RESEARCH ARTICLE



Ion exchange capacity of synthetic zeolite L: a promising way for cerium recovery

Giorgia Confalonieri¹ · Giovanna Vezzalini² · Laura Maletti² · Francesco Di Renzo³ · Vittorio Gozzoli² · Rossella Arletti²

Received: 17 December 2021 / Accepted: 20 April 2022 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2022

Abstract

The increasing rare earth elements' (REE) demand to meet the market request and the current political scenario show that it is essential to find good solutions to recover these elements from waste (both industrial and mining). Zeolites are microporous materials with high cation exchange capacity, up to now only little investigated for REE recycle. Here, we propose the use of NH_4^+ -exchanged zeolite L for Ce recovery from a very diluted solution (0.002 M), mimicking the Ce³⁺ concentration of the liquors deriving from the leaching of spent catalysts. The aim of this work is twofold: (i) to investigate the exploitability of zeolite L as cation exchanger in the Ce recovery; and (ii) to determine the best working conditions. The investigated process consists of a coupled cation exchange: (1) in the first exchange the NH_4^+ cations — present in the zeolite porosities — are exchanged with the Ce³⁺ ions in the solution; and (2) in the second experiment, the Ce³⁺ trapped into the zeolite is recovered through a further exchange with NH_4 . The best working conditions for Ce³⁺ exchange of NH_4 -zeolite L are: batch system, liquid/solid ratio equal to 90 mL/g and 180 mL/g, 24 h of contact at 25 °C. The resulting Ce adsorption capacity (q_i) is equal to ~25 mg/g and ~39 mg/g and the removal efficiency 100% and 77% for the two tested liquid/solid ratios, respectively. The kinetics was proved to be fast and consistent with industrial timing; no energy cost for temperature setting is required; and the acid pH (~4) of the solutions does not affect the zeolite structure stability and its exchange performance. It has been demonstrated that the zeolite framework is not affected by the exchange so that the same absorbent material can be employed many times.

Keywords Ce recovery · Zeolite L · Cation exchange · Waste recovery · Exchange kinetics

Responsible Editor: Tito Roberto Cadaval Jr

Rossella Arletti rossella.arletti@unimore.it

Giorgia Confalonieri giorgia.confalonieri@esrf.fr

- ¹ ID22, Structure of Materials European Synchrotron Radiation Facility 71, Avenue des Martyrs, 384043 Grenoble, France
- ² Dipartimento di Scienze Chimiche e Geologiche, Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Via Giuseppe Campi, 103, 41125 Modena, Italy
- ³ ICGM, University of Montpellier, CNRS, ENSCM, Centre Balard, 1919 Route de Mende, 34090 Montpellier, France

Introduction

Nowadays, the demand for rare earth elements (REE) is increasing due to their extensive use in many technological fields. However, the current political scenario - where REE are considered as strategic resources (Mancheri et al. 2019, Charalampides et al. 2015), the monopoly of only a few countries, the so-called balance problem between demand and natural abundance (Binnemans et al. 2018), and the need to limit the environmental costs of their mining (Haque et al. 2014, Suli et al. 2017), stress the necessity of a recycling policy of these elements. In terms of volumes, one of the most exploited REE is Ce (Charalampides et al. 2015, Binnemans et al. 2018), which is exploited in a huge number of devices such as NiMH batteries (Porvali et al. 2020), fluid catalytic cracking (FCC) catalysts (Innocenzi et al. 2015), redox support for three-way automotive catalysts and other metal catalysts (Gorte 2010), glass polishing and glass films

(Borra et al. 2018) and fluorescent lamps (Tunsu et al. 2016, Yurramendi et al. 2019). These materials contain a variable amount of REEs; for example, Ce dioxide reaches 40-99 wt% in glass polishing waste (Meshram and Abhilash, 2020) - where Ce is the most abundant REE, being at least 65 wt% of the whole REE content (Binnemans et al. 2013) and 5.3 wt% in automotive catalysts (Zhao et al. 2020), while in FCC Ce is 0.2–0.3 wt% (Meshram and Abhilash, 2020), only 10 wt% of the total REE amount (Binnemans et al. 2013). The liquors obtained by leaching these exhausted components can present Ce concentrations ranging from ~0.02 M for the leached solutions coming from the residual waste of exhausted automobile catalysts (Ilyas et al. 2021) to 0.002 M for FCC (Innocenzi et al. 2015). A strategy for the extraction of Ce from these acid solutions is mandatory for the efficient recycling of this metal. Different methods were already tested for REE recovery such as precipitation (double salt precipitation, oxalate precipitation, carbonate precipitation, hydroxide precipitation), solvent extraction (Meshram and Abhilash, 2020), adsorption (de Farias et al. 2021), or ion exchange (Royen & Fortkamp 2016). This last is usually applied using metal-organic frameworks (MOF) materials or resins; however, efficient recycling can be achieved using other porous materials such as zeolites.

Zeolites are microporous natural and synthetic materials characterized by: (i) porous open structures, which makes them good molecular sieves; (ii) ion exchange capacity; (iii) catalytic properties; (iv) adsorption capacity; and (v) reversible dehydration. Due to these properties, they can be exploited for energy storage purposes (Eroshenko et al. 2001, Soulard and Patarin, 2011, Krajnc et al. 2017, Confalonieri et al. 2018, Confalonieri et al. 2020), as agriculture amendments (Ramesh et al. 2011, Eroglu et al. 2017, Nakhli et al. 2017, Mendez-Arguello & Lira-Saldivar 2019), in medicine as drug delivery systems (Stylianou 2012, Bacakova et al. 2018), as scaffolds for organic molecules (Calzaferri et al. 2003, Gigli et al. 2018, Fabbiani et al. 2021) for CO₂ adsorption (Hong et al. 2014, Coudert & Kohen 2017, de Aquino et al. 2020), in catalysis (Corma 2003, Čejka et al. 2010), etc.

