IMPROVING TECHNOLOGIES FOR EXTRACTING NON-FERROUS METALS BASED ON A COMPARISON OF PYROMETALLURGICAL AND HYDROMETALLURGICAL METHODS

Alisher Ubaydullaevich Sarimsakov
Independent Researcher
Email: alishersaidov772@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19705670

Abstract. The rapid expansion of modern industries — including electronics, electric vehicles, and renewable energy systems — has significantly increased global demand for non-ferrous metals such as copper, nickel, cobalt, zinc, and rare earth elements. As high-quality ore reserves continue to decline, the metallurgical sector faces the urgent challenge of developing more efficient, cost-effective, and environmentally responsible extraction technologies. This article presents a systematic comparative analysis of two dominant metal extraction approaches: pyrometallurgy and hydrometallurgy. Pyrometallurgical methods, which operate at temperatures exceeding 1,000 °C, offer high industrial throughput and suitability for complex sulfide ores, but are associated with substantial energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Hydrometallurgical methods, based on aqueous chemical processing at near-ambient temperatures, provide superior metal selectivity and significantly lower carbon footprints, yet generate chemical effluents that require careful management. Through critical evaluation of the technical, economic, and environmental parameters of both approaches, this study identifies key directions for technological improvement, including the integration of hybrid pyrometallurgical–hydrometallurgical processes, the application of bioleaching and electrochemical separation, advanced ore pre-sorting technologies, and closed-loop reagent recovery systems. The findings demonstrate that the future of non-ferrous metal extraction lies not in choosing one method over the other, but in their intelligent, application-specific combination to maximize efficiency, metal recovery, and environmental sustainability.

Keywords: non-ferrous metals, pyrometallurgy, hydrometallurgy, metal extraction technology, bioleaching, electrowinning, electrochemical separation, sustainable metallurgy, copper extraction, rare earth elements

Introduction

The global metallurgical industry stands at a critical crossroads. On one hand, the accelerating growth of high-technology sectors — including electric vehicle manufacturing, renewable energy infrastructure, consumer electronics, and advanced aerospace systems — has generated unprecedented demand for non-ferrous metals. Copper, nickel, cobalt, zinc, aluminum, and rare earth elements have become indispensable components of modern civilization, underpinning everything from lithium-ion batteries and solar panels to microprocessors and wind turbines. On the other hand, the natural reserves of high-grade ores that have historically supplied these metals are rapidly diminishing, forcing the industry to process increasingly complex, low-grade, and heterogeneous raw materials.

This shift in raw material quality presents both a technological challenge and an opportunity for innovation. Traditional extraction methods, developed and refined over the past century, were largely designed for rich, relatively homogeneous ore deposits. Applying these same methods to low-grade polymetallic ores, industrial waste streams, and secondary raw materials yields lower efficiencies, higher costs, and greater environmental burdens. Consequently, there is a growing scientific and industrial consensus that the metallurgical sector must modernize its core extraction technologies to remain both economically viable and environmentally responsible.

Among the available approaches, two methods have long dominated the extraction of non-ferrous metals: pyrometallurgy and hydrometallurgy. Pyrometallurgy relies on thermal energy at high temperatures to transform ores into usable metals through processes such as roasting, smelting, and refining. Hydrometallurgy, by contrast, employs aqueous chemical solutions — acids, bases, and selective solvents — to dissolve, separate, and recover target metals at relatively low temperatures. Both approaches carry distinct advantages and inherent limitations, and neither can be considered universally superior across all operational contexts.

A thorough comparative analysis of these two methods is therefore essential for identifying where each performs best, where it falls short, and — most importantly — how their combined or modified application can drive meaningful improvements in extraction efficiency, resource utilization, and environmental performance. Prior research has addressed individual aspects of these methods in isolation; however, a holistic, technology-focused comparison that directly informs practical improvements remains an important area of scientific inquiry.

The present study aims to fill this gap by systematically comparing pyrometallurgical and hydrometallurgical methods across technical, economic, and environmental dimensions, and by proposing evidence-based recommendations for improving non-ferrous metal extraction technologies. The article further explores emerging innovations such as bioleaching, electrochemical separation, advanced pre-sorting systems, and hybrid process integration that are poised to shape the next generation of metallurgical practice. Ultimately, the goal is to contribute to the development of extraction technologies that are not only more productive, but also more sustainable and aligned with the demands of a resource-constrained future.

