




**Summary  
and  
Conclusions**



©  
m

## *SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS*

The study of catalyst deactivation during hydroprocessing of heavy oil fractions is one of the most important aspects to improve the catalytic performance in petroleum refining processes. Catalyst deactivation is caused by: metal deposition and coke precipitation on the active sites of the catalyst.

**The catalytic activity** of Co-Mo/ $\gamma$ -alumina catalyst during the hydrotreating process was investigated in a cata – test micro reactor unit by using heavy vacuum gas oil (HVGO) as feed stock at the following operating conditions: reaction temperature from 300 to 425°C, hydrogen pressure 15- 65 bar and liquid hourly space velocity from 0.5 to 1.5 h<sup>-1</sup> under a constant H<sub>2</sub> / oil ratio of 250 L/L and reaction time 9 hours.

**Effect of reaction temperature:** the reaction temperature is the most important parameter, which affects the catalytic activity. The hydroconversion was carried out at different reaction temperatures from 300 to 425°C at 50 bar total hydrogen pressure and 0.5 h<sup>-1</sup> liquid hourly space velocity (LHSV). As the reaction temperature increased from 300 to 425°C, HDS was improved from 37.16 % at 300 °C to 98.31 % at 425 °C. The main characteristics and the product quality as diesel index (DI), color and pour point were improved but the total aromatics content was decreased with increasing the reaction temperature.

---

***Effect of hydrogen pressure:*** hydrogen is necessary in hydrotreatment processes for purposes of catalyst stability and decrease of coke content. A hydrogen pressure of 15 to 65 bar was applied at a constant reaction temperature of 350 °C, liquid hourly space velocity (LHSV) 0.5 h<sup>-1</sup>, H<sub>2</sub> / oil ratio of 250 L/L and reaction time of 9 hours. The effect of increase of hydrogen pressure on the product characteristics was observed where, HDS was increased from 70.70 % to 85.19 %, DI and aniline point increased from 58.89 % to 65.01 % and 168.8 % to 182.9 %, respectively while the total aromatics content was decreased from 37.94 % at 15 bar to 30.38 % at 65 bar.

***Effect of liquid hourly space velocity:*** the effect of a space time, which is the reciprocal of LHSV on the hydrotreating process was carried out at reaction temperature of 350 °C, hydrogen pressure of 50 bar, H<sub>2</sub> / oil ratio of 250 L/L and reaction time of 9 hours with varying LHSV between 0.5 to 1.5 h<sup>-1</sup>. It was observed that the product yield, density, color and total aromatics content were increased while HDS activity; aniline point and diesel index were decreased. This means that no improvement in the quality of heavy vacuum gas oil by increasing L.H.S.V. from 0.5 to 1.5 h<sup>-1</sup> was indicated.

***Effect of operating conditions on the activity of the catalyst under study at different reactor zones:*** As indicated in the experimental part, Co-Mo/ $\gamma$  - alumina catalyst was charged in the reactor of cata - test unit in three successive zones. At the end of runs of each parameter (reaction temperature, hydrogen pressure and liquid hourly space velocity), a sample of catalyst was taken from each zone in the reactor and coke content was calculated.

---

It was found that the first zone of the reactor was accumulated by coke than second and third zone. At first zone and in the case of different reaction temperatures, the percentage of the formed coke after 54 h was equal to 4.83 wt % while at the second and third zone it was 3.75 and 3.42 wt %, respectively. In case of pressure and after 36 h the coke content was equal to 4.14, 2.02, 2.04 wt %, while in case of L.H.S.V. and after 45 h it was 3.72, 3.29, 3.26 wt % for each zone respectively. This means that the coke deposition in each reactor zone was arranged as follows:

*First zone > second zone > third zone,*

This can be attributed to coke, which comprises the large part of deposits, may concentrate on hydrotreating catalyst in fixed beds at the reactor entrance and pellet edges.

The hydrotreating experiments with varying operating times were conducted in a fixed - bed cata - test unit. Two feeds were used: HVGO and a blend of 40 % HVGO and 60 % heavy vacuum residue (HVR).

**Deactivation study** was carried out at the following constant conditions: 350 °C of reaction temperature, 50 bar of total hydrogen pressure, 250 L/L H<sub>2</sub>/ oil ratio, 0.5 h<sup>-1</sup> LHSV and time on stream (TOS) of 3, 6, 9, 12 & 24 h. HDS activity of the catalyst was decreased from 86.8 % at the first 3 h to reach 77.05 % and 74.94 % at 3 h to reach 36.46 % after 24 h for both HVGO and feed blend respectively.

---

This drop in HDS may be due to the coverage of the active sites by coke, which is responsible for the hydrotreating reactions.

***Study the effect of time on stream (TOS) on coke formation:*** It was observed that coke formation is very rapid during the early hours of the run, where 3.9 wt % and 10.2 wt % carbon was deposited on the catalyst within the first 3 h of operation in case of HVGO and feed blend, respectively. After the rapid coke builds up during the initial period, coking is slows down and tends to level off or reaches equilibrium value within 24 h.

***Effect of time on stream (TOS) on metal deposition:*** Nickel (Ni) and vanadium (V) removals showed different behaviors during TOS due to the differences in the Ni – and V – porphyrin type structure; in case of V, the linked oxygen atom forms strong bond with the catalyst structure while Ni does not have this oxygen link.

***Effect of time on stream on catalyst textural analysis:*** This effect shows a rapid decrease in both specific surface area and total pore volume during the first 3 to 6 h and then slows down; catalyst pore size distribution plays an important role in catalyst deactivation by coke deposition particularly during the early stages of the run.

**Regenerated catalysts** have the benefit of eliminating the first cause of deactivation, coke deposit, but it can do more in the case of hydroprocessing catalysts.

---


**Regeneration of the catalyst:** After catalyst regeneration, the regenerated catalyst was tested in the hydrotreatment of HVGO under the same operating conditions, and then catalyst surface area was measured after each operating variable. The results indicated that the specific surface area of the deactivated catalyst was gained after regeneration 85.5 %, 82.0 % and 79.8 % of the surface area of fresh catalyst after the effect of hydrogen pressure, liquid hourly space velocity (LHSV) and reaction temperature, respectively.

On comparing the two methods of catalyst regeneration, it is clear that decoking of the catalyst by THF method was decreased by increasing the TOS from 3 to 24 h, i.e. from 7.39 to 0.49 % and from 9.65 to 1.28 % for both HVGO and feed blend, respectively. Contrary, decoking by burn off method was increased from 3.9 to 10.72 % and from 10.2 to 14.0 % for both HVGO and feed blend, respectively, by increasing TOS from 3 to 24 h.


The HDS of the catalyst activity before and after regeneration was 83.01 & 72.54% in case of HVGO and 37.97 & 25.31% in case of feed blend.

