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#### Abstract

The kinetics of methanol oxidation was studied over manganese dioxidemolybdenum trioxide catalyst in an integral flow reactor between 250 and $460^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, at space velocities of $9.6 \times 10^{3}$ to $8.4 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{hr}^{-1}$. The highest conversion of methanol and yield of formaldehyde under these conditions were $84 \%$ with a selectivity of almost $100 \%$ at $365^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The rate equation: $r=\left[k_{1} P_{\mathrm{M}} /\left(1+k_{1} P_{\mathrm{M}} / 2 k_{2} P_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}{ }^{1 / 2}\right)\right]$ deduced, assuming a steady state involving a two-stage irreversible oxidation-reduction process, represented the data satisfactorily.


## Introduction

Formaldehyde, a very important industrial chemical, is now prepared mostly by the partial air oxidation of methanol under controlled conditions, rather than by the alternative dehydrogenation process. Two types of catalysts, silver metal and metallic oxides and their mixtures have been generally used in the manufacture of formaldehyde by methanol oxidation. While the classic procedure uses a silver catalyst and employs a rich mixture of methanol with air, the other method makes use of an oxide catalyst, and employs a lean methanol-air mixture. The oxide type catalysts operate at very high conversions and yields of formaldehyde. Much work has been reported on the mechanism and kinetics of catalytic oxidation of methanol to formaldehyde, using silver as a catalyst.

Several patents (1-5) have been issued in the past, envisaging the use of oxides of vanadium, iron, molybdenum, and tungsten, either alone or mixed with each other, for catalytic oxidation of methanol to formaldehyde. Most of the patent literature ( $6-11$ ) since 1955 has been devoted to improvements in the methods of preparation and recovery of these catalysts, especially of iron-molybdenum oxide mixtures.
Recently the kinetics of methanol oxidation over oxides of iron and molybdenum
have been reported by Boreskov (12), Jiru et al. $(13,14)$ and Dente (15). The effect of water on the oxidation has been studied by Pernicone et al. (16). Bhattacharyya et al. (17) investigated the kinetics of the vapor phase oxidation of methanol on vanadium pentoxide catalyst between 246 and $281^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and postulated a rate mechanism. Bliznakov et al. (18) studied the oxidation of methanol over oxides of molybdenum and manganese at $370^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. However, they did neither define the rate mechanism, study the effect of process variables on the conversion, nor provide any details of the reacting system.

While Boreskov (12) found the rate to be independent of oxygen and first order in methanol, Jiru et al. $(13,14)$ deduced a rate expression based on the redox mechanism, originally suggested by Mars and Van Krevelen (19) for the vapor-phase oxidation of aromatic hydrocarbons on vanadium pentoxide. A rate equation exactly similar to the one developed by Jiru et al. (13) can also be deduced from the modified Hinshelwood mechanism (20).

Recently we studied the oxidation of methanol over a manganese dioxide-molybdenum trioxide catalyst under a fairly wide range of operating conditions, in order to derive a simple, but accurate, rate equation, which might be used effectively
for industrial reactor design and to obtain some insight into the actual mechanism of reaction.

## Nomenclature

$F=$ feed rate (moles of feed $/ \mathrm{hr}$ )
$\Delta G=$ free energy change
$k_{1}, k_{2}=$ reaction rate constants
$p=$ partial pressure (atm)
$r=$ reaction rate
$K_{\underline{p}}=$ equilibrium constant
$\bar{R}=$ oxygen/methanol ratio in feed
$S_{\mathrm{ox}}=$ active site of lattice or adsorbed oxygen
$S_{\text {red }}=$ reduced site of lattice oxygen or the empty site
$S=$ selectivity $[($ moles of formaldehyde formed $/ \mathrm{hr}$ )/(moles of methanol reacted/hr)]
$X=$ conversion [(moles of methanol reacted $/ \mathrm{hr}$ )/(moles of methanol fed/hr)]
Subscript $M$ and $O=$ methanol and oxygen
Overscript $m$ and $n=$ integral or half number in rate equation
$W=$ weight of catalyst (g)
a, placed before a symbol, represents in the feed.

