

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Lu, HT;Li, W;Miandoab, ES;Kanehashi, S;Hu, G

Title:

The opportunity of membrane technology for hydrogen purification in the power to hydrogen (P2H) roadmap: a review

Date:


2021-06-01

Citation:

Lu, H. T., Li, W., Miandoab, E. S., Kanehashi, S. & Hu, G. (2021). The opportunity of membrane technology for hydrogen purification in the power to hydrogen (P2H) roadmap: a review. *Frontiers of Chemical Science and Engineering*, 15 (3), pp.464-482. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11705-020-1983-0>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/258723>



The Opportunity of Membrane Technology for Hydrogen Purification in the Power to Hydrogen (P2H) Roadmap: A Review

Journal:	<i>Frontiers of Chemical Science and Engineering</i>
Manuscript ID	FCSE-2020-0163.R2
Manuscript Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Lu, Hiep Thuan; The University of Melbourne, Department of Chemical Engineering; La Trobe University, Department of Animal, Plant and Soil Sciences Li, Wen; The University of Melbourne, Department of Chemical Engineering Miandoab, Ehsan Soroodan; The University of Melbourne, Department of Chemical Engineering Kanehashi, Shinji; Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Graduate School of Engineering Hu, Guoping; The University of Melbourne, Department of Chemical Engineering
Keywords:	Power to hydrogen, Membrane technology, Hydrogen, Energy
Speciality Area:	Separation science and technology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The Opportunity of Membrane Technology for Hydrogen Purification in the Power to Hydrogen (P2H) Roadmap: A Review

Hiep Thuan Lu^{1,2*}, Wen Li¹, Ehsan Soroodan Miandoab¹, Shinji Kanehashi³, Guoping Hu^{1*}

¹Department of Chemical Engineering, the University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia 3010

²Department of Animal, Plant and Soil Sciences, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC, Australia 3083

³Graduate School of Engineering, Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, 2-24-16 Nakacho, Koganei, Tokyo 184-8588, Japan

* Corresponding Author

Dr. Hiep Thuan Lu

Email: H.lu@latrobe.edu.au

Dept of Animal, Plant and Soil Sciences, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC, Australia 3083

Postal address: AgriBio, 5 Ring Road, Bundoora, VIC 3083

Phone: +61 3 834 44888

Dr. Guoping Hu

Email: guoping.hu@unimelb.edu.au

Dept of Chemical Engineering, the University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia 3010

Phone: +61 3 834 41912

Abstract

The global energy market is in a transition towards low carbon fuel systems to ensure the sustainable development of our society and economy. This can be achieved by converting the surplus renewable energy into hydrogen gas. The injection of hydrogen ($\leq 10\text{ v/v}\%$) in the existing natural gas pipelines is demonstrated to have negligible effect on the pipelines and is a promising solution for hydrogen transportation and storage if the end-user purification technologies for hydrogen recovery from Hydrogen Enriched Natural Gas (HENG) are in place. In this review, the promising membrane technologies for hydrogen separation is revisited and presented. Dense metallic membranes are highlighted with the ability of producing $99.9999999\text{ v/v}\%$ purity hydrogen product. However, high operating temperature ($\geq 300^\circ\text{C}$) incurs high energy penalty, thus, limits its application to hydrogen purification in the P2H roadmap. Polymeric membranes are the promising candidate for hydrogen separation with its commercial readiness. However, further investigation in the enhancement of H_2/CH_4 selectivity is crucial to improve the separation performance. The potential impacts of impurities in HENG on membrane performance are also discussed. The research and development outlook are presented, highlighting the essence of upscaling the membrane separation processes and the integration of membrane technology with pressure swing adsorption technology.

Keywords: Power to hydrogen, Membrane technology, Hydrogen, Energy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1	Table of Contents	
2	Abstract	2
3	1. Introduction	5
4	1.1. Energy outlook to 2040	5
5	1.2. Renewables	6
6	1.3. Power to Hydrogen (P2H)	7
7	2. Membrane for hydrogen separation	9
8	2.1. Fundamental of hydrogen transport in membranes	9
9	2.2. Dense metallic membranes	11
10	2.3. Ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes	12
11	2.4. Inorganic microporous membranes	16
12	2.5. Metal organic framework (MOF) membranes	18
13	2.6. Polymeric membranes	23
14	2.7. Impact of minor impurities in natural gas grid on membrane performance	24
15	3. Discussion and outlook	27
16	3.1. Discussion	27
17	3.2. Research and development (R&D) outlook	29
18	Acknowledgements	33
19	References	34

Table of Figures

Figure 1 The breakdown of primary energy consumption by fuel in 1995, 2017 and an outlook to 2040 (Renewable includes wind, biomass, solar, biofuels and geothermal) [1]	6
Figure 2 The consumption of renewable energy categorised by technology in 2017 and an outlook to 2023 [11]	7
Figure 3 The penetration mechanism of penetrants through membranes [54] (credit: CO2CRC)	10
Figure 4 Robeson's upper bound for H ₂ /CH ₄ separation of polymeric membranes [142, 144, 145, 149-157], adapted from [159]	24
Figure 5 The kinetic diameter and critical temperature of some potential components in natural gas [59, 173] (Data for DMS (dimethyl sulphide) and THT (tetrahydrothiophene) obtained from [174] and Conductor like Screening Model (COSMO), respectively).	26
Figure 6 Summary of H ₂ permeability versus H ₂ /CH ₄ selectivity of some common membrane materials based on the literature data summarised in this review. Since the membrane thickness were not fully reported in literature, the hydrogen permeation is presented in term of hydrogen permeability instead of permeance. (^a H ₂ /CH ₄ selectivity in dense metallic membranes was based on H ₂ /N ₂ selectivity by assuming the identical performance of N ₂ and CH ₄ through the membrane [57])	29
Figure 7 The integrated module of membrane – adsorption process for hydrogen purification [23, 159]	32

Table of Tables

Table 1: Physical properties of hydrogen and methane gas molecules [57]	10
Table 2: A shortlist of palladium membranes for hydrogen separation	14
Table 3: A shortlist of ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes for hydrogen separation	15
Table 4: A shortlist of zeolite membranes for hydrogen separation	19
Table 5: A shortlist of silica membranes for hydrogen separation	20
Table 6: A shortlist of carbon-based membranes for hydrogen separation	21
Table 7: A shortlist of MOF membranes for hydrogen separation	22
Table 8: Summary of hydrogen separation performance of some common membrane materials [40, 49-51, 88, 159, 176]	28

1. Introduction

1.1. Energy outlook to 2040

Energy plays a crucial role in the global economy growth. In the BP Energy Outlook [1], world population will reach 9.2 billion in 2040 and the global gross product (GDP) is proposed to grow 3.2% per annum (p.a.) in the 2017–2040 period assuming that government policies, technology development and social preferences will remain at the current pace and manner of evolution. The expansion of world economy will drive the global energy demand by an increase of 0.8 – 1.2% p.a. with 16.4 – 17.9 Gtoe (giga tons of oil equivalent) of primary energy consumption in 2040 [1].

Although energy demand fluctuates with major changes in global economy or our society [2], it is clear that the overall global energy demand tends to increase from a long term perspective. The global energy consumption showed recovery from the 2008 global economy crisis [2], however, the outbreak of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in 2019 – 2020 added extra uncertainty to the fuel demand. The recent Global Oil Demand Report published by International Energy Agency (IEA) predicts that the global oil demand will drop by 90,000 barrels per day in 2020 in comparison with that in 2019 [3]. However, with the Coronavirus being under control in China, which accounts for more than 80% of the global oil demand in 2019, the global oil demand will rebound in 2021 and grow by 5.7 million barrels per day over 2019 – 2025 [3].

One of the greatest challenges for the energy system is to meet the fast-growing energy demand simultaneously with less or no greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, which is the major driver for climate change. The breakdown of primary energy consumption in 2017 (Figure 1) shows that traditional energy sources such as coal, oil and gas remain to be the major fuels in the global energy market [1]. The production and consumption of fossil fuels produce anthropogenic GHG. The global plans set out in the 2015 United Nations Conference of the Parties (COP21) targeted at an increase of global average temperature to be well below 1.5 °C by 2050 via effective carbon mitigation approaches etc. [4]. One major approach is Carbon Capture, Utilization and Storage (CCUS), which utilises gas separation technologies, such as solvent absorption, membrane separation and adsorption, to capture the CO₂ from the processing gas streams and then either converts the captured CO₂ into fuels or chemicals [5, 6], or stores it underground in geological reservoirs safely and permanently [7]. Globally, 37 large-scale CCUS projects are operating, commissioning or in progress with a total CO₂ capture capacity of 65 Mt p.a. (mega tons per

annum) [5, 8]. Another approach for carbon removal and storage is Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS), which uses biomass to produce energy for CCUS facilities and the whole process results in negative net CO₂ emission [6]. However, both technologies require extremely high capital investment, land footprint and energy consumption [9]. Hence, many other proposals have been made to decarbonise the energy sector such as implementing more renewables, developing better energy storage systems and enhancing energy usage efficiency [1].




Figure 1 The breakdown of primary energy consumption by fuel in 1995, 2017 and an outlook to 2040 (Renewable includes wind, biomass, solar, biofuels and geothermal) [1]

1.2. Renewables

Renewables, such as wind, solar, hydro, biomass and geothermal energy, is expected to play a key role in the clean energy transition process [1, 10, 11]. The IEA estimated that the share of renewables in primary energy consumption would be 12.4% by 2023 (Figure 2) [11]. Generally, the renewables are abundant to meet the global energy demand, however, their deployment highly relies on the readiness of energy generation, transportation and storage infrastructures and technologies. For instance, the net global wave energy is around 2 – 3 terawatt [12] which approximates to the global electricity consumption in 2018 [13]. However, the fluid corrosion and the voltage limit in electricity grid (e.g. $\pm 10\%$ of the nominal value) [14] to resist the fluctuation of renewable energy supply in accordance with weather change are some of the

challenges to overcome for deploying the wave energy in large scale. Similarly, the wind and solar energy to electricity systems in some countries are experiencing a gap in electricity supply between daytime and night time and among seasons as well as the waste of surplus electricity due to the lack of energy storage solutions [15].




Figure 2 The consumption of renewable energy categorised by technology in 2017 and an outlook to 2023 [11]

1.3. Power to Hydrogen (P2H)

One approach to enhance the storage and reserve the production capacity of renewable energy is the Power to Gas (P2G) process chain, in which surplus electricity is used to convert water to hydrogen (P2H) gas via technologies such as alkaline electrolysis [16], proton exchange membrane (PEM) electrolysis [17] and solid oxide electrolysis [18], thereafter, hydrogen can be transported and consumed by end-users for combustion, carbon hydrogenation or methanation etc. [19]. Hydrogen is preferable for renewable energy storage due to its higher mass energy (142 MJ/kg) in comparison with other fuels such as natural gas and gasoline (energy density at around 40 – 60 MJ/kg) [20]. Hydrogen can also be used in several industries such as hydrocarbon reforming and ammonia synthesis [21]. The minimum hydrogen purity requirements in fuel gas, polymer electrolyte fuel cells and rocket engine fuel industries are 54 – 60 %_{v/v}, 99.97 %_{v/v} and 99.999999 %_{v/v}, respectively [22, 23]. The major challenge for hydrogen transportation and storage is its low volumetric density and the possibility of hydrogen-induced fracture on the

1 pipelines and storage facilities [24, 25]. Around 88% of reported hydrogen projects utilised
2 compressed gas tanks for storage and a minority utilised metal hydrides storage [24].

3 The recent cost assessment for hydrogen delivery pathways suggested that the pipeline networks
4 is the most cost effective and environmental friendly approach for large scale hydrogen stations
5 (around 80,000 kg hydrogen capacity required per day) [26]. However, the construction of
6 hydrogen distribution pipelines can cost USD 320 – 1000 per metre for the 20 cm pipelines at
7 68 bars [27, 28], which is at least 10% more expensive than natural gas pipelines [27, 29].

