

Article

Development of NiCu Catalysts for Aqueous-Phase Hydrodeoxygenation

Jacob Gerald Dickinson, and Phillip E. Savage

ACS Catal., Just Accepted Manuscript • DOI: 10.1021/cs500562u • Publication Date (Web): 27 Jun 2014

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on July 4, 2014

Just Accepted

“Just Accepted” manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides “Just Accepted” as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. “Just Accepted” manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. “Just Accepted” manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). “Just Accepted” is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the “Just Accepted” Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the “Just Accepted” Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these “Just Accepted” manuscripts.



ACS Publications
High quality. High impact.

ACS Catalysis is published by the American Chemical Society, 1155 Sixteenth Street N.W., Washington, DC 20036
Published by American Chemical Society. Copyright © American Chemical Society. However, no copyright claim is made to original U.S. Government works, or works produced by employees of any Commonwealth realm Crown government in the course of their duties.

Development of NiCu Catalysts for Aqueous-Phase Hydrodeoxygenation

Jacob G. Dickinson, Phillip E. Savage*

Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, United States

E-mail: psavage@umich.edu

Keywords

Hydrodeoxygenation

Hydrothermal

Raney Ni

o-cresol

Aqueous Phase

NiCu Catalysts

Alumina

Biomass

Abstract

Herein, we report on the development of supported Ni and Raney Ni catalysts doped with Cu for the hydrothermal hydrodeoxygenation (HDO) of o-cresol. Raney Ni catalysts doped with greater than 10 wt% Cu show a significant reduction in gasification activity, and produce a higher yield of liquid products than the unmodified Raney Ni catalyst. Adding Cu did not, however, increase the yield of the desired HDO products, liquid hydrocarbons. The addition of acid sites to the catalysts, by supporting Ni and NiCu on Al₂O₃ and by calcining the Raney Ni to produce Al₂O₃ within the catalyst, however, did significantly increase the HDO activity of the catalysts such that yields of liquid

hydrocarbons exceeded 60%. Two catalysts, a novel calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalyst and a NiCu/Al₂O₃ catalyst, produced the highest liquid hydrocarbon yields to date (~70%) for stable, non-noble-metal, hydrothermal HDO catalysts.

1. Introduction

Hydrodeoxygenation (HDO) is an enabling technology for the conversion of biomass into liquid fuels and chemicals, because it decreases the viscosity and increases the energy density of bio-oils. HDO has been the focus of several extensive reviews ¹⁻³. The present work focuses on HDO occurring in a high-temperature, aqueous (i.e., hydrothermal) reaction environment. Hydrothermal HDO is of interest for several reasons. First, most biomass liquefaction technologies (e.g. fast pyrolysis, pyrolysis, hydrothermal liquefaction) result in a mixture or solution of bio-oil and water that can range from 20-30 wt% water, for bio-oils obtained from the fast pyrolysis of lignocellulosic biomass ⁴, to 80-90 wt% water, for the reactor effluent from the hydrothermal liquefaction (HTL) of microalgae ⁵. The water content in the reactor effluent is a function of the type of biomass, the water content of the biomass, and the processing conditions. Separation of the bio-oil and water after the biomass treatment step is sometimes possible, but can be difficult when the material is a single phase or an oil/water emulsion ⁶. Second, the oxygen content of bio-oil ranges from 5 wt% for bio-oils obtained from the HTL of microalgae ^{5,7} to 50 wt% for bio-oils obtained from the fast pyrolysis of lignocellulosic biomass ⁴. When this oxygen is removed from the bio-oil with H₂, water is formed. Stoichiometry indicates that a bio-oil with 15 wt% oxygen will form an oxygen-free bio-oil and water mixture containing 17 wt%

1
2
3 water upon complete HDO. Therefore, water will be present, likely in high quantities,
4
5 during HDO.
6
7

8 Hydrothermal HDO presents significant challenges to catalyst stability and activity.
9
10 Many common hydrotreating catalysts such as NiMo and CoMo oxidize under
11
12 hydrothermal conditions ⁸, and common catalyst supports such as γ -Al₂O₃ and SiO₂ may be
13
14 unstable under some hydrothermal conditions ⁸⁻¹⁰. This realization has led most
15
16 researchers to use noble metal catalysts (Pt, Pd, Ru, and Rh) for hydrothermal HDO ¹¹.
17
18 Dumesic and co-workers have pioneered the conversion of sugars and biofuel byproduct
19
20 molecules, such as ethylene glycol, to H₂ and alkanes ¹²⁻¹⁶. Many of these studies have
21
22 focused on aqueous-phase reforming of sugars with the goal of producing H₂, but the
23
24 authors found that some metals, such as Ni, Rh, and Ru were more selective for alkane
25
26 production than gas formation ¹⁴. Huber et al. examined the conversion of sorbitol over Pt
27
28 and achieved a high gas phase hydrocarbon yield and found the catalyst to be stable over a
29
30 six-day period ¹⁵. Furthermore, they found that the liquid alkane yield was greater when
31
32 they used a mixture of Pt/Al₂O₃ and SiO₂-Al₂O₃. This increase in liquid alkane yield was
33
34 attributed to the presence of the solid acid (SiO₂-Al₂O₃) catalyst.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Lercher and co-workers have extensively examined the HDO of phenolic molecules
43
44 between 150 and 200 °C using Pd/C with H₃PO₄ or HZSM-5 ¹⁷⁻¹⁹ and achieved complete
45
46 conversion and high selectivity (> 80%) to cycloalkanes. Interestingly, without the acid
47
48 catalyst (i.e., H₃PO₄ or HZSM-5), no cycloalkanes were observed. In later studies, they
49
50 combined the active metal, Pd, and acid catalysts into a single, bifunctional catalyst,
51
52 Pd/HBEA, that produced primarily larger, oxygen free hydroalkylation products from
53
54 phenolic molecules ²⁰.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Savage and coworkers have also made significant progress in catalytically
4 converting bio-oils and bio-derived molecules into liquid hydrocarbons under
5 hydrothermal conditions ²¹⁻³⁰. In general, these studies have taken place at higher
6 temperatures (350 – 500 °C) and pressures (150 to 305 bar) than those examined by
7 Dumesic and Lercher (~200 °C, ~25 bar). These studies revealed that Pt/C is an active and
8 stable catalyst for the decarboxylation of palmitic acid and the hydrothermal HDO of o-
9 cresol and benzofuran ^{21, 22, 29}. It is important to note, that unlike the work of Lercher et al.,
10 these reactions did not require an additional acid catalyst to perform HDO. Nonetheless,
11 these studies have focused on using noble metal catalysts whose high cost make them
12 undesirable.