The regeneration of spent catalyst set up by burn off in air has a great effect on the surface area of the catalyst used in hydrotreatment of HVGO and feed blend; the specific surface area of the fresh catalyst was 175.5 m<sup>2</sup>/g, decreased to 115 m<sup>2</sup>/g and 95.00 m<sup>2</sup>/g after 12h, respectively. After regeneration the surface area increased to 154 m<sup>2</sup>/g and 117m<sup>2</sup>/g for both HVGO and feed blend, respectively.

---



# REFERENCES



www.ck12.com

## *REFERENCES*

**Aarão Reis, F. D. A.;** *Reg. Physica A*, **350**, 407 (2005).

**Abd El – Wahed, M. G., Ahmed, H. S., Mohamed, L. Kh. And Abd El – Salam, H. M.;** *Mansoura J. Chem.*, **34**, 2 (2007).

**Ackerman, F., Berrebi, G., Dufresne, P., Van Lierde, A. and Foguene, M.;** *French Patent EP 555128 AI 930811* (1994).

**Agralwal, R. and Wel, J.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Proc. Des. Dev.*, **23**, 515 (1984).

**Al – Dalama, K. and Stanislaus, A.;** *Chem. Eng. J.*, **120**, 33 (2006).

**Al – Megren, H. A., Xiao, T., Cortes, S. L., Al – Khowaiter, S. H. and Green, M. L.;** *J. Molecular Cat. A*, **225**, 143 (2005).

**Al – Zeghayer, Y.S., Sunderland, P., Al-Masry, W., Al-Mubaddel, F., Ibrahim, A. A., Bhartiya, B. K. and Jibril, B. Y.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **282**, 163 (2005).

**Ali, F.A., Hauser, A., Abdullah, H. A. and Al-Adwani, A.;** *Energy Fuels*, **20**, 45 (2006).

**Ancheta, J., Betancourt, G., Marroquin, G., Centeno, G., Castenedal, L. C., Alonso, F., Munoz, J. A., Gomez, Ma. T. and Royo, P.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **233**, 159 (2002).

**Ancheta, J., Rana, M. S. and Furimsky, E.;** *Cat. Today*, **109**, 3 (2005).

---

**Ancheyta, J., Betancourt, G., Centeno, G., Marroquin, G., Alonso, F. and Garciafigueroa, E.;** *Energy Fuels*, **16**, 1438 (2002).

**Ancheyta, J., Betancourt, G., Centeno, G. and Marroquin, G.;** *Energy Fuels*, **17**, 462 (2003).

**Angelici, R. J.;** *Polyhedron*, **18**, 3073 (1997).

**Appleby, W. G., Gibson, J. W. and Good, G. M.;** *In. Eng. Chem. Proc. Des. Dev.*, **2**, 102 (1962).

**Arteaga, A., Fierro, J. L. G., Grange, P. and Delmon, B.;** (*CoMo HDS Catalysts: Simulated Deactivation and Regeneration. Role of various Regeneration parameters*). *Catalyst Deactivation; Delmon B. and Froment G. F. Eds.; Elsevier: Amsterdam*, 59 (1987) a.

**Baltus, R. E.;** *Fuels Sci. Technol. Int.*, **11**, 751 (1993).

**Bartholomew, C. H.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **212**, 17 (2001).

**Bartholomew, C.;** *Catalyst Deactivation/Regeneration, Encyclopedia of Catalysis, Wiley, New York*, (2002).

**Bartholomew, in:** *Oballa, M. C., Shih, S. S.;* (Eds.), *Catalytic Hydroprocessing of Petroleum and Distillates*, Marcel Dekker, New York, (1994).

**Bartholomew, C. H.;** *Catalyst Deactivation in Hydrotreating of Residue: A review. In catalytic hydroprocessing of petroleum and distillates. Edited by Obulla M.C. and Shih S.;* Marcel Dekker, New York, (1993).

**Beaton, W. I. and Bertolacini, R. J.;** *Cat. Rev. Sci. Eng.*, **33**, 281 (1991).

**Bhatia, S., Beltramini, J. and Do, D. D.;** *Cat. Rev. Sci., Eng.*, **31**, 431 (1990).

---

**Blasco, V., Royo, C., Monzón, A. and Santamaria, J.;** *AIChE J.* **38**, 237 (1992).

**Blashka, S., Bond, G. and Ward, D.;** *Oil Gas J.*, 36 (1998).

**Callejas, M. A., Martinez, M. T., Blasco, T. and Sastre, E.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **218**, 181 (2001).

**Candia, R., Clausen, B. S. and Topsøe, H.;** *Proceedings of the Ninth Iberoamerican Symposium on Catalysis, Lisbon, Portugal*, 211 (1984).

**Castellón, E. R., López, A. J. and Quesada, D. E.;** *Fuel*, **87**, 1195 (2008).

**Christoph, K. and Andreas, J.;** *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, **60**, 4249 (2005).

**Chu, K. S., Dong, D., Hanson, F. V. and Massoth, F. E.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **35**, 4012 (1996).

**Clausen, B. S., Topsøe, H., Candia, R., Villadsen, J., Lengeler, B., Als, N. and Christensen, F.;** *Phys. Chem. J.*, **85**, 3868 (1981).

**Delmon, B. and Grange, P.;** *In Catalyst Deactivation*; **Delmon, B. Froment, G.F., Eds.;** Elsevier: Amsterdam, the Netherlands, (1980).

**Delmon, B.;** *Appl. Cat.*, **18**, 389 (1985).

**Djangkung, S. S. M., Hyouk, K. C., Korai, Y. and Mochida, I.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **280**, 133 (2005).

**Dufresne, P.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **322**, 67 (2007).

**Egorova, M. and Prins, R.;** *J. Cat.*, **224**, 278 (2004).

---

**Eijsbouts, S., Battiston, A. A. and Leerdam, G. C. V.;** *Cat. Today*, **130**, 361 (2008).

**Eijsbouts, S.;** *Stud. Surf. Sci. Cat.*, **127**, 21 (1999).

**Eisenbach, D. and Gallei, E.;** *J. Cat.*, **59**, 377 (1979).

**Fonseca, A., Zeuthen, P. and Nagy, J. B.;** *Fuel*, **75**, 1363 (1996).

**Forzatti, P. and Lietti, L.;** *Cat. Today*, **52**, 165 (1999).

**Frizi, N., Blanchard, P., Payen, E., Baranek, P., Rebeilleau, M., Dupuy, C. and Dath, J. P.;** *Cat. Today*, **130**, 272 (2008).

**Froment, G. F.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **163**, 199 (2001).

**Fulton, J. W.;** *Chem. Eng.*, **95**, 111 (1988).

**Furimsky, E. and Massoth, F. E.;** *Cat. Today*, **52**, 381 (1999).

**Furimsky E.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **171**, 177 (1998).

**Gary, J. H.;** *Hydrotreating in Petroleum Refining Technology and Economics, Fourth Edition*, edited by Dekker M., (2001).