8 A more cost-effective option for hydrogen transport, especially in the market development phase,
9 is to inject hydrogen into the existing natural gas pipelines [30] as the global natural gas pipelines
10 are well built and distributed (> 2.7 million kilometres in 2016) [31]. However, since the
11 traditional natural gas pipelines are commonly made of ferritic stainless steel [32], plastic and
12 cast iron [33], the suggested hydrogen injection concentration in natural gas pipelines is 6 – 10
13 $\text{v/v}\%$ at up to 40 bar pipeline pressure [34, 35] to minimise the ignition risks, leakage issues and
14 pipeline fatigues [30, 36].

15 The hydrogen/natural gas mixture, also called Hydrogen Enriched Natural Gas (HENG), can be
16 utilised directly for power generation [30] and household appliances [37]. However, the
17 increasing displacement of hydrogen in natural gas stream will lower the heating value of gas
18 mixture [38]. In fact, HENG could be used as a carrier to transport hydrogen from production
19 sites to the renewable energy end users if the technologies for purifying hydrogen from HENG
20 are in place.

21 The studies on hydrogen separation from methane reformed off gas and syngas have been
22 reported extensively in literature [15, 30, 39, 40]. These gas streams, however, commonly have
23 10 – 80 $\text{v/v}\%$ H_2 , 2 – 30 $\text{v/v}\%$ CO_2 and up to 60 $\text{v/v}\%$ N_2 in balance of methane [15, 30, 39, 41]
24 while the HENG is a H_2/CH_4 mixture with up to 15 $\text{v/v}\%$ H_2 and less than 2 – 4 $\text{v/v}\%$ CO_2 [30].
25 There are very few investigations on hydrogen recovery from HENG at low temperature
26 (e.g. ambient temperature). Therefore, the development of high efficiency and cost-effective
27 technologies for recovery low hydrogen gas streams is a key to extend the Power to Hydrogen
28 (P2H) technology.

29 Membrane technology is one of the most proven economically viable approach for gas separation
30 and has been commercialised in natural gas sweetening [42] and hydrogen recovered from
31 ammonia purge gas [43] since 1980s. Recently, membrane technology is also implemented in
32 carbon capture studies [44, 45] and plasma technology to convert N_2 and CO_2 into value-added

chemicals [46, 47]. The advantages of membrane technology in comparison with other hydrogen separation technologies such as cryogenic distillation and pressure swing adsorption (PSA) processes are having high energy efficiency, high surface area-to-volume ratio [41], low environmental impact [41, 48, 49] and potential to achieve high purity hydrogen ($> 99.5 \text{ v/v}\%$) [30, 40, 48, 50].

Several review articles have been published to assess the role of membrane separation technology in hydrogen purification. For instance, Adhikari and Fernando (2006) reviewed the use of different membrane types, mainly focusing on inorganic membranes, in hydrogen separation from hydrogen-rich gas streams [40]. The relationships of structure and property between membrane types and hydrogen separation ability was also reported by Ockwig and Nenoff (2007) [51]. In addition, a book chapter about the advances in hydrogen separation and purification using membrane technology was also presented by Zornoza et al. (2013) that summarised the hydrogen separation performance of different membrane materials and membrane reactors [50]. A comparison between H_2 – selective membranes and CO_2 – selective membranes for hydrogen purification was also reported [49]. However, most of these reviews targeted at steam reforming of hydrocarbons that contained high hydrogen concentration (up to 80% in the balance of CO_2 and minor CH_4) at high temperature ($> 350^\circ\text{C}$) [50, 51]. Hence, the scope of this review is to critically assess the role of membrane technologies for hydrogen recovery from HENG and highlight its potential in the P2H pathway.

2. Membrane for hydrogen separation

2.1. Fundamental of hydrogen transport in membranes

A membrane is a barrier that selectively separates some components from a mixture based on the physical nature of penetrants and the interactions between penetrants and penetrant – membrane [49, 50]. The penetration mechanism of H_2 and CH_4 through membranes varies depending upon the membrane types and generally follows one or a combination of the following 4 mechanisms: Knudsen diffusion, Surface diffusion, Molecular sieving, and Solution – Diffusion model (Figure 3) [40, 49, 50, 52]. Knudsen diffusion applies when the mean free path of penetrant (i.e. the average travelling distance of a penetrant molecule inside the pores) is larger than the pore diameter [52, 53]. The gas selectivity via the Knudsen mechanism is proportional to the inverse square root ratio of the molecular weight of transported gases (e.g. Selectivity A/B

$\propto \sqrt{\frac{\text{Molecular weight of component A}}{\text{Molecular weight of component B}}}$ [53]. This ratio for H_2/CH_4 systems is 2.8 that are not attractive in commercial scale due to the low gas selectivity [52].




Figure 3 The penetration mechanism of penetrants through membranes [54] (credit: CO2CRC)

The diffusion of hydrogen through the membrane could be enhanced if the gas molecules absorbed on the pore surface, which is defined as surface diffusion [55]. This mechanism is mainly applied in porous metal membranes and carbon membranes [40, 56]. When the membrane pores and kinetic diameter of penetrants are similar, the gas transport primarily follow the molecular sieving mechanism. According to the kinetic diameters of H_2 and CH_4 (Table 1), the preferred pore diameter for the separation of H_2 from HENG is between 2.89 – 3.80 Å such as ultra-microporous membranes [52].

The widely-accepted mechanism of gas transport in polymeric and dense metallic membranes is solution – diffusion. This mechanism typically involves three steps: (1) the penetrants dissolve into the membrane on the feed side, (2) diffuse through the membrane and (3) desorb on the permeate side of the membrane [41, 52]. The permeation and selectivity of H_2/CH_4 by solution – diffusion mechanism rely on the solubility and diffusivity of penetrants in the membrane [43].

Table 1: Physical properties of hydrogen and methane gas molecules [57]

	Molecular weight/ $\text{g}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$	Kinetic diameter/Å	Critical temperature/K
H_2	2	2.89	33.24
CH_4	16	3.80	191.05

The driving force for gas permeation through membranes is the chemical potential difference of H_2 and CH_4 on the two sides of the membrane, which is mainly in the form of gas partial pressure. The performance of H_2/CH_4 separation membrane can be expressed in term of permeance (Q) or permeability (P) of hydrogen and selectivity (α) of H_2 versus CH_4 (Equation 1 and Equation 2). The hydrogen permeability in metallic membrane follows the Sievert's law (Equation 3) with

the flux being dependent on pressure exponent ' n ' at around 0.5 [58]. The hydrogen separation efficiency is often limited by the pressure ratio across the membrane as shown in Equation 4 [59], which is not a barrier for hydrogen purification from HENG stream as its operation pressure can be as high as 68 bar [30].

$$P_i = Q_i l = \frac{J_i \cdot l}{(p_{i,feed} - p_{i,permeate})}$$

Equation 1

$$\alpha_{H_2/CH_4} = \frac{P_{H_2}}{P_{CH_4}}$$

Equation 2

where Q is the gas permeance of gas component i (e.g. H_2 or CH_4); l is the membrane thickness; J is the gas flux and; $p_{i,feed}$ and $p_{i,permeate}$ are partial pressure of gas component i in the feed and permeate sides of the membrane, respectively.

$$P_{H_2} = \frac{J_{H_2} \cdot l}{(p_{H_2,feed}^n - p_{H_2,permeate}^n)}$$

Equation 3

$$\frac{\text{Feed pressure}}{\text{Permeate pressure}} \geq \frac{H_2 \text{ concentration in permeate}}{H_2 \text{ concentration in feed}}$$

Equation 4

2.2. Dense metallic membranes

Several types of membranes have been extensively studied for hydrogen separation including dense metallic membranes, porous inorganic membranes, metal organic membranes and polymeric membranes. Among these, dense metallic membranes have attracted great interests due to its high hydrogen selectivity and commercial availability [50, 60]. In the presence of catalytic membrane surfaces, hydrogen is transported through the membrane in form of proton, hydride ion or neutral atoms [50]. This mechanism is unique for hydrogen and cannot occur for other gas components in HENG like CH_4 and CO_2 , therefore, the hydrogen purity in metallic membranes can reach up to 99.9999999 v/v% [30].

Palladium membranes

Palladium (Pd) membranes are the most common metallic membranes for hydrogen separation with H_2 permeability on the order of 1000 times greater than other metals such as iron (Fe), nickel (Ni) and platinum (Pt) [61]. Several studies (*Table 2*) on the Pd membranes showed that the H_2/CH_4 selectivity could be extremely high (≥ 1000). However, there are some challenges for using the Pd membranes such as low hydrogen recovery [30] and the mechanical resistance of the membrane in high pressure and the poison effects of impurities such as H_2S and CO in the feed gas [50, 62, 63]. An effective method to increase the hydrogen recovery is depositing the thin Pd membranes on the supports such as Vycor glass [64, 65], ceramics [66, 67], porous alumina [68, 69] or stainless steel (SS) [69-71]. This is because the thinner membrane enhances the hydrogen permeability (*Equation 3*) while the support increases the mechanical strength of the membranes. In addition, the mechanical strength of the membrane have successfully been increased by incorporating Pd with other metals in group IB, IVB, VB and VIB of the periodic table to form alloy membranes without affecting the H_2 selectivity of the membrane [72-78].

It should be noted that low operating temperatures ($\leq 300^\circ C$) lead to hydrogen-induced embrittlement phenomenon in Pd membranes [49, 79], which limits its application significantly. Another barrier restricted the application of metallic membrane is the high cost of membrane materials [51, 80]. Although several palladium membrane modules have been introduced in industrial scale, premium in steam methane reforming and water-gas shift industry (the Pd alloy Micro-Channel™ Technology (Power & Energy Inc., USA [81]), the Hysep® module (Energy research centre of Netherland [82]) and the two-step process of Pd-based membrane module (SINTEF, Norway [82])), dense metallic membranes are not particularly suitable for the purpose of separating hydrogen from HENG pipelines at low temperatures.

2.3. Ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes

Dense ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes have been intensively studied for hydrogen separation with advantages including high mechanical stability and lower manufacturing cost than dense metallic membranes [83, 84]. The H_2 transport through dense ceramic proton conducting membranes follows solution – diffusion mechanism [85, 86], in which H_2 in the feed gas diffuses through the membrane in form of H^+ along with the electrons. The flux of hydrogen can be described by the Wagner theory as shown in Equation 5 [87].

$$J_{H_2} = -\frac{RT}{2F^2l} \int_{Feed}^{Permeate} (\sigma_{H^+} \times t_{e^-}) d \ln p_{H_2}$$

Equation 5

where J_{H_2} is the H_2 flux; R is the universal gas constant; T is the absolute temperature; F is the Faraday constant; l is the membrane thickness; σ_{H^+} is the proton conductivity; t_e is the electronic transport number and p_{H_2} is partial pressure of H_2 .

These ceramic materials are rich of proton and electronic conductivities, such as perovskite-type oxides, pyrochlores, niobates, tantalates and tungstates [88]. The crystal structures for these ceramic materials were well-studied in the literature [88, 89]. Perovskites based oxides (e.g. $BaCeO_3$, $SrZrO_3$ and $SrCeO_3$) are the most common proton conducting materials with proton conductivity in range of $10^{-3} - 10^{-2} \text{ S.cm}^{-1}$ ($400 - 1000^\circ\text{C}$) [90]. Various methods have been applied to enhance the proton conductivity to achieve high H_2 flux, for instance, the doping of trivalent ions (i.e. Yb and Y) into perovskites to partially replace tetravalent ions (i.e. Ce and Zr) [91-93] and the doping of Ca (II) into $La_2Zr_2O_{7-\delta}$ pyrochlores [94]. Another approach is dispersing metallic materials (i.e. Pd, Pt and Ni) into ceramic matrix (called *cermet*) or combining two ceramic proton conducting materials to form a composite membrane (called *cercer*) [86, 88].