13 Reports of active non-noble metal catalysts for hydrothermal HDO are rare. Lercher
14 and associates examined the use of Raney Ni with homogeneous (H₃PO₄ and acetic acid) or
15 solid acid catalysts (Nafion/SiO₂) and determined that only the Raney Ni and Nafion/SiO₂
16 catalyst combination was effective at producing cycloalkanes from 4-n-propylphenol at
17 200 °C ³¹. Again, the researchers determined that the solid acid catalyst was essential for
18 producing cycloalkanes, as conversions and selectivities were negligible without it. These
19 researchers have also examined the use of Ni/HZSM-5 and Ni/γ-Al₂O₃-HZSM-5 catalysts for
20 phenol and phenolic monomer hydrothermal HDO and obtained a 100% yield of
21 hydrocarbons between 200 and 250 °C ^{32, 33}. Unfortunately though, these catalysts showed
22 substantial deactivation in catalyst recycle experiments, even with catalyst regeneration
23 occurring between cycles, due to catalyst particle sintering, Ni leaching, and structural
24 changes to the catalyst support ³².

To address this need to develop active and stable non-noble metal catalysts for hydrothermal HDO, we previously examined a Raney Ni catalyst doped with 10 wt% Cu and found the catalyst to be active, selective, and stable for hydrothermal HDO at 380 °C ²¹. Cu was chosen as a dopant because the base Raney Ni catalyst was active for C-C bond hydrogenolysis, producing primarily methane from the o-cresol fed to the reactor, and because Elliot et al. showed that Cu was inactive for gasification ⁸. We associated this increase in selectivity to liquid phase products to the fact that, in a different catalyst system, Cu reduces the adsorption energy of aromatic molecules when alloyed with Pd to make a PdCu catalyst ³⁴. The present study expands on this previous work to examine the effect of Cu content on the products, selectivities, and yields from reacting o-cresol, a model oxygen-containing compound found in most bio-oils ^{35,36}, with H₂ over various catalysts. This work shows that increasing Cu content drastically reduces the gasification activity of the Raney NiCu catalysts, but is ineffective at increasing the yield of the desired liquid hydrocarbons. To increase the liquid hydrocarbon yield, we added Al₂O₃ to the catalysts through two parallel approaches. One approach was to synthesize a NiCu/Al₂O₃ catalyst and the second was to calcine the Raney Ni catalyst thereby oxidizing the Al in the Raney Ni catalyst to Al₂O₃. With these catalyst modifications, we provide, to the best of our knowledge, the first report of a high ($\geq 60\%$) and stable liquid hydrocarbon yield by using only a non-noble metal catalyst for HDO in hydrothermal conditions.

2. Materials and Methods

This section provides the details of the materials and methods used to complete the experimental work and analyses.

2.1 Materials

We procured all solvents, reagents, and catalyst precursors from Fischer Scientific ($\geq 99\%$ purity) and used them as received. Raney Ni 2800 was obtained from Sigma Aldrich, and the γ -AlOOH that was used as a catalyst support and a catalyst bed diluent was obtained from Morton Thiokol. γ -AlOOH was converted to γ -Al₂O₃ during the calcination and reduction of the catalysts (shown later), therefore, we refer to all such catalysts as Al₂O₃-supported. The ZrO₂ was obtained from Alpha Aesar and deionized water was prepared in house.

2.2 Catalyst Synthesis

We synthesized the Raney NiCu catalysts by dissolving Cu(NO₃)₂•2.5H₂O in 5 mL of ethanol, adding this solution to reduced Raney Ni, heating the resulting mixture to 100 °C in a sealed vial for 1 hr, and then reducing the catalyst in flowing H₂ at 400 °C for 3 hr with a 5°C/min ramp rate. For example, to synthesize the 5% Raney NiCu catalyst we added, by puncturing the parafilm covering the vial, a solution containing 0.137 g of Cu(NO₃)₂•2.5H₂O and 5 mL of ethanol to an Ar filled vial containing 0.713 g of reduced Raney Ni before carrying out the heating and reduction procedures above.

The Al₂O₃- and ZrO₂-supported catalysts were synthesized by impregnating the support with a Ni(NO₃)₂•6H₂O or a Ni(NO₃)₂•6H₂O and Cu(NO₃)₂•2.5H₂O solution in DI H₂O. In general, to achieve the desired metal loadings we performed two impregnations of the γ -AlOOH for the Al₂O₃-supported catalysts, and three impregnations of the ZrO₂ for the ZrO₂-supported catalyst. For example, to synthesize the 10% 0.5% NiCu/Al₂O₃ catalyst we performed two impregnations of 4.5 g of γ -AlOOH with a solution that contained 6.6 g of Ni(NO₃)₂•6H₂O and 0.25 g of Cu(NO₃)₂•2.5H₂O in 13.2 mL of DI H₂O. Following each

1
2
3 impregnation, we dried the catalysts at 110 °C for 12 hr and then calcined them by
4
5 increasing the temperature at 10 °C/min to 400 °C where the temperature was held for 4
6
7 hr. The calcined catalysts were crushed and sieved (150 µm), and then reduced in flowing
8
9 H₂ by increasing the temperature at 5 °C/min to 400 °C where the temperature was held
10
11 for 3 hr.
12
13

14
15 Last, to produce the calcined Raney Ni and calcined Raney NiCu catalysts, we heated
16
17 the Raney Ni in DI water at 80 °C for 3 hr, followed by drying and calcining the catalysts
18
19 using the procedure outlined above. The calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalyst was synthesized
20
21 by adding 0.590 g of Cu(NO₃)₂•2.5H₂O in 5 mL of ethanol to 3.047 g of calcined Raney Ni.
22
23 The resulting mixture was heated and reduced using the procedure discussed for
24
25 producing the Raney NiCu catalysts.
26
27
28