Despite the promising ion exchange properties of zeolites, just a few preliminary works investigated their use for REEs recycling (Faghihian et al. 2005, Duplouy 2016, Barros et al. 2019, Mosai et al. 2019) thus, their potential application to recover these elements from acid-leached liquors of industrial waste should be deeper explored.

In the present paper, we tested the efficiency of NH_4^+ -exchanged zeolite L (NH_4 -L) in Ce recovery from acid solutions. Zeolite L was reported as a promising candidate, among various tested zeolites (FER and FAU), for REE recovery (Duplouy 2016). A recent study by our group investigated the Ce exchange capacity of three different cationic forms of zeolite L and proved the efficacy of this

zeolite in exchanging Ce^{3+} from highly concentrated solutions (Confalonieri et al. 2021). The structural study gave new insight on the sites involved in the exchange and showed that after the Ce exchange, of the NH_4^+ zeolite L, the Ce recovery from the porosities was complete.

For the above-mentioned reasons, in the present work a NH_4^+ -exchanged form of zeolite L, was chosen to test the effectiveness in exchanging Ce from a very diluted solution ([Ce³⁺] = 0.002 M), which mimics the concentration reported for residual liquor of FCC waste (Innocenzi et al. 2015). We experimented different liquid/solid (l/s) ratios while, to follow the requirements of a green process, the temperature was maintained at 25 °C. In fact, several tests performed at higher (but mild) temperature did not indicate improvements in the cation exchange process. In a second step, the extraction of Ce from the Ce-exchanged L zeolite is obtained through a reverse exchange in a NH_4^+ solution. This final exchange is proposed to recover the Ce ions for further utilization by fully exploiting the reversibility of cation exchange in zeolites (Fig. 1).

This work is part of a wider project aimed at exploiting zeolite cation exchange properties to recover REE from waste, to move toward a green circular economy model. In fact, although some conventional adsorbents display high adsorption capacity, they have several limitations, including expensive production and difficult regeneration. Using zeolites for REE recovery will offer the possibility to exploit a material that can be recycled many times (probably for infinite cycles) and that does not need to be regenerated, since once the REE is recovered, the powder can be immediately reused.

We started by testing synthetic zeolites, since the use of pure materials allows a clearer understanding of the process occurring during the exchange and an easier following of the exchange kinetics. The further step of the project, to pursue a greener process, will the exploitation of natural zeolites, this in fact will allow the use of cheap materials, without



Fig. 1 Nutshell of the process

the need of a dedicated synthesis, allowing further energy saving. In addition, the use of an NH_4^+ solution for the first and final exchange will allow the use of the same solution for several exchange cycles, so to avoid waste of chemicals during the treatment stages.

Experimental section

Zeolite L

The synthetic zeolite L has formula $(K_6Na_3(H_2O)_{21}Al_9Si_{27}O_{72})$, $a = 18.4 \text{ Å} c = 7.52 \text{ Å}, \gamma = 120^{\circ}$ and LTL framework type (Baerlocher and McCusker, n.d.). This framework is composed by small cages and two mono-dimensional channels both running along the c axis of the unit cell: a channel built by connection of rings of 12 tetrahedra (12MR) and a smaller elliptical one delimited by rings of 8 tetrahedra (8MR). In the as-synthesized K form, cations occupy different crystallographic positions: two of them participate to the cation exchange — being hosted in the channels — whereas those hosted in the cages cannot be exchanged. The NH₄⁺ exchanged form of synthetic K-L zeolite (NH_4 -L from now on), with chemical formula K_{2 25}(NH₄)_{6 86}Si_{26 91}Al_{9 08}O₇₂·17.07(H₂O), was fully characterized in Confalonieri et al. (2021). In the exchanged form, NH_4^+ ions substitute ~75% of the original K and are hosted just in the two channels (Fig. 2). NH_4^+ -exchanged form was chosen for this study since, once the Ce exchange will be obtained, the zeolite will be further NH_4^+ exchanged to recover Ce from the pores. In this way, the presence of NH_4^+ as unique exchangeable cation in the starting material will allow to obtain a final recovery solution



Fig. 2 Structure of NH_4^+ -exchanged zeolite L with chemical formula $K_{2.25}(NH_4)_{6.86}Si_{26.91}Al_{9.08}O_{72}\cdot17.07(H_2O)$. The extra framework species are drawn showing the fractional occupancy of their crystallographic sites (Confalonieri et al., 2021)

containing only NH_4^+ (easily removable and recyclable by evaporation) and Ce ions.

Ce exchange

A 0.002 M Ce^{3+} solution was prepared dissolving Ce(NO₃)₃·6H₂O (Cerium(III) nitrate hexahydrate, REacton®, 99.5% (REO) — Alfa Aesar) into double-distilled water. NH_{4} -L zeolite was put in contact for 72 h with the solution at 25 °C under stirring. The pH was initially set to 4.3 using HNO₃ to avoid Ce compound precipitation and to mimic the acid conditions of a real industrial waste liquor. The stability of the zeolite framework at this pH condition was tested in order to exclude the possibility of a dealumination process or structural modifications. The pH of the solution was constantly monitored showing a maximum variation from 4.3 to 4.9 after 72 h of contact with the zeolite. No buffer solution was used to avoid competition in the zeolite ion exchange. Various experiments were performed using different liquid/solid ratios (30, 60, 90, 180, 290, 750 mL/g) and the same contact time of 72 h. Several tests were performed at higher temperatures (up to 80 °C, data not reported), but, since they did not indicate improvements in the cation exchange process, we decided to work at room temperature. The exchanged samples were labelled *Ce-X*, where X is the liquid/solid ratio in mL/g. At the end of the process, all the exchanged zeolites were rinsed three times with double-distilled water using an ALC multi-speed centrifuge PK 121, operated at 5000 rpm for 10 min. The samples were finally dried at 60 °C for 24 h.