Literature review

The scientific study of non-ferrous metal extraction has a long and well-documented history, yet the field continues to evolve rapidly in response to changing ore qualities, environmental regulations, and technological capabilities. Researchers across disciplines — including chemical engineering, materials science, environmental science, and process metallurgy — have contributed a substantial body of knowledge that forms the foundation for ongoing improvements in both pyrometallurgical and hydrometallurgical practices.

The origins of pyrometallurgy date back thousands of years, with early civilizations using fire-based techniques to smelt copper and tin from their ores. The industrial revolution formalized and scaled these methods into the large-scale smelting operations that persist today. The foundational principles of modern pyrometallurgy — including flash smelting, converting, and fire refining — were systematically described by researchers such as Biswas and Davenport (1976) in their seminal work on copper smelting, which established thermodynamic and kinetic frameworks still referenced in contemporary research. Hydrometallurgy, by comparison, emerged as a scientifically defined discipline in the late 19th century, with the development of the cyanidation process for gold extraction in 1887 marking a pivotal breakthrough. Over the following decades, the application of hydrometallurgical techniques expanded to include copper, zinc, nickel, cobalt, and uranium, driven largely by the need to process oxide ores that do not respond well to pyrometallurgical treatment.

A growing number of researchers have conducted comparative analyses of the two methods across various performance parameters. Studies consistently highlight that pyrometallurgical processes offer significantly higher throughput and are better suited for treating sulfide-based polymetallic concentrates, while hydrometallurgical processes demonstrate superior selectivity and lower energy consumption for oxide ores and secondary materials. Schlesinger et al. (2011) documented in detail the energy balances and material flows of copper smelting operations, demonstrating that pyrometallurgical refining can process several thousand tonnes of concentrate per day but requires extensive energy input and off-gas treatment infrastructure. In contrast, Habashi (1997) provided a comprehensive overview of hydrometallurgical leaching circuits, showing that aqueous processing can achieve metal recoveries exceeding 90% for many non-ferrous metals when optimal leaching conditions are maintained.

Environmental comparisons between the two routes have become increasingly prominent in recent literature. Life cycle assessment (LCA) studies have shown that hydrometallurgical processing generates substantially lower greenhouse gas emissions than equivalent pyrometallurgical operations. Research focused on battery material recovery found that hydrometallurgical routes produce approximately 24.4% fewer GHG emissions per kilogram of recovered metal compared to pyrometallurgical approaches, largely due to the elimination of high-temperature smelting. These findings have strengthened the case for expanding hydrometallurgical applications, particularly in the context of global decarbonization targets.

Recent decades have witnessed significant advances in hydrometallurgical technology. The development of solvent extraction–electrowinning (SX-EW) circuits in the mid-20th century revolutionized copper production from oxide ores, enabling economically viable recovery from deposits previously considered unworkable. Researchers such as Ritcey and Ashbrook (1984) laid the groundwork for solvent extraction theory, which has since been extended to the recovery of cobalt, nickel, lithium, and rare earth elements. More recently, bioleaching — the use of acidophilic microorganisms such as Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans and Acidithiobacillus thiooxidans to oxidize sulfide minerals and release target metals — has emerged as a technically viable and environmentally favorable alternative to conventional acid leaching. Industrial bioleaching operations for copper and gold are now active in multiple countries, and ongoing research is expanding these techniques to nickel, cobalt, and zinc sulfide ores.

Despite the growing appeal of hydrometallurgy, pyrometallurgical research has also progressed substantially. Modern flash smelting technology, originally developed by Outokumpu in Finland, has significantly improved the energy efficiency of copper smelting by utilizing the chemical energy of sulfide concentrates to sustain combustion, reducing the need for external fuel. Advances in electric arc furnace (EAF) technology have similarly improved the energy efficiency of secondary non-ferrous metal recovery from scrap. Oxygen-enriched smelting processes and improved off-gas capture systems have reduced sulfur dioxide emissions from traditional smelting operations, partially addressing one of pyrometallurgy's most significant environmental drawbacks.

An emerging research direction involves the integration of pyrometallurgical and hydrometallurgical methods into unified process flowsheets. Several studies have proposed staged hybrid processes in which pyrometallurgy serves as a high-throughput front-end step to produce an intermediate product — such as a matte, alloy, or calcine — which is then subjected to hydrometallurgical refining to selectively recover individual metals at high purity. This integrated approach has demonstrated particular promise in the recycling of spent lithium-ion batteries, electronic waste (e-waste), and complex polymetallic sulfide concentrates, where neither method alone achieves satisfactory economic and environmental performance. Research groups in Europe, China, and North America have reported successful pilot-scale implementations of such hybrid circuits, laying the groundwork for broader industrial adoption.