29 30 2.3 Catalyst Characterization 31

32 We performed X-ray Diffraction (XRD), transmission electron microscopy (TEM),
33
34 and CO temperature programmed desorption (TPD) using catalysts passivated overnight at
35
36 70 °C in 1% O₂ in He. XRD characterization was performed on a Rigaku Miniflex 600,
37
38 TEM/STEM was performed on a Jeol 2010f, and CO TPD was performed on a Micromeritics
39
40 Autochem 2910. The passivated catalysts were reduced in situ at 430 °C for 180 min, prior
41
42 to the TPD experiments. CO was added to the catalyst surface at 25 °C and the catalyst was
43
44 heated at 10 °C/min to 550 °C.
45
46
47
48

49 50 2.4 Batch Reactor Procedure 51

52 For each hydrothermal HDO experiment, the reduced catalysts were transferred to
53
54 an Ar glove box in the reduction tube to minimize oxygen exposure. The reduced catalysts
55
56 were loaded into 4.1 mL Swagelok batch reactors in the Ar glove box, and the open end of
57
58
59
60

each reactor was sealed with parafilm. The batch reactors were filled outside of the glove box with 0.67 mL of DI H₂O and either 20 or 100 mg of o-cresol by poking holes through the parafilm, thereby minimizing exposure of the catalyst to air. The batch reactors were then capped, purged with He, and pressurized with He and H₂. Details on the construction, pressurization, extraction, gas analysis, and liquid product analysis are available in our previous work ²². In short, we heated the reactors to 380 °C in a fluidized sand bath, quenched the reactors in water, analyzed the gas content of the reactors with GC/TCD, extracted the reactors with 10 mL of acetone, and analyzed the liquid contents of the reactors with GC/FID. In some instances, multiple reactions were run at a single reaction condition to obtain estimates of the experimental uncertainty, represented by one standard deviation. We report data only from reactors with carbon balances greater than 80%, but in general, the carbon balances were greater than 90%.

2.5 Flow Reactor Description

We used two different flow reactor configurations. The first configuration used a sandbath as the heating source and had a feed that contained DI water, formic acid, and o-cresol. This flow reactor configuration was detailed in our previous work ²¹, and in the present work was used only with the 2% Raney NiCu catalyst. A second flow reactor configuration, shown in fig. 1, is similar to the previous setup, but with a few major improvements. First, H₂ was delivered to the flow reactor with a mass flow controller, instead of using the in situ decomposition of formic acid as the H₂ source. Second, separate pumps for DI water and o-cresol allowed for varying concentrations of o-cresol to be fed to the reactor. Last, we used a tube furnace as the heating source of the reactor to allow for faster heat up and cool down times.




Fig. 1. Flow reactor process flow diagram.

The modified flow reactor, shown in fig. 1, has three 316 stainless steel inlet lines. Chrom Tech Series III pumps fed DI water and the internal standard solution to the reactor and cooled reactor effluent, respectively. o-Cresol, heated to 35 to 40 °C by heat tape, was fed by an ISCO 260D syringe pump, and H_2 was fed through a Brooks 5850 TR mass flow controller from a 6000 psig H_2 cylinder. The preheating tubing within the Applied Test Systems furnace, which was controlled by an Omega PID controller, was 1/16 in. o.d. tubing. The water, H_2 , and o-cresol preheating lines were 80, 60, and 15 in. in length, respectively, and mixed in a cross fitting prior to entering the catalyst bed. The temperature within this cross fitting was monitored by a thermocouple and data logger. The 3.5 in. catalyst bed was constructed from 1/4 in. o.d. tubing with 5 μ m Hastelloy frits placed at both ends. The catalyst bed was loaded with catalyst and γ - $AlOOH$, a diluent, in the Ar glove box. We covered the ends of the catalyst bed with parafilm in the glove box to minimize the exposure of the catalyst to air when the catalyst bed was transferred to the flow reactor. A second thermocouple, positioned in a T fitting, measured the temperature of the product stream exiting the catalyst bed. A tube-in-tube heat exchanger cooled the reactor effluent to room temperature, and a backpressure regulator maintained the desired reaction pressure.

We added an internal standard solution consisting of 4-isopropylphenol (4 g/L) in 2-propanol to the cooled reactor effluent prior the backpressure regulator to form a single liquid phase and to provide an internal standard for use in product quantification. 15 to 20 mL/min of N₂ was added to the reaction stream through an Omega 5400/5500 mass flow controller after the backpressure regulator to provide a reference gas. A Gilson 223 fraction collector with an automated switching valve collected liquid samples in test tubes containing ~3 mL of 2-propanol. When the fraction collector was not collecting liquid samples, the reactor effluent was diverted to a 250 mL flash column that separated the liquid and gas products. The liquid products were sent to a waste container while the gas products were sent to the GC/TCD. The liquid samples were analyzed on an Agilent 6890N gas chromatograph with a flame ionization detector using a 50m HP-5MS capillary column. The injected sample, 1 μ L, was heated by an inlet at 310 °C and separated by the capillary column by holding the column at 35 °C for 10 min, and then ramping the oven temperature at 2 °C/min to 50 °C, 10 °C/min to 160 °C, 30 °C/min to 300 °C, and holding for 2 min. An Agilent 6890N gas chromatograph with a mass spectrometric detector used this same method and column to determine the identities of some molecules.