**Glasson, C., Geantet, C., Lacroix, M., Labruyere, F. and Dufresne, P.;** *J. Cat.*, **212**, 76 (2002).

**Gudlavalleti, S., Ros, T. and Lieftink, D.;** *Appl. Cat. B: Environmental*, **74**, 251 (2007).

**Gültekin, S. and Hamad, E.;** *the Arabian J. Sci. Eng.*, **12** (1987).

**Haber, J., Block, J. H. and Delmon, B.;** *Pure Appl. Chem.*, **67** (8) (9), 1257 (1995).

---

**Halabi, M. A., Stanislaus, A. and Trimm, D. L.; *Appl. Cat.*, 72,193 (1991).**

**Hauser, A., Marafi, A., Stanislaus, A. and Al-Adwani, A.; *Energy Fuels*, 19, 544 (2005).**

**Hauser, A., Stanislaus, A., Marafi, A. and Al-Adwani, A.; *Fuel*, 84, 259 (2005).**

**Higashi, H., Takashi, T. and Kai, T.; *Cat. Surveys Japan*, 5, 2 (2002).**

**Inomata, M., Sato, K., Yamada, Y. and Sazaki, H.; *Oil Gas J.*, 60 (1997).**

**Jacobsen, A. C., Cooper, B. H. and Hannerup, P. N.; *Petrol. World Congr*, 4, 97 (1987).**

**Jiménez, F., Kafarov, V. and Nuñez, M.; *Chem. Eng. J.*, 134, 200 (2007).**

**Kabayashi, S., Kushiya, S., Aizawa, R., Koinuma, Y., Imoue, K., Shimizu, Y. and Egi, K.; *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*,26,2245 (1987).**

**Kabe, T., Aoyama, Y., Wang, D., Ishihara, A., Qian, W. and Zhang, Q.; *Appl. Cat. A*, 209, 237 (2001).**

**Kern, C. and Jess, A.; *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 60, 4249 (2005).**

**Kogan, V. M., Gaziev, R. G., Lee, S. W. and Rozhdestvenskaya, N. N.; *Appl. Cat. A*, 251, 187 (2003).**

**Koizumi, N., Urabe, Y., Inamura, K., Itoh, T. and Yamada, M.; *Cat. Today*, 106, 211 (2005).**

**Mair, B. J. and Rossina, F. D.; *ASTM 224*, 9 (1958).**

---

**Maity, S. K., Ancheyta, J., Alonso, F. and Rana, M. S.;** *Cat. Today*, **98**, 193 (2004).

**Maity, S. K., Ancheyta, J., Soberanis, L., Alonso, F. and Llanos, M. E.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **244**, 141 (2003).

**Maity, S. K., Pérez, V. H., Ancheyta, J. and Rana, M.S.;** *Energy Fuels*, **21**, 636 (2007).

**Manuel, N. I., Zarith, P., Viatches, K. and Daniel, E. R.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **199**, 263 (2000).

**Marafi, M. and Stanislaus, A.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **159**, 259 (1997).

**Marafi, M. and Stanislaus, A.;** *Cat. Today*, **130**, 421 (2008).

**Marafi, M. and Stanislaus, A.;** *Pet. Sci. Tech.*, **19**, 697 (2001).

**Martin, N., Viniegra, M., Lima, E. and Espinosa, G.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **43**, 1206 (2004).

**Martin, N., Viniegra, M., Zarate, R., Espinosa, G. and Batina, N.;** *Cat. Today*, **107**, 719 (2005).

**Matsushita, K., Hauser, A., Marafi, A., Koide, R. and Stanislaus, A.;** *Fuel*, **83**, 1031 (2004).

**Mochida, I., Zhao, X., Skanishi, K., Yamamoto, S., Takashima, H. and Uemura, S.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **418**, 28 (1989).

**Morel, F., Kressmann, S., Harle, V. and Kasztelan, S.;** *Hydrotreating Hydrocracking of Oil Fractions*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, (1997).

---

**Murti, S. D. S., Choi, K. H., Korai, Y. and Mochida, I.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **280**, 133 (2005).

**Myers, T. E., Le, F. S., Myers, B. L., Fleisch, T. H. and Zajac, G. E.;** *AICHE Symposium 85*, 32 (1989).

**Newson, E.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Process Des. Dev.*, **14**, 27 (1975).

**Okamoto, Y., Tomioka, H. and Imanaka, T.;** *J. Cat.*, **66**, 93 (1980).

**Okamoto, Y.;** *Cat. Today*, **132**, 9 (2008).

**Oyekunle, L. O. and Ikpekri, O. B.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **43**, 6647 (2004).

**Oyekunle, L. O., Ikpekri, O. B. and Jaiyeola, A.;** *Cat. Today*, **109**, 128 (2005).

**Perot, G.;** *Cat. Today*, **86**, 111 (2003).

**Pierre, D.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **322**, 67 (2007).

**Ramirez, J. and Minero, F. S.;** *Cat. Today*, **130**, 267 (2008).

**Rana, M. S., Ancheyta, J., Rayo, P. and Maity, S. K.;** *Fuel*, **86**, 1263 (2007).

**Reis, F. D. A. A.;** *Phys. A*, **350**, 407 (2005).

**Richardson, S. M., Nagaishi, H. and Gary, M. R.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **35**, 3940 (1996).

**Royo, C., Ibarra, J. V., Monzón, A. and Santamaria, J.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **33**, 2563 (1994).

**Sahoo, S. K., Ray, S. S. and Singh, I. D.;** *Appl. Cat. A*, **278**, 83 (2004).

---

**Segawa, K. and Shokubai;** *Catalysts and Catalysis*, **48**, 228 (2006).

**Shaban, S.A.;** M. Sc. Thesis, Faculty of Girls, Art, Science and Education. Ain Shams University, (1999).

**Silva, V. L. S. T., Frety, R. and Schmal, M.;** *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **33**, 1692 (1994).

**Speight, J. G.,** *the Desulfurization of Heavy Oil and Residue, 2nd Ed., Marcel Dekker, New York, (2000).*

**Speight, J. G.;** *New Approaches to Hydroprocessing. In International Symposium on Advances in Hydroprocessing of Oil Fractions (ISAHOF 2004), Oaxaca, Mexico, April 18 – 22, 2004; Elsevier Science: New York, 61 (2004).*

**Suokoh, E., Park, Y., Lee, I. and Rhee, H.;** *J. Cat.*, **172**, 314 (1997).

**Tailleur, R. G. and Capriodi, L.;** *Cat Today*, **109**, 185 (2005).

**Takahashi, T., Higashi, H. and Kai, T.;** *Cat. Today*, **104**, 76 (2005).

**Takatsuka, T. and Hori, Y.;** *Petroleum Refining Process, Kodansha, Tokyo, 37 (1998).*

**Tanaka, Y., Shimada, H., Matsubayashi, N., Nishijima, A. and Nomura, M.;** *Cat. Today*, **45**, 319 (1998).

**Topsøe, H., Clausen, B.S., Candia, R., Wivel, C. and Mørup, S.;** *J. Cat.*, **68**, 433 (1981).

**Topsøe, H., Clausen, B. S. and Massoth, F. E.;** *Hydrotreating Catalysis, Springer- Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 114 (1996).*

