Chemoinformatics-Driven Design of New Physical Solvents for Selective CO₂ Absorption

Alexey Orlov, Daryna Yu. Demenko, Charles Bignaud, Alain Valtz, Gilles Marcou, Dragos Horvath, Christophe Coquelet, Alexandre Varnek, Frédérick de Meyer

► To cite this version:

Alexey Orlov, Daryna Yu. Demenko, Charles Bignaud, Alain Valtz, Gilles Marcou, et al.. Chemoinformatics-Driven Design of New Physical Solvents for Selective CO₂ Absorption. Environmental Science and Technology, 2021, 55 (22), pp.15542-15553. 10.1021/acs.est.1c04092. hal-03435228

HAL Id: hal-03435228

<https://hal.science/hal-03435228>

Submitted on 24 Nov 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Chemoinformatics-driven design of new physical solvents for selective CO₂ absorption

*Alexey A. Orlov[§], Daryna Yu. Demenko[§], Charles Bignaud[†], Alain Valtz[‡], Gilles Marcou[§],
Dragos Horvath[§], Christophe Coquelet[‡], Alexandre Varnek^{§*}, Frédérick de Meyer^{†‡*}.*

[§] Laboratory of Chemoinformatics, Faculty of Chemistry, University of Strasbourg, Strasbourg,
67081 France

[†] TotalEnergies S.E., Exploration Production, Development and Support to Operations,
Liquefied Natural Gas – Acid Gas Entity, CCUS R&D Program, Paris, 92078 France

[‡] MINES ParisTech, PSL University, Centre de thermodynamique des procédés (CTP), 35 rue St
Honoré, 77300 Fontainebleau, France

*Keywords: gas solubility, industrial gases, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen, hydrogen, carbon
monoxide, chemoinformatics, machine learning*

ABSTRACT

The removal of CO₂ from gases is an important industrial process in the transition to a low-carbon economy. The use of selective physical (co-)solvents is especially perspective in cases when the amount of CO₂ is large as it enables one to lower the energy requirements for solvent regeneration. However, only a few physical solvents have found industrial application and the design of new ones can pave the way to more efficient gas treatment techniques. Experimental screening of gas solubility is a labor-intensive process, and solubility modeling is a viable strategy to reduce the number of solvents subject to experimental measurements. In this paper, a chemoinformatics-based modeling workflow was applied to build a predictive model for the solubility of CO₂ and four other industrially important gases (CO, CH₄, H₂, N₂). A dataset containing solubilities of gases in 280 solvents was collected from literature sources and supplemented with the new data for six solvents measured in the present study. A modeling workflow based on the usage of several state-of-the-art machine learning algorithms was applied to establish quantitative structure-solubility relationships. The best models were used to perform virtual screening of the industrially produced chemicals. It enabled the identification of compounds with high predicted CO₂ solubility and selectivity towards the other gases. The prediction for one of the compounds – 4-Methylmorpholine was confirmed experimentally.

SYNOPSIS STATEMENT

Developing better solvents for selective CO₂ capture is crucial for reaching net-zero emissions targets.

INTRODUCTION

Global warming due to increasing levels of greenhouse gases CO_2 and CH_4 in the atmosphere has become a major public issue. Several companies and countries have announced ambitious plans to reach net zero CO_2 emissions by 2050. According to the International Energy Agency, Carbon Capture, Utilization or Storage (CCUS) will likely play an important role in achieving this goal.¹ Numerous materials for CO_2 capturing from gases were suggested, including chemical and physical solvents, zeolites, metal oxides, metal-organic frameworks, and membranes.^{2,3} The applicability of a certain technology in each case depends on many factors, including the concentrations of CO_2 and of other components in the gas, the pressure of the gas feed, the temperature, etc. In cases, wherein the partial pressure of CO_2 in a gas mixture is sufficiently large, physical solvents represent a perspective alternative to the conventionally used aqueous amines mixtures because of the lower energy requirement. Indeed, a large part of a physical solvent can be regenerated by pressure swing and air stripping, while the regeneration of chemical solvents requires heating and steam stripping.^{3,4} Pre-combustion CO_2 capture is a key example of a case with a CO_2 partial pressure sufficiently high to use physical solvents. In a pre-combustion process the feed (e.g. coal, natural gas, biomass, etc.) is converted into syngas (H_2 and CO) via gasification, steam reforming, auto thermal reforming or partial oxidation and subsequently the CO is further converted into CO_2 and H_2 via the water gas shift reaction. Typical CO_2 concentrations are in the range of 15 to 60 mol% for a total pressure of 2 to 7 MPa, thus, the CO_2 can be captured with a physical solvent⁵. The other components are mainly H_2 , but also CO , N_2 , CH_4 , H_2O (saturation). The composition strongly depends on the feedstock and on the process. At the moment, only a limited number of physical solvents such as methanol (Rectisol® process), propylene carbonate (Fluor® process), N-acetyl and N-formyl morpholines

(Morphysorb® process), 1-methylpyrrolidin-2-one (Purisol® process), polyethylene glycol ethers (Selexol® process), found application in the industrial CO₂ capture processes. Physical solvents are also often added to chemical solvents (so-called hybrid solvents), for example, to increase the selectivity of absorption towards a specific gas component, to lower the regeneration energy, etc. Examples are sulfolane (Sulfinol® process), thiodiglycol (Hysweet ® process), etc. The search for new physical (co-)solvents is thus an important task.⁶

New suitable solvents should satisfy many criteria, among which are a decent capacity to absorb CO₂, a competitive price, a low volatility (to avoid solvent losses), a low viscosity, etc. Another very important criterium is the selectivity towards CO₂ which should be high enough to obtain a CO₂ stream of acceptable purity for re-utilization or storage, and to avoid losses of valuable chemicals like CH₄. Depending on the source of the CO₂, the selectivity criteria are different. For the removal of CO₂ from natural gas the co-absorption of mainly CH₄, but also of N₂ and H₂O and eventually H₂S should be limited. For a steam methane reformer (SMR), which in a near future is likely to play a key role in the massive production of blue hydrogen from natural gas, the absorption of CO₂ with a high selectivity towards H₂ is important^{7,8}, but also towards CO, H₂O, N₂ and CH₄^{7,8}. The CO₂ present in flue gas from boilers should be removed with a high selectivity towards N₂, but the co-absorption of water and SO_x, NO_x should be low too.

Experimental screening of gas solubility is a time and labor-intensive process, and solubility modeling is a viable strategy to reduce the costs of the required experiments. There were numerous approaches suggested for modeling gas solubility in pure physical solvents. In the work by Pirig et al.⁹ a five-parameter linear equation based on the experimentally measured properties was used to model the solubility in 58 solvents. In the work by Li et al.¹⁰, artificial

neural networks were used to model CO₂ mole fraction solubility in 11 solvents (alcohols, ethers, ketones) at different temperatures and pressures. Several structural features (number of C-H, O-H, C-O, C=O bonds, number of rotatable bonds, etc.) and physical properties of the compounds (density, dipole moment, etc.) were used as descriptors. It enabled achieving high precision of predictions for certain types of physical solvents under varying experimental conditions. Nonetheless, the major disadvantage of the modeling approaches based on experimentally measured parameters – the limited number of compounds for which the parameters are available, complicates their usage for large-scale virtual screening of solvent candidates.

Alternative strategies for modeling CO₂ solubility, that require less preliminary knowledge of the experimental properties, were also suggested. In the works of Li et al.¹¹ and Shi et al.¹² molecular simulations were used to predict CO₂ solubility in nine and twenty-seven physical solvents respectively. Although high predictive accuracy was achieved in both works, molecular simulations are also not very convenient for the large-scale virtual screening, as they are time-consuming and require significant computational resources. Alternatively, the conductor-like screening model for real solvents (COSMO-RS),¹³ a method combining quantum chemical calculations with statistical thermodynamics, was suggested to rapidly screen large sets of various materials. In the work by Kim et al.¹⁴ CO₂ and CH₄ Henry's law coefficients were predicted by COSMO-RS for 63 common liquid solvents and 10 ionic liquids at 300 K. Unfortunately, there was no comparison of the predicted solubilities with the available experimental data.

A pool of gas solubility data accumulated in scientific literature supports applying machine learning for quantitative structure-solubility relationships (QSPR) modeling. In this approach chemical structures of compounds are encoded as vectors of molecular descriptors and machine

learning algorithms are then applied for modeling the property of interest. As compared to the modeling based on the usage of experimentally determined parameters or resource-intensive molecular simulations, this method allows efficient screening of large numbers of compounds. To our knowledge, there was only one work related to QSPR modeling of CO₂ solubility in physical solvents published.¹⁵ In the paper of Gorji et al.,¹⁵ Henry coefficients for 22 solvents composed only of carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen elements at different temperatures were used to build a multiple linear regression model with Dragon¹⁶ descriptors. Although good predictive performance was achieved, the applicability domain (AD) of this model is limited to the specific classes of compounds used for model building. Except for recent publications on H₂S solubility modeling^{17,18}, to our knowledge there were no papers describing the application of the chemoinformatics-driven methods for physical solubility modeling of the major components encountered in natural gas treatment or in the pre-combustion CO₂ capture process : carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), carbon monoxide (CO), hydrogen (H₂), and nitrogen (N₂). Hence, the investigation of the perceptiveness of using chemoinformatics for the rational design of new solvents for the absorption of CO₂ and other industrial gases is an important task.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data collection and preprocessing

A dataset containing mole fraction solubility values (χ) for 280 liquid solvents at 298.15 K and 1 atm was collected (Table S1, Supporting Information) from IUPAC reports^{19–23}, scientific literature^{24–75}, and patents^{76,77}. The mole fraction solubility for a binary (gas-liquid) system is defined¹⁹ as:

$$\chi = \frac{n(g)}{n(g)+n(l)} \quad (1)$$

n(g) – an amount of substance in a gas phase, n(l) – an amount of substance in a liquid phase.