## Experimental Methods

Apparatus. Reactions were studied in an integral fixed bed flow reactor, heated by fluidized sand bath. The flow diagram of
the apparatus used is shown in Fig. 1. Standard Copper Tubing ( $1 / 4 \mathrm{in}$. o.d.) was used throughout the apparatus, except for those portions of the lines in contact with the reactants and products, which were of $1 / 8 \mathrm{in} .316$ stainless steel tubing. All fittings were Swagelok standard stainless steel, and the valves, unless specified, were bellow valves.

Compressed gases, helium (1), nitrogen (2), and air (3) from the cylinders were passed through a series of pressure regulating devices and drying tubes (4) and metered through Brook's glass rotameters (5). Spectroscopic grade methanol was placed in containers (6) through funnels (7), partially compressed with nigrogen, and a needle valve (8) was used to adjust the flow rate. The rate of flow of methanol was measured by counting the number of droplets per unit time passing through a precalibrated sight glass (9), into the evaporating chamber (10).
The reactor (11) was made of 304 stainless steel ( 0.5 in . diam, and 6 in . long) and was heated with a fluidized sand bath (12), the temperature of which was controlled to within $\pm 0.1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Two thermocouples (13) were inserted from the top through the Swagelok connector, and measured the temperature of the catalyst bed.

The reaction products were passed through an air cooled trap (14), water condenser (15) and a drying tube (4). While


Fig. 1. Flow diagram for the oxidation of methanol to formaldehyde,
heavier products, formaldehyde, methanol, and water were thus condensed, the noncondensed gases were passed through a sampling valve (16) leading to a model 25 , Fisher gas partitioner (17) and vented. The heavier products were analyzed in the gas chromatograph (18). Polymcrization of formaldehyde in the gas stream was prevented by maintaining the lines from the methanol sight glass to the liquid trap including the last 2 ft of the air line immediately preceeding the evaporating chamber itself at a temperature of $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, by means of heating tapes, insulated with asbestos tape. Polymer formation in the liquid trap was avoided by the presence of $1 \%$ methanol.

All experimental runs were taken under steady-state conditions. For this purpose, a stream of reactants was passed over the catalyst at the required temperature for about an hour. The products were then collected. Gas samples were analyzed intermittently.
Preparation and physical characteristics of the catalyst. The catalyst, containing $20 \mathrm{wt} \%$ manganese dioxide and $80 \mathrm{wt} \%$ molybdenum trioxide, was prepared in a manner similar to the one used by Klissourski and Bliznakov (21). Manganese dioxide and molybdenum trioxide was obtained by the thermal decomposition of Analar grade manganese nitrate, $\mathrm{Mn}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2}$ and ammonium molybdate, $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right)_{6} \mathrm{Mo}_{7} \mathrm{O}_{24}$, $4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. A paste obtained from the mixture of these oxides in the required amounts was subjected to 6 hr drying at room temperature, 12 hr at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and 6 hr at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The catalyst was subsequently activated by successive 1 hr heatings at $200,250,300$, and $350^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and a $6-\mathrm{hr}$ calcination at, $420^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The surface area of the fresh catalyst determined by the BET method was found to be $7.8 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{g}$. The average diameter of the catalyst particle size was 0.525 mm and had a bulk density of $4.6 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$.

## Analytical Procedure

Acids. The total acid content was obtained by the titration of the condensate from the traps with $0.1 N \mathrm{KOH}$.

Gases. The inlet feed gases and the product gases were analyzed for carbon
dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen, and oxygen by periodic injection of a $0.5-\mathrm{ml}$ sample into the Fisher gas partitioner which contained a $6-\mathrm{ft}$ column of hexamethyl phosphoramide and a $13-\mathrm{ft} 13 \mathrm{X}$ molecular sieve column connected in series.