Ce recovery

All the Ce-exchanged zeolites, obtained as described in the previous section, were contacted for 24 h under stirring, at room temperature, with a solution $[NH_4^+] = 0.8$ M, prepared dissolving NH_4NO_3 (ammonium nitrate, 99%, Carlo Erba) in double-distilled water. The liquid/solid ratio was 60 mL/g; pH was not set. Zeolite samples so obtained are identified with the prefix *Rev*. At the end of the NH_4^+ -exchange, the powders were washed, dried following the procedure reported above, and analysed to check the Ce recovery.

Analytical methods

Inductively coupled plasma (ICP) analysis

The kinetic of Ce^{3+} exchange was monitored daily analysing the exchange solutions with ICP-OES technique. A small fraction of supernatants was withdrawn from the solutions, filtered by cellulose nitrate membrane (0.45 µm) and properly diluted. ICP analysis was performed using a Perkin Elmer Optima 4200 DV to measure the Ce content. Three analyses were performed for each sample, and the initial solution with $[Ce^{3+}] = 0.002$ M was also analysed and used as reference.

Thermogravimetric analysis (TG)

Seiko SSC/5200 thermal analyser was employed to perform thermogravimetric analysis. The temperature range was room temperature (r.t.) -1050 °C with a ramp of 10 °C/min under air flow.

Elemental analysis

Nitrogen content of zeolite samples was analysed through Flash 2000 CHNS/MAS200R instrument. "FLASH" dynamic combustion (modified Dumas method) allows to treat the sample at 1800 °C. Released elementary gases are separated through a chromatographic column and detected by a highly sensitive thermal conductivity (TCD) detector.

SEM-EDS analysis

Chemical analyses of the exchanged zeolites were performed by a scanning electron microscope (SEM) Nova NanoSEM 450 equipped with X-EDS Bruker QUANTAX-200 detector. Samples were prepared compressing the zeolite powders into thin self-supporting discs, then coated with gold. The instrument operated at 15 kV; five analyses for each sample were performed scanning the beam to avoid dehydration and cation migration in the zeolite. The obtained intensities were corrected using the phi-rho-Z method.

X-ray powder diffraction (XRPD)

Diffraction patterns of the original NH_4 -L (Confalonieri et al. 2021), *Ce-90*, *Ce-180*, *Rev-Ce-90*, and *Rev-Ce-180* were collected at ID22, high resolution beamline, of European Synchrotron Radiation Facility, Grenoble, using the new extremely brilliant source (EBS). Wavelength was set at 0.35426696 Å; diffraction intensities were recorded by an Eiger2 X CdTe 2M-W detector preceded by 13 Si(111) analyser crystals. Powder patterns were collected in Debye-Scherrer geometry.

Results and discussion

Ce exchange of NH₄-L

The results of elemental (Table S1) and SEM-EDS (Table S2) analyses of the exchanged zeolite are reported in the Supporting Information, while thermogravimetric curves



Fig. 3 TG (solid line) and DTG (dotted line) curves for zeolite samples exchanged with Ce. For a more readable figure, every TG curve is progressively shifted along the *y* axis of about -2%, while the corresponding DTG one is shifted progressively along the *y* axis of about $0.2\%/^{\circ}$ C.

Table 1 Chemical formula of Ce-exchanged NH_4 -L zeolites calculated from EDS analysis with nitrogen and H₂O content determined by elemental and TG analysis, respectively. Error of the analyses is calculated as reported in Gottardi and Galli (1985), using the following formula: Error% = $\frac{AI-K-NH_4-3Ce}{K+NH_4+3Ce}$ • 100

