

A CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF AND COMMENTS ON DR. MICHAEL'S ON THE LIQUID PHASE PROCESS (SCHAUMFAHRWEISE)

by L. W. Alberts

The Schaumphase Process, or Liquid Phase Suspension Process, was investigated by Dr. Michael in 1940. Similar processes were tried early in 1935 by Ruhrohemie and Gewerschaft Victor on cobalt catalyst. These tests, however, yielded poor results when compared with the dry phase atmospheric pressure cobalt synthesis in a fin-tube converter. A rectangular high tower was used as a converter. The reaction heat was removed by water-cooled tubes uniformly divided over the cross-section area of this converter in numerous layers. The flow of the synthesis gas was either concurrent or countercurrent to the flow of the suspension. The initial results, being fairly promising, could only be retained for a short time. The formation of CH4 increased to an amount prohibitive to economical application of such a process. This fact was found to be due to the settling of the catalyst on the cooling tubes. Thus, this procedure was abandoned.

Dr. Michael started his Schaumphase Process in a cylindrical converter with a stirrer. Besides experiencing difficulty with the stirrer-packing, sedimentation of the catalyst on different parts of the equipment, especially on the inner wall of the converter, was observed. The action of the stirrer on the gas and suspension distribution was designated as perfect. The application of a porous plate "Schaumstein" was apparently found to be satisfactory as well, though a better action of a stirrer, formerly claimed, has not been revoked. Then using the porous plate, similar sedimentation of the catalyst on the wall of the converter was observed. A slowly rotating stirrer, scratching continuously the wall of the converter, was built in. Later, it is claimed, the

deposit of the catalyst was not caused by the sedimentation but by an insoluble sticky material formed during the synthesis reaction in the sump of the converter.

The size of the pores in the porous plate is said to be of essential importance, as well as the size of the bubbles. When the bubbles are too small, the separation of the gas from the oil suspension is no longer perfect. The converter contains too much gas volume; thus, the capacity of the converter decreases. Large bubbles ascent faster.

The figures given by Dr. Michael in internal reports of the I.G. are chronologically, as follows:

May 20, 1940:

Schaumphase Synthesis for Production of Middle-Oil. Synthesis Gas composition is apparently 1.0 H₂ to 1.2 CO. CO₂ content in the synthesis gas must be below 2%. The reaction is performed in three stages. The third stage has to be operated on high temperatures and will yield mainly gasoline.

Space-Time Yield: 600 kg./m3 reaction volume/day

Specific Yield: 165 g.(C5 and above)/Nm3 of CO+H2 present in the fresh synthesis gas and at 93% conversion.

Before the first stage, between the first and second stages, and between the second and third stages, a CO₂ removal plant is provided. For 100,000 m³ of water gas/hr., 570 m³ reactor volume is necessary:

The conversion rates of each stage are given as follows:

1st Stage - 50% 2nd Stage - 50% 3rd Stage - 72%

Neglecting the formation of noncondensable hydrocarbons, the space velocity (volumes of feed gas per volume of catalyst per hour) can be estimated roughly as:

lst Stage - 290 space velocity
2nd Stage - 209
3rd Stage - 258

The space-time yield in the first stage calculated from the specific yield given as 104 g. C₃+ and the space velocity is 744 kg./m³/day. The space-time yield of the second stage calculated from the specific and—yield of 52 g. C₃+/the space velocity is 724 kg./m³/day.

The space-time yield of the second stage calculated from the specific yield of 30 g. C3+ and the space velocity is 743 kg./m3/day.

The average space-time yield, according to the above figures, is about 740 kg./m 3 /day. This would be 25% more than the figure given previously by Michael with about 600 kg./m 3 /day.

The total specific yield is given as 186 g. C_3+ , including 13 g. of alcohols, which would reduce the figure to about 182 g. of pure hydrocarbons, C_3+ .

Conversion rates are given as:

lst Stage - 50% - Specific yield = 104 g. (including 6 g. alcohols)
2nd Stage - 50% - Specific yield = 52 g. (including 4 g. alcohols)
3rd Stage - 72% - Specific yield = 30 g. (including 3 g. alcohols)

Total conversion 93%, total specific yield 186 g., including 30 g. of alcohols and including 21 g. of C3+C4. The CH4+C2H6 formation is by calculation 2% in the first stage, 3% in the second stage, and 20% in the third stage.