A range of ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes has been highlighted in *Table 3* to address their performance for hydrogen separation. The fabrication techniques of these membranes are similar to metallic membranes, with $\geq 2 \mu\text{m}$ in membrane thickness and $10^{-8} - 10^{-9} \text{ mol/m}^2.\text{Pa.s}$ in H_2 permeance [83, 95]. However, the major drawback of this type of membranes is the requirement of high temperature for hydrogen separation. The hydrogen conductivities of most ceramic proton conducting materials were reported to decrease by 100 – 1000 times (i.e. $< 10^{-5} \text{ S.cm}^{-1}$) at low temperature ($< 250^\circ\text{C}$) [88]. To the best knowledge of authors, the study on H_2/CH_4 separation using this type of membranes is very rarely seen. In addition, CH_4 can be dimerised on the surface of ceramic proton conducting membranes such as $SrCe_{0.95}Yb_{0.05}O_{3-\alpha}$ - Pt [89]. Hence, ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes are not suitable for H_2 separation from HENG.

1 Table 2: A shortlist of palladium membranes for hydrogen separation

Membrane material/ Support	Preparation method ^a	Thickness of active layer/ μm	Experiment conditions	Hydrogen permeance $/\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\cdot\text{Pa}^{-1}$	Hydrogen selectivity ^b	Ref.
Pd/SS ^a	ELP	3.5	3.5 bar 500 – 550°C	$1.7 - 9.4 \times 10^{-7}$	∞	[71]
Pd/PPO polymer ^a	ELP	5	1 bar 500°C	1×10^{-6}	∞	[96]
Pd/ α -Al ₂ O ₃	MOCVD	2	1 – 2 bar 300 – 500°C	1×10^{-6}	1000	[68]
Pd/ α -Al ₂ O ₃	ELP	0.9	1.5 bar 500°C	$3 \times 10^{-7} - 3 \times 10^{-6}$	9200	[69]
Pd/YSZ/SS	ELP	27.7	4 bar 350 – 450°C	1.5×10^{-7}	∞	[78]
Pd-Ag alloy/ α -Al ₂ O ₃	ELP	11	4 bar 550°C	1.3×10^{-6}	1000 – 10000	[76]
Pd-Cu alloy	ELP	7.2	2.2 bar 400°C	1.4×10^{-6}	40000	[77]

^a Metal-organic chemical vapor deposition (MOCVD), Electroless plating (ELP), poly(2,6-dimethyl-1,4-phenylene oxide) (PPO), Stainless steel (SS).

^b Due to the limited application of metallic membrane in literature, the hydrogen selectivity is based on H₂/N₂ system. However, in the solution – diffusion mechanism, the transportation behaviour of N₂ and CH₄ through the membrane are proved to be identical [57]. Hence, the trends of H₂/N₂ and H₂/CH₄ selectivity are proposed to be identical.

1 Table 3: A shortlist of ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes for hydrogen separation

Membrane	Type	Thickness of active layer/mm	Temperature /°C	Feed gas	Sweep gas	Hydrogen flux /mol·m ⁻² ·s ⁻¹	Ref.
BaCe _{0.8} Y _{0.2} O _{3-α}	Perovskites	0.20	1050°C	25% H ₂ /He	N ₂	28.30	[91]
Sr(Ce _{0.6} Zr _{0.4}) _{0.85} Y _{0.15} O _{3-δ}	Perovskites	0.17	800°C	Pure H ₂	Ar	130	[92]
Sr _{0.97} Ce _{0.9} Yb _{0.05} O _{3-δ}	Perovskites	1.16	804°C	10% H ₂ /N ₂	Ar	3.30	[93]
Nd _{5.5} W _{0.5} Mo _{0.5} O _{11.25-δ}	Tungstates	0.90	1000°C	50% H ₂ /He	Ar	22.30	[97]
La _{26.78} W _{5.22} O _{55.83}	Tungstates	0.03	1000°C	10% H ₂ /Ar 2.5% H ₂ O	Ar	10.40	[98]
La _{0.5} Ce _{0.5} O _{2-δ} (P)/Ni (E) ^a	Cermets	0.05	900°C	20% H ₂ /Ar 3% H ₂ O	Ar	6.83	[99]
Pd(Zr _{0.9} Y _{0.1} O _{2-δ}) (P)/Pd (E)	Cermets	0.02	900°C	Pure H ₂	N ₂	1410	[100]
BaCe _{0.95} Tb _{0.05} O _{3-δ} (P)/Ni (E)	Cermets	0.09	850°C	50% H ₂ /N ₂	He	67.90	[101]
BaCe _{0.65} Zr _{0.2} Y _{0.15} O _{3-δ} (P)/ Ce _{0.85} Gd _{0.15} O _{2-δ} (E)	Cercers	0.65	755°C	50% H ₂ /He	Ar	21.00	[102]

^a P/E – protonic phase/electronic phase

2.4. Inorganic microporous membranes

Inorganic microporous membranes are commonly used for separating light gas in the mixed gas such as H_2 from H_2/CH_4 gas mixtures. In comparison with dense metallic membranes, the inorganic microporous membranes can resist broader temperatures (25 – 900°C) and are more cost effectively [40, 50]. The flux of hydrogen (J_{H_2}) in dense metallic membrane is proportional to the square root of partial pressure of hydrogen (Equation 3) while J_{H_2} is proportional to partial pressure of hydrogen directly for other membrane materials (Equation 1). Therefore, inorganic microporous membranes are preferred to operate at high pressure of hydrogen. The H_2 transport mechanism in inorganic microporous membranes is mainly molecular sieving which separate H_2 , the smaller kinetic diameter component, from CH_4 , the larger component in the mixture (Table 1). Thus, the diameter of porous membranes must be under 2 nm (e.g. microporous) to separate hydrogen effectively [50]. However, H_2 may also transport through the membranes by the Knudsen diffusion mechanism in presence of defects [103]. This mechanism is less effective in H_2 separation as discussed in Section 2.1 [49, 50, 52]. Therefore, the inevitable challenge for microporous membrane is to form a defect-free membrane to gain high purity hydrogen product.

Zeolite membranes

Zeolite membranes are well studied due to their strong chemical, thermal and mechanical stability. A typical zeolite membrane is built with a crystallised microporous zeolite (e.g. aluminosilicates) deposited on the porous support such as alumina, porous ceramic, stainless steel or polymeric membranes [49]. Recent studies showed that zeolite membranes can separate H_2 at various temperatures (25 – 700°C), however, with much lower H_2/CH_4 selectivity than dense metallic membranes (Table 4). The low hydrogen selectivity might be due to the presence of inter-crystalline mesopores on the zeolite layer that were formed during the aggregation of nanocrystals [104, 105]. These mesopores (2 – 50 nm) drive the gas separation towards Knudsen diffusion mechanism. Recently, some advanced fabrication techniques were studied which successfully reduced the defects in zeolite membranes in particular layer – by – layer seeding free hydrothermal synthesis [106, 107], catalyst cracking deposition hydrothermal synthesis [108] and functionalising the zeolite pores by amorphous materials [109]. However, the studies on zeolite membranes remain mainly in laboratory scale that will require a lot of efforts to scale up and commercialize.

Silica membranes

Silica membranes is favoured as they are often cost effective and easy to fabricate [49, 82]. Most study on silica membrane showed high H_2 permeance and selectivity (*Table 5*). This is due to the amorphous property of ceramic that makes it easy to form nano-scale membrane thickness and pore diameter [49, 82]. Particularly, a silica modified membrane deposited on Vycor glass called Nanosil exhibited an outstanding H_2/CH_4 selectivity at up to 23000 – 27000 [110]. The drawback of silica membranes is its low resistance to water [49, 82]. This challenge could be resolved by introducing metallic oxides such as oxides of cobalt [111] and zirconia [111, 112] into the membrane fabrication stage as the metal ions may reduce the interactions between water – silica matrix and minimise the movement of silanol groups [111]. Certainly, due to the low content of water in natural gas (< 120 ppm [42, 59]), the impact of water on silica membranes in H_2 separation from HENG is less significant than that in syngas industry, which contains up to 40 v/v% H_2O [15, 30, 39, 41]. To the best of our knowledge, investigation on the large scale H_2/CH_4 separation using silica membranes, especially from HENG streams, has been very limited. Thus, more investigations on mixed gas measurement and pilot scale study on H_2/CH_4 separation are needed to verify its performance in industry.

Carbon molecular sieve membranes

Carbon molecular sieve (CMS) membranes have also been widely studied (*Table 6*) for H_2 separation. The gas transport in CMS membranes mostly follows the molecular sieving mechanism. However, some large pores (0.6 – 2 nm in diameter) could more preferably adsorb methane than hydrogen that leads to a reduction in hydrogen permeability and H_2/CH_4 selectivity [49, 113, 114]. Thus, it is critical to control the pore size in CMS membranes to be less than 0.6 nm in diameter. The CMS membranes is fabricated via the pyrolysis process of carbonaceous precursors [49, 50, 115]. The pore dimensions of CMS membranes can be controlled via the types of precursors, pyrolysis conditions and pre- and post-treatment processes [51, 113]. It can be seen from *Table 6* that the hydrogen permeance and H_2/CH_4 selectivity at ambient pressure may reach as high as 10^{-7} mol/m².s.Pa and 1200, respectively. The CMS membranes were also proven to separate H_2 effectively (e.g. achieving 98% recovery and sub-ppb purity) from 50 v/v% H_2 – 50 v/v% CH_4 mixed gas feeding condition [30]. The challenges for commercialising the CMS membranes are the membrane brittleness and high fabrication costs [40, 50] which require further improvement.

Other inorganic microporous membranes

1 Recently, two-dimensional nanomaterials have been integrated into membrane technology and
2 showed the promising H₂/CH₄ separation performance. For instance, the study on graphene-
3 based membranes, which could theoretically achieve single-atom thickness, showed high
4 mechanical and chemical stability and high H₂ separation performance (e.g. 1 mol/m².s.Pa H₂
5 permeance and 10⁸ H₂/CH₄ selectivity) [116]. The studies on hydrogen purification by layered
6 double hydroxides (LDHs) – based membranes, which is formed by positively charged brucite-
7 like layers and an interlayer region containing charge compensating molecules [117, 118], also
8 reached 10⁻⁷ – 10⁻⁸ mol/m².s.Pa and ~ 80 hydrogen permeance and H₂/CH₄ selectivity,
9 respectively [119, 120]. Although the two-dimensional membrane materials are a promising
10 breakthrough in H₂ separation, the major challenges for this membranes are to control the
11 microstructures and to scale up the process [118].

12

13 **2.5. Metal organic framework (MOF) membranes**

14 Over recent decades, several studies focused on MOF membranes due to its ultrahigh porosity
15 in comparison with other porous membranes [49, 121, 122], which enhances the gas sorption
16 capacity and gas transport as a sequence. Some highlighted MOF membranes for hydrogen
17 separation are summarised in Table 7, which indicates that H₂ permeance in the MOF membranes
18 is averagely 10 – 100 times higher than other porous membranes (e.g. 10⁻⁶ mol/m².s.Pa versus
19 10⁻⁷ – 10⁻⁸ mol/m².s.Pa). As organic linkers in MOF membrane cannot provide an additional
20 linkage to surrounding MOF crystals and the membrane support, the major challenge is the
21 fabrication of continuous and defect-free membranes [49, 122, 123]. This can be achieved via
22 better pore shape and size control in the membrane fabrication process. For instance, Huang et
23 al. (2010) successfully fabricated a continuous defect-free ZIF-90 membrane on Al₂O₃ support
24 by using 3-aminopropyltriethoxysilane (APTES) as covalent linkers between ZIF-90 and Al₂O₃
25 support [122]. In a different approach, Liu et al. (2015) used the ZnAl-layered double hydroxides
26 as a buffer for connecting the ZIF-8 seed layer onto the Al₂O₃ support and the well-intergrown
27 ZIF-8 membrane was formed during the secondary growth [120]. Recently, zeolitic-imidazolate
28 framework-8 (ZIF-8) is successfully incorporated on hollow fibre membrane in a laboratory scale
29 continuous process [124, 125], which shows a promising signal for commercial scale application
30 of MOF membranes in the future.