2.6 Flow Reactor Procedure

To start up the flow reactor shown in fig. 1, we first attached the catalyst bed to the reactor, then pressurized the system with 70 bar H₂ to check for leaks. After confirming the absence of leaks, we released the reactor pressure, and began flowing H₂ at 50 – 100 mL/min while heating the reactor to 550 °C for at least one hour for the in situ catalyst reduction. We then cooled the reactor to approximately 400 °C and started flowing water, H₂, and o-cresol. For the calcined Raney Ni and calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalysts we set the

H₂O, o-cresol, and H₂ flow rates to 1 mL/min, 0.030 mL/min, and 0.006 mol/min, respectively, to build the reaction pressure. Upon the reactor reaching ~240 bar, we lowered the H₂O flow rate to the desired steady state value of 0.270 mL/min, while maintaining the other flow rates. At this point, we also started the internal standard solution flowing at 0.400 mL/min and the N₂ reference gas flowing at 20 mL/min. The startup procedure for the 10%, 0.5% NiCu/Al₂O₃ catalyst differed only in the H₂O flow rate, which was set at 0.270 mL/min during the entire startup period. Upon reaching the desired temperature of 365 °C at the mixing point thermocouple and the desired reactor pressure of 280 bar, we began collecting samples. We found that the reactor took approximately 225 min to achieve steady carbon balances and we report this time as zero min on stream.

2.7 Data Analysis

We calculated conversion, yield, selectivity, and carbon recovery as follows:

$$\text{Conversion} = 1 - \frac{C_{oc,e}}{C_{oc,o}} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Yield} = \frac{C_i}{C_{oc,o}} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Selectivity} = \frac{C_i}{\sum C_i} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Carbon recovery} = \frac{\sum C_i}{C_{oc,o}} \quad (4)$$

where C_{oc,e}, C_{oc,o}, and C_i refer to the concentrations, in mol C/L, of o-cresol exiting the reactor, of o-cresol entering the reactor, and of any product, respectively. We also will refer to the liquid hydrocarbon yield, which is the sum of the yields of all hydrocarbons in the liquid phase reactor effluent. On occasion, the flow reactor would release a large volume of

1
2
3 gas, resulting in a slight pressure drop in the reactor. This increased gas flow resulted in
4
5 high yields of the carbon containing gasses (i.e., methane and CO₂) and high carbon
6
7 recoveries ($\geq 120\%$) if sampling occurred simultaneously with a gas release. When such
8
9 anomalous data were collected, we removed them from the data set.
10
11
12
13
14

15 **3. Results and Discussion**

16
17
18 This section is divided into two major parts. The first section examines the effect of
19
20 Cu loading on product yields and selectivities for the hydrothermal HDO of o-cresol. The
21
22 second section discusses improvements to the NiCu catalysts made through the addition of
23
24 acid sites. Within each major section, we first discuss reaction results and then examine the
25
26 findings of the catalyst characterization.
27
28
29

30 **3.1 Raney NiCu catalysts and the effect of Cu loading**

31
32 Previous work ²¹ indicates that Raney Ni 2800 promoted with 10 wt% Cu is an
33
34 active and stable catalyst for hydrothermal HDO. The goal of this section is to examine the
35
36 effect of Cu loading and to develop a catalyst and reaction scheme for hydrothermal HDO
37
38 that produces high liquid hydrocarbon yield. To achieve this goal, the catalyst must not
39
40 only be active, it must also be selective for C-O bond hydrogenolysis.
41
42
43

44 **3.1.1 2% Raney NiCu**

45
46 Previous work ²¹ showed that a 10% Raney NiCu catalyst had a lower HDO turnover
47
48 frequency (TOF) than did unmodified Raney Ni. Further, the total activity (i.e., TOF for
49
50 conversion) of the 10% Raney NiCu catalyst is even more suppressed when compared with
51
52 the unmodified Raney Ni catalyst. We desired to learn whether reducing the Cu content
53
54 would improve overall and HDO activity without diminishing the selectivity increases, and
55
56
57
58
59
60

therefore the higher liquid hydrocarbon yield, observed with the 10% Raney NiCu catalyst. Therefore, we synthesized a 2% Raney NiCu catalyst and tested this catalyst in the flow system described previously²¹ at 380 °C using formic acid decomposition as the H₂ source.

Fig. 2 shows the variation of conversion and liquid hydrocarbon yield with time on stream (TOS). The most abundant liquid hydrocarbon products were toluene, methylcyclohexane, benzene and cyclohexane. In addition to these products, oxygenated products consisting primarily of methylcyclohexanone and phenol formed. Methane and CO₂ were the only gaseous products, but due to the presence of formic acid in the reactor feed, it is unclear whether these carbon-containing molecules originate from the formic acid or o-cresol.




Fig. 2. Conversion and liquid hydrocarbon yield from reacting o-cresol over 2% Raney NiCu (W/F = 56 min, 380 °C, 305 bar, feed solution (ambient conditions): 24.7 g/L o-cresol, 147 mL/L formic acid, balance DI H₂O, feed flow rate (ambient temperature) = 0.218 mL/min, 430 °C in situ H₂ catalyst reduction).

Fig. 2 shows that the maximum liquid hydrocarbon yield of 19% occurred around 200 min on stream. This maximum liquid hydrocarbon yield is similar to the 21 ± 4% average liquid hydrocarbon yield obtained previously from a 10% Raney NiCu catalyst

using the same reaction conditions ²¹. After reaching this maximum, the liquid hydrocarbon yield quickly declined to 0% at 470 min on stream and thereafter. Likewise, conversion decreased rapidly after 200 min on stream. It is clear that the 2% Raney NiCu catalyst deactivates rapidly after about 240 min on stream.

The cause of the deactivation is unknown, and is beyond the primary focus of this work. We did perform several simple experiments, however, that permit speculation regarding the cause of deactivation. We previously reported that CO is in the reaction stream that contacts the catalyst bed. Fig. 3 shows the results from CO TPD of the unmodified Raney Ni catalyst and the 10% Raney NiCu catalyst used previously ²¹. These results will be discussed more thoroughly in a later section. At present, we will simply remark that CO remained adsorbed to both the Raney Ni and 10% Raney NiCu catalysts at temperatures approaching 600 °C. This finding is important because it points to a possible cause of catalyst deactivation, CO poisoning, and a possible means of regenerating the catalyst, reduction of the catalyst at high temperature (e.g., 550 °C) in flowing H₂. Literature also indicates that CO₂, when reacted over a Ni catalyst, can form adsorbed CO ³⁷. The preferential pathway for the removal of adsorbed CO when H₂ is present is through a HCO or COH pathway that converts bound CO to methane ³⁸.




Fig. 3. CO temperature programmed desorption spectra of Raney Ni and 10% Raney NiCu.