Liquid products. Liquid samples were analyzed by injection into a gas chromatograph. The gas chromatograph, assembled in the department, consisted of a GowMac model TR III A, 4W2, temperature regulated thermal conductivity cell, and model 405C:1 power supply control unit. A $5-\mathrm{m}, 15 \mathrm{wt} \%$ sucrose octa acetate on Columnpak T, column was used in separating the liquid products, $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{HCHO}$, $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{HCOOH}$, and $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{OH}$. This proved to be the most efficient column for such separations (22).

Thermodynamic considerations. The free energy change ( $\Delta G$ ) and the equilibrium constant ( $K_{p}$ ) of the reaction

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(\mathrm{~g}) & +\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \\
& =\mathrm{HCHO}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{~g}), \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

were calculated as functions of temperature, the necessary data being collected from the literature or calculated by the group contribution method (23, 24).
The value of $\Delta G$ and $K_{p}$ recorded in Table 1 indicate that the reaction is highly irreversible.

TABLE 1
The Values of $\Delta G$ and $K_{p}$ of the Reaction
[Eq. (1)] at 1 Atmosphere and Different Temperatures

| Temp. <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $-(\Delta G)$ <br> $(\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{g}$ mole $)$ | $K_{p}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \pi$ | 26.266 | $1.785 \times 10^{19}$ |
| 127 | 25.713 | $1.115 \times 10^{14}$ |
| 227 | 25.068 | $9.040 \times 10^{10}$ |
| 327 | 24.347 | $7.371 \times 10^{8}$ |
| 427 | 22.749 | $1.637 \times 10^{6}$ |

## Results and Discussion

Experiments were conducted at atmospheric pressure, in the temperature range $250-460^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, for catalyst to feed ratios $(W / F)$ of $2.5-22.0 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{hr} / \mathrm{mole}$, oxygen to methanol ratios ( $\bar{R}$ ) of 2.42-5.04 and space velocities of $9.6 \times 10^{3}$ to $8.4 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{hr}^{-1}$. No


Fig. 2. Effect of temperature on the conversion and selectivity.
reaction between air and methanol was observed to take place even after several hours at $460^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, in the absence of the catalyst.

Feed rates were calculated on the basis of the rotameter readings, and the flow rate of methanol. The effluent rates were computed on the basis of the total flow rate and composition of the product stream. Air was used for the oxidation because the presence of nitrogen in it reduced the local heating effect on the catalyst, and its cheapness as compared to oxygen.

The activity of the catalyst remained fairly constant during the course of the study. The experiments were performed at random in order to nullify any effects due to change in catalytic activity.

While conversion ( $X$ ) is referred to as the moles of methanol consumed (reacted per hour) to the moles of methanol fed per hour, the rate of formation is referred as the moles of various products formed per hour per gram of the catalyst. The ratio of moles of formaldehyde produced per hour to the moles of methanol reacted has been defined as selectivity ( $S$ ) .

Effect of temperature. The effect of temperature on the conversion and yield of formaldehyde was investigated in the temperature range $250-460^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Figure 2 shows the effect of the temperature on conversion and yield at a catalyst to feed ratio ( $W / F$ ) of 16.3 and oxygen to methanol ratio ( $\bar{R}$ )
of 2.42. With increasing temperature, both conversion and yield increased up to $365^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, after which conversion continued to increase reaching almost $100 \%$ at $460^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, while the yield decreased. The selectivity was nearly $100 \%$ up to $365^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and then decreased at higher temperatures.

Effect of oxygen/methanol ratio. The effect of oxygen to methanol ratio in the feed on the conversion of methanol and the yield of formaldehyde for a $W / F$ ratio of 13.3 at $365^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ is shown in Fig. 3. While with increasing reactant ratios, the conver-


Fig. 3. Effect of oxygen/methanol ratio ( $\bar{R}$ ) on conversion and selectivity.