1 Table 4: A shortlist of zeolite membranes for hydrogen separation

Zeolite type/ support	Synthesis method	Thickness of active layer/ μm	Experiment conditions	Hydrogen permeance $/\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\cdot\text{Pa}^{-1}$	Hydrogen selectivity ^a	Ref.
MFI/ceramic	Hydrothermal	3	1– 4 bar 25 – 300°C	5×10^{-8}	12	[126]
LTA/ α - Al_2O_3	Seeding free hydrothermal	3.5	1 bar 100°C	2×10^{-7}	5 – 6.5	[106]
FAU/ α - Al_2O_3	Seeding free hydrothermal	3	1 bar 100°C	8×10^{-7}	3.5 – 5.6	[107]
CHA/ α - Al_2O_3	Hydrothermal	3 – 4	2.7 bar 27 – 200°C	2.4×10^{-8}	25 – 10	[127]
La_2NiO_4 MFI/ α - Al_2O_3	Hydrothermal	60	25 – 700°C	5.5×10^{-7}	9.2	[128]
MFI/ α - Al_2O_3	Hydrothermal	2 – 3	2 bar 25 – 500°C	5.3×10^{-7}	4	[108]
	Hydrothermal with CCD ^b	2 – 3	2 bar 25 – 500°C	3.9×10^{-7}	180	

^a H_2/CH_4 ideal selectivity

^b Catalyst cracking deposition (CCD)

1 Table 5: A shortlist of silica membranes for hydrogen separation

Silica type/ support	Synthesis method	Thickness of active layer/nm	Experiment conditions	Hydrogen permeance / $\text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \cdot \text{Pa}^{-1}$	Hydrogen selectivity ^a	Ref.
SiO ₂ /Ceramic	Sol – gel	20 – 30	1 bar 100 – 600°C	10 ⁻⁷	2800	[129]
Co – SiO ₂ /ZrO ₂ – SiO ₂ /α-Al ₂ O ₃	Sol – gel	20	1 – 3 bar 200 – 500°C	1.8 x 10 ⁻⁷	480 – 730	[111]
ZrO ₂ – Y ₂ O – SiO ₂ /Ceramic	Sol – gel	-	1 – 1.5 bar 150°C	1 x 10 ⁻⁸	4	[112]
MTES – SiO ₂ / α-Al ₂ O ₃	Sol – gel	-	1 – 6 bar 50 – 200°C	3.4 x 10 ⁻⁹	24 – 46	[130]
SiO ₂ /γ-Al ₂ O ₃ /α-Al ₂ O ₃	Sol – gel	20 – 30	2 bar 600°C	5 x 10 ⁻⁷	5900	[131]
SiO ₂ modified/Vycor glass (called Nanosil)	High temperature atmosphere CVD ^b	-	1.2 bar 200 – 700°C	1.8 x 10 ⁻⁸	23000 – 27000	[110]

^a H₂/CH₄ ideal selectivity

^b Methyltriethoxysilane (MTES); Chemical vapour deposition (CVD)

1 Table 6: A shortlist of carbon-based membranes for hydrogen separation

Precursor	Synthesis method	Thickness of active layer/ μm	Experiment conditions	Hydrogen permeance $/\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\cdot\text{Pa}^{-1}$	Hydrogen selectivity	Ref.
6FDA/BPDA – TMPDA ^a	Pyrolysis	30 – 35	1 – 8.3 bar 25°C	$3.4 – 7.5 \times 10^{-8}$	400 – 500 ^b	[132]
Kapton polyimide	Pyrolysis	0.3 – 0.5	Up to 6 bar 30°C – 250°C	3.1×10^{-10}	150 ^c	[133]
phenol–formaldehyde novolac resin	Pyrolysis	45	2 bar 25°C	$1.7 \times 10^{-9} – 1.2 \times 10^{-7}$	5 – 558 ^b	[134]
Polyimide	Pyrolysis	-	10.8 bar 30 – 120°C	$3.4 \times 10^{-7} – 6.0 \times 10^{-8}$	132 – 631 ^b	[135]
Polyimide	Pyrolysis	-	10 bar 80°C	1.4×10^{-7}	540 ^b	[136]
Polypyrrolone	Pyrolysis	40 – 50	1 bar 35°C	$1.3 – 4.9 \times 10^{-8}$	270 – 1200 ^b	[137]

^a 5,5-[2,2,2- trifluoro-1-(trifluoromethyl) ethylidene-1,3-isobenzofurandione (6FDA); 3,3',4,4'-biphenyl tetra carboxylic acid dianhydride (BPDA); 2,4,6-Trimethyl-1,3-phenylenediamine (TMPDA)

^b H₂/CH₄ mixed gas selectivity

1 Table 7: A shortlist of MOF membranes for hydrogen separation

MOF type/ support	Synthesis method	Thickness of active layer/ μm	Experiment conditions	Hydrogen permeance $/\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\cdot\text{Pa}^{-1}$	Hydrogen selectivity ^a	Ref.
$\text{Cu}_3(\text{BTC})_2$ / Cu net	Hydrothermal	60	1 bar 25°C	10^{-6}	5.9	[138]
ZIF-90/ $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$	Hydrothermal	20	1 bar 25 – 200°C	$1.4 - 2.5 \times 10^{-7}$	7 – 16	[122]
ZIF-8/ Titania	Hydrothermal and microwave heating	30 – 50	1.1 – 2 bar 25°C	6×10^{-8}	11.2	[139]
ZIF-8/ZnAl- NO_3 LDHs/ $\gamma\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$	Hydrothermal (in-situ growth)	1.3	1 bar 25°C	1.4×10^{-7}	12.5	[119]
ZIF-95/ $\alpha\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$	Hydrothermal (in-situ growth)	30	1 bar 325°C	1.9×10^{-6}	11.0	[140]
Ni-MOF-74	Hydrothermal (in-situ growth)	10 – 25	1 bar 25°C	10^{-6}	2.9	[141]
NH ₂ -MIL- 53(Al)/ Glass frit	Colloidal assembly of MOF seeds	15	1 bar 15 – 80°C	1.5×10^{-6}	20.7	[123]

^a H₂/CH₄ mixed gas selectivity

2.6. Polymeric membranes

Polymeric membranes are the most mature membranes for hydrogen separation with the first industrial application reported in 1980s [42]. Some commercial membrane modules such as Prism® (Air products and Chemicals, Inc.) [142] and polyaramid module (Dupont) [143] could achieve up to 97% hydrogen recovery. The low costs, ease of fabricating a large area/volume ratio hollow fibre or spiral wound module makes polymeric membranes very competitive. Recently, polyimide-based membranes such as 5,5-[2,2,2-trifluoro-1-(trifluoromethyl)ethylidene]-1,3-isobenzofurandione (6FDA) and Matrimid® introduced on an industrial scale showed even better H₂ transport than conventional polysulfone and cellulose acetate membranes [42, 50].

A critical limitation in polymer membrane performance is the trade-off between gas permeability and selectivity, also known as Robeson upper bound (Figure 4) [144, 145]. However, the empirical upper bound relationship between H₂ permeability and H₂/CH₄ selectivity is a temporary figure that will be shifted to the higher limit with more advanced membrane structures and properties discovered [144, 145]. In fact, several approaches have been investigated to crossover the upper bound. In last decades, many laboratory scale membranes have been reported to cross the upper bound such as Polymer of Intrinsic Microporosity (PIM) membrane [146-148] and thermal rearranged polymer membranes (TR) [149-153]. The incorporation of CMS [154], ZIF [155, 156], UiO-66 [156] and multi-walled carbon nanotube [157] into polymeric membranes, which is called mixed matrix membrane (MMM), also demonstrated the potential to enhance the H₂ permeability without affecting or even increasing the H₂/CH₄ selectivity. Simultaneously, researchers have successfully fabricated the defect-free ultra-thin polymeric membranes (~30 nm) by continuously assembly of polymer (CAP) technique [158] that showed a breakthrough in gas permeance. Certainly, most of the advanced H₂ selective membranes and fabrication techniques are on laboratory scales that require more investigations and efforts to convert them into industry.




Figure 4 Robeson's upper bound for H_2/CH_4 separation of polymeric membranes [142, 144, 145, 149-157], adapted from [159]

2.7. Impact of minor impurities in natural gas grid on membrane performance

The typical gas standard regulations in many areas still allow the presence of minor impurities such as CO_2 , H_2S , water, C_3^+ hydrocarbons and inert gases in the natural gas pipeline grids [59, 160]. Organosulfur compounds such as dimethyl sulphide (DMS) and tetrahydrothiophene (THT) are also injected into the commercial natural gas stream at concentrations around 200 ppb as a legislative practice for detecting natural gas leakage [161, 162]. These compounds are commonly removed via the hydrodesulfurization (HDS) process prior entering the methane reforming reactors [163]. However, such desulfurization process requires high energy inputs to maintain high reaction pressure and temperature [30]. Hence, an essential factor in selecting the membrane materials for hydrogen recovery from HENG is to consider their resistance to potential minor impurities in natural gas. Generally, the presence of these impurities could alter the membrane performance by following four ways: (1) competing with hydrogen to permeate through the membrane; (2) occupying and blocking the membrane free volume; (3) plasticising the membrane and (4) degrading or poisoning the membrane materials [41].

Dense metallic membranes

Due to the special hydrogen transport mechanism, hydrogen permeation through dense metallic membranes is not affected by most of impurities except H₂S. It was reported that H₂S at concentrations ~ 2 ppm can react with conventional Pd and Pt membranes to form the metal sulphide on the membrane surface, which then completely inhibit the H₂ permeation through the membrane [63, 164, 165]. Such limitation can be minimised by fabricating the Pd alloy membranes with metals in group IB, IVB, VB and VIB of the periodic table.

O'Brien et al. [63] reported a body-centred cubic Pd₄₇Cu₅₃ membrane (thickness 25 µm) which could resist up to 1000 ppm H₂S for 6 hours with only 10% H₂ permeance loss. Similarly, Peters, et al. [164] observed only 20 – 30% loss in H₂ flux when exposing a Pd₇₇Ag₂₃ membrane (thickness 10 µm) to 5 ppb – 20 ppm H₂S – H₂ mixed gas for 265 hours. Recent studies further demonstrated that the close to full recovery of H₂ flux through Pd alloy membranes were obtained when removing the H₂S in the feed gas [164, 165]. This suggested that the dominant interaction of H₂S and alloy membranes was reversible adsorption rather than sulfidation reaction.

Molecular sieve membranes

Figure 5 showed that the kinetic diameter of H₂ is much smaller than most of potential impurities. Thus, these impurities retain in the retentate side of the molecular sieving mechanism driving membranes, along with CH₄. Figure 5 also showed that H₂O is more permeable than H₂ that could reduce the purity of hydrogen product stream. H₂O was also reported to densify the silica membrane at temperature above 500°C [88, 166]. However, the impact of H₂O on the purity of H₂ product stream is often negligible due to the strict control of H₂O content in natural gas grids (e.g. commonly in ppm – ppb level [59, 160]) to avoid the formation of hydrates. The water-resistance of silica membrane could also be overcome by doping the metal oxides into silica matrix [166, 167] or replacing hydroxyl functional group (—OH) on the pore surfaces by methyl (—CH₃) [168] or perfluorodecyl functional groups [169].

In addition, impurities with high condensation temperature such as C₃⁺ hydrocarbon, sulfur compounds and water on microporous membranes may condense and block the membrane pores, which can potentially reduce the hydrogen permeability but enhance the H₂/CH₄ selectivity [88, 170-172].




Figure 5 The kinetic diameter and critical temperature of some potential components in natural gas [59, 173] (Data for DMS (dimethyl sulphide) and THT (tetrahydrothiophene) obtained from [174] and COnductor like Screening Model (COSMO), respectively).