Median values were then taken for the solvents associated to several reliable measurements of χ at the particular temperature. The final dataset used for modeling is present in Table S1 (Supporting Information). Extrapolation and interpolation of the data to 298.15 K were performed assuming a linear variation of Henry's coefficients with temperature or by the equations suggested in the IUPAC report or corresponding papers. The compounds that are structural outliers with respect to the training set majority, comprising water, carbon disulfide, octamethylcyclotetrasiloxane and hydrazines were not included to the dataset. These compounds contain rare or unique fragments significantly affecting their gas-absorbing properties, and, hence, confident predictions cannot be obtained for them by statistical modeling.

The collected mole fraction solubilities were converted to the Kuenen coefficients S using the following formula⁷⁸:

$$S = \frac{R \times T \times P}{M_w} \times \frac{\chi}{1 - \chi} \quad (2)$$

S – Kuenen coefficient (m^3kg^{-1}), R – ideal gas constant ($8.314 \text{ m}^3\text{PaK}^{-1}\text{mol}^{-1}$), T and P – standard temperature and pressure (273.15 K and 101.325 kPa), M_w – molecular weight of compound (kgmol^{-1}), χ – mole fraction solubility value.

The Kuenen coefficient is the volume of saturated gas reduced at 273.15 K and 1 atm pressure, which is dissolved by unit mass of pure solvent at the temperature of measurement and partial pressure of 1 atm. This parameter is widely used in industrial applications, as it enables one to

directly estimate the efficiency of the particular solvent related to its cost and dimensions of the required industrial unit (design-capital expenses cost CAPEX). Here, Kuenen coefficients were used for the data analysis and models interpretation.

The selectivity index SI was calculated using the following formula:

$$SI = \frac{\chi_{CO_2}}{\chi_{gas}} \quad (3)$$

SI – selectivity index, experimental or predicted χ_{CO_2} and χ_{gas} – mole fraction solubilities of CO_2 and other gases respectively.

All χ values were also transformed to a logarithmic scale, i.e. the negative value of the decimal logarithm was taken (Figure S1).

Modeling

Standardization

All compound structures were standardized using in-house standardization procedures based on KNIME,⁷⁹ which included aromatization, stereochemistry depletion, etc.

Descriptors

193 different ISIDA fragment descriptor sets were generated using the Fragmentor17 software.^{80,81} ISIDA fragments represent either sequences (the shortest topological paths with an explicit representation of all atoms and bonds), atom-centered fragments (all connected atoms to a certain topological distance), or triplets (all the possible combinations of 3 atoms in a graph with the topological distance between each pair indicated). The number of fragments in each set

varied from 30-40 (for short sequences of atoms/bonds) to 400-1200 (for long sequences up to 6 atoms) for different gases.

Quantum chemical descriptors resulted from DFT calculations in the gas phase, with model wB97X-D 6-31G* performed with the Spartan 18.0 program⁸². Default QSAR descriptors available in Spartan including energy, dipole moment, E_{HOMO} , and E_{LUMO} were calculated.

Machine learning algorithms

Random forest (RF): RF algorithm⁸³ implemented in sci-kit learn library (v. 0.22.1)^{84,85} was used. The following hyperparameters were tuning during optimization (grid search): number of trees (100, 300, 1000), number of features (all features, one-third of all features, $\log_2$ of the number of features), the maximum depth of the tree (5, 10, full tree), bootstrapping (with and without the usage of bootstrap samples for building the tree).

XGBoost (XGB): XGBoost algorithm⁸⁶ as implemented in XGBoost python module (v.1.2.0)⁸⁷ was used. The following hyperparameters were tuning during optimization (grid search): number of trees (50, 100, 300, 500), number of features (all features, 70% of all features), number of samples (all samples, 70% of all samples), the maximum depth of the tree (3, 5, 10), learning rate (0.3, 0.1, 0.5, 0.05), the minimum sum of instance weight needed in a node (1, 5, 10). All other parameters were left as default.

Support vector regression (SVR): SVR algorithm⁸⁸ implemented in sci-kit learn library (v. 0.22.1), was used. The descriptors were scaled to the [0,1] range before applying the algorithm. The following hyperparameters were tuning during optimization (grid search): kernel (linear, rbf,

poly, sigmoid), kernel coefficient (1, 0.1, 0.01, 0.001, 0.0001), regularization parameter (0.1, 1, 10, 100, 1000).

Model validation workflow

The modeling workflow was implemented using sci-kit learn library (v. 0.22.1) in python 3.7 scripting language. Identical modeling workflows were used for solubility modeling (expressed as $-\lg \chi$) of all gases. At the first stage of the modeling, a machine learning algorithm: RF, SVR and XGB were tested in 5-fold cross-validation, which was repeated 5 times (Figure S2). For each descriptor set, the model's measures of performance were calculated and several models with a coefficient of determination $Q^2_{CV} \geq 0.7$ were selected for consensus modeling.

The following equations were used to calculate the measures of the model's performance in cross-validation:

$$Q^2_{CV} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^5 (1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_{i,exp} - y_{i,pred})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_{i,exp} - \bar{y})^2})}{5} \quad (4)$$

$$RMSE_{CV} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^5 \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_{i,exp} - y_{i,pred})^2}{n}}}{5} \quad (5)$$

$$MAE_{CV} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^5 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|y_{i,exp} - y_{i,pred}|}{n}}{5} \quad (6)$$

Above, n is the number of compounds in the entire learning set, $y_{i,exp}$, $y_{i,pred}$ experimental and values predicted in 5-fold cross-validation for compound i from the learning set, j is the index of the repetition of the 5-fold cross-validation procedure. For each measure of the model's performance, the standard deviation over 5 repetitions was calculated.

Each of the selected models was then associated with an Applicability Domain (AD), defined as a bounding box.⁸⁹ Hence, the pool of selected models extracted from the given data set was used as a consensus predictor, returning for each input solvent candidate a mean value of solubility estimates and its standard deviation, taken over the predictions returned by each model in the pool, if the compounds appeared outside AD of all the models, or, alternatively, over the predictions returned by only those models having the candidate within their AD.

Outlying data points were defined as the data points for which absolute errors ($|\chi_{\text{exp}} - \chi_{\text{pred}}|$) from cross-validation were larger than $2 \times \text{RMSE}_{\text{CV}}$ threshold.

Y-randomization test

The absence of chance correlation was checked through the Y-randomization procedure. Y-randomization test was performed in the following way: $-\lg\chi$ values (y values) were shuffled, surrogate models from the cross-validation were built using shuffled values and the values from the corresponding cross-validation test set were calculated. This procedure was repeated 100 times for each fold and the maximum values of the coefficient of determination were compared with the coefficient of determination obtained for the original $-\lg\chi$ values.

Virtual screening

An in-house dataset comprising 4,082 industrially produced compounds and their structural analogs was screened in the following way. Only structures containing the same atoms (C, H, N, O, S, P, halogens) as in the learning set were kept. All structures were standardized and ISIDA descriptors were calculated for them as described above. Individual ISIDA models refitted to the entire dataset with the hyperparameters selected in the cross-validation were used

to compose the final consensus model as described above. Then, predictions were made using the ISIDA consensus model. Only compounds that were inside the applicability domain defined as bounding box for at least three ISIDA fragment types were considered.

Software implementation

The developed model was implemented into the ISIDA-Predictor software.⁸¹

Experimental measurement of CO₂ solubility

A “static-synthetic” technique based on a closed-circuit method^{90–92} was used for the determination of CO₂ solubility in the solvents. In this method, which is explained in detail in the supplementary information (Text S1, Figures S3, S4), the system pressure is measured at constant temperature for different overall compositions. To determine the global compositions, the quantities of pure substances charged into the stirred equilibrium cell, which is evacuated and placed in a thermostatic liquid bath, need to be known precisely. The purified and degassed solvents are charged into the cell as compressed liquids using thermostatted piston injectors. Then, the gas is added stepwise as a liquefied gas using the same injection pumps or as a gaseous component using a thermo-regulated gas bomb. Knowing the pressure, temperature, and volume of the gas bomb, the amount of gas inside the bomb can be calculated using correlated PvT data of the gas. Thus, the injected amount of gas can be obtained from the pressure difference in the bomb before and after each injection.

Since only temperature, pressure, total loadings, gas-liquid interface level and total volumes are measured, the compositions of the coexisting phases need to be determined by the evaluation of the raw data. From the known amount of solvent, the liquid phase volume is determined using

precise information about the density of the liquid solution inside the equilibrium chamber. From the total volume of the cell, the remaining gas phase volume can be calculated precisely (see supplementary information). At given equilibrium conditions (temperature, gas phase volume, and gas pressure) the amounts of gas in the gas phase and thus, also in the liquid phase are obtained. In this approach, several effects influence the resulting liquid phase compositions. These effects are the small amounts of solvents in the gas phase, the compressibility of the solvent under the gas pressure, the partial molar volume of the dissolved gas and the solvent activity coefficient. All effects are considered in an isothermal and isochoric algorithm by solving the mass and volume balances.