Fig. 4. Effect of $W / F$ ratio on conversion, theoretical, and experimental values.
sion of methanol and the yield of formaldehyde decreased rapidly, selectivity remained constant at nearly $100 \%$.

Effect of W/F ratio. Figure 4 shows the effect of various $W / F$ ratios on the conversion of methanol at $365^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for several methanol-air mixtures (4-8\% methanol in air). While the solid lines in Fig. 4 refer to the curves predicted by substituting the calculated values of $k_{1}$ and $k_{2}$ obtained from Eqs. (5) and (6) into the rate equation, the circles represent the experimental data. The conversion increased with the increased ratios of $W / F$ and the yield with increased methanol in the methanol-air mixture.

The present kinetic data (Table 2) were critically examined following the approach suggested by Hougen and Watson (25), whereby various mechanisms, which might control the rate of reaction are postulated and the rate expressions consistent with these hypothesis are derived. The ratecontrolling mechanism of the solid catalyzed gas reaction may be the mass transfer of the reactants or desorption of products or surface reaction between adsorbed gases or between an adsorbed gas


Fig. 5. Effect of feed rate on conversion and selectivity.
and gaseous reactant at the catalyst surface. The rate expressions are then fitted into experimental data, and the expression giving the best fit is retained, while others are discarded.

Heat and mass transfer effects. The temperature and partial pressure gradients between the flowing fluid and the exterior surface of the catalyst were evaluated by


Fig. 6. Effect of partial pressure of methanol on the initial rate.

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |  000000000000000000000000000000 |
|  |  <br>  |