Dense polymeric membranes

The effects of impurities on hydrogen separation depend on their solubility and diffusivity in the materials for those membranes relying on solution – diffusion gas transport mechanism. In comparison with H₂, most impurities have larger kinetic diameter (lower gas diffusivity) and higher condensation temperature (higher gas solubility) (Figure 5). As the preferred membrane materials (Section 2.6) for H₂ recovery from HENG are mostly relying on diffusivity selection such as glassy polymer (e.g. cellulose acetate [173] and polysulfone [51]), impurities with high condensation temperature may condense and block the membrane free volume. Schell et al. [172] reported that the presence of 1200 ppm water vapour (80 v/v% H₂/CH₄ feed gas at 60°C and 2410 kPa) suppressed the H₂ flux through cellulose acetate membranes by 6% and enhanced the H₂/CH₄ selectivity by 4%. The researchers also observed the similar phenomenon (e.g. 15% decrease in H₂ flux and 10% increase in H₂/CH₄ selectivity) when introducing aromatic hydrocarbons into H₂/CH₄ mixed gas.

The condensates inside the membrane may also plasticise the membrane matrix and lead to an increase in permeation of all penetrants and decrease in gas selectivity [59]. However, most researches have shown that polymeric membranes have strong resistance to impurities such as H₂S, C₃⁺, etc. in crude natural gas [51, 172, 173], which is beneficial for the H₂ separation from HENG. Nevertheless, the impact of impurities in commercial natural gas, specially added odorants, on this membrane materials are not yet clear and need further investigation.

3. Discussion and outlook

3.1. Discussion

Overall, the pathway of converting power to hydrogen is a prospective solution for storing and redistributing surplus renewable energy to ensure clean, secure and sustainable energy supply future. Recent techno-analysis estimated that the bulk energy storage cost (\$ per kW) of P2H technology can be 1.5 – 4.3 times less than other energy storage technologies such as batteries, supercapacitors, pumped hydro and flywheels [175]. Although the delivery and temporary storage of hydrogen in natural gas pipelines inherit the advantages of the existing natural gas distribution network, efficiency and cost-effective technologies that purifies hydrogen from HENG is the key to push P2H into practice. Hydrogen separation has been well investigated in syngas and methane reformed off gas industries [15, 30, 39, 40], however, very few studies were conducted for Power to Hydrogen.

The hydrogen separation performance of different membrane materials has been discussed and summarised in Table 8 and Figure 6. Although dense metallic membranes are promising to achieve an extremely high hydrogen purity and comparative hydrogen permeance or recovery in comparison with other membrane materials, the high operating temperature ($\geq 300^{\circ}\text{C}$) hinders its application in hydrogen recovery from HENG. Ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes are not suitable for hydrogen purification from HENG due to high operating temperature ($\geq 400^{\circ}\text{C}$) requirement and the ability to dimerising CH_4 . Polymeric membranes are leading in the commercial readiness compared to other hydrogen separation membranes with only low operating temperature required. The challenges for these membranes are the moderate hydrogen selectivity which limits the hydrogen purity in product stream. In addition, inorganic microporous and metal organic framework membranes are also promising for hydrogen separation at low operating temperatures such as ambient temperature. The key to these membranes is to improve the reproductivity in membrane fabrication and performance, especially on pilot- and industrial-scale.

1 Table 8: Summary of hydrogen separation performance of some common membrane materials [40, 49-51, 88, 159, 176]

	Dense metallic membrane	Ceramic mixed protonic-electronic conducting membranes	Inorganic microporous membrane ^a			MOF membrane	Polymeric membrane
			Zeolite	Silica	Carbon based		
Temperature/ ^o C	300 – 600	400 – 1000	25 – 700	50 – 700	25 – 900	15 – 325	25 – 200
H ₂ selectivity ^a	1000 – ∞ ^b	– ^c	4 – 25 ^d	Up to 5900 ^e	Up to 1200	3 – 21	Up to 730
Hydrogen permeance /mol·m ⁻² ·s ⁻¹ ·Pa ⁻¹	2 x 10 ⁻⁷ – 3 x 10 ⁻⁶	10 ⁻⁸ – 10 ⁻⁹	2 x 10 ⁻⁸ – 8 x 10 ⁻⁷	3 x 10 ⁻⁹ – 5 x 10 ⁻⁷	2 x 10 ⁻⁹ – 3 x 10 ⁻⁷	6 x 10 ⁻⁸ – 2 x 10 ⁻⁶	~ 10 ⁻⁹ – 3 x 10 ⁻⁷
Development stage	Small commercial scale	Lab-scale membrane modules	Lab-scale membrane modules	Lab-scale membrane modules	Lab-scale membrane modules	Lab-scale membrane modules	Large commercial scale

^a The summary excludes some advanced membrane materials that require more database to make the conclusion

^b H₂/N₂ selectivity with assumption that selectivity of H₂/N₂ and H₂/CH₄ being identical [57]

^c The selectivity of H₂ in ceramic mixed pro- tonic – electronic conducting membrane is proposed to similar to dense metallic membrane. However, there is limited data reported in literature [88].

^d MFI type zeolite membrane prepared by catalyst cracking deposition hydrothermal synthesis could achieve up to 180 H₂/CH₄ selectivity [108]

^e Nanosil membrane could achieve 23000 – 27000 H₂/CH₄ selectivity [110]

2




Figure 6 Summary of H_2 permeability versus H_2/CH_4 selectivity of some common membrane materials based on the literature data summarised in this review. Since the membrane thickness were not fully reported in literature, the hydrogen permeation is presented in term of hydrogen permeability instead of permeance. (^a H_2/CH_4 selectivity in dense metallic membranes was based on H_2/N_2 selectivity by assuming the identical performance of N_2 and CH_4 through the membrane [57])

3.2. Research and development (R&D) outlook

Many promising membrane materials for hydrogen recovery from HENG, including their fabrications and separation performance, have been highlighted and discussed. On this basis, we would like to address the R&D outlook to achieve the high hydrogen purification membranes and drive membrane separation into HENG industry.

Development of novel membrane materials and membrane fabrication technologies

To the greatest extent, the development in hydrogen purification membrane will remain focusing on the following key approaches: (1) The design and synthesis of novel membrane materials with high hydrogen selectivity and permeability; (2) The modification of the structure and morphology of existing membranes; (3) The incorporation of different membranes into a copolymer, composite

1 or mixed matrix membrane to combine the best features of each membrane material; (4) The
2 development of advanced membrane fabrication technologies to produce ultrathin membranes.

3 The gas transport mechanisms for H_2/CH_4 separation membranes are dominant by molecular
4 sieving and solution – diffusion (with diffusion selectivity). Both mechanisms require the well
5 control of membrane morphology such as pore sizes and shapes, fraction free volume distribution
6 etc., to enhance H_2/CH_4 selectivity. Thus, the R&D trend is expected to shift toward membrane
7 materials that either have uniform pore size such as MOF and two-dimensional membranes (i.e.
8 graphene-based membranes, LDHs membranes, etc.) or the ability to tune or crosslink the
9 membrane free volume such as TR polymers and PIMs membranes. Simultaneously, the
10 incorporation of advanced membrane materials with commercialised membrane materials will
11 also attract great interests. The incorporation could combine the best features of each membrane
12 material and overcome current challenges in fabricating large defect-free membranes. The
13 commercial readiness of conventional membranes could also potentially reduce the time
14 consumption for scaling up the incorporated membranes.

15 Another crucial approach for enhancing the hydrogen recovery is to reduce the thickness of active
16 membrane layer but maintain its selectivity and mechanical strength. Along with the conventional
17 thin film composite (TFC) membranes, the ultra-thin film coating techniques such as CAP and
18 metal-induced ordered microporous polymer TFC membranes are able to reduce the membrane
19 thickness to nanometre scale without affecting the gas selectivity. Therefore, it is worthwhile to
20 drive the R&D in H_2 selective membrane fabrication toward this field, starting with the
21 investigations on precursor selection for CAP processes of advanced membrane materials.

22 ***Pilot scale and economic assessment studies***

23 The development of membrane technologies in hydrogen purification has been relying on
24 conventional polymeric membrane materials and palladium membranes (Table 8). Although
25 several membrane materials have been introduced for H_2/CH_4 separation, there are very limited
26 membrane modules introduced into practice such as Vaporsep- H_2^{TM} solution developed by
27 Membrane Technology and Research (USA) [177] and Micro-Channel TM Technology developed
28 by Power and Energy Inc. (USA) [81]. Beside the lack of technology supports to fabricate the
29 large defect-free membranes as addressed above, the lack of pilot scale studies is another major
30 obstacle for commercialising advanced membrane materials. Therefore, it is recommended that
31 more efforts and investments be put on pilot-scale membranes studies for hydrogen separation
32 from HENG.

The cost of hydrogen separation from 10 v/v% H₂/CH₄ at 20 bar and 80% recovery was estimated to be USD 3.3 – \$8.3/kg H₂ using the pressure swing adsorption (PSA) [30]. The target of hydrogen cost is proposed to be USD 1.5/kg H₂ [84]. However, there is lack of techno-economic study on hydrogen recovery from HENG by membrane technologies. The database collected from pilot scale studies is also valuable resources for economic assessments and further upscale of these membranes.

The majority of laboratory studies on hydrogen purification membranes focused on pure H₂ and CH₄ separation performance at low operating pressures and a few on H₂/CH₄ mixtures. In the real world, membranes for hydrogen recovery from HENG may expose to several impurities (section 2.7) and high pressures (68 bar and ambient temperature). Thus, it is worthwhile to investigate the performance of candidate membranes in HENG simulated condition, particularly for pilot studies.

Membrane modelling

The transition of technology from laboratory to industry requires extraordinary efforts and resources, especially for membranes in the new P2H energy sector. Hence, developing robust membrane models validated with experiments is essential to minimise the R&D costs and accelerate the technology transition. Several mathematical models have been developed for CO₂/H₂ separation in integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) process [178-181]. By counting that CH₄ behaving more inert than CO₂ in membrane separation [57], these models will be the valuable resources for the process development of hydrogen purification from HENG.

Technology integration

While membrane technology has advantages of cost effectiveness and small facility footprint, purify hydrogen gas stream up to 99.99 v/v% from HENG at low temperatures is a critical challenge. Another technology that can achieve 99.999 v/v% hydrogen purity is the pressure swing adsorption, which is a mature technology for hydrogen separation [182]. However, PSA requires large land footprint to accommodate the adsorption and frequent regeneration cycles for hydrogen separation from its low concentration mixtures [50]. Therefore, an integrated membrane – adsorption process (called HylyPure® process as shown in Figure 7) is a promising approach to combine the best of both technologies [23, 159, 183]. Recently, Liemberger et al. reported an integrated process of an aromatic polyimide hollow fibre membrane module with a PSA that could recover at least 60% hydrogen at purity 98.0 – 99.3 v/v% from 1 – 10 v/v% H₂/CH₄ feed gas at 21 – 51 bar and ambient temperature [23]. Certainly, the technology integration opportunity will also be open to other hydrogen purification technologies such as cryogenic and solvent absorption. Hence, more

investigations on the integrated hydrogen separation units such as material development, process optimisation and economic analysis are suggested to testify its industry potential.




Figure 7 The integrated module of membrane – adsorption process for hydrogen purification [23, 159]

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support of Early Career Researcher Grants Scheme awarded by the University of Melbourne entitled ‘Production of High Purity Hydrogen from Mixed Pipeline Gases’ and Future Fuel CRC ‘Novel Separation Technology development for hydrogen and future fuels systems’.