---

**Topsøe, H., Clausen, B. S. and Massoth, F. E.;** *Catalysis, Sci. Tech., 11, 1* (1996).

**Topsoe, H., Clausen, B. S. and Massoth, F. E.;** *J. R. Anderson, Boudart M. (Eds.), Hydrotreating Cat. Sci. and Tech., 11, Springer, Berlin, (1996).*

**Topsøe, H.;** *Appl. Cat. A, 322, 3 (2007).*

**Van Doorn, J. and Moulijn, J. A.;** *Fuel Process Techno., 26, 39 (1990).*

**Vogelaar, B. M., Berger, R. J., Bezemer, B., Janssens, J. P., Langeveld, A. D. V., Eijsbouts, S. and Moulijn, J. A.;** *Chem. Eng. Sci., 61, 7463 (2006).*

**Yang, Y. Q., Tye, C. T. and Smith, K. J.;** *Cat. Communi., 9, 1364 (2008).*

---

---

## Catalyst deactivation during hydrotreating process

Abd EL-Wahed M.G<sup>\*</sup>, Ahmed H. S., Mohamed L. Kh. and Abd EL-Salam H. M.

Egyptian Petroleum Research Institute Nasr City, Cairo Faculty of Science,  
Zagazig University, Egypt

### Abstract

The deactivation of a Co-Mo/  $\gamma$  - alumina hydrotreating catalyst is investigated in a cata - test micro reactor unit by using heavy vacuum gas oil (HVGO) and a blend of 40: 60 % HVGO and heavy vacuum residue (HVR) as feed stocks at the following constant operating conditions: temperature of 350°C, pressure of 50 bar, H<sub>2</sub> / oil ratio of 250 L/L and LHSV of 0.5 h<sup>-1</sup> with different durations ranging from 3 – 24 h. The results showed that a rapid coke build up on the catalyst surface is very fast during the first hours of run reaches as high as 3.9 wt. % and 10.2 wt. % in case of HVGO and feed blend respectively, within 3 h. and then tends to level off or reach as an equilibrium value within 24 h. The drops in catalyst surface area were particularly high (28.57 % and 41.71 %) for HVGO and feed blend respectively during the first 3 h. of operation. Pore size distribution analysis indicated that the coke which formed during the first hours was deposited predominantly in the narrow pores < 50 Å of the catalyst. The improvement of surface area after regeneration is very important to reuse the catalyst again incase of HVGO than the feed blend.

**Keywords:** Hydrotreating; deactivation; coke deposition; regeneration.

### INTRODUCTION

The study of catalyst deactivation during hydroprocessing of heavy oil fractions is one of the most important aspects to improve the catalytic performance in petroleum refining processes [Ancheyta, et al. (2003); Furimsky and Massoth (1999); Maity, et al. (2007) and Vogelar, et al. (2006)]. Catalysts deactivation is caused by: metal deposition on active catalytic surface which is irreversible and whose rate depends on the metal level in the feed; the carbonaceous material deposition and precipitation on the external as well as internal structure of catalyst, pore constriction and blockage, characterized by a very strong loss in activity [Tailleur and Capriodi (2005)].

Cokes formed very rapidly during the first hours of time - on stream, and deactivation of catalyst by this material appears to rapidly reach

a pseudo steady state level [**Hauser, et al. (2005) and Matsushita, et al. (2004)**], while metals in the feed (mainly V and Ni) are converted to their sulfides, which deposit within the pores and irreversibly deactivate the catalyst.

Metals, mainly vanadium build up until pore mouth plugging. With a low-metals feed-stock, there is an initial activity loss as coke is deposited on the catalyst. This is followed by a more gradual loss in activity as the metals deposited. However, with a high metals feed stock, there is a more rapid and severe deactivation after the initial coke deposition [**Furimsky, (1998); Beaton and Bertolacini (1991); Rana, et al. (2007) and Ancheta, et al. (2005)**].

Regeneration is carried out by burning off the deposits in an oxygen – rich stream. Logically, regenerate composition is related to the necessity of avoiding excessive temperature rises that may damage the catalyst. The temperature needed for regeneration must be carefully controlled to avoid catalyst sintering [**Delmon, et al. (1980); Pierre (2007) and Christoph and Andreas (2005)**].

The present work considers, a series of vacuum gas oil hydrotreating runs with different durations ranging from 3 to 24 hours, conducted together with a blend mixture, 40 % vacuum gas oil and 60 % heavy vacuum residue.

## EXPERIMENTAL

**Feed stock:** Heavy vacuum gas oil (HVGO) kindly supplied from Suez Petroleum Company and feed blend (40 - 60) 40 % heavy vacuum gas oil and 60 % heavy vacuum residue (HVR) were used in this investigation. The main characteristics of feeds are collected in Table 1.

**Catalyst:** A commercial Co-Mo/ $\gamma$ -alumina hydrotreating catalyst (surface area = 175.5 m<sup>2</sup>/g, pore volume = 0.4254 cc/g, average pore diameter = 194 Å; CoO = 4.1 % and MoO<sub>3</sub> = 12.8 % was used in this investigation.

**Catalytic Activity Test:** The hydrotreating experiments with varying operating times were conducted in a fixed-bed cata-test unit. Fifty milliliters of catalyst together with an equal amount of glass beads was charged in the reactor and used in each run. Two feeds were used: HVGO and a blend of 40 % HVGO and 60 % HVR as shown in Table (1). More details about the cata-test unit, catalyst loading, experimental procedure and catalyst pre-sulfiding were reported elsewhere [Menoufy, et al. (2002)]. Deactivation study was carried out at the following constant conditions: 350°C of reaction temperature, 50 bar of total H<sub>2</sub> pressure, and 250 L/L hydrogen - to - oil ratio, 0.5 h<sup>-1</sup> of liquid hourly space velocity (LHSV) and time on stream (TOS) 3, 6, 9, 12 and 24 h.

The most important properties of the products were measured using the following standard (ASTM) methods:

Specific gravity 60/60 °F	ASTM D-1298
Aniline point, °F	ASTM D 611-82
Pour point, °C	ASTM D 97-88
Color	ASTM D-1500
Conradson- carbon residue, wt%	ASTM D-189
Asphaltene content, wt%	IP - 143
Sulfur content, wt%	IP - 336

Metals analysis was conducted by using atomic absorption spectrometer, Perkin- Elmer 800, Surface area and average pore diameter of the catalysts were carried out using quanta chrome NOVA automated gas sorption system, model 2002 and mercury porosimeter.

At the end of each run, the coked catalyst was removed, soxhlet extracted with cyclohexane then toluene and then dried in an electric oven at 110°C for 2h then cooled. The washed and dried spent catalyst sample was taken off to be analyzed for carbon, metals, BET surface areas, pore volume and pore size distribution.

**Regeneration:** The washed catalyst was then heated at different temperature in an electric oven to eliminate the carbon and sulfur residues in air as CO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> respectively.