The partial pressure is obtained during the iterative procedure:

$$P_{\text{gas}} = P_{\text{sys}} - P_{\text{solvent}} \quad (6)$$

where P_{gas} – partial pressure of the acid gas in the system, P_{sys} – total pressure in the system, P_{solvent} – partial pressure of a solvent vapour. This equation is valid at low pressure and in the absence of chemical reactions in the gas phase. The method to calculate the uncertainty of the measured experimental data is explained in the supplementary information. The uncertainty of the measured CO_2 solubility at 1 atm. is equal or lower than 1%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data collection, preprocessing and analysis

IUPAC reports on gas solubilities in non-aqueous solvents contain to our knowledge the most complete and carefully analyzed publicly available data on gas solubility. The data from these reports were used to compose the “cores” of our datasets. As the largest number of data points

for various solvents was available at 298.15 K and 1 atm, the data at this temperature and pressure was chosen for modeling. Since the mole fraction values can vary significantly depending on the experimental methods being used, we chose only the data points which were considered as the most reliable by IUPAC's or Total's experts. Data from recent publications either at 298.15 K or obtained by extrapolation or interpolation of the data measured at close temperatures were also added to the dataset.

Besides the data collected from IUPAC reports and literature, data points for six compounds, hexametapol (HMPA), 1,3-Dimethylimidazolidin-2-one (DMI), thiodiglycol (TDG), and three tertiary amines 2-[2-hydroxyethyl(methyl)amino]ethanol (MDEA), 2-[ethyl(2-hydroxyethyl)amino]ethanol (EDEA), and 2-[2-(diethylamino)ethoxy]ethanol (DEAE-EO) were measured experimentally and added to the dataset (Figure 1a; Table S1). The choice of the solvents was motivated by their wide application in industrial processes and the absence of consistent data at 298.15 K for them in the literature. TDG is employed in a commercial mixed chemical/physical solvent formulation for sour gas treating (HySWEET technology) developed by TotalEnergies S.E.⁹³ HMPA and DMI are being used as solvents for gases, polymers, and in organic synthesis. Aqueous amines are used as chemical solvents, and only little is known about the physical solubility of gases in pure amines. One of the few examples is MDEA, which, in an aqueous solution, is commonly used for industrial gas treatment, and for which the CO₂ mole fraction solubility can be estimated from Skylogianni.⁹⁴ The value is extremely high (~0.04 at 1 atm and 313K) as compared to other physical solvents (see below). Hence, considering the growing interest in water-lean solvents⁹⁵, including the ones based on pure amines⁹⁶, we have chosen three industrial amines (MDEA, EDEA, DEAE-EO) for the experimental assessment of CO₂ physical solubility.

All the solvents showed close to linear variation of mole fraction solubility vs partial pressure of the gas in the pressure range 0-2 atm (Figure 1a). Estimated mole fraction solubilities for TDG and DMI (0.0041; 0.0150) are in good agreement with the data that can be obtained by extrapolation from recent publications.^{27,97} On the contrary, CO₂ mole fraction solubility in HMPA (0.024) is lower, than the one suggested by IUPAC's expert¹⁹ (0.031), but is close to the one obtained by Schay et al.¹⁹ (0.028). The mole fractions values in MDEA (0.1) and EDEA (0.08) are remarkably high and in agreement with the aforementioned data for MDEA from the Skylogianni et al. obtained at higher temperatures.⁹⁴ At the same time, the CO₂ solubility in DEAE-EO is much lower (0.02) and is the same as in two other tertiary amines present in the dataset: triethylamine (0.02) and perfluorotributylamine (0.02).

The high CO₂ solubility in pure MDEA and EDEA triggers the question whether the absorption is purely physical. It is commonly reported in the literature that, contrary to primary and secondary amines, tertiary amines cannot chemically absorb CO₂ in the absence of water^{98,99} (we have verified that no water was present in the solvent in the experiments performed in the present paper). This view has been challenged by Maddox¹⁰⁰ and more recently by Heldebrandt et al.^{101,102} who studied the reaction of CO₂ with anhydrous tertiary amines. Both conclude that reversible Lewis acid-base adducts are formed at high pressure (note that in this work we compare solubilities at low pressure, 1 atm.). Heldebrandt¹⁰¹ suggests that the difference in absorption capacity between pure amines can be explained by solvent polarity effects. Either way, anhydrous tertiary amines do absorb less CO₂ than aqueous tertiary amines, but some still absorb significant amounts of CO₂.

Figure 1. (a) Variation of mole fraction with partial pressure for CO₂ in TDG (×), DMI (★), HMPA (●), MDEA (▼), EDEA (■), and DEAE-EO (□) at 298.15 K experimentally measured for this paper. (b) Plot of experimental molecular fraction values (χ_{exp}) vs Kuenen coefficients (S_{exp}) at 298.15 K and 1 atm for CO₂.

There were 211 mole fraction solubility values collected for CO₂. The largest mole fraction CO₂ solubility was for tertiary amines MDEA and EDEA (Figure 1b). Among other classes of compounds with large CO₂ solubility were phosphoric acid esters, long chain ethers, and esters. To estimate the efficiency of a solvent related to its cost and dimensions of the required industrial unit, mole fractions were converted to Kuenen coefficients. MDEA and EDEA also have the largest Kuenen coefficients. By contrast to the trend observed for mole fractions, the largest Kuenen coefficient values in other compound classes were for small polar compounds: nitriles, ketones (acetone, butan-2-one), tetrahydrofuran (THF). Notably, the solvents, which are used in industrial gas treatment processes are not among the best ones in terms of CO₂ solubility (Figure 1b).

Other gases are less studied as compared to CO₂. There were less than 105 mole fraction solubility values collected for each of other gases (N₂, H₂, CO, CH₄). It is worth noting, that polar CO and non-polar CH₄, N₂, H₂ showed similar solubility trends. The largest values were

for non-polar compounds, including perfluorated alkanes, and long-chain n-alkanes (Figure S5). The minimal χ values were for polar solvents, such as methanol, *N,N*-dimethylformamide (DMF).

The collected experimental data were used to analyze the trends in the selectivity of CO₂ absorption towards other gases (Figure S6). The only industrial solvent for which the data were available for all the solvents is methanol, which is not selective at 298.15 K and 1 atm. The industrially used solvents were among the best ones in terms of the CO₂/CH₄ selectivity. The highest selectivity index (SI_{exp}) was for dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO, SI_{exp}=24) and *N*-formyl morpholine (NFM, SI_{exp}=21). Among other most selective solvents were industrially used propylene carbonate (PC) and *N*-Methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP). The large selectivity stems from the extremely low solubility of CH₄ in these solvents. The same observation was made for all other gases: the most selective are the polar solvents, such as DMF, 1,4-dioxane, DMSO, etc. (Figure 1b, Figures S3-S4).

Quantitative structure solubility relationships

Application of the machine learning allowed one to establish quantitative structure-solubility relationships. Reasonable predictive accuracy was achieved in the repeated cross-validation procedure for all the gases (Table 1). None of the models has shown chance correlation in the y-scrambling procedure.

Table 1. Performance estimation for modeling of mole fraction solubility expressed as $-\lg\chi$.

Gas	ISIDA consensus models	Q^2_{CV}	RMSE _{CV}	MAE _{CV}
CO ₂	20 RF, 17 XGBoost	0.71±0.01	0.12±0.01	0.08±0.01

CH ₄	9 SVR, 15 XGBoost	0.77±0.02	0.15±0.01	0.10±0.01
CO	5 SVR, 8 XGBoost	0.78±0.03	0.12±0.01	0.09±0.01
H ₂	2 RF, 3 SVR, 23 XGBoost	0.77±0.04	0.15±0.01	0.10±0.01
N ₂	9 SVR, 12 XGBoost	0.75±0.06	0.17±0.01	0.11±0.01

Since the collected datasets are small, the presence of compounds containing rare fragments, or compounds with noise in the experimental data lead to unstable modeling results. Several compounds, which were systematically mispredicted (the absolute error >0.7 log units) in the cross-validation procedure were removed: dodecanal and dodecene for the H₂ model, and dimethyl ether and dodecanal for the CO model. The values for all these compounds are significantly different from their close structural analogs. They were obtained by interpolation and additional experimental confirmation is required to assess whether the values are reliable. After the removal of outliers, the models with reasonable figures of merit were obtained for each gas (Table 1). The lowest mean absolute error (MAE_{CV}) was for the CO₂ model, which is based on the largest pool of data. Note, that MAE_{CV} is close to the variance in the experimental data. For example, the standard deviation for propylene carbonate based on IUPAC's data¹⁹ and the recently published data³⁶ can be estimated as 0.05 log units.

To check if some other descriptor types can lead to significantly better results, we calculated quantum chemical descriptors using Spartan software. The results of modeling were on average comparable to those obtained by the usage of ISIDA fragments (Table S2). Considering the advantages of ISIDA fragments, i.e. speed of calculation and intuitive interpretation of structure-property relationships, we further focused on this descriptor type.

For each model, the compounds for which absolute errors were larger than $2 \times \text{RMSE}_{\text{CV}}$ threshold were analyzed (Figure 2, Table S3). These compounds either contain rare fragments or can be considered as “solubility cliffs”: small changes in structure (e.g. replacement of hydrogen atom by methyl group) lead to large changes in solubility (see Figure S7 and discussion below). For example, hexafluorobenzene – the only polyhalogenated aromatic compound and MDEA – one of few representatives of alkanolamines in the dataset were among the compounds with the largest errors for the CO_2 model. The datasets for the gases are rather chemically diverse. Many compounds containing rare fragments appear outside AD of the models in the cross-validation. There were 15% of compounds appearing to be outside AD in the cross-validation for CO_2 , while about 20-25% of compounds were outside AD for other gases. The presence of compounds with rare fragments leads to high variance of predictions in the cross-validation. From the learning curve (Figure S8), one can see that adding data improves the performance on the validation sets, and, therefore, decreases the gap between prediction accuracy on validation and training sets. Hence, further accumulation of the experimental data on gas solubility organic solvents is required for building more robust models with enlarged applicability domains and the extended range of temperature and pressure values.