The above-mentioned results are proven only in the first stage. The second stage is said to have been calculated, and the third stage is said to be proven in a short test with a corresponding gas composition. When before each stage of synthesis the CO₂ content is less than 2%, the following partial pressures of CO+H2 can be calculated, taking into account the small increase of volume by formation of 2 to 3% CH4 and some hydrocarbons, noncondensible;

1st Stage - about 96% CH₄ - 2% 2nd Stage - about 91% CH₄ - 3% 3rd Stage - about 86% CH₄ - 20%

It is remarkable that with the synthesis gas containing 86% CO+H2 at 72% conversion, the formation of CH4 is as high as 20%. For the reported space velocities and conversion rates, the values for the formation of CH4 are presumably too optimistic in the first stage as particularly in the second stage. The value given for the third stage may be right for a short time in the reaction of a fresh catalyst, but it would certainly be much higher when operated for a longer time with such high space velocities. A conversion of 72% at 258 space velocity (CO+H2) might require temperatures at which the decomposition of the liquid occurs. The truth in this assumption may be proved by data given later by Michael when space-time yields are 350 kg·/m³/day and temperatures not higher than 260-270°C. Temperatures exceeding 270°C. are said to crack the oil so that oil from foreign sources would be necessary in order to maintain the oil balance.

It remains to be mentioned that at this time the consumption of catalyst, including regeneration, is 4.7 liters per ton of product; the cost of one liter of catalyst equals about EM 3.20, or \$1.30 per liter. The production per cubic meter of catalyst is, therefore, about 215 tons of hydrocarbons. This figure is far above the corresponding figures for

0658

the cobalt catalyst as used in German chemical plants. The cost of RM 3.20 per liter is almost identical with those of the cobalt catalyst based on equal production of hydrocarbons.

_1941:

In 1941, results are reported for production of middle oil and of gasoline:

Middle Oil Process:

Reaction Temperature	240-250°C•
Conversion Rate	90%
Space-time yield	200 kg •/m ³ /day
Specific Yield	170 g. 1+s hydrocarbons/Nm3 of
Bpooling in-	CO+Ho (including 7 g. alcohols
	in the reaction water)

Products:

Gasoline	30%
0il (-350°C •)	30%
Paraffin	40%
C3+C4	4-5%
CH ₄ +C ₂	3%

3 stages - 3 CO2 removals.

Gasoline Process:

Reaction Temperature Conversion Rate Space-time Yield Specific Yield	300-310°C. 90% 400 kg./m ³ /day 160 g. (including C ₃ , C ₄ , and alcohols)
---	--

Products:

Gasoline	60% Res. Octane N	۰ ٥	90
011 (-350°C.)	30%		٠
Paraffin	10%		

3 stages - 3 CO2 removals.

These results differ considerably from those given the year before regarding space-time yields. For almost identical specific yield (2nd and 3rd stages are calculated again) the space-time yield has dropped to almost 25% of that previously reported. The synthesis gas used had apparently E2:CO ratio equal to 0.8:1. Nothing is reported about the consumption ratio.

In June, 1942, Dr. Michael reported the following data:

	**					
mation	5%			CO+H2	at 90%	conversion
olefins)	10%	19	11 11		4 4	
(C2,C3,C4)	-6%-	11	.1111	_11_		
1.2 1.	•					
lids, Hydro-	79%	150	11 11	π.	п т	, w.
	94		- 4-3	00 To	`	
-50° C•	270		R.\um.	CU+02	14001 0	
50-100°C•	22%	33	12 44		147% Ga	EOTIDO
100-150°C -	16%	24	n n	π)70 gms	 refined
150-200°C.	10%	15	п п)Res. 0	• No • 70
1 -200	-304	45	/\m3	-00+110	-Catena	_No70
200-300-0	00/0	70	R 11	00,472	UU JAIIO	1.00.0
> 350 ℃	40%	30			41	•
	(C2,C3,C4) stion water) lids, Hydro50° C. 50-100°C. 100-150°C. 150-200°C.	% olefins) 10% (C2,C3,C4) 6% of the following of the foll	% olefins) 10% 19 (C2,C3,C4) 6% 11 etion water) lids, Hydro- 79% 150 -50°C° 2% 3 50-100°C° 22% 33. 100-150°C° 16% 24 150-200°C° 10% 15	% olefins) 10% 19 " (C2,C3,C4) 6% 11 " stion water) lids, Hydro- 79% 150 " -50 ° C ° 2% 3 g •/Nm ³ 50-100 ° C ° 22% 33 " 100-150 ° C ° 16% 24 " 150-200 ° C ° 10% 15 " 1 200-350 ° C ° 30% 45 g •/Nm ³	% olefins) 10% 19 " " (C2.C3.C4) 6% 11 " " stion water) lids, Hydro- 79% 150 " " -50 ° C · 2% 3 g ·/Nm³ C0+H2 50-100 ° C · 22% 33 " " 100-150 ° C · 16% 24 " " 150-200 ° C · 10% 15 " " 1 200-350 ° C · 30% 45 g ·/Nm³ C0+H2	% olefins) 10% 19 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "

July, 1942:

In July, 1942, Dr.: Michael reported that the recirculating oil-catalyst suspension is cooled by about 5°C. The achieved space-time yield of a converter with reaction volume of 1.5 m³ is 350 kg./m³/day. Michael claims that for production of 80 metric tons/day of hydrocarbons a reactor volume of 50 m³ is sufficient (this is evidently a mistake, because 50 x 350 = 17.5 tons per day). For 80 tons per may a reactor volume of 230 m³ would be necessary or, in other words, 5-1/2 times as much.

A thousand standard m3 CO+H2 yield:

	Oxygenated Compounds	Olefins
$240 \text{ m}^3 \text{ CO}_2 = 474.6 \text{ kg}.$		-
44 kg. H20		
10 kg • CH4+C2H6		
18 kg. C ₃ +C ₄	-	80%
9 kg. Alcohols in reaction water	•	
77 kg. Gasoline - 200°C.	4%	70%
47 kg. 011 - 200-350°C.	2%	56%
31 kg. Paraffin > 350°C.	1-2%	•
Total: 710.6 kg.) Conversion - about 977	•	

0690

August, 1942:

Synthesis Gas: The most favorable synthesis gas is water gas produced by means of oxygen. The nitrogen as well as the CO_2 content should not exceed 1-2% each in order to achieve a high conversion of the gas. The $E_2:CO$ ratio should be 0.8:1 to 0.75:1. The total sulfur is not to exceed 2 mg./m³.

Catalyst: At present, the raw material for the catalyst is iron-carbonyl. It is either decomposed at 250°C. in oil or burned to hematite and reduced. 2% of potassium borate are added and the mixture is pulverized under oil. Nothing certain can be said about the life-time of the catalyst; it certainly might be several months or a year. No catalyst could be run over a period of more than 2-1/2 months. It is claimed that sulfur impurities in the synthesis gas, caused by war conditions, also contaminated the catalyst. The regeneration of the catalyst is simple. The catalyst is melted, reduced, and pulverized. The concentration of the catalyst is 0.35 to 0.40 kg. per liter of oil-catalyst suspension.

The reaction temperature is 250-275°C. 3 stages of operation and 3 CO2 removal plants.

Gas recycle is employed (no figures are given about the rate of recirculation). The space-time yield is given for one 1-1/2 m³ converter (that is, a single stage operation — the other stages are still calculated) as 310 kg·/m³/day at 250°C. and a space velocity of 80; as 470 kg·/m³/day at 275°C. and a space velocity of 125.

Products:

Specific yield = 164 g. primary products (solid and liquids, including 9 g. valuable products (alcohols) from the reaction water.

18 g · C₃+C₄ (80% olefins)

Product Distribution:

1970 d minde				Esters,
Weight (1+s)_	Alcohols	Olefins	Paraffins	Acids, etc.
-50°C • 4	0	85	12	3
50-100°C • 20	5	83	-7 -	- 5
100-150°C • 16	15	67	11	7
150-200°C . 10	12	62	20	6
200-250°C • 12	12	63	17	8
250-300°C 10	10	54	25	11
300-350°C • 8	5	45	38	12
350°C • 20	-	-	.=	-

Grade of branching 25-28%
" " C4 " 15%

1943:

The following figures were given:

Reaction temperature	250°C •
Pressure	20 atm.
Reaction volume	1.5 m ³
Space-time yield	350 kg \cdot /m ³ /day

Products:

Gasoline	. 45%
011	30%
Paraffin	12-15%
C3, C4	8%
Alcohols	4% (in the reaction water)

General Remarks:

Space-time yield in a converter of 8 meter height equals 300 kg./m3/day at 250°C.

Space-time yield in a converter of 3 meter height equals 500 kg $^{\text{m}3}$ /day at 250°C.

Gas bubbles of uniform small size could only be produced by Schaumstein (porous ceramic); this was true only when the gas flow did not

exceed 28 liters/cm²/hr. If this figure is taken as a limit, the number of converters is larger and the space velocity applicable is considerably less than, for instance, in the Duftschmidt process. The resulting increase of equipment investment might be found prohibitive for the process.