Fig. 4 shows the liquid hydrocarbon yield from three cycles of reacting o-cresol over the same 2% Raney NiCu catalyst that was used in fig. 2 (table S1, supplementary information). Each cycle consisted of reducing the catalyst at 550 °C in flowing H₂, then passing the feed solution over the catalyst for 720 min. It is clear from fig. 4 that the liquid hydrocarbon yields for each cycle overlap, indicating that the HDO activity of the catalyst was regenerated after each cycle by simply re-reducing the catalyst. This result is consistent with CO poisoning causing the loss in catalyst activity, but it does not preclude other methods of deactivation. The catalyst could be losing activity from oxidation of the Ni metal by supercritical water, or from some other unknown catalyst poison. Other common deactivation causes such as sintering or coking are unlikely, because these conditions are irreversible by reduction.




Fig. 4. Liquid hydrocarbon yield from reacting o-cresol over 2% Raney NiCu (W/F = 80 min, 380 °C, 305 bar, feed solution (ambient conditions): 24.7 g/L o-cresol, 147 mL/L formic acid, balance DI H₂O, feed flow rate (ambient temperature) = 0.200 mL/min, 550 °C in situ H₂ catalyst reduction between runs).

3.1.2 Cu loading effects

This section elucidates the effect of Cu loading on the HDO selectivity of 1-40 wt% Raney NiCu catalysts using H₂ (rather than formic acid) as the reductant to avoid the formation of CO. We performed these reactions in 4.1 mL batch mini-reactors to rapidly screen these catalysts.

Fig. 5 and table S2 shows that at low Cu loading (e.g. 1 - 7%) the conversion of o-cresol was nearly 100%, and the selectivity to gas products, such as methane (55 - 68% yield), ethane (~1% yield), and CO₂ (15 - 30% yield), was high. Selectivity to liquid products was low. The liquid products were mainly oxygenated intermediates such as phenol (1.4 - 8.3% yield), cyclohexanone (0-2.7% yield), methylcyclohexanone (0.4-2.4% yield), and methylcyclohexanol (0 - 2.4% yield).




Fig. 5. Effect of Cu loading for Raney NiCu catalysts on selectivity, conversion, and liquid hydrocarbon yield in 4.1 mL reactors (380 °C, 30 min, 20 mg catalyst, 20 mg of o-cresol, 0.67 mL DI H₂O, 19 bar H₂ (STP), w×t/m = 30 min, 17:1 H₂ to o-cresol).

There is a dramatic shift in product selectivities and conversion when the Cu content of the Raney NiCu catalyst increased beyond 7% Cu. Fig. 5 shows that the conversion of o-cresol drops beyond 7% Cu loading and remains relatively steady at ~70%. Also between 7 and 25% Cu, the product selectivities shift from forming gas to forming liquid products. Again, methane and CO₂ were the main gasses while the aforementioned oxygenated intermediate molecules were present in high yields (table S2).

These results support the conclusion that Cu decreases the hydrocracking (C-C bond hydrogenolysis with H₂) activity of the catalyst. It is likely, on the low Cu loaded catalysts, that cyclohexanol, after forming from the hydrogenation of cyclohexanone, continues to react to form methane. This hypothesis is supported by literature showing that Ni is a more active hydrogenation and hydrocracking metal than Cu⁸. The lower overall activity of the high Cu loaded catalysts manifests in the decreased conversion observed. In contrast to the conversion and liquid and gas product selectivities in fig. 5, the liquid hydrocarbon yield varied little as the Cu content of the catalysts is varied. The liquid hydrocarbon yield varied only from a low of $2.5 \pm 0.2\%$ for the 1% Raney NiCu catalyst to $5.6 \pm 1.4\%$ for the 5% Raney NiCu catalyst.

The goal of this work was to produce a non-noble metal catalyst that is active, selective, and stable for hydrothermal HDO because such a catalyst would result in high liquid hydrocarbon yield, while minimizing the formation of lower value gas products. The results above indicate that Cu doping the Raney Ni catalyst is itself, insufficient to achieve this goal because the addition of Cu results only in minimizing unwanted gas products and not in increasing the yield of the desired liquid hydrocarbon products.

3.1.3 Raney NiCu catalyst characterization

1
2
3 The reaction results presented in section 3.1.2 indicate that the addition of Cu to a
4 Raney Ni catalyst has a dramatic effect on the product selectivities when o-cresol is reacted
5
6 at 380 °C in supercritical water. This section elucidates the morphology of the Raney NiCu
7
8 catalysts by discussing the results from titration, diffraction, and microscopy experiments
9
10 used to characterize the catalysts.
11
12
13
14

15 Fig. 3 shows the results of CO TPD of both the unmodified Raney Ni and 10% Raney
16
17 NiCu catalysts. Both spectra contain two major peaks at 75 and 405 °C. The Raney Ni
18
19 spectrum contains one shoulder between 105 and 140 °C, while the Raney NiCu spectrum
20
21 contains two shoulders, one between 105 and 115 °C, and the other, broader shoulder,
22
23 between 145 and 210 °C. This second broad shoulder is an entirely new feature in the 10%
24
25 Raney NiCu spectrum that was not observed in the Raney Ni spectrum. Both spectra were
26
27 integrated, and the 10% Raney NiCu catalyst adsorbed 1.7 times the CO of the Raney Ni
28
29 catalyst. The new shoulder and the increased CO uptake suggest that a new phase is formed
30
31 when the Raney Ni catalyst is doped with Cu, but the results do not provide direct evidence
32
33 of the type of phase the Cu forms. We also examined a Cu standard (100 nm Cu particles)
34
35 under the same reduction and TPD conditions and found no significant CO uptake because
36
37 the Cu particles sintered. Therefore, it is likely that the Cu and Ni in the 10% Raney NiCu
38
39 catalyst form an alloy due to the relatively high CO uptake observed.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Fig. 6 shows the XRD patterns of the 1-40% Raney NiCu catalysts. The dominant
48
49 features of each diffraction pattern at low Cu loading (1-7%) are the Ni planes. As the Cu
50
51 loading increases, a peak forms at the base of the Ni(111) peak in the 10% Raney NiCu
52
53 catalyst. Further increases in Cu loading increase the size of this peak, identified as a
54
55 $\text{Ni}_{0.5}\text{Cu}_{0.5}$, indicating the formation of an alloy of Ni and Cu. The 40% Raney NiCu catalyst
56
57
58
59
60

shows the formation of a third peak in the (111) plane, identified as a Cu rich phase, $(\text{Cu}_{19}\text{Ni})_{0.2}$. In addition to the (111) plane, one also observes the formation of the $\text{Ni}_{0.5}\text{Cu}_{0.5}$ and $(\text{Cu}_{19}\text{Ni})_{0.2}$ phases in the (200) and (220) planes. These results indicate that Ni and Cu form an alloy under the synthesis and reduction conditions used, and that at low to moderate Cu loading, this alloy appears to be roughly equal parts Ni and Cu.