Figure 2. Plot of predicted ($-\lg\chi_{\text{pred}}$) vs experimental ($-\lg\chi_{\text{exp}}$) values for ISIDA consensus model in cross-validation procedure for CO_2 (a), CH_4 (b), CO (c), H_2 (d), N_2 (e). The predicted values are calculated as an average of 5 folds. Compounds for which absolute errors were larger than $2 \times \text{RMSE}_{\text{CV}}$ are shown in red. Dash lines indicate $\pm 2 \times \text{RMSE}_{\text{CV}}$ threshold.

In contrast to the above examples, solubility of CO_2 in alcohols, glycols and ethers was systematically studied. Yet, one of the largest absolute errors were for glycols (glycerol, ethane-1,2-diol), which is related to a sharp change in solubility with the replacement of $-\text{OH}$ group to $-\text{OCH}_3$ (Figure S7). For example, the mole fraction solubility in glycerol is more than three-time smaller, than the solubility in its closest structural analog – propylene glycol (PG). At the same time solubility in another structural analog – diethylene glycol (DEG), containing the same number of carbon and oxygen atoms as glycerol, is six time higher. This phenomenon can be

explained by considering forces driving the process of gas dissolution. The mechanistic interpretation of this process assumes the formation of a cavity capable of accommodating a gas molecule by breaking solvent-solvent bonds and introduction and fixation of a gas molecule in this cavity due to gas-solvent interactions. Hence, solubility of gases in liquids depends upon two types of interactions: gas-solvent and solvent-solvent.^{103,104} Strong gas-solvent and weak solvent-solvent interactions lead to greater solubility. In line with that, CO₂ solubility in glycols and their ethers follows the cohesive energy density values trend: the solubility is increasing from glycerol to DEG with the decreasing cohesive energy density (glycerol: 1142 MPa; DEG: 615 MPa).¹⁰⁵ However, the cohesive energy density is not the only factor affecting the solubility of CO₂. Although carbon dioxide is nonpolar, its appreciable polarizability and ability to accept hydrogen bonds from suitable donor solvents¹⁰⁶ makes structure solubility landscape more complex. For example, CO₂ solubility is lower in hexane than in dimethyl ether of ethylene glycol (DMEG), while the cohesive energy density of DMEG is higher than that of hexane (DMEG: 317 MPa; hexane: 222 MPa)^{105,107}. Thus, the interplay between cohesive energy density and solvent-CO₂ interactions should be taken into account in the process of the design of new solvents.

Virtual screening

To find new solvents with high CO₂ solubility and high selectivity towards other gases, we performed the virtual screening of the in-house library of industrially produced chemicals and their close structural analogs comprising more than 4,000 chemicals (Figure S9). It is worth noting that the experimentally measured physico-chemical properties such as melting and boiling points, density, flash points, etc. were available only for a small fraction of the dataset and thus, we did not check if the compounds possess plausible values of properties at 298.15 K and 1 atm. Most of the screened compounds (87%) appeared to be inside AD of the CO₂ model. There were

numerous compounds found with high predicted CO₂ mole fractions values and Kuenen coefficients, several of which were superior to the existing industrially used solvents (Figure 3a). Among the best CO₂ solvents according to mole fraction solubilities were tertiary amines and long-chain esters (e.g., dioctyl adipate, $\chi_{\text{pred}} = 0.27$), while the largest Kuenen coefficients were for tertiary amines and the close structural analogs of the compounds with the largest Kuenen coefficients from the learning set: ethers (e.g. ethyl methyl ether, $S_{\text{pred}} = 0.0068$), ketones (e.g. methoxyacetone, $S_{\text{pred}} = 0.0053$) and nitriles (e.g. butyronitrile, $S_{\text{pred}} = 0.0052$). One of the tertiary amines with the largest Kuenen coefficient ($S_{\text{pred}} = 0.0054$) – 4-Methylmorpholine (NMM) was selected for the experimental measurement of solubility. NMM showed linear variation of mole fraction solubility vs partial pressure of the gas in the pressure range indicating pure physical solubility (Figure 3b). The experimental mole fraction solubility (0.26) matched the predicted one (0.24) well. The CO₂ solubility in NMM is appreciably higher than in industrially used NFM, which instead of a tertiary amine group contains an amide group. We have measured the dynamic viscosity of NMM: 0,92 cP at 20 °C. The dynamic viscosity of water at 20 °C is 1 cP. The viscosity of NMM is thus comparable to water. NMM is much less viscous than e.g. pure MDEA (100 cP at 20 °C) or pure EDEA (90 cP at 20 °C), which is a significant advantage. On the other hand, the boiling point of NMM is 116 °C (MDEA 243 °C). NMM is thus more volatile than MDEA. The NMM solvent should thus be used at a lower temperature, to minimize the solvent losses. This is e.g. also done in the Rectisol process which uses methanol (boiling point 65 °C).

The environment, health and safety (EHS) of solvents for CO₂ capture is a potential issue. In principle, amine emissions should not be an obstacle because the causes are well known and counter-measures can be put in place (operating temperature and pressure, water wash, Brownian

demister, reclaiming units, etc.). One clear advantage of using physical solvents is that there is much less thermal and oxidative solvent degradation because the regeneration is not thermal and the high operating pressure avoids oxygen ingress. According to the safety datasheet¹⁰⁸ NMM is flammable, corrosive and harmful, but the substance contains no components considered to be either persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic.

Figure 3. **(a)** A plot of CO₂ molecular fraction values vs Kuenen coefficients. Experimental values – black and orange (solvents used in the industry). **(b)** Variation of mole fraction with partial pressure for CO₂ in NMM at 298.15 K experimentally measured in this paper; χ_{exp} – experimental mole fraction value at 1 atm and 298.15 K, χ_{pred} – predicted value. Predicted values for compounds inside AD – grey, outside AD – light grey, for NMM – green. The position of the NFM on the plot is shown for comparison.

The selectivity of the NMM calculated from predicted mole fraction values is comparable to the one of industrially used solvents (Figure S10). Other tertiary amines were also among the most selective solvents. For example, the 3-(Dimethylamino)-1,2-propanediol was among the most selective solvents for all gases. Among other classes of solvents with the highest selectivity

indexes were cyclic amides (e.g. 5-(hydroxymethyl)-1-methylpyrrolidin-2-one) and ketones (e.g. methoxyacetone).

To conclude, the rational approach to the design of new physical solvents based on the usage of machine learning for modeling of structure-solubility relationships was suggested in this paper. The collected data on solubility of gases were used to build QSPR models, which were then applied to identify compounds potentially superior to the existing ones via virtual screening of industrially produced chemicals. We have identified pure tertiary amines with a remarkable CO₂ absorption capacity. Previously, the team of Heldebrandt et al.¹⁰¹ has investigated the use of pure, anhydrous amines for high pressure CO₂ absorption. They compared the performance of anhydrous EDEA to the Fluor solvent (propylene carbonate), to Selexol, and to aqueous MDEA for a representative absorber. Despite the attractiveness due to lower energy consumptions, the use of anhydrous or water-lean amines faces numerous challenges, for example, their lower absorption capacity and their higher viscosity.⁶ In this work we have focused on the gas solubility. A further extension of the chemoinformatics workflow for the prediction of other industrial important solvent properties might be very useful in the identification of the most suitable physical (co-)solvent (optimal absorption properties, selectivity, viscosity,¹⁰⁹ EHS impact,¹¹⁰ etc.) for a given application.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information.

477 Table S1. Mole fraction solubilities of gases in organic liquid solvents at 298.15 K and 1 atm.

478 Figure S1. Negative logarithm of mole fraction solubility values distribution.

479 Figure S2. A scheme for building the ISIDA consensus model.

480 Text S1. Description of the experimental protocols.

481 Figure S3a. Schematic diagram of apparatus used to determine gas solubility.

482 Figure S3b. Flow diagram of the synthetic apparatus used to determine gas solubility.

483 Figure S4. A pictorial view of CO₂ loading arrangement.

484 Figure S5. Plots of experimental molecular fraction values vs Kuenen coefficients for (CH₄, H₂,
485 CO, N₂).

486 Figure S6. Plots of selectivity indexes based on experimental molecular fraction values vs CO₂
487 Kuenen coefficients.

488 Table S2. Outliers from ISIDA consensus models.

489 Table S3. Performance estimation for modeling using quantum-chemical descriptors.

490 Figure S7. Variation of CO₂ solubility in several series of structurally similar solvents.

491 Figure S8. Learning curves for machine learning models. Figure S9. Distribution of molecular
492 descriptors for the compounds from the screening library and the learning set.

493 Figure S10. Plots of predicted selectivity indexes vs Kuenen coefficient of CO₂.

494

495 AUTHOR INFORMATION

496 **Corresponding Author**

497 *Professor Alexandre Varnek. Laboratory of Chemoinformatics, Faculty of Chemistry,

498 University of Strasbourg, 4, Blaise Pascal Str., 67081, Strasbourg, France. email:

499 varnek@unistra.

500 *Doctor Frédéric de Meyer. TotalEnergies S.E., Exploration Production, Development and

501 Support to Operations, Liquefied Natural Gas – Acid Gas Entity, CCUS R&D Program, Paris,

502 92078 France. email: frederick.de-meyer@totalenergies.com.

503 **Author Contributions**

504 The manuscript was written through contributions of all authors. All authors have given approval

505 to the final version of the manuscript.