$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	Sample	Chemical formula	Error (%)
$\begin{array}{cccc} Ce-30 & \mathrm{K_{2.15}\ NH_{46.30}\ Ce_{0.18}\ Si_{26.80}\ Al_{9.24}\ O_{72}\ 17.56} & 2.90 \\ H_2\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{K_{2.19}\ NH_{45.95}\ Ce_{0.37}\ Si_{26.77}\ Al_{9.21}\ O_{72}\ 17.71} & -0.47 \\ H_2\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{K_{2.16}\ NH_{45.47}\ Ce_{0.55}\ Si_{26.79}\ Al_{9.15}\ O_{72}\ 18.90} & -1.59 \\ H_2\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{K_{2.11}\ NH_{44.97}\ Ce_{0.87}\ Si_{26.67}\ Al_{9.19}\ O_{72}\ 19.92} & -6.29 \\ H_2\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{K_{1.97}\ NH_{44.62}\ Ce_{0.93}\ Si_{26.70}\ Al_{9.26}\ O_{72}\ 20.00} & -1.59 \\ H_2\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{K_{1.89}\ NH_{44.44}\ Ce_{0.97}\ Si_{26.69}\ Al_{9.30}\ O_{72}\ 20.09} & 0.82 \\ H_2\mathrm{O} & \mathrm{K_{1.89}\ NH_{44.44}\ Ce_{0.97}\ Si_{26.69}\ Al_{9.30}\ O_{72}\ 20.09} & 0.82 \\ \end{array}$	NH ₄ -L	K _{2.25} (NH ₄) _{6.86} Si _{26.91} Al _{9.08} O ₇₂ ·17.07 H ₂ O	-0.3
$\begin{array}{cccc} Ce-60 & \mathrm{K}_{2.19}\mathrm{NH}_{45.95}\mathrm{Ce}_{0.37}\mathrm{Si}_{26.77}\mathrm{Al}_{9.21}\mathrm{O}_{72}17.71 & -0.47 \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O} & & \\ Ce-90 & \mathrm{K}_{2.16}\mathrm{NH}_{45.47}\mathrm{Ce}_{0.55}\mathrm{Si}_{26.79}\mathrm{Al}_{9.15}\mathrm{O}_{72}18.90 & -1.59 \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O} & & \\ Ce-180 & \mathrm{K}_{2.11}\mathrm{NH}_{44.97}\mathrm{Ce}_{0.87}\mathrm{Si}_{26.67}\mathrm{Al}_{9.19}\mathrm{O}_{72}19.92 & -6.29 \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O} & & \\ Ce-290 & \mathrm{K}_{1.97}\mathrm{NH}_{44.62}\mathrm{Ce}_{0.93}\mathrm{Si}_{26.70}\mathrm{Al}_{9.26}\mathrm{O}_{72}20.00 & -1.59 \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O} & & \\ Ce-750 & \mathrm{K}_{1.89}\mathrm{NH}_{44.44}\mathrm{Ce}_{0.97}\mathrm{Si}_{26.69}\mathrm{Al}_{9.30}\mathrm{O}_{72}20.09 & 0.82 \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O} & & \\ \end{array}$	Ce-30	$\begin{array}{c} K_{2.15}NH_{46.30}Ce_{0.18}Si_{26.80}Al_{9.24}O_{72}17.56\\ H_2O \end{array}$	2.90
$\begin{array}{cccc} Ce-90 & \mathrm{K_{2.16}\ NH_{45.47}\ Ce_{0.55}\ Si_{26.79}\ Al_{9.15}\ O_{72}\ 18.90} & -1.59 \\ \mathrm{H_{2}O} & & -1.59 \\ Ce-180 & \mathrm{K_{2.11}\ NH_{44.97}\ Ce_{0.87}\ Si_{26.67}\ Al_{9.19}\ O_{72}\ 19.92} & -6.29 \\ \mathrm{H_{2}O} & & -6.29 \\ Ce-290 & \mathrm{K_{1.97}\ NH_{44.62}\ Ce_{0.93}\ Si_{26.70}\ Al_{9.26}\ O_{72}\ 20.00} & -1.59 \\ \mathrm{H_{2}O} & & -1.59 \\ \mathrm{Ce}-750 & \mathrm{K_{1.89}\ NH_{44.44}\ Ce_{0.97}\ Si_{26.69}\ Al_{9.30}\ O_{72}\ 20.09} & 0.82 \\ \mathrm{H_{2}O} & & -1.59 \\ \end{array}$	Ce-60	$\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{K_{2.19}\ NH_{4\ 5.95}\ Ce_{0.37}\ Si_{26.77}\ Al_{9.21}\ O_{72}\ 17.71} \\ \mathrm{H_{2}O} \end{array}$	-0.47
$\begin{array}{cccc} Ce-180 & \mathrm{K}_{2.11} \mathrm{NH}_{44.97} \mathrm{Ce}_{0.87} \mathrm{Si}_{26.67} \mathrm{Al}_{9.19} \mathrm{O}_{72} 19.92 & -6.29 \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O} & \\ Ce-290 & \mathrm{K}_{1.97} \mathrm{NH}_{44.62} \mathrm{Ce}_{0.93} \mathrm{Si}_{26.70} \mathrm{Al}_{9.26} \mathrm{O}_{72} 20.00 & -1.59 \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O} & \\ Ce-750 & \mathrm{K}_{1.89} \mathrm{NH}_{44.44} \mathrm{Ce}_{0.97} \mathrm{Si}_{26.69} \mathrm{Al}_{9.30} \mathrm{O}_{72} 20.09 & 0.82 \\ \mathrm{H}_{2}\mathrm{O} & \end{array}$	Ce-90	$\begin{array}{c} K_{2.16} \mathrm{NH_{45.47}} \mathrm{Ce_{0.55}} \mathrm{Si_{26.79}} \mathrm{Al_{9.15}} \mathrm{O_{72}} \mathrm{18.90} \\ \mathrm{H_2O} \end{array}$	-1.59
$\begin{array}{ccc} Ce-290 & \mathrm{K}_{1.97} \mathrm{NH}_{44.62} \mathrm{Ce}_{0.93} \mathrm{Si}_{26.70} \mathrm{Al}_{9.26} \mathrm{O}_{72} 20.00 & -1.59 \\ \mathrm{H}_2\mathrm{O} & \\ Ce-750 & \mathrm{K}_{1.89} \mathrm{NH}_{44.44} \mathrm{Ce}_{0.97} \mathrm{Si}_{26.69} \mathrm{Al}_{9.30} \mathrm{O}_{72} 20.09 & 0.82 \\ \mathrm{H}_2\mathrm{O} & \end{array}$	Ce-180	$\begin{array}{c} K_{2.11} \mathrm{NH}_{44.97} \mathrm{Ce}_{0.87} \mathrm{Si}_{26.67} \mathrm{Al}_{9.19} \mathrm{O}_{72} \mathrm{19.92} \\ \mathrm{H}_2\mathrm{O} \end{array}$	-6.29
$\begin{array}{ccc} \textit{Ce-750} & \text{K}_{1.89} \text{NH}_{44.44} \text{Ce}_{0.97} \text{Si}_{26.69} \text{Al}_{9.30} \text{O}_{72} 20.09 & 0.82 \\ & \text{H}_2 \text{O} \end{array}$	Ce-290	$\begin{array}{c} K_{1.97} \mathrm{NH}_{44.62} \mathrm{Ce}_{0.93} \mathrm{Si}_{26.70} \mathrm{Al}_{9.26} \mathrm{O}_{72} 20.00 \\ \mathrm{H}_2\mathrm{O} \end{array}$	-1.59
	Ce-750	$\begin{array}{c} K_{1.89} NH_{44.44} Ce_{0.97} Si_{26.69} Al_{9.30} O_{72} 20.09 \\ H_2O \end{array}$	0.82

and chemical formulas are shown in Fig. 3 and Table 1, respectively.