| R | Effect of Variables on Conversion, Rate of Formation and Selectivity for Formaldehyde Production in Methanol Oxidation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Feed, moles/hr. |  |  | Aralysis of Froducts, moles $/ \mathrm{hr}$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | HCHO | $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$ | $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | CO | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ |
| 2.42 | 0.030 | 0.0788 | 0.2963 | 0.0159 | 0.0141 | 0.0159 | 0 | 0 | 0.0709 | 0.2963 |
| 2.42 | 0.035 | 0.0919 | 0.3456 | 0.0185 | 0.0165 | 0.0185 | 0 | 0 | 0.0827 | 0. 3456 |
| 2. 42 | 0.040 | 0. 1050 | 0.3450 | 0.0213 | 0.0187 | 0.0213 | 0 | 0 | 0.0944 | 0.3450 |
| 2.42 | 0.045 | 0. 1181 | 0. 4444 | 0.0238 | 0.0331 | 0.0238 | 0 | 0 | 0. 1062 | 0.4440 |
| 2.42 | 0.030 | 0.0788 | 0.2960 | 0.0114 | 0.0035 | 0.0416 | 0.00302 | 0.01208 | 0.0537 | 0.2730 |
| 2.42 | 0.030 | 0.0788 | 0. 2960 | 0.0015 | 0 | 0.0585 | 0.00142 | 0.02708 | 0.0453 | 0.2730 |
| 5.04 | 0.030 | 0.1580 | 0.5930 | 0.0032 | 0.0269 | 0.0032 | 0 | 0 | 0.1560 | 0.5930 |
| 5.04 | 0.030 | 0.1580 | 0. 5930 | 0.0063 | 0.0237 | 0.0063 | 0 | 0 | 0.1540 | 0. 5930 |
| 5.04 | 0.030 | 0.1580 | 0.5930 | 0.0108 | 0.0192 | 0.0108 | 0 | 0 | 0.1520 | 0.5930 |
| 5.04 | 0.030 | 0.1580 | 0.5930 | 0.0154 | 0.0146 | 0.0154 | 0 | 0 | 0.1500 | 0. 5930 |
| 5.04 | 0.030 | 0.1580 | 0.5930 | 0.0180 | 0.0120 | 0.0180 | 0 | 0 | 0.1490 | 0. 5930 |
| 5. 04 | 0.030 | 0.1580 | 0.5930 | 0.0219 | 0.0081 | 0.0219 | 0 | 0 | 0.1470 | 0.5930 |
| 3.61 | 0.030 | 0.1150 | 0.4310 | 0.0033 | 0.0267 | 0.0033 | 0 | 0 | 0.1060 | 0.4070 |
| 3.61 | 0.030 | 0.1150 | 0.4310 | 0.0084 | 0.0216 | 0.0084 | 0 | 0 | 0.1040 | 0.4070 |
| 3.61 | 0.030 | 0.1150 | 0.4310 | 0.0142 | 0. 0158 | 0.0142 | 0 |  | 0.1010 | 0.4070 |
| 3.61 | 0.030 | 0.1150 | 0.4310 | 0.0195 | 0.0105 | 0.0195 | 0 | 0 | 0.0980 | 0. 4070 |
| 3.61 | 0.030 | 0.1150 | 0.4310 | 0.0215 | 0.0085 | 0.0215 | , | 0 | 0.0973 | 0. 4070 |
| 3.61 | 0.030 | 0.1150 | 0.4310 | 0.0225 | 0.0075 | 0.0225 | 0 | 0 | 0.0968 | 0. 4070 |
| 3.02 | 0.030 | 0.0970 | 0.3650 | 0.00375 | 0.0263 | 0.0037 | 0 | 0 | 0.0891 | 0. 3410 |
| 3.02 | 0.030 | 0.0970 | 0. 3650 | 0.00900 | 0.0210 | 0.0090 | 0 | 0 | 0.0865 | 0. 3410 |
| 3.02 | 0.030 | 0.0970 | 0.3650 | 0.01500 | 0.0150 | 0.0150 | 0 | 0 | 0.0835 | 0.3410 |
| 3.02 | 0.030 | 0.0970 | 0. 3650 | 0.02030 | 0.0097 | 0.0203 | 0 | 0 | 0.0809 | 0.3410 |
| 3.02 | 0.030 | 0.0970 | 0. 3650 | 0.02220 | 0.0078 | 0.0222 | 0 |  | 0.0799 | 0. 3410 |
| 3.02 | 0.030 | 0.0970 | 0.3650 | 0.02370 | 0.0063 | 0.0237 | , | 0 | 0.0792 | 0. 3410 |
| 2.79 | 0.030 | 0.0900 | 0. 3390 | 0.00408 | 0.0259 | 0.0040 | 0 | 0 | 0.0817 | 0. 3150 |
| 2.79 | 0.030 | 0.0900 | 0. 3390 | 0.00870 | 0.0212 | 0.0087 | 0 | 0 | 0.0793 | 0. 3150 |
| 2.79 | 0.030 | 0.0900 | 0. 3390 | 0.01550 | 0.0146 | 0.0155 | 0 | 0 | 0.0760 | 0. 3150 |
| 2. 79 | 0.030 | 0.0900 | 0. 3390 | 0.02090 | 0.0092 | 0.0209 | 0 | 0 | 0.0733 | 0. 3150 |
| 2.79 | 0.030 | 0.0900 | 0. 3390 | 0.02360 | 0. 0064 | 0.0236 |  | 0 | 0.0719 | 0. 3150 |
| 2. 79 | 0.030 | 0.0900 | 0. 3390 | 0.02450 | 0.0055 | 0.0245 | 0 | 0 | 0.0715 | 0. 3150 |
| 2. 42 | 0.030 | 0.0788 | 0. 2960 | 0.0042 | 0.0258 | 0.0042 | 0 | 0 | 0.0767 | 0. 2730 |
| 2. 42 | 0.030 | 0.0788 | 0. 2960 | 0.0099 | 0.0201 | 0.0099 | 0 | 0 | 0.0738 | 0.2730 |
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Analysis of Products，moles／hr．

| $z^{N}$ | 응ㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇ응 <br>  <br>  <br>  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0^{N}$ |  ○○心 <br>  <br>  |
| $0^{N}$ | 0000000000000000000000000000000 |
| 8 | 000000000000000000000000000 |
| $\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | 出 <br>  |
| 出 |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
| 足 |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |



号兑
TABLE 2 （Cont．）
Fecd，moles／hr

| $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{3} \\ & \stackrel{y}{3} \\ & \stackrel{y}{u} \\ & \frac{u}{4} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |




|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $z^{N}$ | NNNNNNN |
| $0^{\sim}$ |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |
| $0^{2}$ | 00000 |

$8 \mid 0000000$


| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$ |
| :--- |
| 0.0108 |
| 0.0297 |
| 0.0294 |
| 0.0289 |
| 0.0283 |
| 0.0279 |
| 0.0273 |


| $\bigcirc$ | N M \％＝ |
| :---: | :---: |
| \％ |  |
| I | $\bigcirc 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 00^{\circ} 0^{\circ}$ |



| $\stackrel{4}{3}$ | ○に mommo <br>  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 迺 ${ }_{\text {d }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | mi 유N 우N |
| 号定 |  |

TABLE 3
Two-Stage Redox Mechanisms

| Reaction order |  |  | Reaction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | $\begin{gathered} m \\ \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \mathrm{O}_{2} \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 1 | 1 | 0.5 | $\frac{W}{F} \frac{{ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{M}}}{\ln (1-x)}=-\frac{1}{k_{1}}+\frac{4 \alpha}{k_{2}} \frac{\left.{ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{1 / 2} \cdots\left({ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}-1 / 2 x_{0} p_{\mathrm{M}}\right)^{1 / 2}\right]}{\ln (1-x)}$ |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | $\frac{W}{F} \frac{1}{x}=-\frac{1}{k_{1}} \frac{\ln (1-x)}{o p_{\mathrm{M}} x}+\frac{\alpha}{k_{2}}$ |
| 3 | 0.5 | 0 | $\frac{W}{F} \frac{1}{x}=\frac{2}{k_{1}} \frac{\left[1-(1-x)^{1 / 2}\right]}{{ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{M}^{1 / 2}} x}+\frac{\alpha}{k_{2}}$ |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{W}{F} \frac{{ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{M}}}{\ln (1-x)}=-\frac{1}{k_{1}}+\frac{2 \alpha}{k_{2}} \frac{\left.\ln \left[{ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{O} 2} /{ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}-1 / 2_{0} p_{\mathrm{M}} x\right)\right]}{\ln (1-x)}$ |
| 5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | $\frac{W}{F} \frac{{ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{M}^{1 / 2}}}{\left[1-(1-x)^{1 / 2}\right]}=\frac{2}{k_{1}}+\frac{4 \alpha}{k_{2}} \frac{{ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}{ }_{0}^{1 / 2}-\left({ }_{0} p_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}-1 / 2_{0} p_{\mathrm{M}} x\right)^{1 / 2}}{p^{1 / 2}\left[1-(1-x)^{1 / 2}\right]}$ |

the method of Yoshida et al. (26). The highest temperature difference across the film, thus calculated, was of the order of $1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The highest partial pressure gradient, thus calculated, was of the order of 0.005 atm , which showed that the pressure drop across the gas film was insignificant and that the effect of mass transfer was negligible.

The effects of diffusion were kept at a minimum by using a high velocity of the gas through the catalyst. The fair constancy of conversion obtained by changing the feed rate, while keeping $W / F$ constant as shown in Fig. 5, suggested that the diffusion of the gases was not rate controlling. The internal diffusional resistance in the catalyst particles was negligible since a change in particle size ( $0.20-1.65 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) did not vary the reaction rate to any measurable degree.