References

1. BP. BP Energy Outlook: 2019 edition. 2019
2. IEA. World Energy Outlook 2013. Flagship report. 2013
3. IEA. Oil 2020. Fuel report. 2020
4. United Nations. Paris Agreement - United nations framework convention on climate change. 2015
5. Pour N, Webley P A, Cook P J. Opportunities for application of BECCS in the Australian power sector. *Applied Energy*, 2018, 224: 615-635
6. Kemper J. Biomass and carbon dioxide capture and storage: A review. *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control*, 2015, 40: 401-430
7. Rubin E, Meyer L, Coninck H D, Abanades J C, Akai M, Benson S, Caldeira K, Cook P, Davidson O, Doctor R, et al. IPCC Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. 2005
8. Global CCS Institute. The Global Status of CCS: 2017. 2017
9. Andrews J, Shabani B. Re-envisioning the role of hydrogen in a sustainable energy economy. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2012, 37(2): 1184-1203
10. Mohn K. The gravity of status quo: A review of IEA's World Energy Outlook. *Economics of Energy & Environmental Policy*, 2020, 9(1)
11. IEA. Renewables 2018: Analysis and Forecasts to 2023. Market Report. 2018
12. Pecher A, Kofoed J P. Handbook of ocean wave energy. London, UK: Springer Nature, 2017, 20
13. IEA. Global Energy & CO₂ Status Report 2019. Flagship Report. 2019
14. Robinius M, Raje T, Nykamp S, Rott T, Müller M, Grube T, Katzenbach B, Küppers S, Stolten D. Power-to-Gas: Electrolyzers as an alternative to network expansion—An example from a distribution system operator. *Applied Energy*, 2018, 210: 182-197
15. Maroufmashat A, Fowler M. Transition of future energy system infrastructure through power-to-gas pathways. *Energies*, 2017, 10(8): 1089
16. Kreuter W, Hofmann H. Electrolysis: the important energy transformer in a world of sustainable energy. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 1998, 23(8): 661-666
17. Ursua A, Gandia L M, Sanchis P. Hydrogen production from water electrolysis: current status and future trends. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 2011, 100(2): 410-426
18. Laguna-Bercero M. Recent advances in high temperature electrolysis using solid oxide fuel cells: A review. *Journal of Power Sources*, 2012, 203: 4-16

19. Götz M, Lefebvre J, Mörs F, McDaniel Koch A, Graf F, Bajohr S, Reimert R, Kolb T. Renewable Power-to-Gas: A technological and economic review. *Renewable Energy*, 2016, 85: 1371-1390
20. Ehteshami S M M, Chan S H. The role of hydrogen and fuel cells to store renewable energy in the future energy network – potentials and challenges. *Energy Policy*, 2014, 73: 103-109
21. IEA. The Future of Hydrogen. Technology Report. 2019
22. Sato S, Nagai K. Polymer membranes with hydrogen-selective and hydrogen-rejective properties. *Membrane*, 2005, 30(1): 20-28
23. Liemberger W, Groß M, Miltner M, Harasek M. Experimental analysis of membrane and pressure swing adsorption (PSA) for the hydrogen separation from natural gas. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 2017, 167: 896-907
24. Gahleitner G. Hydrogen from renewable electricity: An international review of power-to-gas pilot plants for stationary applications. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2013, 38(5): 2039-2061
25. Sinigaglia T, Lewiski F, Martins M E S, Siluk J C M. Production, storage, fuel stations of hydrogen and its utilization in automotive applications-a review. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2017, 42(39): 24597-24611
26. Demir M E, Dincer I. Cost assessment and evaluation of various hydrogen delivery scenarios. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2018, 43(22): 10420-10430
27. Saadi F H, Lewis N S, McFarland E W. Relative costs of transporting electrical and chemical energy. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 2018, 11(3): 469-475
28. van der Zwaan B C C, Schoots K, Rivera-Tinoco R, Verbong G P J. The cost of pipelining climate change mitigation: An overview of the economics of CH₄, CO₂ and H₂ transportation. *Applied Energy*, 2011, 88(11): 3821-3831
29. Dodds P E, Staffell I, Hawkes A D, Li F, Grünewald P, McDowall W, Ekins P. Hydrogen and fuel cell technologies for heating: A review. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2015, 40(5): 2065-2083
30. Melaina M W, Antonia O, Penev M. Blending Hydrogen into Natural Gas Pipeline Networks. A Review of Key Issues. Technical Report NREL/TP-5600-51995. 2013
31. SNAM. Global Gas Report 2018. In: The 27th World Gas Conference. Washington D.C.: International Gas Union, 2018
32. Yang C, Ogden J. Determining the lowest-cost hydrogen delivery mode. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2007, 32(2): 268-286

- 1 33. Schmura E, Klingenberg M, Paster M, Gruber J. Existing natural gas pipeline materials and
2 associated operational characteristics. DOE Hydrogen Program - FY 2005 Progress Report.
3 2005
- 4 34. Al Rafea K. Utilizing 'power-to-gas' technology for storing energy and to optimize the
5 synergy between environmental obligations and economical requirements. Dissertation for
6 the Doctoral Degree. Ontario, Canada: University of Waterloo, 2017, 13
- 7 35. Altfeld K, Pinchbeck D. Admissible hydrogen concentrations in natural gas systems. Gas
8 Energy, 2013, 2103(03): 1-2
- 9 36. Penev M, Melaina M, Bush B, Muratori M, Warner E, Chen Y. Low-carbon natural gas for
10 transportation: Well-to-wheels emissions and potential market assessment in California.
11 Technical Report NREL/TP-6A50-66538. 2016
- 12 37. Jemena Gas Networks (NSW) Limited. Western Sydney Green Gas Project - Environmental
13 Impact Statement. 2019
- 14 38. Karim G A, Wierzba I, Al-Alousi Y. Methane-hydrogen mixtures as fuels. International
15 Journal of Hydrogen Energy, 1996, 21(7): 625-631
- 16 39. Todd D M. Gas turbine improvements enhance IGCC viability. In: Proceedings of the 2000
17 gasification technologies conference. California, USA: GE Power Systems, 2000, 8-11
- 18 40. Adhikari S, Fernando S. Hydrogen membrane separation techniques. Industrial &
19 Engineering Chemistry Research, 2006, 45(3): 875-881
- 20 41. Lu H T. The impact of impurities on the performance of cellulose triacetate membranes for
21 CO₂ separation. Dissertation for the Doctoral Degree. Victoria, Australia: University of
22 Melbourne, 2018, 3-47
- 23 42. Baker R W. Future directions of membrane gas separation technology. Industrial &
24 Engineering Chemistry Research, 2002, 41(6): 1393-1411
- 25 43. Ghosal K, Freeman B D. Gas separation using polymer membranes: An overview. Polymers
26 for Advanced Technologies, 1994, 5(11): 673-697
- 27 44. Merkel T C, Lin H, Wei X, Baker R. Power plant post-combustion carbon dioxide capture:
28 An opportunity for membranes. Journal of Membrane Science, 2010, 359(1-2): 126-139
- 29 45. Kentish S E, Scholes C A, Stevens G W. Carbon dioxide separation through polymeric
30 membrane systems for flue gas applications. Recent Patents on Chemical Engineering,
31 2008, 1(1): 52-66
- 32 46. Chen G, Buck F, Kistner I, Widenmeyer M, Schiestel T, Schulz A, Walker M, Weidenkaff
33 A. A novel plasma-assisted hollow fiber membrane concept for efficiently separating
34 oxygen from CO in a CO₂ plasma. Chemical Engineering Journal, 2020, 392: 123699

- 1 47. Bogaerts A, Neyts E C. Plasma technology: An emerging technology for energy storage.
2 ACS Energy Letters, 2018, 3(4): 1013-1027
- 3 48. Barelli L, Bidini G, Gallorini F, Servili S. Hydrogen production through sorption-enhanced
4 steam methane reforming and membrane technology: a review. Energy, 2008, 33(4): 554-
5 570
- 6 49. Li P, Wang Z, Qiao Z, Liu Y, Cao X, Li W, Wang J, Wang S. Recent developments in
7 membranes for efficient hydrogen purification. Journal of Membrane Science, 2015, 495:
8 130-168
- 9 50. Zornoza B, Casado C, Navajas A. Chapter 11 - Advances in Hydrogen Separation and
10 Purification with Membrane Technology. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier, 2013, 245-268
- 11 51. Ockwig N W, Nenoff T M. Membranes for hydrogen separation. Chemical Reviews, 2007,
12 107: 4078–4110
- 13 52. Koros W J, Fleming G. Membrane-based gas separation. Journal of Membrane Science,
14 1993, 83(1): 1-80
- 15 53. Uhlhorn R, Keizer K, Burggraaf A. Gas and surface diffusion in modified γ -alumina
16 systems. Journal of Membrane Science, 1989, 46(2-3): 225-241
- 17 54. Hu G, Jiang K, Wang R, Li G. Chapter 7 Technological Assessment of CO₂ Capture and
18 EOR/EGR/ECBM. UK: Taylor & Francis, 2020 (in press), ISBN: 9780367898809
- 19 55. Paul D. 1.04 - Fundamentals of Transport Phenomena in Polymer Membranes. London, UK:
20 Elsevier, 2010, 75-90
- 21 56. Boutilier M S, Sun C, O'Hern S C, Au H, Hadjiconstantinou N G, Karnik R. Implications of
22 permeation through intrinsic defects in graphene on the design of defect-tolerant membranes
23 for gas separation. ACS Nano, 2014, 8(1): 841-849
- 24 57. Lin H, Freeman B D. Gas solubility, diffusivity and permeability in poly (ethylene oxide).
25 Journal of Membrane Science, 2004, 239(1): 105-117
- 26 58. Roa F, Way J D. Influence of alloy composition and membrane fabrication on the pressure
27 dependence of the hydrogen flux of palladium– copper membranes. Industrial &
28 Engineering Chemistry Research, 2003, 42(23): 5827-5835
- 29 59. Baker R W, Lokhandwala K. Natural gas processing with membranes: An overview.
30 Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 2008, 47(7): 2109-2121
- 31 60. Lu G, Da Costa J D, Duke M, Giessler S, Socolow R, Williams R, Kreutz T. Inorganic
32 membranes for hydrogen production and purification: a critical review and perspective.
33 Journal of Colloid and Interface Science, 2007, 314(2): 589-603

61. Yun S, Ted Oyama S. Correlations in palladium membranes for hydrogen separation: A review. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2011, 375(1): 28-45
62. Kamakoti P, Morreale B D, Ciocco M V, Howard B H, Killmeyer R P, Cugini A V, Sholl D S. Prediction of hydrogen flux through sulfur-tolerant binary alloy membranes. *Science*, 2005, 307(5709): 569-573
63. O'Brien C P, Howard B H, Miller J B, Morreale B D, Gellman A J. Inhibition of hydrogen transport through Pd and Pd₄₇Cu₅₃ membranes by H₂S at 350° C. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2010, 349(1-2): 380-384
64. Kuraoka K, Zhao H, Yazawa T. Pore-filled palladium-glass composite membranes for hydrogen separation by novel electroless plating technique. *Journal of Materials Science*, 2004, 39(5): 1879-1881
65. Itoh N, Akiha T, Sato T. Preparation of thin palladium composite membrane tube by a CVD technique and its hydrogen permselectivity. *Catalysis Today*, 2005, 104(2-4): 231-237
66. Burggraaf A J. Important characteristics of inorganic membranes. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier, 1996, 21-34
67. Collins J P, Way J D. Hydrogen selective membrane. US Patent, 5652020, 1997-07-29
68. Yan S, Maeda H, Kusakabe K, Morooka S. Thin palladium membrane formed in support pores by metal-organic chemical vapor deposition method and application to hydrogen separation. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 1994, 33(3): 616-622
69. Yun S, Ko J H, Oyama S T. Ultrathin palladium membranes prepared by a novel electric field assisted activation. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2011, 369(1-2): 482-489
70. Tong J, Shirai R, Kashima Y, Matsumura Y. Preparation of a pinhole-free Pd–Ag membrane on a porous metal support for pure hydrogen separation. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2005, 260(1-2): 84-89
71. Shi Z, Wu S, Szpunar J A, Roshd M. An observation of palladium membrane formation on a porous stainless steel substrate by electroless deposition. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2006, 280(1-2): 705-711
72. Okazaki J, Tanaka D A P, Tanco M A L, Wakui Y, Mizukami F, Suzuki T M. Hydrogen permeability study of the thin Pd–Ag alloy membranes in the temperature range across the α – β phase transition. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2006, 282(1): 370-374
73. Harris J R. Coated diffusion membrane and its use. US Patent, 4536196, 1985-08-20
74. Peters T A, Kaleta T, Stange M, Bredesen R. Development of thin binary and ternary Pd-based alloy membranes for use in hydrogen production. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2011, 383(1): 124-134