Fig. 6. X-ray diffraction patterns of the Raney NiCu catalysts (passivated in 1% O_2 at 70 °C overnight, Cu $\text{K}\alpha$ source, 40 kV, 15 mA, 1.25°/min).

Fig. 7 shows TEM and STEM images of the 10% Raney NiCu catalyst. Fig. 7a shows a TEM image of the catalyst particle examined. Fig. 7d shows the STEM image used to generate the elemental map. We calculated the x distance across Fig. 7d, using the scale bar from Fig. 7a and common points in both images, as 870 nm. Fig. 7b, c, e, and f show the elemental maps of Ni, Cu, Zn, and Al. One expects Ni, Cu, and Al to be present in the catalyst. Zn, on the other hand, (Fig. 7e) served as a control element to determine the amount of background signal one should expect. Examination of Fig. 7e indicates that the background signal is low compared to the signals obtained from the other elements. Fig. 7f shows that

the Al appears to be segregated to both ends of the catalyst particle examined, with relatively little Al present in the middle of the image. This segregation is likely a result of the leaching methods that are used to remove Al from the Ni matrix during the synthesis of Raney Ni.

Fig. 7b and c indicate that Ni and Cu appear to spread evenly across the catalyst surface. This finding likely indicates that the Cu added to the catalyst is not present in Cu islands, but rather is present in a NiCu alloy that is relatively evenly dispersed on the catalyst surface. This finding is also in agreement with the XRD and TPD results presented earlier. All of the catalyst characterization findings are consistent with the results of Huber and Shabacker who used a Sn doped Raney Ni catalyst for aqueous phase reforming reactions and found that the Sn incorporated in the Ni catalyst³⁹⁻⁴¹.




Fig. 7. TEM and STEM elemental maps of 10% Raney NiCu. Fig. 7a. shows the original TEM image of the catalyst. Fig. 7d. shows the STEM image taken of the section of the catalyst used for the elemental map. Fig. 7b, c, e, and f. show the result from elemental maps of Ni, Cu, Zn, and Al respectively.

3.2 Improved Ni-based Hydrothermal HDO catalysts with the addition of acid sites

Section 3.1 showed that the addition of Cu to Ni catalysts suppresses gasification activity, but has little effect on the HDO activity of these catalysts. In short, the Raney NiCu catalysts are active for the hydrogenation of o-cresol, but are not sufficiently active for the C-O hydrogenolysis required for HDO. Recent research suggests that acid sites are essential for hydrothermal HDO reactions over Ni catalysts ^{31, 42}. Zhao et al. found that the Raney Ni 4200 and 2400 are active for HDO only when an additional acid catalyst, in this case Nafion supported on SiO₂, was added to the reaction mixture ³¹. Mortensen et al. found that the non-hydrothermal HDO of phenol occurred more rapidly on acidic supports such as ZrO₂ and Al₂O₃, leading these researchers to speculate that the HDO reaction actually occurred at the metal/support interface ⁴².

This section elucidates the influence of added acidity on the product yields and selectivities by modifying the reaction system in three ways. First, we used the 10% Raney NiCu catalyst in an aqueous solution of HCl or H₂SO₄. Second, we synthesized Ni and NiCu catalysts on acidic supports (e.g., Al₂O₃ and ZrO₂). Third, we further modified the Raney Ni catalyst by oxidizing some of the Al in the catalyst to Al₂O₃ by calcining the catalyst in air at 400 °C (see section 2). This calcined Raney Ni catalyst is a novel catalyst, that to the best of our knowledge, has never before been used for HDO. The only prior report we found of intentionally producing Al₂O₃ through calcination on a Raney Ni catalyst used the Al₂O₃ as a binder for an extruded catalyst ⁴³.

3.2.1 Batch experiments with acidic Ni catalysts

We examined a variety of catalysts in 4.1 mL batch mini-reactors to quickly assess their activity for hydrothermal HDO under a variety of conditions. Table 1 summarizes these results and conditions used. These experiments used less catalyst (10 vs. 20 mg),

1
2
3 more o-cresol (100 vs. 20 mg), and a lower H₂ to o-cresol molar ratio (6:1 vs. 17:1) than did
4
5
6 the batch reactions that generated fig. 5. These reaction conditions were chosen primarily
7
8 to prevent complete conversion. Table 1 indicates that the addition of HCl and H₂SO₄ had a
9
10 negative effect on liquid hydrocarbon yield and conversion. We suspect, although we did
11
12 not test this hypothesis, that the Cl and S poisoned the 10% Raney Ni catalyst and rendered
13
14 the catalyst almost completely inactive.
15
16