506 **Funding Sources**

507 This work was supported by the Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage (CCUS) transverse

508 R&D program from TotalEnergies S.E.

509 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

510 The authors are grateful to Dr. Fanny Bonachera for her help with the implementation of

511 models to the Predictor software. The authors sincerely acknowledge the Laboratory for

512 Thermophysical Properties in Oldenburg, Germany, for performing a part of the experimental

513 work.

514 ABBREVIATIONS

- 515 Caroxin D – 1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4-octafluoro-1,4-bis(1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropan-2-yloxy)butane
- 516 Caroxin F – 1,1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6-tridecafluoro-6-(1,1,1,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropan-2-
517 yloxy)hexane
- 518 DEG – 2-(2-hydroxyethoxy)ethanol (diethylene glycol)
- 519 DEGM – 2-(2-Methoxyethoxy)ethan-1-ol (diethylene glycol monomethyl ether)
- 520 diglyme – 1-methoxy-2-(2-methoxyethoxy)ethane
- 521 DMF – N,N-dimethylformamide
- 522 DMI – 1,3-Dimethylimidazolidin-2-one
- 523 DMSO – methylsulfinylmethane (dimethyl sulfoxide)
- 524 EG – ethane-1,2-diol (ethylene glycol)
- 525 glycerol – propane-1,2,3-triol
- 526 HMPA – N-[bis(dimethylamino)phosphoryl]-N-methylmethanamine (hexametapol)
- 527 M2CA – methyl 2-cyanoacetate
- 528 MDEA – 2-[2-hydroxyethyl(methyl)amino]ethanol 2-[ethyl(2-hydroxyethyl)amino]ethanol
- 529 EDEA – 2-[ethyl(2-hydroxyethyl)amino]ethanol
- 530 DEAE-EO – 2-[2-(diethylamino)ethoxy]ethanol
- 531 methoxyacetone – 1-methoxypropan-2-one
- 532 NMM – 4-methylmorpholine

- 533 NFM – morpholine-4-carbaldehyde (N-formylmorpholine)
- 534 NMP – 1-methylpyrrolidin-2-one
- 535 PC – 4-methyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-one (propylene carbonate)
- 536 TDG – 2-(2-hydroxyethylsulfanyl)ethanol (thiodiglycol)
- 537 pentaglyme – 1-methoxy-2-[2-[2-[2-(2-methoxyethoxy)ethoxy]ethoxy]ethoxy]ethane
- 538 perflubron – 1-bromo-1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,8-heptafluorooctane
- 539 perfluoroheptane – 1,1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,7-hexafluoroheptane
- 540 perfluoro(methylcyclohexane) – 1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,5,5,6-undecafluoro-6-
- 541 (trifluoromethyl)cyclohexane
- 542 perfluorooctane – 1,1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,5,5,6,6,7,7,8,8,8-octafluorooctane
- 543 perfluorotributylamine – 1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,4-nonafluoro-N,N-bis(1,1,2,2,3,3,4,4,4-
- 544 nonafluorobutyl)butan-1-amine
- 545 THF – oxolane (tetrahydrofuran)
- 546 TPrP – tripropyl phosphate
- 547 χ – mole fraction solubility
- 548 S – Kuenen coefficient
- 549 SI – Kuenen coefficients selectivity index
- 550 squalane – 2,6,10,15,19,23-hexamethyltetracosane

551

552 REFERENCES

- 553 (1) Net Zero by 2050, A Roadmap for the Global Energy Sector, IEA Report, May 2021.
554 <https://www.iea.org/reports/Net-Zero-by-2050> (Accessed 17.06.2021).
- 555 (2) Sifat, N. S.; Haseli, Y. A Critical Review of CO₂ Capture Technologies and Prospects for
556 Clean Power Generation. *Energies* 2019, 12 (21), 4143.
557 <https://doi.org/10.3390/en12214143>.
- 558 (3) Abdulsalam, J.; Mulopo, J.; Amosa, M. K.; Bada, S.; Falcon, R.; Oboirien, B. O. Towards a
559 Cleaner Natural Gas Production: Recent Developments on Purification Technologies. *Sep.*
560 *Sci. Technol.* 2019, 54 (15), 2461–2497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01496395.2018.1547761>.
- 561 (4) N.Borhani, T.; Wang, M. Role of Solvents in CO₂ Capture Processes: The Review of
562 Selection and Design Methods. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 2019, 114, 109299.
563 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109299>.
- 564 (5) Wang, X.; Song, C. Carbon Capture From Flue Gas and the Atmosphere: A Perspective.
565 *Front. Energy Res.* 2020, 8, 560849. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2020.560849>.
- 566 (6) Wanderley, R. R.; Pinto, D. D. D.; Knuutila, H. K. From Hybrid Solvents to Water-Lean
567 Solvents – A Critical and Historical Review. *Sep. Purif. Technol.* 2021, 260, 118193.
568 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2020.118193>.
- 569 (7) Collodi, G.; Azzaro, G.; Ferrari, N.; Santos, S. Techno-Economic Evaluation of Deploying
570 CCS in SMR Based Merchant H₂ Production with NG as Feedstock and Fuel. *Energy*
571 *Procedia* 2017, 114, 2690–2712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1533>.
- 572 (8) Yan, Y.; Thanganadar, D.; Clough, P. T.; Mukherjee, S.; Patchigolla, K.; Manovic, V.;
573 Anthony, E. J. Process Simulations of Blue Hydrogen Production by Upgraded Sorption

- 574 Enhanced Steam Methane Reforming (SE-SMR) Processes. *Energy Convers. Manag.* 2020,
575 222, 113144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2020.113144>.
- 576 (9) Pirig N. Ya.; Polyuzhin I. V.; Makitra R. G. Carbon Dioxide Solubility. *Russ. J. Appl.*
577 *Chem.* 1993, 4 (66), 691–695.
- 578 (10) Li, H.; Yan, D.; Zhang, Z.; Lichtfouse, E. Prediction of CO₂ Absorption by Physical
579 Solvents Using a Chemoinformatics-Based Machine Learning Model. *Environ. Chem. Lett.*
580 2019, 17 (3), 1397–1404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10311-019-00874-0>.
- 581 (11) Li, H.; Tang, Z.; He, Z.; Gui, X.; Cui, L.; Mao, X. Structure-Activity Relationship for CO₂
582 Absorbent. *Energy* 2020, 197, 117166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.117166>.
- 583 (12) Shi, W.; Thompson, R. L.; Macala, M. K.; Resnik, K.; Steckel, J. A.; Siefert, N. S.;
584 Hopkinson, D. P. Molecular Simulations of CO₂ and H₂ Solubility, CO₂ Diffusivity, and
585 Solvent Viscosity at 298 K for 27 Commercially Available Physical Solvents. *J. Chem.*
586 *Eng. Data* 2019, 64 (9), 3682–3692. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jced.8b01228>.
- 587 (13) Klamt, A. Conductor-like Screening Model for Real Solvents: A New Approach to the
588 Quantitative Calculation of Solvation Phenomena. *J. Phys. Chem.* 1995, 99 (7), 2224–2235.
589 <https://doi.org/10.1021/j100007a062>.
- 590 (14) Kim, J.; Maiti, A.; Lin, L.-C.; Stolaroff, J. K.; Smit, B.; Aines, R. D. New Materials for
591 Methane Capture from Dilute and Medium-Concentration Sources. *Nat. Commun.* 2013, 4
592 (1), 1694. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2697>.
- 593 (15) Gorji, A. E.; Gorji, Z. E.; Riahi, S. Quantitative Structure-Property Relationship (QSPR) for
594 Prediction of CO₂ Henry's Law Constant in Some Physical Solvents with Consideration of
595 Temperature Effects. *Korean J. Chem. Eng.* 2017, 34 (5), 1405–1415.
596 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11814-017-0018-0>.

- 597 (16) Kode Srl, *Dragon (Software for Molecular Descriptor Calculation) Version 7.0.8*, 2017,
598 <https://chm.kode-solutions.net>.
- 599 (17) Orlov, A. A.; Marcou, G.; Horvath, D.; Cabodevilla, A. E.; Varnek, A.; Meyer, F. de.
600 Computer-Aided Design of New Physical Solvents for Hydrogen Sulfide Absorption. *Ind.*
601 *Eng. Chem. Res.* 2021, 60 (23), 8588–8596. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.0c05923>.
- 602 (18) H. Rostami; Riahi, S. Quantitative Structure–Property Relationship Study on Solubility of
603 Hydrogen Sulfide in Organic Solvent; Kish, Iran, 2014.
- 604 (19) Carbon Dioxide in Non-Aqueous Solvents at Pressures Less than 200 KPa. In IUPAC
605 Solubility Data Series (Volume 50); Fogg, P. G. T.; Ed.; Pergamon: Amsterdam, 61988; Pp.
606 1-483, 1992.
- 607 (20) Methane. In IUPAC Solubility Data Series (Volume 27/28); Clever, H. L.; Young, C. L.;
608 Eds.; Pergamon: Amsterdam, 61988; Pp 1–783, 1987.
- 609 (21) Carbon Monoxide. In IUPAC Solubility Data Series (Volume 43); Cargill, R.W.; Ed; Eds.;
610 Pergamon: Amsterdam, 61988; Pp 1–783, 1990.
- 611 (22) Hydrogen and Deuterium. In IUPAC Solubility Data Series (Volume 5/6); Young, C. L.;
612 Ed; Pergamon: Amsterdam, 61988; Pp 1–646, 1981.
- 613 (23) Nitrogen and Air. In IUPAC Solubility Data Series (Volume 10); Battino, R; Ed;
614 Pergamon: Amsterdam, 61988; Pp 1–570, 1982.
- 615 (24) Décultot, M.; Ledoux, A.; Fournier-Salaün, M.-C.; Estel, L. Solubility of CO₂ in Methanol,
616 Ethanol, 1,2-Propanediol and Glycerol from 283.15 K to 373.15 K and up to 6.0 MPa. *J.*
617 *Chem. Thermodyn.* 2019, 138, 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2019.05.003>.