The temperature is increased from 100 to 350°C at rate of 50 °C /h then the product is maintained at 350°C for 1h, heated to 450 °C at 25 °C /h, and maintained at this temperature for 24h.

After cooling to room temperature the percentage of coke was determined by loss of weight before and after consumption.

## Result and discussion:

### 1- Effect of time on stream on the products quality

The influence of initial coking on hydrodesulfurization (HDS) reaction was investigated by the analysis of the hydrotreated products as for sulfur content. The rate constant for (HDS) reaction at various coke levels was calculated using the kinetic equation [Marafi and Stanislaus (1997)].

$$K_{HDS} = LHSV \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \frac{1}{S_P^{n-1}} - \frac{1}{S_F^{n-1}} \right)$$

Where LHSV is the liquid hourly space velocity, n is the reaction order =1.5,  $S_F$  is the sulfur content in the feed (wt %) and  $S_P$  is the sulfur content in product (wt %). The results clearly demonstrate that the HDS activity of the catalyst decreases from 86.84 % at the first 3 h to reach 83.01 % after 12 h then decreased to 77.05 % after 24 h as shown in Table (2). The loss of HDS activity caused by coke deposition on hydrotreated catalyst may be due to the coke blocking in edges and corners of the active  $MoS_2$  crystallites.

The catalytic active sites in the sulfided Co-Mo/  $\gamma$   $Al_2O_3$  catalyst used in this study are responsible for promoting hydrotreating reactions as hydrodesulfurization (HDS), hydrodenitrogenation (HDN) and hydrogenation (the sulfur vacancies in  $MoS_2$  crystallites).

These crystallites remain dispersed on the alumina surface as hexagonal slabs; coke deposition may cover these active sites leading to a decrease in

their activity towards the hydrotreating reactions as HDS and hydrogenation.

The other characteristics of the products which are shown in Table (2) as yields, density, aromatic contents, and diesel indices were also affected by coke deposition.

On the other hand, the products quality of the yields produced from hydrotreating the blend mixture are given in Table (3). The data show that at the first 3h, the hydrodesulfurization activity was decreased to 74.94 % then it was decreased sharply to 46.08 % after 6 h and slows down to reach about 36.46 % after 24 h.

It is also observed that after 6 h of run asphaltene conversion and consequently coke formation are drastically reduced (asphaltene and coke deposition changed from 4.01 to 6.79 % and from 13.2 to 14 % when TOS was increased from 6 to 24 h respectively). Asphaltene content, Conradson carbon residue (C.C.R), aromatic content were increased sharply from 3 - 6 h and small increase from 6 - 24 h.

This behavior is attributed to that the feed blend contains (7.74%) asphaltene content and (181.2 PPM) metals content (Ni and V) and Conradson carbon residue 13.01%. These properties of feed, Table (1), differ than the feed 100% of vacuum gas oil and cause great amount of carbon and metals deposited on the catalyst at first hours [Murthi, et al. (2005) and Sahoo, et al. (2004)].

Tables (2) and (3) represented the comparison between the quality of characteristics of hydrotreatment HVGO and that of feed blend. From the obtained results, it is clear that the yield and aromatic content are higher in case of feed blend than in case of HVGO, which is due to the more catalyst deactivation as a result of higher coke deposition.

## **2- Effect of time on stream on coke formation**

A series of heavy vacuum gas oil and blend hydrotreating experiments of duration ranging from 3 h to 24 h were conducted to investigate the influence of processing time on coke build up on the catalyst surface. Figure 1, represented the relation between time on stream and coke formation of HVGO and feed blend hydrotreatment and these results show that the coke formation is very rapid during the early hours of the run. More than 3.9 wt % and 10.2 wt % carbon is deposited on the catalyst within the first 3 h of operation in case of HVGO and feed blend, respectively. After the rapid coke build up during the initial period, coking slows down and tends to level off or reach an equilibrium value within 24 h [Ancheyta, et al. (2002)]. Coke deposited in case of blend was higher than that of HVGO; which may be attributed to the amount of the carbonaceous deposits formed from the heavy components in the feed stocks [Tanaka, et al. (1998)]. It is not surprising since asphaltenes, which are very large poly aromatic compounds, are the major coke precursors. This confirms that deposition of coke is the main source of catalyst deactivation during first hours of run [Manuel, et al. (2000)].

## **3- Effect of time on stream on metal deposition**

Nickel and vanadium removals showed different behaviour during time on stream (TOS). This can be attributed to the difference in Ni - and V - porphyrin type structure, In case of V, the linked oxygen atom forms strong bond with the catalyst surface while Ni does not have this oxygen link. It should also be mentioned that the initial V content is about 3 times higher than Ni content (Fig. 2) and this difference affects metal deposition on the catalyst where the rate of Ni deposit formation is strongly influenced by formation of V deposits.

During blend hydroprocessing, asphaltenes are converted to smaller molecules and metals (porphyrine and non porphyrine types) transformed and deposited into catalyst causing catalyst deactivation. The molecules do not penetrate deeply into the catalyst and accumulated as metal sulfides into the pore mouth and block the way to enter the reactants. Metal deposition is affected deeply by the pore size distribution of the catalyst [Furimsky (1998)].

#### **4- Effect of time on stream on catalyst textural analysis**

The surface area and pore volume of the used catalyst samples from the different runs conducted at varying duration time were measured with a view to gain additional information on the influence of initial coke on catalyst deactivation by loss of surface area and porosity. The surface area and pore volume of the catalyst are plotted as a function of processing time in Figs. (3, 4). The decrease in surface area is particularly rapid during the first 3 to 6 hr and then slows down.

A similar decrease is also noticed in the catalyst pore volume, Fig. 4. With increasing processing time, the decrease of surface area and pore volume of spent catalyst in case of hydrotreated feed blend was higher than in case of hydrotreated HVGO. The observed loss in surface area and pore volume of the catalyst during processing could be attributed to coke deposition. The micro pores present in the fresh catalyst contribute significantly to the catalyst total surface area. Blockage of these micro pores with coke deposition [Marafi and Stanislaus (1997)] can be expected to lead to loss of both pore volume and surface area.

Surface area decreases about 41.71 % in case of feed blend and 28.57 % in case of HVGO due to coke and metal deposition.

The initial coke deposited during the early hours of the run had a significant effect on the pore size distribution of the catalyst. Pores

smaller than 50 and 100 Å diameters appear to be affected more by the initial coke deposition than the large pores. Thus the total volume of the micro pores having diameter less than 50 Å is found to be reduced by (73.05 % and 83.98 %) for HVGO and feed blend respectively. The narrow meso pores (50 – 100 Å diameters) are not appreciably affected during the first hours, but they become progressively blocked by coke with increasing TOS. Thus within 3 h of operation (21.21 % and 52.73 %) for HVGO and feed blend the volume located in mesopores (20 - 200 Å) meso pores is lost. Large meso pores and macro pores are not affected to any significant level by the initial coke deposits. Catalyst pore distribution, thus, plays an important role in catalyst deactivation by coke deposition, particularly during the early stages of the run, as indicated in Table (4).