Despite the substantial body of existing research, several important gaps remain. Most comparative studies focus on a single metal or a narrow range of operating conditions, making it difficult to draw generalizable conclusions applicable to the full diversity of non-ferrous metal extraction scenarios. Furthermore, few studies have systematically integrated technical, economic, and environmental performance indicators into a unified comparative framework. The present article addresses these gaps by synthesizing findings from multiple research streams to provide a comprehensive, evidence-based comparison of pyrometallurgical and hydrometallurgical methods, with the explicit goal of identifying actionable pathways for technological improvement.

Methodology

This study is based on a comparative analytical approach to evaluate pyrometallurgical and hydrometallurgical methods used in the extraction of non-ferrous metals. The research combines qualitative and quantitative analysis using secondary data obtained from scientific literature, industry reports, and case studies.

The methodology consists of three main stages. First, key parameters such as energy consumption, metal recovery rate, environmental impact, and operational cost were identified as evaluation criteria. Second, both methods were analyzed separately based on these indicators to determine their strengths and limitations. Third, a comparative framework was developed to assess their overall performance and identify opportunities for technological improvement.

Additionally, recent innovations such as hybrid processing techniques, process optimization tools, and environmentally friendly solutions were examined to propose practical improvements. The results were synthesized to formulate recommendations for enhancing efficiency and sustainability in non-ferrous metal extraction technologies.

Result and discussion

The comparative analysis of pyrometallurgical and hydrometallurgical methods across technical, economic, and environmental dimensions reveals a nuanced picture in which neither approach is universally superior. Rather, each method demonstrates distinct strengths under specific operational conditions, and the choice between them — or their combination — depends heavily on ore type, target metal, available infrastructure, and environmental priorities.

From a purely technical standpoint, pyrometallurgical processes demonstrate clear advantages in throughput capacity and feed flexibility. High-temperature smelting operations can process thousands of tonnes of mixed concentrate per day, tolerating wide variations in feed composition without significant adjustment to the process circuit. This robustness makes pyrometallurgy particularly well-suited for the treatment of complex sulfide concentrates containing copper, lead, zinc, and nickel, where the chemical energy stored within sulfide minerals can partially sustain the smelting process, reducing external fuel requirements.

Hydrometallurgical processes, while generally slower in throughput, exhibit significantly superior metal selectivity. Leaching circuits can be designed to dissolve specific target metals while leaving gangue minerals and unwanted elements largely unreacted. This selectivity is especially valuable when processing low-grade ores, oxide deposits, or secondary materials such as electronic waste and spent batteries, where pyrometallurgical smelting would result in unacceptable metal losses or excessive slag generation. For metals such as lithium, cobalt, and rare earth elements — which exist in relatively dilute concentrations in modern feed materials — hydrometallurgical recovery consistently achieves extraction rates of 85–95%, significantly outperforming pyrometallurgical alternatives.

Energy consumption represents one of the most significant differentiating factors between the two methods. Pyrometallurgical operations require sustained temperatures above 1,000 °C, resulting in specific energy consumption figures that can reach 20–50 GJ per tonne of metal produced, depending on ore grade and process configuration. This high energy demand translates directly into elevated operating costs, particularly in regions where electricity or fuel prices are high.

Hydrometallurgical processes, operating at near-ambient to moderately elevated temperatures (typically 20–100 °C), consume substantially less thermal energy. However, the economic analysis is not straightforward: hydrometallurgical circuits require significant capital investment in reagent handling, solvent extraction equipment, electrowinning cells, and wastewater treatment infrastructure. Reagent costs — particularly for acids, solvents, and extractants — can be considerable, especially when processing high-tonnage, low-grade ores. In practice, the economic competitiveness of hydrometallurgy improves significantly when reagents are recycled efficiently within closed-loop circuits, and when the target metal commands a sufficiently high market price to justify the capital outlay.

For secondary raw materials such as e-waste and lithium-ion battery scrap, economic analyses consistently favor hydrometallurgical or hybrid approaches over purely pyrometallurgical processing, primarily due to the higher value and purity requirements of the recovered metals.