Since the diffusion steps, which are physical processes, were found not to be rate controlling, the remaining steps, viz., the adsorption of the reactants, reaction between the adsorbed gases, and the desorption of gases were examined in detail. The method of initial rates as described by Yang and Hougen (27) was applied to the experimental data to eliminate some of the controlling steps. A plot of initial rates against partial pressure of methanol indicated that the desorption of the products was definitely not rate controlling (Fig. 6).

Since mass transfer from the gas stream to the catalyst surface and diffusion
through the catalyst pores and desorption of the products were not rate controlling, the possibility of the adsorption of reactants and surface reaction as rate controlling was left.

The kinetic expressions derived by Mars and Van Krevelen (19) for the vapor phase oxidation of aromatic hydrocarbons on vanadium pentoxide on the basis of the oxidation-reduction mechanisms were tested. Fifteen different rate equations based on 2 -stage and 3 -stage mochanisms (Tables 3 and 4) were derived. Based on these equations, the rate coefficients were evaluated, and the mechanism giving a negative coefficient in the rate equation (as found by the method of least square error) was rejected.
The following two-stage mechanism with $m$ equal to 1 , and $n$ equal to 0.5 was found to give the best fit:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{ox}} \xrightarrow{k_{1}} \mathrm{HCHO}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O},  \tag{2}\\
\mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\mathrm{red}} \xrightarrow{k_{2}} S_{\mathrm{ox}} \tag{3}
\end{gather*}
$$

$S_{o x}$ being an active site of lattice or adsorbed oxygen and $S_{\text {red }}$, the reduced site of lattice oxygen or the empty site. The rate expression which most satisfactorily represented the data was:

$$
\begin{equation*}
r=\frac{k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}}}{1+k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}} / 2 k_{2} p_{\mathrm{O}_{2}^{1 / 2}}^{1 /}}, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $k_{1}$ and $k_{2}$ were temperature dependent constants.
Table 4
Three-Stage Redox Mecianisms

