

# A Review of Environmental, Economic, and Application Aspects of Green Hydrogen Production Technologies

Rabia Khatoon<sup>1\*</sup>, Asghar Ali Ghoto<sup>2</sup>, Majid Ali<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, University of Larkano, Larkana, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, Mehran University, Khairpur, Pakistan

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Massachusetts Lowell, United States

\* Corresponding Author: Rabia Khatoon (mscrabia@outlook.com)

**Table S1: Various H<sub>2</sub> production methods with their advantages and disadvantages, system efficiency, operating temperature, energy efficiency, and H<sub>2</sub> production cost (Anwar et al., 2021)**

Production method	Advantages	Disadvantages	Temperature range (°C)	Efficiency (%)	Estimated cost (US\$.kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Ref
Steam methane reforming (SMR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conventional method</li> <li>Developed infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CO and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions</li> <li>Unstable supply</li> </ul>	700-1000	74-85	2.27	(Ahmed et al., 2016; Chi & Yu, 2018; Pinsky et al., 2020)
Gasification of solid fuel (Coal)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inexpensive feedstock</li> <li>Abundant in nature</li> <li>Neutral CO<sub>2</sub></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistent H<sub>2</sub> production</li> <li>Formation of tar</li> <li>Generation of heavy oil</li> </ul>	700-1000	60-75	1.48	(Chi & Yu, 2018; Pinsky et al., 2020)
Biomass process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inexpensive</li> <li>Renewable source dependent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>H<sub>2</sub> production depends on the season.</li> <li>Unclean H<sub>2</sub> due to CH<sub>4</sub> as a byproduct</li> </ul>	800-1000	35-50	1.8-2.05	(Chi & Yu, 2018; Pinsky et al., 2020)
Water electrolysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conventional technology</li> <li>Eco-friendly</li> <li>No carbon footprint</li> <li>Low energy requirement</li> <li>Useful O<sub>2</sub> as an additional product</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Storage problems</li> <li>Shipping issues</li> <li>Applicable only for a specific purpose</li> </ul>	500-1000+	60-80	10.30	(Anwar et al., 2021; Chi & Yu, 2018; Pinsky et al., 2020)
Solar energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abundant energy source</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variation in the intensity of solar radiation</li> </ul>	200-2000	20	10-30	(VEZIROGLU, 2002)
Nuclear energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carbon free</li> <li>Sustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uncertain future</li> <li>Depend on the mining of uranium</li> </ul>	300-950	45-50	4.5-7	(Balat & Balat, 2009; Chi & Yu, 2018; Pinsky et al., 2020)
Wind energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pollution free</li> <li>Reduction of GHG emissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prone to global climate change</li> <li>Fluctuation issues due to the variability of wind energy</li> </ul>	---	21	7-11	(Anwar et al., 2021; Chi & Yu, 2018; Pinsky et al., 2020)

**Table S2: Calculation of the H<sub>2</sub> production cost based on the various options. A study conducted by Achour et al. (2023)**

Case No	Total chemical and utility cost (US\$/hr)	Total chemical and utility cost (US\$/d)	Electricity cost (US\$/kW/h)	Hydrogen production (kg/hr)	Total electricity cost	Total energy required (kW/hr)	Electricity cost of producing 1 kg H <sub>2</sub> (US\$/hr)	Desalination cost (US\$/kg H <sub>2</sub> )	Total cost (US\$/kg)
<b>First option</b>									
<b>Case 03</b>	0.368	8.84	0.06	22.12	69.69	1010	3.149	0.028	3.51
<b>Case 15</b>	0.384	9.22	0.06	22.12	69.69	1010	3.149	0.029	3.53
<b>Second option</b>									
<b>Case 03</b>	0.368	8.84	0.104	22.12	105.04	1010	4.747	0.034	5.11
<b>Case 15</b>	0.384	9.22	0.104	22.12	105.04	1010	4.747	0.035	5.13
<b>Third option</b>									
<b>Case 03</b>	0.368	8.84	0.168	22.12	169.68	1010	7.669	0.051	7.720
<b>Case 15</b>	0.384	9.22	0.168	22.12	169.68	1010	7.669	0.052	7.721

## References

- Achour, Y., Berrada, A., Arechkik, A., & El Mrabet, R. (2023). Techno-economic assessment of hydrogen production from three different solar photovoltaic technologies. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 48(83), 32261-32276. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2023.05.017>
- Ahmed, A., Al-Amin, A. Q., Ambrose, A. F., & Saidur, R. (2016). Hydrogen fuel and transport system: A sustainable and environmental future. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 41(3), 1369-1380. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.11.084>
- Anwar, S., Khan, F., Zhang, Y., & Djire, A. (2021). Recent development in electrocatalysts for hydrogen production through water electrolysis. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 46(63), 32284-32317. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2021.06.191>
- Balat, M., & Balat, M. (2009). Political, economic and environmental impacts of biomass-based hydrogen. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, 34(9), 3589-3603. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2009.02.067>
- Chi, J., & Yu, H. (2018). Water electrolysis based on renewable energy for hydrogen production. *Chinese Journal of Catalysis*, 39(3), 390-394. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1872-2067\(17\)62949-8](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1872-2067(17)62949-8)
- Pinsky, R., Sabharwall, P., Hartvigsen, J., & O'Brien, J. (2020). Comparative review of hydrogen production technologies for nuclear hybrid energy systems. *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, 123, 103317. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnucene.2020.103317>
- VEZIROGLU, T. N. (2002). Hydrogen energy system for sustainability Permanent solution to global energy environmental problems. *Journal of advanced science*, 13(3), 101-116. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2978/jsas.13.101>