- 618 (25) Yamamoto, H.; Kamei, H.; Tokunaga, J. Solubilities of Argon, Oxygen and Nitrogen in
619 1,2-Propanediol + Water Mixed Solvent at 298.15 K and 101.33 kPa. *J. Chem. Eng. Japan*.
620 1994, 27 (4), 455-459.
- 621 (26) Li, Y.; Liu, Q.; Huang, W.; Yang, J. Solubilities of CO₂ Capture Absorbents Methyl
622 Benzoate, Ethyl Hexanoate and Methyl Heptanoate. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* 2018, 127, 25–
623 32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2018.07.010>.
- 624 (27) Li, X.; Jiang, Y.; Han, G.; Deng, D. Investigation of the Solubilities of Carbon Dioxide in
625 Some Low Volatile Solvents and Their Thermodynamic Properties. *J. Chem. Eng. Data*
626 2016, 61 (3), 1254–1261. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jced.5b00893>.
- 627 (28) Henni, A.; Tontiwachwuthikul, P.; Chakma, A. Solubilities of Carbon Dioxide in
628 Polyethylene Glycol Ethers. *Can. J. Chem. Eng.* 2008, 83 (2), 358–361.
629 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cjce.5450830224>.
- 630 (29) Zhao, Z.; Xing, X.; Tang, Z.; Zhao, Y.; Fei, W.; Liang, X.; He, Z.; Zhang, S.; Guo, D.
631 Solubility of CO₂ and H₂S in Carbonates Solvent: Experiment and Quantum Chemistry
632 Calculation. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control* 2017, 59, 123–135.
633 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijggc.2017.02.011>.
- 634 (30) Deng, D.; Han, G.; Jiang, Y.; Ai, N. Solubilities of Carbon Dioxide in Five Biobased
635 Solvents. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 2015, 60 (1), 104–111.
- 636 (31) Yogish, K. Solubility of CO₂ in Some Physical Solvents. *J. Chem. Eng. Jpn.* 1991, 24 (1),
637 135–137. <https://doi.org/10.1252/jcej.24.135>.
- 638 (32) Miller, M. B.; Chen, D.-L.; Luebke, D. R.; Johnson, J. K.; Enick, R. M. Critical Assessment
639 of CO₂ Solubility in Volatile Solvents at 298.15 K. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 2011, 56 (4), 1565–
640 1572. <https://doi.org/10.1021/je101161d>.

- 641 (33) Hansen, C. M. *Hansen Solubility Parameters: A User's Handbook*, 2nd ed.; CRC Press:
642 Boca Raton, 2007.
- 643 (34) Gennaro, A.; Isse, A. A.; Vianello, E. Solubility and Electrochemical Determination of
644 CO₂ in Some Dipolar Aprotic Solvents. *J. Electroanal. Chem. Interfacial Electrochem.*
645 1990, 289 (1–2), 203–215. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0728\(90\)87217-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0728(90)87217-8).
- 646 (35) Anouti, M.; Dougassa, Y. R.; Tessier, C.; El Ouatani, L.; Jacquemin, J. Low Pressure
647 Carbon Dioxide Solubility in Pure Electrolyte Solvents for Lithium-Ion Batteries as a
648 Function of Temperature. Measurement and Prediction. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* 2012, 50, 71–
649 79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2012.01.027>.
- 650 (36) Li, Y.; You, Y.; Huang, W.; Yang, J. Solubility Measurement and Thermodynamic
651 Properties Calculation for Several CO₂ + Ether Absorbent Systems. *J. Chem. Eng. Data*
652 2019, 64 (3), 1020–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jced.8b00936>.
- 653 (37) Li, Y.; Zheng, D.; Dong, L.; Xiong, B. Solubilities of Carbon Dioxide in 2-Methoxyethyl
654 Acetate, 1-Methoxy-2-Propyl Acetate and 3-Methoxybutyl Acetate. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.*
655 2014, 74, 126–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2014.01.019>.
- 656 (38) Li, Y.; Liu, Q.; Huang, W.; Yang, J. Below the Room Temperature Measurements of
657 Solubilities in Ester Absorbents for CO₂ Capture. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* 2018, 127, 71–79.
658 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2018.07.021>.
- 659 (39) Flowers, B. S.; Mittenthal, M. S.; Jenkins, A. H.; Wallace, D. A.; Whitley, J. W.; Dennis,
660 G. P.; Wang, M.; Turner, C. H.; Emel'yanenko, V. N.; Verevkin, S. P.; Bara, J. E. 1,2,3-
661 Trimethoxypropane: A Glycerol-Derived Physical Solvent for CO₂ Absorption. *ACS*
662 *Sustain. Chem. Eng.* 2017, 5 (1), 911–921.
663 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.6b02231>.

- 664 (40) Li, Y.; Huang, W.; Zheng, D.; Mi, Y.; Dong, L. Solubilities of CO₂ Capture Absorbents 2-
665 Ethoxyethyl Ether, 2-Butoxyethyl Acetate and 2-(2-Ethoxyethoxy)Ethyl Acetate. *Fluid*
666 *Phase Equilibria* 2014, 370, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fluid.2014.02.029>.
- 667 (41) Schappals, M.; Breug-Nissen, T.; Langenbach, K.; Burger, J.; Hasse, H. Solubility of
668 Carbon Dioxide in Poly(Oxymethylene) Dimethyl Ethers. *J Chem Eng Data* 2017, 5.
- 669 (42) Gui, X.; Tang, Z.; Fei, W. Solubility of CO₂ in Alcohols, Glycols, Ethers, and Ketones at
670 High Pressures from (288.15 to 318.15) K. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 2011, 56 (5), 2420–2429.
671 <https://doi.org/10.1021/je101344v>.
- 672 (43) Gui, X.; Wang, W.; Wang, C.; Zhang, L.; Yun, Z.; Tang, Z. Vapor–Liquid Phase
673 Equilibrium Data of CO₂ in Some Physical Solvents from 285.19 K to 313.26 K. *J. Chem.*
674 *Eng. Data* 2014, 59 (3), 844–849. <https://doi.org/10.1021/je400985u>.
- 675 (44) Jou, F.-Y.; Otto, F. D.; Mather, A. E. Solubility of H₂S and CO₂ in Diethylene Glycol at
676 Elevated Pressures. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* 2000, 175 (1), 53–61.
677 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3812\(00\)00440-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3812(00)00440-4).
- 678 (45) F. Blanchard; B. Carre; F. Bonhomme; P. Biensan; D. Lemordat. Solubility of Carbon
679 Dioxide in Alkylcarbonates and Lactones. *Can. J. Chem.* No. 81, 385–391.
- 680 (46) Wu, F.; Zhao, Q.; Tao, L.; Danaci, D.; Xiao, P.; Hasan, F. A.; Webley, P. A. Solubility of
681 Carbon Monoxide and Hydrogen in Methanol and Methyl Formate: 298–373 K and 0.3–3.3
682 MPa. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 2019, 64 (12), 5609–5621.
683 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jced.9b00676>.
- 684 (47) Qureshi, M. S.; Le Nedelec, T.; Guerrero-Amaya, H.; Uusi-Kyyny, P.; Richon, D.;
685 Alopaeus, V. Solubility of Carbon Monoxide in Bio-Oil Compounds. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.*
686 2017, 105, 296–311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2016.10.030>.

- 687 (48) Brunner, E. Solubility of Hydrogen in 10 Organic Solvents at 298.15, 323.15, and 373.15
688 K. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 1985, 30 (3), 269–273. <https://doi.org/10.1021/je00041a010>.
- 689 (49) Brunner, E. Solubility of Hydrogen in Diols and Their Ethers. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* 1980,
690 12 (10), 993–1002. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9614\(80\)90140-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9614(80)90140-8).
- 691 (50) Purwanto; Deshpande, R. M.; Chaudhari, R. V.; Delmas, H. Solubility of Hydrogen,
692 Carbon Monoxide, and 1-Octene in Various Solvents and Solvent Mixtures. *J. Chem. Eng.*
693 *Data* 1996, 41 (6), 1414–1417. <https://doi.org/10.1021/je960024e>.
- 694 (51) Krüger, M. B.; Selle, C.; Heller, D.; Baumann, W. Determination of Gas Concentrations in
695 Liquids by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance: Hydrogen in Organic Solvents. *J. Chem. Eng.*
696 *Data* 2012, 57 (6), 1737–1744. <https://doi.org/10.1021/je2013582>.
- 697 (52) Henni, A.; Tontiwachwuthikul, P.; Chakma, A. Solubility Study of Methane and Ethane in
698 Promising Physical Solvents for Natural Gas Sweetening Operations. *J. Chem. Eng. Data*
699 2006, 51 (1), 64–67. <https://doi.org/10.1021/je050172h>.
- 700 (53) Hesse, P. J.; Battino, R.; Scharlin, P.; Wilhelm, E. Solubility of Gases in Liquids. 21.
701 Solubility of He, Ne, Ar, Kr, N₂, O₂, CH₄, CF₄, and SF₆ in 2,2,4-Trimethylpentane At T=
702 298.15 K. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* 1999, 31 (9), 1175–1181.
703 <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcht.1999.0529>.
- 704 (54) Battino, R.; Rettich, T. R.; Tominaga, T. The Solubility of Nitrogen and Air in Liquids. *J.*
705 *Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* 1984, 13 (2), 563–600. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555713>.
- 706 (55) Bo, S.; Battino, R.; Wilhelm, E. Solubility of Gases in Liquids. 19. Solubility of He, Ne,
707 Ar, Kr, Xe, N₂, O₂, CH₄, CF₄, and SF₆ in Normal 1-Alkanols n-C₁₂H₂₆+1OH (1 .L to req. 1
708 .L to req. 11) at 298.15 K. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 1993, 38 (4), 611–616.
709 <https://doi.org/10.1021/je00012a035>.