As evident in Table 1, the H_2O content increases with the Ce amount. This is because: (i) Ce³⁺ has a larger solvation sphere in comparison to NH_4^+ (~9.1 (Lutz et al. 2012) versus ~5.8 (Chang & Dang 2003) H_2O molecules in the first hydration shell, respectively); and (ii) due to the reduced number of cations (trivalent Ce vs monovalent cations), more space is available in the channel (Confalonieri et al. 2021). The weight loss imputable to H_2O corresponds to the first peak of the derivative thermogravimetric analysis — DTG — curves. From Fig. 3, it is possible to observe a

shift at higher temperature of this peaks as a function of the liquid/solid ratio used in the exchange. This is related to the increase of exchanged Ce with increasing liquid/solid ratio used. In fact, being the bonds between the H₂O molecules and Ce stronger with respect to those with ammonium ions, the H₂O molecules are released at higher temperature (Confalonieri et al. 2021). The weight losses above 300 °C are related to the NH₄⁺ loss. TG results suggest a slightly higher NH₄⁺ content for samples with low liquid/solid ratio, corresponding to a lower Ce exchange, in agreement with elemental analyses (Table S1).

The kinetics of the Ce^{3+} exchange was monitored every 24 h (Fig. 4; Table S3).

From ICP results (Fig. 4; Table S3), it appears that the Ce³⁺ concentration into the solution decreases for all the liquid/solid ratios tested, so confirming that NH_4 -L zeo-lite extracts Ce³⁺ from the solutions. The exchange occurs mainly in the first 24 h (Fig. 4, bottom panel) and affects



mainly the NH_4^+ ions (Table 1). A slight decrease in the K content with respect to starting NH_4 -L sample is observed (Table 1), indicating that some residual K can be further exchanged by Ce (see discussion below). The data after 72 h of contact is stable enough to be considered as equilibrium values (Table S3), and the experiments with different residual Ce³⁺ amounts in solution allow to establish an experimental $Ce^{3+}-NH_4^+$ exchange isotherm, as shown in Fig. 5. The experimental points are expressed as Az vs As, where $Az = 3 Ce^{3+} / Al$ (molar) in the zeolite and As =C (Ce³⁺) / initial C (NH₄⁺) (equivalents) in solution. The isotherm can be fitted by a constant separation factor model Az = (K As Az_{max}) / (1 + K As), in which K = $\alpha_B^A - 1$, where $\alpha_B^A = (Az / As) / (Bz / Bs)$ is the separation factor, in which $Bz = NH_4^+ / Al$ (molar) in the zeolite and Bs = $C (NH_4^+)$ / initial $C (NH_4^+)$ (equivalents) in the solution (LeVan et al. 1997) (Breck 1984). The value of the separation factor of the exchange of Ce for ammonium is 67, indicating a much higher affinity of NH_4 -L for Ce than for ammonium. Such a value is not uncommon in the exchange of multivalent-monovalent cations in zeolites (Breck 1984). The isotherm reaches an asymptotic value of Az_{max} at 0.31. This corresponds to a clear limit of Ce content at ~1 Ce atom p.u.c. This value is very close to the 1.17 Ce p.u.c. reported for the NH_4 -L using a highly concentrated Ce solution, which represents the maximum Ce adsorption in zeolite L and involves only sites positioned in the main channel

In conclusion, Ce cannot saturate all the anion sites of zeolite L; however, the aim of this work is not to obtain the complete cation exchange of the zeolite, but rather to define the best conditions to recover Ce from a very diluted liquor. In particular, we would like to: (1) obtain an efficient uptake

(Confalonieri et al. 2021).



Fig. 4 Percentage of Ce withdrawn from the solution (i.e. exchanged) by the zeolite after 3 days of contact with the solutions at various liquid/solid ratios. The total percentage of exchanged Ce is reported in the top panel, while in the bottom one, the Ce percentage after 24, 48, and 72 h is shown. The anomalous behaviour of sample Ce-750 is explained in Table S3.

Fig. 5 Ce-NH₄ exchange isotherm in NH_4 -L. The experimental points are expressed as Az vs As, where Az = 3 Ce³⁺ / Al (molar) in the zeolite and As = C (Ce³⁺) / initial C (NH⁴⁺) (equivalents) in solution

of Ce, reducing at the minimum the Ce left in the solution and, in the meantime (2) achieve a high concentration of Ce in the zeolite to reduce the number of uptake-recovery cycles; and (3) prove that the same zeolite powder can be used many times to recover Ce from solutions. Among the tested systems, two demonstrated to be the most suitable for these purposes: *Ce-90* and *Ce-180*, showing an uptake of 100% and 77% of the Ce in the solution the first 24 h (Fig. 4; Table S3)

Ce recovery

The Ce recovery from the Ce exchanged zeolites was fulfilled through a further exchange with a NH_4^+ 0.8 M solution.

As reported in Table 2 (and in Tables S4 and S5), an almost complete release of Ce is obtained for all the samples.