#### **5- Regeneration of the catalyst:**

The regeneration of spent catalyst set up by burn off in air are very affected on the surface area of HVGO and feed blend. The surface area of the fresh catalyst was 175.5 m<sup>2</sup>/g, decreased to 115 m<sup>2</sup>/g and 95.00 m<sup>2</sup>/g after 12h respectively. After regeneration the area increased to (154 m<sup>2</sup>/g and 117m<sup>2</sup>/g) for both HVGO and feed blend. Alternatively the loss of surface area of spent catalyst equals to 28.57 % and 41.71 %, but the regeneration of catalyst becomes 12.61 % and 33.34 % respectively are given in Table (5). The improvement of surface area after regeneration is very important to reuse the catalyst again incase of HVGO than the feed blend.

#### **Conclusions**

- HDS activity of the catalyst decreases from 86.8 % at the first 3 h. to reach 77.05 % after 24 h. for the HVGO and 74.94 % at 3 h. to reach 36.46 % after 24 h. for feed blend. This drop due to the coke coverage of the active sites is responsible for the hydrotreating reactions.

- Coke formation is very rapid during the early hours of the run. More than 3.9 wt % and 10.2 wt % carbon is deposited on the catalyst within the first 3 h. of operation in case of HVGO and feed blend, respectively.
- Ni and V removals showed different behaviors during TOS due to the differences in the Ni – and V – porphyrin type structure.
- Catalyst pore distribution plays an important role in catalyst deactivation by coke deposition particularly during the early stages of the run.
- Regeneration has the benefit of eliminating the first cause of deactivation due coke deposition.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to express their sincerest appreciation to prof. Dr. F.Y. El – Kady, professor of Catalysis, Refining Division, Egyptian Petroleum Research Institute, for his kind help and fruitful discussions.

### REFERENCES

- Ancheta J., Rana M. S., Furimsky E.; *Cat. Today*. 109:3. (2005)
- Ancheyta J., Betancourt G., Centeno G., Marroquin G., Alonso F., Garciafigueroa E.; *Energy & Fuels*. 16 (2002) 1438
- Ancheyta J., Betancourt G., Centeno G., Marroquin G.; *Energy & Fuels*. 17 (2003) 462
- Beaton W. I., Bertolacini R. J., *Cat. Rev. Sci. Eng.* 33 (1991) 281
- Christoph K., Andreas J.; *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 60 (2005) 4249
- Delmon B., Grange P., In *Catalyst Deactivation*; Delmon B. Froment G.F., Eds.; Elsevier: Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 1980
- Furimsky E., *Appl. Cat. A*: 171 (1998) 177
- Furimsky E., Massoth F.E.; *Cat. Today*. 52 (1999) 381
- Hauser A., Stanislaus A., Marafi A., Al – Adwani A.; *Fuel*. 84 (2005) 259

- Maity S. K., Perez V. H., Ancheta J., Rana M. S.; *Energy & Fuels*.21 (2007) 636
- Manuel N. I., Zarith P., Viatches K., Daniel E. R.; *Appl. Cat. A*: 199 (2000) 263
- Marafi M., Stanislaus A.; *Appl. Cat. A*: 159 (1997) 259
- Matsushita K., Hauser A., Marafi A., Koide R., Stanislaus A.; *Fuel*. 83 (2004) 1031
- Menoufy M. F., Elkady F. Y., Sif El-Din O. I., Ahmed H. S.; *Chem. in Industry, Conference and Expulsion, Petroleum Refining Session, Manama, Bahrian, (2002).*
- Murti S. D. S., Choi Ki – H., Korai Y., Mochida I.; *Appl. Cat. A*: 280 (2005) 133
- Pierre D.; *Appl. Cat. A*: 322 (2007) 67
- Rana M. S., Ancheyta J., Rayo P., Maity S. K.; *Fuel*. 86 (2007) 1263
- Sahoo S. K., Ray S. S., Singh I. D.; *Appl. Cat.A*: 278 (2004) 83
- Tailleur R. G., Capriodi L.; *Cat Today*. 109 (2005) 185
- Tanaka Y., Shimada H., Matsubayashi N., Nishijima A., Nomura M.; *Cat. Today*. 45 (1998) 319
- Vogelar B. M., Berger R. J., Bezemer B., Janssens J. P., Langeveld A. D. V., Eijsbouts S., Moulijn J. A.; *Chem. Eng. Sci.*61 (2006) 7463

**Table (1):** Main characteristics of feed stocks

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>HVGO</b>	<b>Feed Blend</b>
Specific gravity,60/60 °F	0.8744	0.9829
Sulfur content, wt %	1.83	3.95
Nitrogen content, wt %	0.063	-
Conradson carbon residue, wt %	-	13.01
Asphaltene content, wt %	-	7.74
Pour point, °C	12	-
Aniline point, °F	168.8	-
Olefins content, wt %	12.9	-
Color	5.5	-
<b>Component analysis, wt %</b>		
Total Saturates	57.06	10.61
Total aromatics	42.63	79.92
Resins	1.41	9.47
<b>Metal analysis, PPM</b>		
Vanadium ( V )	-	98.4
Nickel ( Ni )	-	82.8

**Table (2):** Effect of time on stream on the product quality of HVGO during hydrotreating process  
**Conditions:** (350°C, 50 bar, 0.5 h<sup>-1</sup>)

<b>Time, h</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Properties</b>					
Yield, wt %	76.90	78.50	80.29	83.93	92.89
Density, 60/60 °F	0.8453	0.8472	0.8475	0.8478	0.8479
Sulfur content, wt %	0.2409	0.3011	0.3063	0.3110	0.4200
Hydrodesulfurization, %	86.84	83.55	83.26	83.01	77.05
Rate constant (K <sub>HDS</sub> )	1.589	1.529	1.524	1.519	1.410
Aniline point, °F	174.2	174.2	174.2	174.2	174.2
Diesel index %	62.53	61.88	61.77	61.67	61.64
Color	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
<b>Component analysis, wt %</b>					
Total Saturates	62.89	63.02	62.85	62.79	62.71
Total Aromatics	36.22	36.34	36.70	36.90	37.10
Resins	0.89	0.64	0.45	0.31	0.19

**Table (3):** Effect of time on stream on the product quality of feed blend during hydrotreating process.

**Conditions:** ( 350°C, 50 bar, 0.5 h<sup>-1</sup>)

<b>Time, h</b> <b>Properties</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>
Yield, wt%	87.44	93.88	95.33	97.22	99.50
Density, 60/60 °F	0.926	0.935	0.938	0.945	0.948
Sulfur content, wt %	0.99	2.13	2.35	2.45	2.51
Hydrodesulfurization %	74.94	46.08	40.51	37.97	36.46
Rate constant (K <sub>HDS</sub> )	2.960	1.820	1.600	1.500	1.440
Asphaltene content, wt%	0.88	4.01	5.31	6.18	6.79
Conradson carbon residue, wt%	1.604	9.980	10.250	10.310	10.650
<b>Component analysis, wt%</b>					
Total Saturates	52.36	47.52	44.18	41.68	39.11
Total Aromatics	46.01	49.84	53.06	55.44	58.00
Resins	1.63	2.64	2.76	2.88	2.89