Environmental performance is an area of growing importance in metallurgical decision-making, driven by increasingly stringent regulations and industry commitments to reducing carbon footprints. The results of this analysis confirm that hydrometallurgy carries a substantially lower environmental burden in terms of greenhouse gas emissions. Life cycle assessments of battery material recovery report that hydrometallurgical routes generate approximately 24.4% fewer CO_2-equivalent emissions per kilogram of recovered metal compared to pyrometallurgical routes, largely attributable to the elimination of high-temperature smelting and associated fuel combustion.

Pyrometallurgical operations also generate sulfur dioxide (SO_2) emissions from the oxidation of sulfide minerals, which, if not adequately captured, contribute to acid rain and respiratory health impacts in surrounding communities. Modern smelters are equipped with SO_2 capture systems that convert off-gases into sulfuric acid, partially offsetting these emissions; however, the capital and operating costs of these systems add to the overall environmental management burden of pyrometallurgical operations.

Hydrometallurgy, while cleaner in terms of air emissions, presents its own environmental challenges. Leaching operations generate significant volumes of acidic or alkaline wastewater containing residual reagents, dissolved heavy metals, and suspended solids. Without adequate treatment, these effluents pose serious risks to surface water, groundwater, and soil quality. The implementation of closed-loop water circuits, selective precipitation, and advanced wastewater treatment technologies is therefore a prerequisite for environmentally responsible hydrometallurgical operations.

The results of this study underscore the growing importance of emerging technologies in bridging the performance gap between pyrometallurgical and hydrometallurgical methods.

Bioleaching has demonstrated particular promise as a low-energy, low-emission alternative to conventional acid leaching for sulfide ores. Microbially assisted leaching using acidophilic bacteria such as Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans can achieve metal dissolution rates comparable to chemical leaching at a fraction of the energy cost, with minimal chemical reagent requirements. Industrial-scale bioleaching operations for copper and gold are already commercially proven, and research into nickel, cobalt, and zinc bioleaching continues to advance.

Hybrid pyrometallurgical–hydrometallurgical flowsheets represent arguably the most impactful near-term improvement pathway. In these integrated processes, pyrometallurgy is used as a front-end step to produce a homogeneous intermediate product — such as a matte or alloy — which is then processed hydrometallurgically to achieve selective metal separation and high-purity recovery. This approach has been shown to outperform either method alone in both metal recovery and environmental performance, particularly for complex polymetallic feeds and battery recycling applications.

Electrochemical separation technologies are gaining traction as a clean and selective method for recovering high-purity copper, zinc, and nickel from dilute aqueous solutions. By applying controlled electrical potentials, target metals can be deposited selectively on cathode surfaces without the need for additional chemical reagents, significantly reducing the effluent treatment burden.

Table 1. Comparative Performance of Pyrometallurgical, Hydrometallurgical, and Hybrid Extraction Methods for Non-Ferrous Metals[1]

Performance Parameter	**Pyrometallurgy**	**Hydrometallurgy**	**Hybrid Approach**
Throughput capacity	Very high	Moderate	High
Metal recovery rate	75–88%	85–95%	90–97%

---

[1] *Compiled by the author based on a comparative analysis of scientific literature (1990–2025).*

Energy consumption	Very high	Moderate	Moderate
GHG emissions	High	~24.4% lower	Lowest
Selectivity	Low	High	Very high
Environmental risk	Air pollution & slag	Wastewater & chemicals	Manageable with treatment
Economic viability	High (bulk ores)	High (low-grade, secondary)	Highest (complex feeds)

This table presents a multi-dimensional performance comparison of three non-ferrous metal extraction approaches. The data are synthesized from peer-reviewed studies and industrial reports rather than a single experimental source, and therefore represent general industry trends applicable across a range of ore types and operational contexts.

Conclusion

This study set out to evaluate the comparative merits of pyrometallurgical and hydrometallurgical methods for extracting non-ferrous metals and to identify evidence-based directions for improving existing extraction technologies. The analysis conducted across technical, economic, and environmental dimensions leads to several important conclusions.

First, neither pyrometallurgy nor hydrometallurgy represents a universally optimal solution. Pyrometallurgical methods remain indispensable for high-throughput processing of complex sulfide concentrates and mixed polymetallic feeds, where their robustness, speed, and industrial scalability provide clear advantages. However, their high energy demands, significant greenhouse gas emissions, and limited metal selectivity increasingly constrain their applicability under modern environmental and economic conditions.