Table 2 Ce oxide (wt%) in zeolite samples before and after NH_4^+ exchanges (i.e. after Ce recovery), from EDS analysis

Name	Ce ₂ O ₃ (wt%)	Name	$Ce_2O_3 (wt\%)$
Ce-30	1.35 (8)	Rev-Ce-30	0.16 (11)
Ce-60	2.71 (2)	Rev-Ce-60	0.15 (5)
Ce-90	3.95 (6)	Rev-Ce-90	0.35 (32)
Ce-180	6.20 (15)	Rev-Ce-180	0.29 (12)
Ce-290	6.55 (60)	Rev-Ce-290	0.23 (10)
Ce-750	6.83 (32)	Rev-Ce-750	0.20 (10)

The effectiveness of the final exchange is also shown by the nitrogen content, which recovers the original value of NH_4 -L. To test the impact of these treatments on the zeolite structure and evaluate the possible reuse of the same zeolite powder in further cycles of Ce recovery, X ray powder diffraction patterns before and after the whole process were collected for the two most promising samples. In Fig. 6, the diffraction pattern of the original NH_4 -L (Confalonieri et al. 2021) is compared with that of samples Ce-90 and Ce-180 before and after the Ce recovery. The two samples containing Ce clearly show differences in the peak intensity ratios related to the incorporation of the REE in comparison to the original NH_4 -L (Fig. 6, left panel. These changes disappear completely after the second exchange with NH₄⁺ solution (Fig. 6, right panel), demonstrating a complete recovery of Ce. Neither structure modifications nor loss of crystallinity was detected.

Comparison with other adsorbent materials

The adsorption capacity of the two most promising samples was calculated as in Zhao et al. (2019):

$$q_t = (C_0 - C_t)V/m$$

where C_0 and C_t are the initial concentration and the residual concentration (mg/L) of Ce in the solution; V is the volume of Ce³⁺ solution (L), and m is the weight of the zeolite (g).



Fig. 6 Comparison between XRPD patterns of NH_4 -L (Confalonieri et al. 2021) and of the samples Ce-90 and Ce-80 before (left panel) and after (right panel) Ce recovery

Ce-90 and *Ce-180* show a Ce adsorption capacity (q_i) equal to ~25 mg/g and ~39 mg/g, respectively, for an initial Ce³⁺ concentration of 280 mg/L. Interesting evaluations can be made comparing the value calculated for Ce-180 with those obtained for other materials in similar conditions, such as those described in the review by De Farias et al. (2021). Our sample displays higher adsorption capacity than some reported adsorbents such as poly-yglutamic acid crosslinked with polyvinyl alcohol (Gao et al. 2015), which was, by the way, studied at lower concentration (100 mg/L), cyanobacteria of the genus Arthrospira (Sadovsky et al. 2016), as well as for some treated olive pomace (Akbas and Yusan, 2020). Similar performances, instead, are obtained by a novel hybrid inorganic materials $H_n PMo_{12}O_{40}$ (Fe(III)_xSn(II)_ySn(IV)_{1-x-y} (Yousefi et al. 2015), only if compared in similar experimental conditions (temperature, 25 °C, pH, ~4, while the concentration is lower, 100 mg/L). Differently, higher Ce adsorption capacity is shown by HKUST-1 metal-organic framework (MOF) (353 mg/g), but the subsequence process for REE recovery (methanol washing) is not able to completely remove the absorbed Ce³⁺. A high value is also displayed by monolithic multi-porous carboxymethyl cellulose-g-poly (acrylamide)/ attapulgite (205.48 mg/g), where the final Ce recovery was obtained using HCl solution, while the material was regenerated through NaOH solution with the need of neutralisation and formation of salt wastes (Wang et al. 2020).

Even if other materials showed adsorption capacity similar or higher than those shown by our systems (i.e. marine algae (Vijayaraghavan et al. 2010), polymers (Maruthapandi et al. 2020) (de Farias et al. 2021), the use of zeolites has many advantages and indicates them as potential interesting adsorbents to be exploited for a green recovery of REE. In fact, first of all, cationic zeolite syntheses are easy and do not require exotic and expensive organic chemicals to be realized. This work can, in addition, pave the way to the use of natural zeolites for REE recovery further improving the sustainability of the process.

Conclusions

 NH_4^+ -exchanged zeolite L demonstrated to be a suitable candidate for Ce recovery from a diluted solution ([Ce³⁺] = 0.002 M), which mimics the leached liquor from the residual waste of some industrial processes. Our work indicates that 100% of Ce can be already extracted in batch from the solution at room temperature, with a liquid/solid ratio of 90 mL/g and 24 h of contact between zeolite and solution. With a liquid/solid ratio of 180 mL/g, 77% Ce³⁺ in solution is drawn in 24 h and the zeolite approaches its maximum capacity, being ready for an effective counter-exchange cycle. In complete cycles of uptake and release of Ce, the counter-exchange of

 NH_4^+ for Ce³⁺ allowed the complete Ce recovery. The kinetics of the process was proved to be fast and consistent with industrial timing; no energy cost for temperature setting is required; and acid conditions of the solutions do not affect the zeolite structure. Despite the NH_4 -L should be tested in a more complex system (i.e. with a multicomponent solution), which better simulates a leached liquor, the obtained results are very promising for future industrial applications. This work can pave the way for the use of zeolites as "green tools" to recover REE from liquor of different nature in a circular economy perspective.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-20429-1.

Acknowledgements The authors thank Gianluca Malavasi and Lorenzo Tassi for the laboratory equipment and Massimo Tonelli, Monica Malavasi, Monica Vaccari, Simona Bigi and Michelangelo Polisi for their technical support.

Author contribution All the authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection, and analysis were performed by Giorgia Confalonieri, Vittorio Gozzoli and Laura Maletti. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Giorgia Confalonieri, and all the authors commented on the previous versions of the manuscript. All the authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data availability All the data are available in the supporting information file. Further data can be requested to the authors.