**Table (4):** Pore size distribution of catalysts coked for different duration.**Conditions:** (350°C, 50 bar, 0.5 h<sup>-1</sup>)

A <sup>o</sup>	BET m <sup>2</sup> /g		Total pore volume cc/g		>50		50-100		100-250		250-400		Total meso		>400	
	HVGO	FB*	HVGO	FB*	HVGO	FB*	HVGO	FB*	HVGO	FB*	HVGO	FB*	HVGO	FB*	HVGO	FB*
	175.5	175.5	0.425	0.425	0.026	0.026	0.273	0.273	0.054	0.054	0.024	0.024	0.351	0.351	0.049	0.049
	125	102	0.338	0.203	0.007	0.004	0.215	0.129	0.065	0.039	0.013	0.008	0.293	0.176	0.038	0.023
	122.5	100	0.316	0.190	0.006	0.004	0.200	0.120	0.056	0.034	0.018	0.011	0.274	0.164	0.036	0.022
	120	98	0.310	0.183	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.067	0.040	0.200	0.120	0.270	0.162	0.034	0.021
	115	95	0.294	0.177	0.006	0.003	0.137	0.082	0.088	0.053	0.033	0.020	0.258	0.155	0.031	0.019
	112.5	92.5	0.240	0.144	0.005	0.003	0.076	0.046	0.105	0.063	0.031	0.019	0.212	0.128	0.023	0.014

eed blend





Fig.(1) Effect of time on stream on coke of HVGO and blend feed during hydrotreating process.



Content of blend




Fig.(3) Effect of time on stream on surface area of HVGO and blend feed during hydrotreating process.






Fig.(4) Effect of time on stream on pore volume of HVGO and blend feed during hydrotreating process.

**Table (5):** Effect of regeneration on the loss of surface area of HVGO and feed blend during hydrotreating process

<b>Loss of surface area (m<sup>2</sup>/g) %</b> <b>catalyst</b>	<b>Spent</b>	<b>Regeneration</b>
<b>Oil</b>	28.57	12.61
<b>Blend</b>	41.71	33.34





www.ck12.com



جامعة الزقازيق  
كلية العلوم  
قسم الكيمياء

# "دراسة على تهميد وإعادة تنشيط حفاز أثناء عمليات المعالجة الهيدروجينية"

رسالة مقدمة من

هويدا ممدوح عبدالسلام أحمد

بكالوريوس العلوم- كيمياء (١٩٩٨)

للحصول على

درجة الماجستير في العلوم في الكيمياء

الى  
قسم الكيمياء- كلية العلوم  
جامعة الزقازيق

٢٠٠٨



جامعة الزقازيق  
كلية العلوم  
قسم الكيمياء

## "دراسة على تهميد وإعادة تنشيط حفاز أثناء عمليات المعالجة الهيدروجينية"

رسالة مقدمة من

هويدا ممدوح عبدالسلام أحمد

بكالوريوس العلوم- كيمياء (١٩٩٨)

للحصول على

درجة الماجستير في العلوم في الكيمياء

الى

قسم الكيمياء- كلية العلوم  
جامعة الزقازيق

تحت اشراف

د/هدى سيد أحمد

استاذ مساعد

قسم تكرير البترول

معهد بحوث البترول

أ.د/محمد جمال حلمي عبد الواحد

استاذ الكيمياء الفيزيائية

عميد كلية العلوم

جامعة الزقازيق

د./لطيفة خليل محمد

استاذ مساعد بقسم تكرير البترول

معهد بحوث البترول

تقرير الصلاحية

عنوان الرسالة: " دراسة على تهميد وإعادة تنشيط حفاز أثناء عمليات المعالجة الهيدروجينية "

رسالة مقدمة من

هويدا ممدوح عبدالسلام أحمد  
بكالوريوس العلوم- كيمياء (١٩٩٨)  
كلية العلوم- جامعة الزقازيق  
للحصول على درجة الماجستير فى الكيمياء

وقد تمت مناقشة الرسالة والموافقة عليها..... من قبل اللجنة الآتية:

التوقيع	السادة المحكمين
	١- الأستاذ الدكتور/ صلاح عبد الغنى أبو العينين أستاذ الكيمياء الفيزيائية - قسم الكيمياء - كلية العلوم - جامعة عين شمس.
	٢- الأستاذ الدكتور / نادية عبد الحكيم يوسف أستاذ الكيمياء الفيزيائية - قسم الكيمياء - كلية العلوم - بنات عين شمس.
	٣- الأستاذ الدكتور / محمد جمال حلمى عبد الواحد أستاذ الكيمياء الفيزيائية - قسم الكيمياء - وعميد كلية العلوم - جامعة الزقازيق.

تاريخ الموافقة:

## الملخص العربي

ان عملية تهميد حفاز وإعادة نشاطيته من العمليات الهامة فى صناعة البترول وخاصة فى عمليات المعالجة الهيدروجينية. وقد تمت دراسة نشاطية حفاز الكوبلت-موليبدينم/ ألومينا فى عملية المعالجة الهيدروجينية باستخدام نظام الديناميكي مستمر و السولار المخلخل كمادة تغذية تحت الظروف الآتية:

- درجات الحرارة : ٣٠٠ - ٤٢٥ °م
  - الضغط الهيدروجينى : ١٥ - ٦٥ جو
  - السرعة الفراغية : ٠,٥ - ١,٥ ساعة<sup>١</sup>
  - مادة التغذية إلى الهيدروجين ٢٥٠ لتر / لتر
  - زمن التفاعل ٩ ساعات
- أوضحت النتائج أن زيادة درجات الحرارة من ٣٠٠ إلى ٤٢٥ م° وثبات كلاً من الضغط الهيدروجينى عند ٥٠ بار والسرعة الفراغية ٠,٥ س<sup>١</sup> وزمن التفاعل ٩ ساعات لها تأثير هام فى تحسين إزالة الكبريت من ٣٧,١٦ إلى ٩٨,٣١ % وأيضاً تعمل على تحسين ملحوظ فى الخواص الطبيعية للسائل المنتج مثل معامل الديزل واللون ونقطة الإنسكاب وكذلك نقطة الأنيلين بينما تقل نسبة المواد العطرية بزيادة درجة الحرارة.
- وبدراسة تأثير العامل الثانى(الضغط) من ظروف التشغيل باستخدام ضغط هيدروجينى من ١٥ - ٦٥ بار ودرجة حرارة ٣٥٠ م° , سرعة فراغية ٠,٥ س<sup>١</sup> وزمن التفاعل ٩ ساعات فقد وجد أنه يتم تحسين إزالة الكبريت من ٧٠,٧٠ إلى ٨٥,١٩ % بزيادة الضغط كما وجد أيضاً ان الخواص الطبيعية للمنتج يتم تحسينها.
- عندما تقل السرعة الفراغية يزداد زمن التلامس فى المفاعل وتبعاً لذلك نجد انه لا تحسين فى خواص السائل للمنتج بزيادة السرعة الفراغية من ٠,٥ - ١,٥ س<sup>١</sup> عند ثبات كلاً من درجة الحرارة ٣٥٠ م° , الضغط ٥٠ بار وزمن التفاعل ٩ ساعات.
- وقد تم تقسيم المفاعل إلى ثلاث طبقات وبدراسة ظروف التشغيل على فاعلية الحفاز وجد ان الطبقة الأولى من المفاعل هى التى يتراكم فيها الكربون اكثر من الطبقة الثانية والثالثة .