- 710 (56) Hesse, P. J.; Battino, R.; Scharlin, P.; Wilhelm, E. Solubility of Gases in Liquids. 20.
711 Solubility of He, Ne, Ar, Kr, N₂, O₂, CH₄, CF₄, and SF₆ in n-Alkanes n-C₁H_{2l+2} ($6 \leq l \leq$
712 16) at 298.15 K. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 1996, 41 (2), 195–201.
713 <https://doi.org/10.1021/je9502455>.
- 714 (57) Pardo, J.; López, M. C.; Santafé, J.; Royo, F. M.; Urieta, J. S. Solubility of Gases in
715 Butanols. I. Solubilities of Nonpolar Gases in 1-Butanol from 263.15 to 303.15 K at 101.33
716 KPa Partial Pressure of Gas. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* 1995, 109 (1), 29–37.
717 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812\(95\)02712-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812(95)02712-N).
- 718 (58) Pardo, J.; López, M. C.; Mayoral, J. A.; Royo, F. M.; Urieta, J. S. Solubility of Gases in
719 Butanols. III. Solubilities of Non-Polar Gases in 2-Butanol from 263.15 to 303.15 K at
720 101.33 KPa Partial Pressure of Gas. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* 1997, 134 (1–2), 133–140.
721 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3812\(97\)00064-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3812(97)00064-2).
- 722 (59) Pardo, J.; López, M. C.; Santafé, J.; Royo, F. M.; Urieta, J. S. Solubility of Gases in
723 Butanols II. Solubilities of Nonpolar Gases in 2-Methyl-1-Propanol from 263.15 to 303.15
724 K at 101.33 KPa Partial Pressure of Gas. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* 1996, 119 (1), 165–173.
725 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812\(95\)02984-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812(95)02984-2).
- 726 (60) Pardo, J.; Mainar, A. M.; Lopez, M. C.; Royo, F.; Urieta, J. S. Solubility of Gases in
727 Butanols IV. Solubilities of Nonpolar Gases in 2-Methyl-2-Propanol at 303.15 K and
728 101.33 KPa Partial Pressure of Gas. *Fluid Ph. Equilibria*. 1999, 155 (1), 127–137.
- 729 (61) Weng, W.-L.; Chen, J.-T.; Chang, J.-S.; Chang, S.-L. Vapor–Liquid Equilibria for Nitrogen
730 with 2-Hexanol, 2-Heptanol, or 2-Octanol Binary Systems. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* 2006,
731 248 (2), 168–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fluid.2006.08.005>.

- 732 (62) Gallardo, M. A.; Melendo, J. M.; Urieta, J. S.; Losa, C. G. Solubility of Non-Polar Gases in
733 Cyclohexanone between 273.15 and 303.15 K at 101.32 KPa Partial Pressure of Gas. *Can.*
734 *J. Chem.* 1987, 65 (9), 2198–2202. <https://doi.org/10.1139/v87-368>.
- 735 (63) Gallardo, M. A.; López, M. C.; Urieta, J. S.; Losa, C. G. Solubility of He, Ne, Ar, Kr, Xe,
736 H₂, D₂, N₂, O₂, CH₄, C₂H₄, C₂H₆, CF₄, SF₆ and CO₂ in Cyclopentanone from 273.15 K
737 to 303.15 K and Gas Partial Pressure of 101.33 KPa. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* 1989, 50 (1),
738 223–233. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812\(89\)80292-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812(89)80292-4).
- 739 (64) Gallardo, M.A.; López, M.C.; Urieta, J.S.; Gutierrez Losa, C. Solubility of 15 non-polar
740 gases (He, Ne, Ar, Kr, Xe, H₂, D₂, N₂, O₂, CH₄, C₂H₄, C₂H₆, CF₄, SF₆ and CO₂) in
741 cycloheptanone. *Fluid Ph. Equilibria*. 1990, 58 (1–2), 1990, 159-172.
- 742 (65) Arai, C; Yoshitama, T.; Nishihara, K.; Sano, Y. Gas Solubilities in Esters of Oleic Acid.
743 *Kagaku Kougaku Ronbunshu* 1989, 15 (6), 1193–1195.
- 744 (66) Lizano, L. P.; López, M. C.; Royo, F. M.; Urieta, J. S. Solubility of Non Polar Gases in
745 Formaldehyde Diethyl Acetal Between -10 and 30°C, and 1 Atm Partial Pressure of Gas. *J.*
746 *Solut. Chem.* 1990, 19 (7), 721–728. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00647390>.
- 747 (67) Urieta, J. S.; Gibanel, F.; Martínez-López, J. F.; Pardo, J. I.; Mainar, A. M. Solubilities of
748 Gases in Cycloethers. The Solubility of 13 Nonpolar Gases in 2,5-Dimethyltetrahydrofuran
749 at 273.15 to 303.15 K and 101.32 KPa. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* 2019, 132, 306–315.
750 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2018.12.037>.
- 751 (68) Gibanel, F.; López, M. C.; Royo, F. M.; Rodríguez, V.; Urieta, J. S. Solubility of Nonpolar
752 Gases in Tetrahydropyran at 0 to 30°C and 101.33 KPa Partial Pressure of Gas. *J. Solut.*
753 *Chem.* 1994, 23 (11), 1247–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00974033>.

- 754 (69) Gibanel, F.; López, M. C.; Gallardo, M. A.; Urieta, J. S.; Gutiérrez Losa, C. Solubility of
755 Nonpolar Gases in Hexamethylenoxide. *Fluid Phase Equilibria* 1988, 42, 261–268.
756 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812\(88\)80063-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3812(88)80063-3).
- 757 (70) Mainar, A.M.; Pardo, J.; Royo, F.M.; Lopez, M.C.; Urieta, J.S. Solubility of nonpolar gases
758 in 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol at 25C and 101.33 kPa partial pressure of gas. *J. Solution. Chem.*
759 1996, 25 (6) , 589-595.
- 760 (71) Lopez, M. C.; Gallardo, M. A.; Urieta, J. S.; Gutierrez Losa, C. Solubility of Nonpolar
761 Gases in Halogenated Compounds. 1. Solubility of Hydrogen, Deuterium, Nitrogen,
762 Oxygen, Methane, Ethylene, Ethane, Carbon Tetrafluoride, Sulfur Hexafluoride and Carbon
763 Dioxide in Chlorocyclohexane at 263.15-303.15 K and 101.32 KPa of Partial Pressure of
764 Gas. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 1987, 32 (4), 472–474. <https://doi.org/10.1021/je00050a027>.
- 765 (72) Lopez, M. C.; Gallardo, M. A.; Urieta, J. S.; Gutierrez Losa, C. Solubility of Nonpolar
766 Gases in Halogenated Compounds. 2. Solubility of Hydrogen, Deuterium, Nitrogen,
767 Oxygen, Methane, Ethylene, Ethane, Carbon, Tetrafluoride, Sulfur Hexafluoride and
768 Carbon Dioxide in Bromocyclohexane at 263.15- to 303.15 K and 101.32 KPa Partial
769 Pressure of Gas. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 1989, 34 (2), 198–200.
770 <https://doi.org/10.1021/je00056a015>.
- 771 (73) Nitta, T.; Nakamura, Y.; Ariyasu, H.; Katayama, T. Solubilities of Nitrogen in Binary
772 Solutions of Acetone with Cyclohexane, Benzene, Chloroform and 2-Propanol. *J. Chem.*
773 *Eng. Jpn.* 1980, 13 (2), 97–103. <https://doi.org/10.1252/jcej.13.97>.
- 774 (74) Akimoto, T.; Nitta, T.; Katayama, T. Nitrogen Solubility and Vapor Pressure of Binary
775 Mixed Solvents Containing Benzene, Carbon Tetrachloride, Cyclohexane and 1-Hexane. *J.*
776 *Chem. Eng. Jpn.* 1984, 17 (6), 637–641. <https://doi.org/10.1252/jcej.17.637>.

777 (75) Mainar, A. M.; Pardo, J.; García, J. I.; Royo, F. M.; Urieta, J. S. Solubility of Gases in
778 Fluoroorganic Alcohols. *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.* 1998, 94 (24), 3595–3599.
779 <https://doi.org/10.1039/A807488G>.

780 (76) Atlani, M.; Loutaty, R.; Wakselman, C.; Yacono, C. Method of Purifying a Gas Mixture
781 Containing Undesirable Gas Compounds. 4504287, March 12, 1985.

782 (77) Barber, R.F.G; Ritter, T.J.; Sweeney, C.W. Removing Sulfur Compounds from Gases.
783 2245889A, January 15, 1992.

784 (78) Gamsjäger, H.; Lorimer, J. W.; Salomon, M.; Shaw, D. G.; Tomkins, R. P. T. The IUPAC-
785 NIST Solubility Data Series: A Guide to Preparation and Use of Compilations and
786 Evaluations (IUPAC Technical Report). *Pure Appl. Chem.* 2010, 82 (5), 1137–1159.
787 <https://doi.org/10.1351/PAC-REP-09-10-33>.