| No. | Reaction order |  | Reaction mechanism | Rate equation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{m}{\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\mathrm{O}_{2}}$ |  |  |
| 1 | 1, 2 | 0.5 | $\begin{aligned} & m \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\mathrm{ox}} \xrightarrow{k_{1}}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)_{m}-S_{\mathrm{ox}} \\ & \left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)_{m}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{ox}} \xrightarrow{k_{2}} m \mathrm{HCHO}(\mathrm{~g})+m \mathrm{IH}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\mathrm{red}} \end{aligned}$ | $r=\frac{k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}^{m}}}{1+\left(k_{1} / k_{2}\right) p_{\mathrm{M}^{m}}+0.5 k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}}{ }^{m} / k_{3} \bar{p}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}$ |
| 2 | 1, 2 | 0.5 | $\begin{aligned} & S_{\text {red }}+n \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \xrightarrow{k_{\mathrm{s}}} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{ox}} \\ & m \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\mathrm{ox}} \xrightarrow{k_{1}}(\mathrm{HCHO})_{m}-S_{\mathrm{red}}+m \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{~g}) \\ & (\mathrm{HCHO})_{m}-S_{\text {red }} \xrightarrow{k_{2}} m \mathrm{HCHO}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\text {red }} \end{aligned}$ | $r=\frac{k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}^{m}}}{1+\left(k_{1} / k_{2}\right) p_{\mathrm{M}^{m}}+0.5 k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}^{m}} / k_{3} p_{\mathrm{O} 2^{n}}{ }^{n}}$ |
| 3 | 1,2 | 0.5 | $\begin{aligned} & S_{\text {red }}+n \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \xrightarrow{k_{\mathrm{s}}} S_{\mathrm{ox}} \\ & m \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{Sox}_{\mathrm{ox}} \xrightarrow{k_{1}} m \mathrm{HCHO}(\mathrm{~g})+\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{m}-\mathrm{S}_{\text {red }} \\ & \left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{m}-S_{\text {red }} \xrightarrow{k_{2}} m \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\text {red }} \\ & S_{\text {red }}+n \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \xrightarrow{k_{3}} S_{\mathrm{ox}} \end{aligned}$ | $r=\frac{k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}}{ }^{m}}{1+\left(k_{1} / k_{2}\right) p_{\mathbf{M}^{m}}^{m}+0.5 k_{1} p_{\mathbf{M}^{m}} / k_{3} p_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}{ }^{n}}$ |
| 4 | 1, 2 | 0.5 | $\begin{aligned} & m \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\mathrm{ox}} \xrightarrow{k_{1}} m \mathrm{HCHO}(\mathrm{~g})+m \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\mathrm{rcd}} \\ & S_{\mathrm{red}}+n \mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \xrightarrow{k_{2}}\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)_{n}-S_{\mathrm{red}} \\ & \left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)_{n}-S_{\mathrm{red}} \xrightarrow{k_{3}} S_{\mathrm{ox}} \end{aligned}$ | $r=\frac{k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}^{m}}}{1+0.5\left(k_{1} / k_{3}\right) p_{\mathbf{M}^{m}}+0.5\left(k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}^{m}} / k_{2} p_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}\right.}$ |
| 5 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & m \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\mathrm{ox}} \stackrel{k_{1}}{\longrightarrow} m \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{~g})+(\mathrm{HCHO})_{m}-S_{\mathrm{red}} \\ & (\mathrm{HCHO})_{m}-S_{\text {red }} \stackrel{K_{2}}{\rightleftharpoons} m \mathrm{HCHO}(\mathrm{~g})+S_{\text {red }} \\ & S_{\mathrm{red}}+n \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{2}}(\mathrm{g}) \xrightarrow{k_{3}} S_{\mathrm{ox}} \end{aligned}$ | $r=\frac{k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}}{ }^{m}}{1+0.5\left(k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}^{m}}^{m} / k_{3} p_{\mathrm{o}_{2}}\right)+0.5\left(k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}}^{m} p_{f}^{m} / K_{2} k_{3} p_{\mathrm{o}_{2}}{ }^{n}\right)}$ |



Fig. 7. Effect of temperature on the rate constants $k_{1}$ and $k_{2}$.

Equation (4) seems to indicate a pseudo-first-order rate equation. Since the percentage methanol in air (oxygen) is small, the term $k_{1} p_{\mathrm{M}} / 2 k_{2} p_{02}{ }^{1 / 2}$ in the denominator is always much less than one, and hence can be neglected.

The activation energies of the individual steps were evaluated from the Arrhenius plots, as shown in Fig. 7 and equations relating $k_{1}$ and $k_{2}$ with temperature were obtained.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \log k_{1}=3.432-\frac{3.81 \times 10^{3}}{T}  \tag{5}\\
& \log k_{2}=-7.508+\frac{3.23 \times 10^{3}}{T} \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

The values of $k_{1}$ and $k_{2}$, obtained from Eqs. (5) and (6) were used to obtain theoretical rates from which the values of $W / F$ were calculated at different conversions. The values of $W / F$ thus calculated for different conversions were plotted (solid lines in Fig. 4). The percentage deviation between the experimental and calculated
values was less than $5 \%$, except for the last condition in which the experimental value of $W / F$ exceeded 22 g hr/mole. The value of $k_{2}$ decreases with increasing temperature. This is possibly due to $k_{2}$ representing apparently an over all value, rather than a single step rate constant. Such a postulate is quite reasonable in view of the highly exothermic oxidation reaction.

The present kinetic results agree with those reported by earlier workers using iron-molybdenum oxide (13-15), vanadium pentoxide (17), and manganese-molybdenum oxide (18) catalysts in the vaporphase oxidation of methanol. Also, the methanol oxidation in its thermodynamic aspects with those reactions reported in the literature (28) and in patents.
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