Declarations

Ethical approval Not applicable

Consent to participate Not applicable

Consent for publication All the authors agreed with the content and that all gave explicit consent to submit. They obtained consent from the responsible authorities at the institute/organization, where the work has been carried out.

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- Akbas YA, Yusan S (2020) Development and characterization of non-treated and chemically modified olive pomace biosorbents to remove Ce(III) ions from aqueous solutions. J. Radioanal. Nucl. Chem. 323:763–772
- Bacakova L, Vandrovcova M, Kopova I, Jirka I (2018) Applications of zeolites in biotechnology and medicine - a review. Biomat. Sci. 6:974–989
- Baerlocher C, McCusker LB (n.d.) Database of zeolite structures. http://www.iza-structure.org/databases/. Accessed 2021
- Barros O, Costa L, Costa F, Lago A, Rocha V, Vipotnik Z, Silva B, Tavares T (2019) Recovery of rare earth elements from wastewater towards a circular economy. Molecules 24:1005

- Binnemans K, Jones PT, Blanpain B, Van Gerven T, Yang YX, Walton A, Buchert M (2013) Recycling of rare earths: a critical review. J Clean Prod. 51:1–22
- Binnemans K, Jones PT, Müller T, Yurramendi L (2018) Rare earths and the balance problem: how to deal with changing markets? J Sustain Metall 4:126–146
- Borra CR, Vlugt TJH, Yang YX, Offerman SE (2018) Recovery of cerium from glass polishing waste: a critical review. Metals 8:801
- Breck DW (1984) Zeolite Molecular sieves, 2nd edition. Krieger, Malabar (FL) 529-592 pp
- Calzaferri G, Huber S, Maas H, Minkowski C (2003) Host-guest antenna materials. Angew Chem Int Ed 42:3732–3758
- Čejka J, Corma A, Zones S (2010) Zeolite and catalysis: synthesis, reactions and applications. Wyley-YCH, Weinheim
- Chang TM, Dang LX (2003) On rotational dynamics of an NH_4^+ ion in water. Chem Phys 118:8813–8820
- Charalampides G, Vatalis KI, Apostoplos B, Ploutarch-Nikolas B (2015) Rare earth elements: industrial applications and economic dependency of Europe. Procedia Econ Financ 24:126–135
- Confalonieri G, Ryzhikov A, Arletti R, Nouali H, Quartieri S, Daou TJ, Patarin J (2018) Intrusion-extrusion of electrolyte aqueous solutions in pure silica chabazite by in situ high pressure synchrotron X-ray powder diffraction. J Phys Chem C 122:28001–28012
- Confalonieri G, Daou TJ, Nouali H, Arletti R, Ryzhikov A (2020) Energetic performance of pure silica zeolites under high-pressure intrusion of LiCl aqueous solutions: an overview. Molecules 25:2145
- Confalonieri G, Vezzalini G, Quattrini F, Quartieri S, Dejoie C, Arletti R (2021) Ce-exchange capacity of zeolite L in different cationic forms: a structural investigation. J Appl Crystallogr 54:1766–1774
- Corma A (2003) State of the art and future challenges of zeolites as catalysts. J Catal 216:298–312
- Coudert FX, Kohen D (2017) Molecular insight into CO₂ "Trapdoor" adsorption in zeolite Na-RHO. Chem Mater 29:2724–2730
- de Aquino TF, Estevam ST, Viola VO, Marques CRM, Zancan FL, Vasconcelos LB, Riella HG, Pires MJR, Morales-Ospino R, Torres AEB, Bastos-Neto M, Cavalcante CL (2020) CO₂ adsorption capacity of zeolites synthesized from coal fly ashes. Fuel 276:118143
- de Farias ABV, da Costa TB, da Silva MGC, Vieira MGA (2021) Cerium recovery from aqueous solutions by bio/adsorption: a review in a circular economy context. J Clean Prod 326:129395
- Duplouy L (2016) Preliminary investigation of rare earth elements ion exchange on zeolites. Dissertation University of Helsinki, Université de Lille
- Eroglu N, Emekci M, Athanassiou CG (2017) Applications of natural zeolites on agriculture and food production. J Sci Food Agric 97:3487–3499
- Eroshenko V, Regis RC, Soulard M, Patarin J (2001) Energetics: a new field of applications for hydrophobic zeolites. J Am Chem Soc 123:8129–8130
- Fabbiani M, Confalonieri G, Morandi S, Arletti R, Quartieri S, Santoro M, Di Renzo F, Haines J, Fantini R, Tabacchi G, Fois E, Vezzalini G, Ricchiardi G, Martra G (2021) Steering polymer growth by molding nanochannels: 1,5-hexadiene polymerization in high silica mordenite. Microporous and Mesoporous Mater 311:110728
- Faghihian H, Amini MK, Nezamzadeh AR (2005) Cerium uptake by zeolite A synthesized from natural clinoptilolite tuffs. J Radioanal Nucl Chem 264:577–582
- Gao YQ, Zhang SM, Zhao KY, Wang ZW, Xu SX, Liang ZP, Wu K (2015) Adsorption of La³⁺ and Ce³⁺ by poly-gamma-glutamic acid crosslinked with polyvinyl alcohol. J Rare Earths 33:884–891
- Gigli L, Arletti R, Tabacchi G, Fabbiani M, Vitillo JG, Martra G, Devaux A, Miletto I, Quartieri S, Calzaferri G, Fois E (2018) Structure and host-guest interactions of perylene-diimide dyes in zeolite L nanochannels. J Phys Chem C 122:3401–3418