17
18 Table 1 also summarizes the results of several active catalysts. The temporal
19
20 variation of conversion and liquid hydrocarbon yield from these catalysts appear in fig. 8.
21
22 Table 1 and fig. 8 reveal that the 10% Ni/ZrO₂ catalyst had a low liquid hydrocarbon yield
23
24 and conversion, but a high selectivity to liquid products. The 10% Ni/Al₂O₃ catalyst showed
25
26 the highest conversion, liquid hydrocarbon yield, and selectivity to liquid products. Last,
27
28 the calcined Raney Ni catalyst had a high conversion, a relatively low liquid hydrocarbon
29
30 yield, and a low selectivity to liquid products when compared to the 10% Ni/Al₂O₃ catalyst.
31
32 Nonetheless, the calcined Raney Ni catalyst generally had higher liquid hydrocarbon yields
33
34 than the 10% Raney NiCu catalyst. For the catalysts tested in fig. 8, the liquid hydrocarbons
35
36 were cyclohexane, benzene, toluene and methylcyclohexane. The major oxygenated
37
38 products were methylcyclohexanol, methylcyclohexanone, phenol, cyclohexanol, and
39
40 cyclohexanone. The gas product was primarily methane with smaller amounts of CO₂. The
41
42 yields of individual products are shown in table S3.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Summary of catalysts tested in 4.1 mL batch reactors (380 °C,15-180 min, 10 mg catalyst, 100 mg of o-cresol, 0.67 mL DI H₂O or DI water acid solution, 41 bar H₂ (STP), 6:1 H₂ to o-cresol, X= conversion, LH = liquid hydrocarbon, S_{liq} = selectivity to liquid products).

Catalyst	X	LH Yield	S _{liq}	Time (min)	W×t/m (min)
10% Raney NiCu	37-80%	0-7%	65-87%	15-45	1.5-4.5
10% Raney NiCu + HCl ¹	1-4%	0%	----	15-60	1.5-6.0
10% Raney NiCu + H ₂ SO ₄ ²	0-5 %	0-1%	----	30-60	3.0-6.0
10% Ni/Al ₂ O ₃	54-93%	12-35%	85-91%	30-150	0.15-1.5
10% Ni/ZrO ₂	14-67%	0-8%	64-98%	15-180	0.3-1.8
Calcined Raney Ni	57-88%	3-12%	44-68%	15-60	1.5-6.0

¹1.04 wt% HCl in DI water. ²0.2 wt% H₂SO₄ in DI water




Fig. 8. Conversion (dashed lines) and liquid hydrocarbon yield (solid lines) from Ni and NiCu catalysts in 4.1 mL batch reactors. Table 1 summarizes all of catalysts tested (380 °C, 10 mg catalyst, 100 mg of o-cresol, 0.67 mL DI H₂O, 41 bar H₂ (STP), 6:1 H₂ to o-cresol).

The high liquid hydrocarbon yield from the 10% Ni/Al₂O₃ catalyst and the increased liquid hydrocarbon yield from the calcined Raney Ni catalyst support the hypotheses by Mortensen et al. ⁴² and Zhao et al. ³² that acid sites, like those found in Al₂O₃, assist in C-O hydrogenolysis, and therefore increase HDO activity. The results obtained with the calcined

Raney Ni catalyst were especially encouraging because such a catalyst has not been studied previously for HDO. Furthermore, it is suspected that the liquid hydrocarbon yield, shown in fig. 8, was low due to the relatively high gasification activity of the catalyst (i.e., low selectivity to liquid products in table 1), but in section 3.1 it was shown that Cu decreases the gasification activity of Raney Ni. Therefore, with these two tools, the addition of Cu and the addition of Al_2O_3 , the activity and selectivity of Ni catalysts can be tuned.

3.2.2 Flow reactions

At this point, this work identified several catalysts that are active for hydrothermal HDO, but several challenges remain. The first challenge is to obtain a high liquid hydrocarbon yield (e.g., > 50%) with these catalysts, and the second challenge is to determine the stability of these catalysts under the harsh hydrothermal conditions. These challenges were addressed by performing a series of flow reactor experiments using the reactor shown in fig. 1 and described in detail in the methods section.

3.2.2.1 Calcined Raney Ni

Calcined Raney Ni was tested in the flow reactor, and fig. 9 shows the results. The conversion of o-cresol, at a W/F (mass of catalyst active metal/mass flow rate of o-cresol) of 12.7 min, is generally between 75 and 90%, and appears to decrease slightly with TOS. The liquid hydrocarbon yield was generally between 25 and 45% with the higher yields appearing at later TOS. The linear trend line fit to the liquid hydrocarbon yield data indicates an increasing liquid hydrocarbon yield with TOS. Fig. 9 also shows that the yields of the two major liquid hydrocarbon products, methylcyclohexane and cyclohexane, appear relatively steady with TOS, if not increasing slightly. A variety of other minor liquid hydrocarbon products also formed, and in general had low individual yields (< 2%). The

sum of these products, however, significantly increased the liquid hydrocarbon yield. These products include butane, 2-methylbutane, hexane, methylcyclopentane, 1,3-dimethylcyclopentane, ethylcyclopentane, toluene, and methylcyclohexene (table s4). These minor products indicate that this catalyst has a relatively high isomerization activity compared with the other catalysts examined.

Fig. 9 shows that the methane yield was between 20 and 40% during the reaction, indicating that this catalyst still retains significant gasification activity. This gasification activity also appears to be maintained with TOS indicating that this catalyst is unlikely to become more selective for liquid products, either oxygenated or hydrocarbons, without a modification to the catalyst.




Fig. 9. Results from reacting o-cresol over calcined Raney Ni ($W/F = 12.7$ min, $T_{\text{inlet}} = 365$ °C, $T_{\text{outlet}} = 390$ °C, 280 bar, feed flow rates (mL/min, ambient temperature): $\text{H}_2\text{O} = 0.270$, o-cresol = 0.030, internal standard solution = 0.400, $\text{H}_2 = 0.006$ mol/min, H_2 to o-cresol molar ratio = 20:1, 550 °C in situ H_2 catalyst reduction).

