total amount of adsorbed gas in a slit pore with width h and free volume unity. v(h)dh ( $V_f = \int v(h)dh$ ) is the contribution to  $V_f$  from pores with width between h and h + dh.

#### Molecular Physics

For the  $q_i$  computation of activated carbons, Birkett and Do [16] have shown that a formula, similar to Eq. 7, expressing  $q_i$  as a weighted average on the isosteric heats  $q_i^h$  of the slits with width h is incorrect and should be replaced by

$$q_i = H_b + \frac{\int q(h)_i \left(\partial \bar{N}_a^h / \partial \bar{P}\right)_{T, V_h} v(h) dh}{\left(\partial \bar{N}_a / \partial \bar{P}\right)_{T, V_f}}$$
(8)

where  $\bar{N}_a^h$  is the molecule number adsorbed in a slit with a width h and free volume unity and  $q(h)_i = q_i^h - H_b$ . In practice the use of Eq. 7 and 8 with simulation results, supposes that the pore size distribution v(h) is experimentally known and partial derivatives are estimated from discrete approximations.

Experimental estimates of  $q_i$  are often obtained from adsorption isotherms determined at close temperature intervals by using the formula [28],

$$q_i = \frac{T}{\rho_b} \left[ \frac{dP}{dT} \right]_{eq,m_a} \tag{9}$$

where the subscript eq,  $m_a$  indicates that the pressure derivative with respect to temperature is computed at equilibrium between bulk and adsorbed phases and constant value of  $m_a$ . The possibility that a correct estimate of  $q_i$  for adsorbents, such as active carbons, can be obtained from Eq. 9 depends on its compatibility with Eq. 8 which has to be established and, obviously on its validity when it is used for a single pore with a given width. By computing adsorption isotherms at temperatures 298 K and 288 K,  $[dP/dT]_{eq,m_a}$  can be calculated at 293 K from

$$\left[\frac{dP}{dT}\right]_{eq,m_a} = \frac{P(T+dT,m_a) - P(T-dT,m_a)}{2dT}$$
(10)

where  $P(T + dT, m_a)$  and  $P(T - dT, m_a)$  are the pressures on isotherms at temperatures T + dT and T - dT where the total adsorption is equal to the value  $m_a$ obtained at a given pressure P on the isotherm at temperature T. Such a verification of the agreement between the Eqs. 4 and 9 is successful when the slit pores have widths  $h \ge 1.6$  mn. For instance, for h = 2.5 nm from Eq. 4,  $q_i$  is equal to 14.1 and 14.7 kj/mol at P = 0.02 and 0.1 MPa, respectively, and, from Eq. 9, equal to 14.5 and 15.2 kj/mol. The differences of few percents between the estimates of  $q_i$  are compatible with the statistical error on simulations results and uncertainty which results from the discrete approximation of the pressure derivative. For  $h \leq 1.2$ nm the discrepancy between the two estimates of  $q_i$  increases when h decreases and at h = 0.6 nm and P = 0.02 and 0.10 MPa,  $q_i$  values obtained from Eq. 4 are, respectively equal to 33.1 and 37.3 kj/mol and, from Eq. 9, equal to 37.1 and 46.7 kj/mol. The explanation of such differences is the large numerical error on the dP/dT estimate from isotherms at temperatures differing by 10 K in the pressure domain where,  $m_a$  varies quite slowly. In fact, a precise estimate of  $(dP/dT)_{ea,m_a}$ for h = 0.6 nm at 293 K, can be only obtained from very accurate computations of the adsorption isotherms at 295 and 291 K. Using the results of such computations, Eq. 10 give, for h = 0.6,  $q_i$  equal to 33.3 and 37.7 kj/mol at P = 0.02 and 0.10 in close agreement with the simulation data obtained from Eq. 4. So, it seems possible to determine  $q_i$  from Eq. 9 for the mesopores  $h \simeq 1.5 - 2.0$  nm and micropores  $h \leq 0.9$  nm when, in the latter case, adsorption isoterms, differing in temperature only by few degrees are determined with an accuracy of  $\simeq 0.2\%$  in the domain of pressures where  $m_a$  is almost constant.