- فى حالة دراسة تأثير درجات الحرارة وبعد انتهاء التفاعل أى بمرور ٥٤ ساعة وجد ان نسبة الكربون ٤,٨٣ % نسبة وزنية للطبقة الأولى بينما ٣,٧٥ , ٣,٤٢ % للطبقة الثانية والثالثة على التوالى.
- وبدراسة زيادة الضغط الهيدروجينى من ١٥ - ٦٥ بار ومرار ٣٦ ساعة وجد ان نسبة الكربون هى ٤,١٤ & ٢,٠٢ & ٢,٠٤ % للطبقات الثلاث على التوالى. بينما فى حالة السرعة الفراغية ومرار ٤٥ ساعة وجد ان نسبة الكربون ٣,٧٥ & ٣,٢٩ & ٣,٢٦ % فى الطبقات الثلاث، ولذلك وجد ان نسبة الكربون المترسب تكون كالتالى:

#### الطبقة الأولى < الطبقة الثانية < الطبقة الثالثة

- وقد تم استخدام مادة تغذية اخرى تتكون من خليط من السولار المخلخل والمتبقى الثقيل المخلخل بنسبة ٤٠ - ٦٠ % وذلك بجانب مادة التغذية الأساسية وهى السولار المخلخل وذلك تحت الظروف الآتية: درجة الحرارة ٣٥٠ م° والضغط الهيدروجينى ٥٠ بار وسرعة فراغية ٠,٥ س<sup>-١</sup> ونسبة التغذية إلى الهيدروجين ٢٥٠ ل/ل مع اختلاف فى الوقت من ٣ - ٢٤ ساعة لدراسة عملية تهميد الحفاز المستخدم.
- وقد وجد ان فاعلية الحفاز لإزالة الكبريت فى الثلاث ساعات الأولى هى ٨٦,٨ % لتصل إلى ٧٧,٠٥ % & ٧٤,٩٤ % إلى ٣٦,٤٦ % بعد مرور ٢٤ ساعة فى حالة استخدام السولار المخلخل وخليط من السولار المخلخل والمتبقى الثقيل المخلخل، وذلك فقد يمكن رجوعه إلى ترسيب الكربون على المراكز النشطة للحفاز والمسئولة عن التفاعل.
- وقد وجد أيضاً بأن تكوين الكربون يكون سريعاً جداً أثناء الثلاث ساعات الأولى من التفاعل. بالنسبة للسولار المخلخل يكون كمية الكربون المترسبة ٣,٩ % أما فى حالة خليط من السولار المخلخل والمتبقى الثقيل المخلخل يكون ١٠,٢ % ثم بعد ذلك يصل إلى مرحلة الثبات بزيادة زمن التفاعل من ٩ إلى ٢٤ ساعة.
- وجد أيضاً انه فى حالة استخدام خليط من السولار المخلخل والمتبقى الثقيل المخلخل يترسب كلاً من النيكل والفانديوم على الحفاز بزيادة زمن التفاعل من ٣ إلى ٢٤ ساعة.
- أما بالنسبة للتوزيع المسامى للحفاز فقد وجد انه له دور هام فى عملية تهميد الحفاز بسبب الكربون خاصة فى المراحل الأولى من العملية الحفزية.

- ولقد تمت إعادته تنشيط الحفاز بعد عملية التهميد فى الطبقات المختلفة ووجد ان المساحة النوعية للسطح وحجم المسام الكلية يتغير باختلاف الطبقات نظراً لتكوين الكربون على الطبقة الأولى أكثر من الثانية والثالثة, ولذا فإن الكربون المترسب يكون بالقرب من مدخل المسام أسرع من داخلها وبالتالي فإن مساحة السطح تتأثر بذلك خاصة مع دراسة تأثير درجات حرارة التفاعل وتكون أقل من مثيلاتها فى حالة تأثير كلاً من الضغط الهيدروجينى والسرعة الفراغية.

- وقد تمت إزالة الكربون بطريقتين: باستخدام رباعى هيدروفيوران والحرق فى الهواء هما:

❖ فى حالة استخدام رباعى هيدروفيوران وقد وجد ان كمية الكربون المزالة تقل مع زيادة الوقت من ٣ إلى ٢٤ ساعة لتصل فى حالة السولار المخلخل من ٧,٣٩ إلى ٠,٤٩% بينما فى حالة خليط من السولار المخلخل والمتبقى الثقيل المخلخل فتصل من ٩,٦٥ إلى ١,٢٨%.

❖ وفى حالة الحرقة بواسطة الهواء عند درجة حرارة ٤٥٠ م° وجد ان كمية الكربون المزالة تزداد بزيادة الوقت من ٣ إلى ٢٤ ساعة.

- وبدراسة فاعلية الحفاز بعد التنشيط بالحرق فى الهواء بالنسبة لإزالة الكبريت فقد وجد ان نسبة إزالة الكبريت قبل التنشيط وبعده فى حالة السولار المخلخل تكون ٨٣,٠١ & ٧٢,٥٤% بينما فى حالة خليط من السولار المخلخل والمتبقى الثقيل المخلخل فتكون ٣٧,٩٧ & ٢٥,٣١%.

- واستخدام طريقة الحرق فى الهواء لإعادته تنشيط الحفاز المهمد وجد أن لها تأثير واضح على إعادته مساحة السطح مقارنة بالحفاز الغير المستخدم ( Fresh ) وكان ذلك واضحاً بالنسبة لمساحة السطح حيث كانت مساحة السطح للحفاز قبل استخدامه فى العمليات ١٧٥,٥ م<sup>٢</sup>/جم وبعد استخدام لمدة ١٢ ساعة فإن المساحة قلت إلى ١١٥ م<sup>٢</sup>/جم وبعد التنشيط زادت إلى ١٥٤ م<sup>٢</sup>/جم وذلك باستخدام السولار المخلخل كمادة تغذية بينما عند استعمال خليط من السولار المخلخل والمتبقى الثقيل المخلخل فقد وجدت انها ٩٥ & ١١٧ م<sup>٢</sup>/جم على التوالى.