- Gorte RJ (2010) Ceria in catalysis: from automotive applications to the water gas shift reaction. AIChE 56:1126–1135
- Gottardi G, Galli E (1985) Natural zeolites. Minerals, Rocks and Mountains. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg
- Haque N, Hughes A, Lim S, Vernon C (2014) Rare earth elements: overview of mining, mineralogy, uses, sustainability and environmental impact. Resources 3:614–635
- Hong SH, Jang MS, Cho SJ, Ahn WS (2014) Chabazite and zeolite 13X for CO_2 capture under high pressure and moderate temperature conditions. Chem Commun 50:4927–4930
- Ilyas S, Kim H, Srivastava RR (2021) Hydrometallurgical recycling of rare earth metal-cerium from bio-processed residual waste of exhausted automobile catalysts. JOM 73:19–26
- Innocenzi V, Ferella F, De Michelis I, Veglio F (2015) Treatment of fluid catalytic cracking spent catalysts to recover lanthanum and cerium: comparison between selective precipitation and solvent extraction. J Ind Eng Chem 24:92–97
- Krajnc A, Varlec J, Mazaj M, Ristic A, Logar NZ, Mali G (2017) Superior performance of microporous aluminophosphate with LTA topology in solar-energy storage and heat reallocation. Adv Energy Mater 7:1601815
- LeVan MD, Carta G, Yon CMRHP, D.W. Green (Eds.) (1997): Adsorption and ion exchange. In: Perry RH, Green DW (Editors), Perry's chemical engineering handbook, 7th edition. McGraw-Hill, New York
- Lutz OMD, Hofer TS, Randolf BR, Rode BM (2012) Computational study of the cerium(III) ion in aqueous environment. Chem Phy. Lett. 539:50–53
- Mancheri NA, Sprecher B, Bailey G, Ge JP, Tukker A (2019) Effect of Chinese policies on rare earth supply chain resilience. Resour Conserv Recycl 142:101–112
- Maruthapandi M, Luong JHT, Gedanken A (2020) Nitrogenenriched porous benzimidazole-linked polymeric network for the adsorption of La (III), Ce (III), and Nd (III). J Phys Chem C 124:6206–6214
- Mendez-Arguello B, Lira-Saldivar RH (2019) Potential use of zeolite on sustainable agriculture for the new green revolution. Ecosistemas Y Recursos Agropecuarios 6:191–193
- Meshram P, Abhilash (2020) Recovery and recycling of cerium from primary and secondary resources- a critical review. Miner Process Extr Metall Rev 41:279–310
- Mosai AK, Chimuka L, Cukrowska EM, Kotze IA, Tutu H (2019) The recovery of rare earth elements (REEs) from aqueous solutions using natural zeolite and bentonite. Water Air Soil Pollut 230:188
- Nakhli SAA, Delkash M, Bakhshayesh BE, Kazemian H (2017) Application of zeolites for sustainable agriculture: a review on water and nutrient retention. Water Air Soil Pollut 228:464
- Porvali A, Agarwal V, Lundstrom M (2020) REE(III) recovery from spent NiMH batteries as REE double sulfates and their simultaneous hydrolysis and wet-oxidation. Waste Manage 107:66–73
- Ramesh K, Reddy DD, Biswas AK, Rao AS (2011) Zeolites and their potential uses in agriculture. In: Advances in agronomy. Vol 113, pp 215-236
- Royen H, Fortkamp U (2016) Rare earth elements purification, separation and recycling. Report of IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute 2016
- Sadovsky D, Brenner A, Astrachan B, Asaf B, Gonen R (2016) Biosorption potential of cerium ions using Spirulina biomass. J Rare Earths 34:644–652
- Soulard M, Patarin J (2011): Process for high-pressure energy storage by solvation/desolvation and associated storage device. Patent, France
- Stylianou MA (2012) Natural zeolites in medicine. In: Handbook of natural zeolites, Bentham Science Publishers pp 317-334

- Suli LM, Ibrahim WHW, Aziz BA, Deraman MR, Ismail NA (2017) A review of rare earth mineral processing technology. Chem Eng Res Bull 19:20
- Tunsu C, Ekberg C, Foreman M, Retegan T (2016) Targeting fluorescent lamp waste for the recovery of cerium, lanthanum, europium, gadolinium, terbium and yttrium. Miner Process. Extr. Metall. 125:199–203
- Vijayaraghavan K, Sathishkumar M, Balasubramanian R (2010) Biosorption of lanthanum, cerium, europium, and ytterbium by a brown marine alga, turbinaria conoides. Ind Eng Chem Res 49:4405–4411
- Wang F, Zhu YF, Wang AQ (2020) Preparation of carboxymethyl cellulose-g-poly(acrylamide)/attapulgite porous monolith with an eco-friendly pickering-MIPE template for Ce(III) and Gd(III) adsorption. Frontiers in Chemistry 8:398
- Yousefi T, Yavarpour S, Mousavi SH, Torab-Mostaedi M, Davarkhah R, Mobtaker HG (2015) Effective removal of Ce(III) and Pb(II) by new hybrid nano-material: HnPMo12O40@Fe(III)(x)Sn(II)(y) Sn(IV)(1-x-y). Process Saf Environ Prot 98:211–220

- Yurramendi L, Gijsemans L, Forte F, Aldana JL, del Rio C, Binnemans K (2019) Enhancing rare-earth recovery from lamp phosphor waste. Hydrometallurgy 187:38–44
- Zhao L, Azhar MR, Li XJ, Duan XG, Sun HQ, Wang SB, Fang XC (2019) Adsorption of cerium (III) by HKUST-1 metal-organic framework from aqueous solution. J Colloid Interface Sci 542:421–428
- Zhao ZX, Qiu ZF, Yang J, Ma BT, Li Z, Lu SG, Xu YY, Cao LM, Zhang W (2020) Recovery of rare earth element cerium from spent automotive exhaust catalysts using a novel method. Waste and Biomass Valorization 11:4967–4976

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.