788 (79) KNIME. <https://www.knime.com/open-for-innovation-0> (accessed 2021-03 -03).

789 (80) Varnek, A.; Fourches, D.; Hoonakker, F.; Solov'ev, V. P. Substructural Fragments: An
790 Universal Language to Encode Reactions, Molecular and Supramolecular Structures. *J.*
791 *Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* 2005, 19 (9–10), 693–703. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-005-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10822-005-9008-0)
792 9008-0.

793 (81) Varnek, A.; Fourches, D.; Horvath, D.; Klimchuk, O.; Gaudin, C.; Vayer, P.; Solov'ev, V.;
794 Hoonakker, F.; Tetko, I.; Marcou, G. ISIDA - Platform for Virtual Screening Based on
795 Fragment and Pharmacophoric Descriptors. *Curr. Comput. Aided-Drug Des.* 2008, 4 (3),
796 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.2174/157340908785747465>.

797 (82) Spartan 18.0; Wavefunction, Inc.:www.wavefun.com.

798 (83) Breiman, L. Random Forests. *Mach. Learn.* 2001, 45 (1), 5–32.
799 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>.

- 800 (84) Pedregosa, F.; Varoquaux, G.; Gramfort, A.; Michel, V.; Thirion, B.; Grisel, O.; Blondel,
801 M.; Prettenhofer, P.; Weiss, R.; Dubourg, V.; Vanderplas, J.; Passos, A.; Cournapeau, D.;
802 Brucher, M.; Perrot, M.; Duchesnay, É. Scikit-Learn: Machine Learning in Python. *J.*
803 *Mach. Learn. Res.* 2011, 12 (85), 2825–2830.
- 804 (85) <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/> (accessed 23.10.20).
- 805 (86) Chen, T.; Guestrin, C. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the*
806 *22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*;
807 ACM: San Francisco California USA, 2016; pp 785–794.
808 <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785>.
- 809 (87) XGBoost, https://xgboost.readthedocs.io/en/latest/python/python_intro.html (accessed
810 31.05.21).
- 811 (88) Cortes, C.; Vapnik, V. Support-Vector Networks. *Mach. Learn.* 1995, 20 (3), 273–297.
812 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00994018>.
- 813 (89) Sahigara, F.; Mansouri, K.; Ballabio, D.; Mauri, A.; Consonni, V.; Todeschini, R.
814 Comparison of Different Approaches to Define the Applicability Domain of QSAR Models.
815 *Molecules* 2012, 17 (5), 4791–4810. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules17054791>.
- 816 (90) Descamps, C.; Coquelet, C.; Bouallou, C.; Richon, D. Solubility of Hydrogen in Methanol
817 at Temperatures from 248.41 to 308.20K. *Thermochim. Acta* 2005, 430 (1), 1–7.
818 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tca.2004.12.001>.
- 819 (91) Soubeyran, A.; Rouabhi, A.; Coquelet, C. Thermodynamic Analysis of Carbon Dioxide
820 Storage in Salt Caverns to Improve the Power-to-Gas Process. *Appl. Energy* 2019, 242,
821 1090–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.03.102>.

- 822 (92) Dicko, M.; Coquelet, C.; Theveneau, P.; Mougin, P. Phase Equilibria of H₂S-Hydrocarbons
823 (Propane, n-Butane, and n-Pentane) Binary Systems at Low Temperatures *J. Chem. Eng.*
824 *Data* 2012, *57*, 5, 1534–1543.
- 825 (93) Cadours, R.; Shah, V.; Weiss, C.; Roquet, D.;ALLEMAND, F. Industrial Operation of
826 HySWEET®, a New Hybrid Solvent for Improved Mercaptan Removal. In *Proceedings of*
827 *the 2nd Annual Gas Processing Symposium*; Elsevier, 2010; pp 221–228.
828 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1876-0147\(10\)02024-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1876-0147(10)02024-0).
- 829 (94) Skylogianni, E.; Wanderley, R. R.; Austad, S. S.; Knuutila, H. K. Density and Viscosity of
830 the Nonaqueous and Aqueous Mixtures of Methyldiethanolamine and Monoethylene
831 Glycol at Temperatures from 283.15 to 353.15 K. *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 2019, *64* (12), 5415–
832 5431. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jced.9b00607>.
- 833 (95) Heldebrant, D. J.; Koech, P. K.; Glezakou, V.-A.; Rousseau, R.; Malhotra, D.; Cantu, D. C.
834 Water-Lean Solvents for Post-Combustion CO₂ Capture: Fundamentals, Uncertainties,
835 Opportunities, and Outlook. *Chem. Rev.* 2017, *117* (14), 9594–9624.
836 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.6b00768>.
- 837 (96) Zheng, R. F.; Barpaga, D.; Mathias, P. M.; Malhotra, D.; Koech, P. K.; Jiang, Y.; Bhakta,
838 M.; Lail, M.; V. Rayer, A.; Whyatt, G. A.; Freeman, C. J.; Zwoster, A. J.; Weitz, K. K.;
839 Heldebrant, D. J. A Single-Component Water-Lean Post-Combustion CO₂ Capture Solvent
840 with Exceptionally Low Operational Heat and Total Costs of Capture – Comprehensive
841 Experimental and Theoretical Evaluation. *Energy Environ. Sci.* 2020, *13* (11), 4106–4113.
842 <https://doi.org/10.1039/D0EE02585B>.

- 843 (97) Vahidi, M.; Shokouhi, M. Experimental Solubility of Carbon Dioxide and Hydrogen
844 Sulfide in 2,2'-Thiodiglycol. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* 2019, 133, 202–207.
845 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2019.02.024>.
- 846 (98) Versteeg, G. F.; van Swaaij, W. P. M. On the Kinetics between CO₂ and Alkanolamines
847 Both in Aqueous and Non-Aqueous Solutions—II. Tertiary Amines. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 1988,
848 43 (3), 587–591. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509\(88\)87018-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509(88)87018-0).
- 849 (99) Versteeg, G. F.; van Swaaij, W. P. M. On the Kinetics between CO₂ and Alkanolamines
850 Both in Aqueous and Non-Aqueous Solutions—I. Primary and Secondary Amines. *Chem.*
851 *Eng. Sci.* 1988, 43 (3), 573–585. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509\(88\)87017-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509(88)87017-9).
- 852 (100) Maddox, R. N.; Mains, G. J.; Rahman, M. A. Reactions of Carbon Dioxide and Hydrogen
853 Sulfide with Some Alkanolamines. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 1987, 26 (1), 27–31.
854 <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie00061a006>.
- 855 (101) Rainbolt, J. E.; Koech, P. K.; Yonker, C. R.; Zheng, F.; Main, D.; Weaver, M. L.;
856 Linehan, J. C.; Heldebrant, D. J. Anhydrous Tertiary Alkanolamines as Hybrid Chemical
857 and Physical CO₂ Capture Reagents with Pressure-Swing Regeneration. *Energy Environ.*
858 *Sci.* 2011, 4 (2), 480–484. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C0EE00506A>.
- 859 (102) Mathias, P. M.; Jasperson, L. V.; VonNiederhausern, D.; Bearden, M. D.; Koech, P. K.;
860 Freeman, C. J.; Heldebrant, D. J. Assessing Anhydrous Tertiary Alkanolamines for High-
861 Pressure Gas Purifications. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 2013, 52 (49), 17562–17572.
862 <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie4020974>.
- 863 (103) Battino, R.; Clever, H. L. The Solubility of Gases in Liquids. *Chem. Rev.* 1966, 66 (4),
864 395–463. <https://doi.org/10.1021/cr60242a003>.

- 865 (104) Pierotti, R. A. A Scaled Particle Theory of Aqueous and Nonaqueous Solutions. *Chem.*
866 *Rev.* 1976, 76 (6), 717–726. <https://doi.org/10.1021/cr60304a002>.
- 867 (105) Abboud, J.-L. M.; Notari, R. Critical Compilation of Scales of Solvent Parameters. Part I.
868 Pure, Non-Hydrogen Bond Donor Solvents. *Pure Appl. Chem.* 1999, 71 (4), 645–718.
869 <https://doi.org/10.1351/pac199971040645>.
- 870 (106) Lewis, M.; Wu, Z.; Glaser, R. Polarizabilities of Carbon Dioxide and Carbodiimide.
871 Assessment of Theoretical Model Dependencies on Dipole Polarizabilities and Dipole
872 Polarizability Anisotropies. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2000, 104 (48), 11355–11361.
873 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp002927r>.
- 874 (107) Zeng, W.; Du, Y.; Xue, Y.; Frisch, H. L. Solubility Parameters. In *Physical Properties of*
875 *Polymers Handbook*; Mark, J. E., Ed.; Springer New York: New York, NY, 2007; pp 289–
876 303. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-69002-5_16.
- 877 (108) Sigma-Aldrich Catalog, <https://www.sigmaaldrich.com/FR/En/Sds/Aldrich/M56557>
878 (Accessed 11.08.21).
- 879 (109) Kauffman, G. W.; Jurs, P. C. Prediction of Surface Tension, Viscosity, and Thermal
880 Conductivity for Common Organic Solvents Using Quantitative Structure–Property
881 Relationships. *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.* 2001, 41 (2), 408–418.
882 <https://doi.org/10.1021/ci000139t>.
- 883 (110) Singh, A. K.; Bilal, M.; Iqbal, H. M. N.; Raj, A. Trends in Predictive Biodegradation for
884 Sustainable Mitigation of Environmental Pollutants: Recent Progress and Future Outlook.
885 *Sci. Total Environ.* 2021, 770, 144561. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144561>.
886