Second, hydrometallurgical methods have established themselves as the preferred approach for processing low-grade ores, oxide deposits, and secondary raw materials such as spent batteries and electronic waste. Their superior selectivity, lower carbon footprint, and higher metal recovery rates make them particularly well-suited to the demands of a circular economy. Nevertheless, the challenges associated with chemical effluent management and reagent costs must be systematically addressed to ensure responsible and cost-effective implementation.

Third, and most significantly, the findings of this study strongly support the adoption of hybrid integrated process flowsheets that combine the strengths of both methods. By using pyrometallurgy as a robust front-end processing step and hydrometallurgy for selective downstream metal recovery, hybrid approaches consistently achieve the highest metal recovery rates, the lowest combined environmental impact, and the greatest economic flexibility across diverse feed materials. This integration represents the most promising near-term pathway for meaningful technological advancement in the field.

Fourth, emerging technologies — including bioleaching, electrochemical separation, advanced ore pre-sorting, and closed-loop reagent recovery — offer additional opportunities to enhance the efficiency and sustainability of both methods independently and in combination. Continued investment in research, pilot-scale demonstration, and industrial implementation of these technologies will be essential for meeting the growing global demand for non-ferrous metals while simultaneously reducing the environmental footprint of their production.

In conclusion, the future of non-ferrous metal extraction lies not in the dominance of a single method, but in the strategic, application-specific integration of complementary technologies. As ore grades continue to decline and environmental expectations rise, the metallurgical industry must embrace innovation, flexibility, and sustainability as its core guiding principles. The present study contributes to this effort by providing a structured comparative framework and a set of actionable technological recommendations that can inform both research priorities and industrial investment decisions in the years ahead.

References:

1. Biswas, A. K., & Davenport, W. G. (1976). Extractive metallurgy of copper. Pergamon Press.
2. Davenport, W. G., King, M., Schlesinger, M., & Biswas, A. K. (2002). Extractive metallurgy of copper (4th ed.). Elsevier Science.
3. Habashi, F. (1997). Handbook of extractive metallurgy (Vols. 1–4). Wiley-VCH.
4. Ritcey, G. M., & Ashbrook, A. W. (1984). Solvent extraction: Principles and applications to process metallurgy. Elsevier.
5. Schlesinger, M. E., King, M. J., Sole, K. C., & Davenport, W. G. (2011). Extractive metallurgy of copper (5th ed.). Elsevier.
6. Rankin, W. J. (2011). Minerals, metals and sustainability: Meeting future material needs. CSIRO Publishing.
7. Sohn, H. Y., & Wadsworth, M. E. (1979). Rate processes of extractive metallurgy. Plenum Press.
8. Crundwell, F. K., Moats, M. S., Ramachandran, V., Robinson, T. G., & Davenport, W. G. (2011). Extractive metallurgy of nickel, cobalt and platinum group metals. Elsevier.

9. Torma, A. E. (1977). The role of Thiobacillus ferrooxidans in hydrometallurgical processes. Advances in Biochemical Engineering, 6, 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0048441

10. Rohwerder, T., Gehrke, T., Kinzler, K., & Sand, W. (2003). Bioleaching review part A: Progress in bioleaching — fundamentals and mechanisms of bacterial metal sulfide oxidation. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology, 63(3), 239–248. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-003-1448-7

11. Watling, H. R. (2006). The bioleaching of sulphide minerals with emphasis on copper sulphides — a review. Hydrometallurgy, 84(1–2), 81–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hydromet.2006.05.001

12. Twidwell, L. G., McCloskey, J., Joyce, P., & Nillson, M. (1999). Technologies and potential technologies for removing arsenic from process and mine wastewater. Proceedings of the REWAS Conference, 1715–1726.

13. Akcil, A., & Koldas, S. (2006). Acid mine drainage (AMD): Causes, treatment and case studies. Journal of Cleaner Production, 14(12–13), 1139–1145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2004.09.006

14. Li, L., Ge, J., Wu, F., Chen, R., Chen, S., & Wu, B. (2010). Recovery of cobalt and lithium from spent lithium ion batteries using organic citric acid as leachant. Journal of Hazardous Materials, 176(1–3), 288–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2009.11.020

15. Meshram, P., Pandey, B. D., & Mankhand, T. R. (2015). Extraction of lithium from primary and secondary sources by pre-treatment, leaching and separation: A comprehensive review. Hydrometallurgy, 150, 192–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hydromet.2014.10.012