75. Peters T A, Kaleta T, Stange M, Bredesen R. Hydrogen transport through a selection of thin Pd-alloy membranes: Membrane stability, H₂S inhibition, and flux recovery in hydrogen and simulated WGS mixtures. *Catalysis Today*, 2012, 193(1): 8-19
76. Nair B K R, Choi J, Harold M P. Electroless plating and permeation features of Pd and Pd/Ag hollow fiber composite membranes. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2007, 288(1-2): 67-84
77. Gade S K, Thoen P M, Way J D. Unsupported palladium alloy foil membranes fabricated by electroless plating. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2008, 316(1-2): 112-118
78. Sanz R, Calles J A, Alique D, Furones L, Ordóñez S, Marín P, Corengia P, Fernandez E. Preparation, testing and modelling of a hydrogen selective Pd/YSZ/SS composite membrane. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2011, 36(24): 15783-15793
79. Roa F, Block M J, Way J D. The influence of alloy composition on the H₂ flux of composite Pd-Cu membranes. *Desalination*, 2002, 147(1-3): 411-416
80. Lukyanov B N, Andreev D V, Parmon V N. Catalytic reactors with hydrogen membrane separation. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 2009, 154(1): 258-266
81. Emerson S, Magdefrau N, She Y, Thibaud-Erkey C. Advanced Palladium Membrane Scale-up for Hydrogen Separation. Technical Report DE-FE0004967. 2012
82. De Falco M, Iaquaniello G, Palo E, Cucchiella B, Palma V, Ciambelli P. 11 - Palladium-based membranes for hydrogen separation: preparation, economic analysis and coupling with a water gas shift reactor. UK: Woodhead Publishing, 2013, 456-486
83. Rosensteel W A, Ricote S, Sullivan N P. Hydrogen permeation through dense BaCe_{0.8}Y_{0.2}O_{3-δ}-CeO_{0.8}Y_{0.2}O_{2-δ} composite-ceramic hydrogen separation membranes. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2016, 41(4): 2598-2606
84. Elangovan S, Nair B, Small T, Heck B, Bay I, Timper M, Hartvigsen J, Wilson M. Ceramic membrane devices for ultra-high purity hydrogen production: mixed conducting membrane development. Pennsylvania, USA: Springer, 2009, 67-81
85. Phair J, Badwal S. Review of proton conductors for hydrogen separation. *Ionics*, 2006, 12(2): 103-115
86. Tao Z, Yan L, Qiao J, Wang B, Zhang L, Zhang J. A review of advanced proton-conducting materials for hydrogen separation. *Progress in Materials Science*, 2015, 74: 1-50
87. Fontaine M L, Norby T, Larring Y, Grande T, Bredesen R. Oxygen and hydrogen separation membranes based on dense ceramic conductors. *Membrane Science and Technology*, 2008, 13: 401-458

- 1 88. Cardoso S P, Azenha I S, Lin Z, Portugal I, Rodrigues A E, Silva C M. Inorganic
2 membranes for hydrogen separation. *Separation & Purification Reviews*, 2018, 47(3): 229-
3 266
- 4 89. Lundin S T B, Patki N S, Fuerst T F, Ricote S, Wolden C A, Way J D. Dense Inorganic
5 Membranes for Hydrogen Separation. New Jersey, USA: World Scientific Publishing, 2017
- 6 90. Meulenberg W, Ivanova M, Serra J, Roitsch S. Proton-Conducting Ceramic Membranes for
7 Solid Oxide Fuel Cells and Hydrogen (H₂) Processing. Cambridge, UK: Elsevier, 2011,
8 541-567
- 9 91. Tan X, Tan X, Yang N, Meng B, Zhang K, Liu S. High performance BaCe_{0.8}Y_{0.2}O_{3-α}
10 (BCY) hollow fibre membranes for hydrogen permeation. *Ceramics International*, 2014,
11 40(2): 3131-3138
- 12 92. Hung I M, Chiang Y J, Jang J S C, Lin J C, Lee S W, Chang J K, Hsi C S. The proton
13 conduction and hydrogen permeation characteristic of Sr(Ce_{0.6}Zr_{0.4})_{0.85}Y_{0.15}O_{3-δ} ceramic
14 separation membrane. *Journal of the European Ceramic Society*, 2015, 35(1): 163-170
- 15 93. Mather G C, Poulidi D, Thursfield A, Pascual M J, Jurado J R, Metcalfe I S. Hydrogen-
16 permeation characteristics of a SrCeO₃-based ceramic separation membrane: Thermal,
17 ageing and surface-modification effects. *Solid State Ionics*, 2010, 181(3-4): 230-235
- 18 94. Omata T, Otsuka-Yao-Matsuo S. Infrared absorption spectra of high temperature proton
19 conducting Ca²⁺-doped La₂Zr₂O₇. *Journal of the Electrochemical Society*, 2001, 148(12):
20 475-482
- 21 95. Hamakawa S, Li L, Li A, Iglesia E. Synthesis and hydrogen permeation properties of
22 membranes based on dense SrCe_{0.95}Yb_{0.05}O_{3-α} thin films. *Solid State Ionics*, 2002, 148(1-2):
23 71-81
- 24 96. Tong J, Su L, Haraya K, Suda H. Thin and defect-free Pd-based composite membrane
25 without any interlayer and substrate penetration by a combined organic and inorganic
26 process. *Chemical Communications*, 2006(10): 1142-1144
- 27 97. Escolástico S, Somacescu S, Serra J M. Tailoring mixed ionic–electronic conduction in H₂
28 permeable membranes based on the system Nd_{5.5}W_{1-x}Mo_xO_{11.25-δ}. *Journal of Materials*
29 *Chemistry A*, 2015, 3(2): 719-731
- 30 98. Chen Y, Cheng S, Chen L, Wei Y, Ashman P J, Wang H. Niobium and molybdenum co-
31 doped La_{5.5}WO_{11.25-δ} membrane with improved hydrogen permeability. *Journal of*
32 *Membrane Science*, 2016, 510: 155-163

99. Zhu Z, Sun W, Wang Z, Cao J, Dong Y, Liu W. A high stability Ni-La_{0.5}Ce_{0.5}O_{2-δ} asymmetrical metal-ceramic membrane for hydrogen separation and generation. *Journal of Power Sources*, 2015, 281: 417-424
100. Balachandran U, Lee T, Chen L, Song S, Picciolo J, Dorris S. Hydrogen separation by dense cermet membranes. *Fuel*, 2006, 85(2): 150-155
101. Meng X, Song J, Yang N, Meng B, Tan X, Ma Z F, Li K. Ni-BaCe_{0.95}Tb_{0.05}O_{3-δ} cermet membranes for hydrogen permeation. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2012, 401: 300-305
102. Rebollo E, Mortalò C, Escolástico S, Boldrini S, Barison S, Serra J M, Fabrizio M. Exceptional hydrogen permeation of all-ceramic composite robust membranes based on BaCe_{0.65}Zr_{0.20}Y_{0.15}O_{3-δ} and Y-or Gd-doped ceria. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 2015, 8(12): 3675-3686
103. Chiu W V, Park I S, Shqau K, White J C, Schillo M C, Ho W S W, Dutta P K, Verweij H. Post-synthesis defect abatement of inorganic membranes for gas separation. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2011, 377(1): 182-190
104. Xu S, Zhang X, Cheng D-g, Chen F, Ren X. Effect of hierarchical ZSM-5 zeolite crystal size on diffusion and catalytic performance of n-heptane cracking. *Frontiers of Chemical Science and Engineering*, 2018, 12(4): 780-789
105. Ye Z, Zhang H, Zhang Y, Tang Y. Seed-induced synthesis of functional MFI zeolite materials: Method development, crystallization mechanisms, and catalytic properties. *Frontiers of Chemical Science and Engineering*, 2019: 1-16
106. Huang A, Wang N, Caro J. Synthesis of multi-layer zeolite LTA membranes with enhanced gas separation performance by using 3-aminopropyltriethoxysilane as interlayer. *Microporous and Mesoporous Materials*, 2012, 164: 294-301
107. Huang A, Wang N, Caro J. Seeding-free synthesis of dense zeolite FAU membranes on 3-aminopropyltriethoxysilane-functionalized alumina supports. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2012, 389: 272-279
108. Tang Z, Dong J, Nenoff T M. Internal surface modification of MFI-type zeolite membranes for high selectivity and high flux for hydrogen. *Langmuir*, 2009, 25(9): 4848-4852
109. Shafie A H, An W, Hejazi S A H, Sawada J A, Kuznicki S M. Natural zeolite-based cement composite membranes for H₂/CO₂ separation. *Separation and Purification Technology*, 2012, 88: 24-28
110. Prabhu A K, Oyama S T. Highly hydrogen selective ceramic membranes: application to the transformation of greenhouse gases. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2000, 176(2): 233-248

111. Tsuru T. Development of metal-doped silica membranes for increased hydrothermal stability and their applications to membrane reactors for steam reforming of methane. *Journal of the Japan Petroleum Institute*, 2011, 54(5): 277-286
112. Fan J, Ohya H, Suga T, Ohashi H, Yamashita K, Tsuchiya S, Aihara M, Takeuchi T, Negishi Y. High flux zirconia composite membrane for hydrogen separation at elevated temperature. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2000, 170(1): 113-125
113. Koresh J E, Soffer A. The carbon molecular sieve membranes: general properties and the permeability of CH₄/H₂ mixture. *Separation Science and Technology*, 1987, 22(2-3): 973-982
114. Vieira-Linhares A M, Seaton N A. Non-equilibrium molecular dynamics simulation of gas separation in a microporous carbon membrane. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 2003, 58(18): 4129-4136
115. Saufi S M, Ismail A F. Fabrication of carbon membranes for gas separation – A review. *Carbon*, 2004, 42(2): 241-259
116. Jiang D E, Cooper V R, Dai S. Porous graphene as the ultimate membrane for gas separation. *Nano Letters*, 2009, 9(12): 4019-4024
117. Wang Q, O'Hare D. Recent advances in the synthesis and application of layered double hydroxide (LDH) nanosheets. *Chemical Reviews*, 2012, 112(7): 4124-4155
118. Lu P, Liu Y, Zhou T, Wang Q, Li Y. Recent advances in layered double hydroxides (LDHs) as two-dimensional membrane materials for gas and liquid separations. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2018, 567: 89-103
119. Liu Y, Wang N, Caro J. In situ formation of LDH membranes of different microstructures with molecular sieve gas selectivity. *Journal of Materials Chemistry A*, 2014, 2(16): 5716-5723
120. Liu Y, Peng Y, Wang N, Li Y, Pan J H, Yang W, Caro J. Significantly enhanced separation using ZIF-8 membranes by partial conversion of calcined layered double hydroxide precursors. *ChemSusChem*, 2015, 8(21): 3582-3586
121. Ranjan R, Tsapatsis M. Microporous metal organic framework membrane on porous support using the seeded growth method. *Chemistry of Materials*, 2009, 21(20): 4920-4924
122. Huang A, Dou W, Caro J r. Steam-stable zeolitic imidazolate framework ZIF-90 membrane with hydrogen selectivity through covalent functionalization. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 2010, 132(44): 15562-15564