In summary, our calculations of the CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption and isosteric heat in graphitic

#### Molecular Physics

slit pores of various widths are compatible with experiments, (cf., for instance, [8]) and show that, at room temperature and low pressures, an unambiguous comparison between simulation data and adsorption experiments on activated carbon seems only possible when the pore size distribution of the material is known or if, in the pore network, the pores have mainly a width larger than 1.5 nm. They also show that in narrow pores ( $h \simeq 0.8$  nm), the excess weight percent is of the order of 20 %, a value obviously favorable for the  $CO_2$  capture.

re and an ore size dh (h ≃ 0.8 nm), th ory favorable for the C

#### Molecular Physics

REFERENCES

References

- [1]D.D. Do, D. Nicholson and H.D. Do, J. Colloid Interface Sci. 324, 15 (2008).
- [2]D.D. Do, D. Nicholson and H.D. Do, J. Colloid Interface Sci. 325, 7 (2008).
- [3] D.D. Do and H.D. Do, J. Phys. Chem. B **110**, 17531 (2006).
- [4]G.R. Birkett and D.D. Do, Adsorption 13, 407 (2007).
- [5]S.K. Jain, K.E. Gubbins, R.J.-M. Pellenq and J.P. Pikunic, Carbon 44, 2445 (2006).
  [6] D. Nicholson, Langmuir 15, 2508 (1999).
- [7] R. Babarao, Z. Hu, J. Jiang, S. Chempath and S.I. Sandler, Langmuir 23, 659 (2007).
  [8] B. Guo, L. Chang and K. J. Xie, Nat. Gas Chem. 15, 223 (2006).
- [9] S. Himeno, T. Komatsu and S. J. Fujita, Chem. Eng. Data 50, 369 (2005).
- [10] M. Bienfait, P. Zeppenfeld, N. Dupont-Pavlovsky, M. Muris, M.R. Johnson, T. Wilson, M. DePies and O.E. Vilches, Phys. Rev. B 70, 035410 (2004).
- [11] J.-S. Lee, J.-H. Kim, J.-T. Kim, J.-K. Suh, J.-M. Lee and C.-H. Lee, J. Chem. Eng. Data 47, 1237 (2002).
- [12]E.A. Ustinov, D.D. Do and V.B. Fenelonov, Carbon 44, 653 (2006).
- 13]H. Pan, J. A. Ritter and P. B. Balbuena, Langmuir 14, 6323 (1998).
- 14 P.B. Balbuena and K.E. Gubbins, Langmuir 9, 1801 (1993).
- [15]B.J. Schindler and M.D. LeVan, Carbon 46, 644 (2008).
- 16]G. Birkett, D.D. Do, Langmuir. 22, 9976 (2006).
- 17] J.M. Stubbs and J.I. Siepmann, J. Chem. Phys. 121, 1525 (2004).
- [18] J.G. Harris and K.H. Yung, J. Chem. Phys. **99**, 12021 (1995).
   [19] L.A Girifalco and R.A. Lad, J. Chem. Phys. **25**, 693 (1956).
- [20] W.A. Steele, The interaction of gases with solid surfaces, (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1974).
- [21] D.Y. Sun, J.W. Liu, X.G. Gong and Zhi-Feng Liu, Phys. Rev. B 75, 075424 (2007).
- [22] J.W. Patrick, editor, Porosity in Carbons (Edward Arnold, London, 1995).
- [23] D. Nicholson and N.G. Parsonage, Computer Simulation and the Statistical Mechanics of Adsorption, (Academic Press, London, 1982).
- [24] M.P. Allen and D.J. Tildesley, Computer Simulation of Liquids, (Oxford University Press, New York, 1990).
- Latie J. Chen T.K. Bos J6). [25] D. Frenkel and B. Smit, Understanding Molecular Simulation, (Academic Press, London, 2002).
- [26] B. Weinberger, F. Darkrim-Lamari, and D. Levesque, J. Chem. Phys. 124, 234712 (2006).
   [27] P. Malbrunot, D. Vidal, J. Vermesse, R. Chahine and T.K. Bose, Langmuir 13, 539 (1997).
- - [28] T. Vuong and P.A. Monson, Langmuir **12**, 5425 (1996).
- [29]Y. He and N.A. Seaton 21, 8297 (2005).





Figure 1. Potential energy (Kelvin degree) of one  $CO_2$  molecule in graphitic slit pores with widths increasing from 0.6 nm to 2.5 nm. Fig. 1(a) : axis of the molecule parallel to the pore walls, Fig. 1 (b) : axis of the molecule perpendicular to the pore walls. The middle of the slit is the coordinate origin of the z axis.



Figure 2. Excess adsorption ( $w_{ex} = 100 \ m_e M_{CO_2}, M_{CO_2}$  molar mass of CO<sub>2</sub>) for graphitic slit pores with widths increasing from 0.6 nm to 2.5 nm at T = 293 K.





Figure 3. Isosteric heat (kj/mol) for graphitic slit pores with widths increasing from 0.6 nm to 2.5 nm at T = 293 K.







URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tandf/tmph







URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tandf/tmph

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
Ω.	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
IÖ	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
21	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
27	
31	
38	
39	
40	
41	
10	
42	
42 43	
42 43 44	
42 43 44 45	
42 43 44 45 46	
42 43 44 45 46 47	
42 43 44 45 46 47	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 55 56	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 4 55 56 57	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 95 51 52 53 55 55 57 57	
42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 55 56 57 58	