123. Zhang F, Zou X, Gao X, Fan S, Sun F, Ren H, Zhu G. Hydrogen Selective NH₂ - MIL - 53 (Al) MOF Membranes with High Permeability. *Advanced Functional Materials*, 2012, 22(17): 3583-3590
124. Brown A J, Brunelli N A, Eum K, Rashidi F, Johnson J, Koros W J, Jones C W, Nair S. Interfacial microfluidic processing of metal-organic framework hollow fiber membranes. *Science*, 2014, 345(6192): 72-75
125. Sutrisna P D, Savitri E, Himma N F, Prasetya N, Wenten I G. Current perspectives and mini review on zeolitic imidazolate framework-8 (ZIF-8) membranes on organic substrates. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 2019, 703(1): 012045
126. Dong J, Lin Y, Liu W. Multicomponent hydrogen/hydrocarbon separation by MFI - type zeolite membranes. *AIChE Journal*, 2000, 46(10): 1957-1966
127. Poshusta J C, Tuan V A, Falconer J L, Noble R D. Synthesis and permeation properties of SAPO-34 tubular membranes. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 1998, 37(10): 3924-3929
128. Liu B S, Au C T. A La₂NiO₄-zeolite membrane reactor for the CO₂ reforming of methane to syngas. *Catalysis Letters*, 2001, 77(1-3): 67-74
129. Lee D, Zhang L, Oyama S, Niu S, Saraf R F. Synthesis, characterization, and gas permeation properties of a hydrogen permeable silica membrane supported on porous alumina. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2004, 231(1-2): 117-126
130. Moon J H, Bae J H, Bae Y S, Chung J T, Lee C H. Hydrogen separation from reforming gas using organic templating silica/alumina composite membrane. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2008, 318(1-2): 45-55
131. Gu Y, Oyama S T. Ultrathin, hydrogen-selective silica membranes deposited on alumina-graded structures prepared from size-controlled boehmite sols. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2007, 306(1-2): 216-227
132. Jones C W, Koros W J. Carbon molecular sieve gas separation membranes-I. Preparation and characterization based on polyimide precursors. *Carbon*, 1994, 32(8): 1419-1425
133. Petersen J, Matsuda M, Haraya K. Capillary carbon molecular sieve membranes derived from Kapton for high temperature gas separation. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 1997, 131(1-2): 85-94
134. Wei W, Hu H, You L, Chen G. Preparation of carbon molecular sieve membrane from phenol-formaldehyde Novolac resin. *Carbon*, 2002, 40(3): 465-467

135. Kusuki Y, Shimazaki H, Tanihara N, Nakanishi S, Yoshinaga T. Gas permeation properties and characterization of asymmetric carbon membranes prepared by pyrolyzing asymmetric polyimide hollow fiber membrane. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 1997, 134(2): 245-253
136. Tanihara N, Shimazaki H, Hirayama Y, Nakanishi S, Yoshinaga T, Kusuki Y. Gas permeation properties of asymmetric carbon hollow fiber membranes prepared from asymmetric polyimide hollow fiber. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 1999, 160(2): 179-186
137. Kita H, Yoshino M, Tanaka K, Okamoto K-i. Gas permselectivity of carbonized polypyrrolone membrane. *Chemical Communications*, 1997(11): 1051-1052
138. Guo H, Zhu G, Hewitt I J, Qiu S. "Twin copper source" growth of metal-organic framework membrane: $\text{Cu}_3(\text{BTC})_2$ with high permeability and selectivity for recycling H_2 . *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 2009, 131(5): 1646-1647
139. Bux H, Liang F, Li Y, Cravillon J, Wiebcke M, Caro J r. Zeolitic imidazolate framework membrane with molecular sieving properties by microwave-assisted solvothermal synthesis. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 2009, 131(44): 16000-16001
140. Huang A, Chen Y, Wang N, Hu Z, Jiang J, Caro J. A highly permeable and selective zeolitic imidazolate framework ZIF-95 membrane for H_2/CO_2 separation. *Chemical Communications*, 2012, 48(89): 10981-10983
141. Lee D J, Li Q, Kim H, Lee K. Preparation of Ni-MOF-74 membrane for CO_2 separation by layer-by-layer seeding technique. *Microporous and Mesoporous Materials*, 2012, 163: 169-177
142. Sanders D F, Smith Z P, Guo R, Robeson L M, McGrath J E, Paul D R, Freeman B D. Energy-efficient polymeric gas separation membranes for a sustainable future: A review. *Polymer*, 2013, 54(18): 4729-4761
143. Ekiner O, Vassilatos G. Polyaramide hollow fibers for hydrogen/methane separation—spinning and properties. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 1990, 53(3): 259-273
144. Robeson L M. Correlation of separation factor versus permeability for polymeric membranes. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 1991, 62(2): 165-185
145. Robeson L M. The upper bound revisited. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2008, 320(1-2): 390-400
146. Esposito E, Mazzei I, Monteleone M, Fuoco A, Carta M, McKeown N, Malpass-Evans R, Jansen J. Highly permeable matrimid®/PIM-EA (H_2)-TB blend membrane for gas separation. *Polymers*, 2019, 11(1): 46

147. McKeown N B, Budd P M. Polymers of intrinsic microporosity (PIMs): organic materials for membrane separations, heterogeneous catalysis and hydrogen storage. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 2006, 35(8): 675-683
148. Li F Y, Xiao Y, Chung T S, Kawi S. High-performance thermally self-cross-linked polymer of intrinsic microporosity (PIM-1) membranes for energy development. *Macromolecules*, 2012, 45(3): 1427-1437
149. Kim S, Lee Y M. Rigid and microporous polymers for gas separation membranes. *Progress in Polymer Science*, 2015, 43: 1-32
150. Park H B, Jung C H, Lee Y M, Hill A J, Pas S J, Mudie S T, Van Wagner E, Freeman B D, Cookson D J. Polymers with cavities tuned for fast selective transport of small molecules and ions. *Science*, 2007, 318(5848): 254-258
151. Han S H, Lee J E, Lee K-J, Park H B, Lee Y M. Highly gas permeable and microporous polybenzimidazole membrane by thermal rearrangement. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2010, 357(1-2): 143-151
152. Han S H, Misdan N, Kim S, Doherty C M, Hill A J, Lee Y M. Thermally rearranged (TR) polybenzoxazole: effects of diverse imidization routes on physical properties and gas transport behaviors. *Macromolecules*, 2010, 43(18): 7657-7667
153. Yeong Y F, Wang H, Pramoda K P, Chung T S. Thermal induced structural rearrangement of cardo-copolybenzoxazole membranes for enhanced gas transport properties. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2012, 397: 51-65
154. Zornoza B, Téllez C, Coronas J, Esekile O, Koros W J. Mixed matrix membranes based on 6FDA polyimide with silica and zeolite microsphere dispersed phases. *AIChE Journal*, 2015, 61(12): 4481-4490
155. Safak Boroglu M, Yumru A B. Gas separation performance of 6FDA-DAM-ZIF-11 mixed-matrix membranes for H₂/CH₄ and CO₂/CH₄ separation. *Separation and Purification Technology*, 2017, 173: 269-279
156. Kim E, Kim H, Kim D, Kim J, Lee P. Preparation of mixed matrix membranes containing ZIF-8 and UiO-66 for multicomponent light gas separation. *Crystals*, 2019, 9(1): 15
157. Weng T H, Tseng H H, Wey M Y. Preparation and characterization of multi-walled carbon nanotube/PBNPI nanocomposite membrane for H₂/CH₄ separation. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2009, 34(20): 8707-8715
158. Xie K, Fu Q, Xu C, Lu H, Zhao Q, Curtain R, Gu D, Webley P A, Qiao G G. Continuous assembly of a polymer on a metal-organic framework (CAP on MOF): a 30 nm thick

- polymeric gas separation membrane. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 2018, 11(3): 544-550
159. Hu G, Chen C, Lu H T, Wu Y, Liu C, Tao L, Men Y, He G, Li G. A review of technical advances, barriers and solutions in the power to gas (P2G) roadmap. *Engineering*, 2020 (in press)
160. APA Group. Gas Specification for Roma-Brisbane Pipeline 2010
161. De Wild P, Nyqvist R, De Bruijn F, Stobbe E. Removal of sulphur-containing odorants from fuel gases for fuel cell-based combined heat and power applications. *Journal of Power Sources*, 2006, 159(2): 995-1004
162. Golebiowska M, Roth M, Firlej L, Kuchta B, Wexler C. The reversibility of the adsorption of methane–methyl mercaptan mixtures in nanoporous carbon. *Carbon*, 2012, 50(1): 225-234
163. Farrauto R J. Introduction to solid polymer membrane fuel cells and reforming natural gas for production of hydrogen. *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 2005, 56(1): 3-7
164. Peters T A, Stange M, Veenstra P, Nijmeijer A, Bredesen R. The performance of Pd–Ag alloy membrane films under exposure to trace amounts of H₂S. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2016, 499: 105-115
165. De Nooijer N, Sanchez J D, Melendez J, Fernandez E, Pacheco Tanaka D A, van Sint Annaland M, Gallucci F. Influence of H₂S on the hydrogen flux of thin-film PdAgAu membranes. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2020, 45(12): 7303-7312
166. Fotou G, Lin Y, Pratsinis S E. Hydrothermal stability of pure and modified microporous silica membranes. *Journal of Materials Science*, 1995, 30(11): 2803-2808
167. Uhlmann D, Smart S, Diniz da Costa J C. H₂S stability and separation performance of cobalt oxide silica membranes. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2011, 380(1): 48-54
168. De Vos R M, Maier W F, Verweij H. Hydrophobic silica membranes for gas separation. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 1999, 158(1-2): 277-288
169. Wei Q, Ding Y L, Nie Z R, Liu X G, Li Q Y. Wettability, pore structure and performance of perfluorodecyl-modified silica membranes. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2014, 466: 114-122
170. Glass R W, Ross R A. Surface studies of the adsorption of sulfur-containing gases at 423.deg.K on porous adsorbents. II. Adsorption of hydrogen sulfide, methanethiol, ethanethiol, and dimethyl sulfide on .gamma.-alumina. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry*, 1973, 77(21): 2576-2578

171. Akamatsu K, Nakane M, Sugawara T, Hattori T, Nakao S. Development of a membrane reactor for decomposing hydrogen sulfide into hydrogen using a high-performance amorphous silica membrane. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2008, 325(1): 16-19
172. Schell W, Wensley C, Chen M, Venugopal K, Miller B, Stuart J. Recent advances in cellulosic membranes for gas separation and pervaporation. *Gas Separation & Purification*, 1989, 3(4): 162-169
173. Lu H, Kanehashi S, Scholes C, Kentish S. The impact of ethylene glycol and hydrogen sulphide on the performance of cellulose triacetate membranes in natural gas sweetening. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2017, 539: 432-440
174. Plaisance C P, Dooley K M. Zeolite and metal oxide catalysts for the production of dimethyl sulfide and methanethiol. *Catalysis Letters*, 2009, 128(3-4): 449-458
175. Walker S B, Mukherjee U, Fowler M, Elkamel A. Benchmarking and selection of Power-to-Gas utilizing electrolytic hydrogen as an energy storage alternative. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 2016, 41(19): 7717-7731
176. Lubitz W, Tumas W. Hydrogen: An Overview. *Chemical Reviews*, 2007, 107(10): 3900-3903
177. Iulianelli A, Drioli E. Membrane engineering: Latest advancements in gas separation and pre-treatment processes, petrochemical industry and refinery, and future perspectives in emerging applications. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 2020, 206: 106464
178. Coker D, Freeman B, Fleming G. Modeling multicomponent gas separation using hollow - fiber membrane contactors. *AIChE Journal*, 1998, 44(6): 1289-1302
179. Kundu P K, Chakma A, Feng X. Simulation of binary gas separation with asymmetric hollow fibre membranes and case studies of air separation. *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 2012, 90(5): 1253-1268
180. Soroodan Miandoab E, Kentish S E, Scholes C A. Non-ideal modelling of polymeric hollow-fibre membrane systems: Pre-combustion CO₂ capture case study. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2020, 595: 117470
181. Franz J, Scherer V. An evaluation of CO₂ and H₂ selective polymeric membranes for CO₂ separation in IGCC processes. *Journal of Membrane Science*, 2010, 359(1-2): 173-183
182. Basile A, Dalena F, Tong J, Veziroğlu T N. Hydrogen Production, Separation and Purification for Energy. UK: The Institution of Engineering and Technology, 2017

- 1
2
3 183. Liemberger W, Halmschlager D, Miltner M, Harasek M. Efficient extraction of hydrogen
4 transported as co-stream in the natural gas grid – The importance of process design. Applied
5 Energy, 2019, 233-234: 747-763
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60