Previous work revealed an increase in liquid hydrocarbon yield with TOS, similar to that in fig. 9, when using a Pt/C catalyst for the hydrothermal HDO of o-cresol. A potential

1
2
3 cause of this increase in activity was reduction of the catalyst surface that had been
4
5 oxidized during reactor startup ²¹. Similarly, oxidation of the present Ni catalyst may have
6
7 occurred during the reactor startup, and gradual re-reduction during the reaction led to
8
9 increasing liquid hydrocarbon yields. Another possible cause of the increase in liquid
10
11 hydrocarbon yield with TOS is an increase in the Al₂O₃ content of the Raney Ni catalyst
12
13 caused by the oxidizing hydrothermal environment. Suchanek developed an Al₂O₃-H₂O
14
15 phase diagram by subjecting γ -Al(OH)₃ and γ -AlOOH to a hydrothermal environment and
16
17 showed that under conditions similar to those used in this reaction, α -Al₂O₃ is formed ⁴⁴.
18
19 Therefore, it is also possible that the increase in liquid hydrocarbon yield observed in fig. 9
20
21 is due to an increasing concentration of acid Al₂O₃ sites adjacent to the Ni active metal,
22
23 allowing for HDO reactions to occur more readily.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Previous work with Raney Ni, using formic acid as the H₂ source and similar
31
32 reaction conditions, provided only very low yields of liquid hydrocarbons, 6.4%, at a very
33
34 similar W/F of 12 min ²¹. Therefore, the development of calcined Raney Ni represents a
35
36 significant step forward in developing a low-cost, active, and stable catalyst for
37
38 hydrothermal HDO.
39
40

41 3.2.2.2 Supported NiCu catalyst

42 Fig. 10 shows the results from reacting o-cresol over a 10%, 0.5% NiCu/Al₂O₃
43
44 catalyst at a W/F of 3.22 min using the same reaction conditions as above. We doped this
45
46 catalyst with a small amount of Cu (0.5%) to suppress the gasification pathway.
47
48
49
50

51 Fig. 10 shows the conversion remained steady at ~100% throughout the 24 hr
52
53 experiment. The liquid hydrocarbon yield was generally between 50 and 80%, with an
54
55 average of 71 ± 19%. During this experiment the reaction pressure would occasionally
56
57
58
59
60

drop to around 225 bar, for an unknown reason, before rebuilding to 280 bar. These occasional process upsets induced atypical scatter in the data collected. Nonetheless, the results clearly show a high average liquid hydrocarbon yield and no significant catalyst deactivation over the 24 hr reaction. The stability of this catalyst was surprising due to the reported instability of γ - Al_2O_3 under hydrothermal conditions⁸⁻¹⁰. It is worth noting that the two potential transformations of γ - Al_2O_3 under the reaction conditions used, γ - Al_2O_3 to AlOOH ⁹ or γ - Al_2O_3 to α - Al_2O_3 ⁴⁴, would have occurred to a significant extent over the 24 hr reaction, if either transformation was going to occur. The γ - Al_2O_3 may also have been stabilized by the presence of o-cresol or other alcohol-containing species in the reaction mixture⁴⁵.




Fig. 10. Results from reacting o-cresol over 10%, 0.5% NiCu/ Al_2O_3 (W/F = 3.22 min, T_{inlet} = 365 °C, T_{outlet} = 390 °C, 280 bar, feed flow rates (mL/min, ambient temperature): H_2O = 0.270, o-cresol = 0.030, internal standard solution = 0.400, H_2 = 0.006 mol/min, H_2 to o-cresol molar ratio = 20:1, 550 °C in situ H_2 catalyst reduction).

Fig. 10 also shows that the yields of the three major liquid hydrocarbon products: cyclohexane, toluene, and methylcyclohexane. These three products accounted for > 85%

of the liquid hydrocarbon yield, but small yields of benzene ($\leq 3\%$) and methylcyclohexene ($\leq 2\%$) were also observed. This finding indicates that this supported catalyst is much less active for isomerization than the calcined Raney Ni catalyst.

The yields of oxygenated and gas products were generally low. The oxygenated products were phenol, cyclohexanone, cyclohexanol, 2-methylcyclohexanol, and 2-methylcyclohexanone, and the average yield for each oxygenated molecule was $\leq 2\%$ (table S5). The gas products were methane and CO_2 with average yields of $5 \pm 2\%$ and $3 \pm 2\%$, respectively.

3.2.2.3 Calcined 5% Raney NiCu

The calcined Raney Ni catalyst tested in both batch and flow reactors showed very promising results because of the increased liquid hydrocarbon yield when compared with previous work ²¹. Examination of the products revealed that this catalyst was still too active for gasification, because, as shown in fig. 9 and table S4, between 20 and 40% of the carbon from o-cresol formed methane. Therefore, to suppress this gasification activity, we added 5% Cu to the calcined Raney Ni catalyst, and reacted o-cresol over this catalyst at a W/F of 19.9 min.




Fig. 11. Results from reacting o-cresol over 5% calcined Raney NiCu (W/F = 19.9 min, T_{inlet} = 365 °C, T_{outlet} = 390 °C, 280 bar, feed flow rates (mL/min, ambient temperature): H_2O = 0.270, o-cresol = 0.030, internal standard solution = 0.400, H_2 = 0.006 mol/min, H_2 to o-cresol molar ratio = 20:1, 550 °C in situ H_2 catalyst reduction).

Fig. 11 shows that the o-cresol was completely converted over the calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalyst throughout the reaction. The liquid hydrocarbon yield was ~40% early in the reaction and increased linearly to ~60% after 1200 min on stream. As with the calcined Raney Ni catalyst, the two major liquid hydrocarbon products were methanocyclohexane and cyclohexane. The methanocyclohexane yield increased linearly with TOS from ~20 to ~40% while the cyclohexane yield remained steady at $10 \pm 2\%$ over the course of the reaction. The remaining liquid hydrocarbon and oxygenated products (table S6) were the same as those observed with the calcined Raney Ni catalyst, and each product had a low yield ($\leq 2\%$).

Fig. 11 also shows the methane yield from the calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalyst and indicates that at early TOS, the catalyst was active for gasification, but after 800 min on

stream the gasification activity is lower and steady, producing methane in $17 \pm 3\%$ yield. This yield of methane compares favorably to the $34 \pm 4\%$ yield of methane observed with the calcined Raney Ni. Furthermore, this decrease in methane yield occurred even with an increase in W/F from 12.7 to 19.9 min. It is likely that this increase in selectivity toward liquid products, and more specifically liquid hydrocarbon products, in the calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalyst is due primarily to the decrease in the gasification activity of the calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalyst compared with the calcined Raney Ni catalyst. The reason for the increase in the liquid hydrocarbon yield with TOS is again not known with certainty, but we speculate that this increase is due to the same reasons discussed above for the calcined Raney Ni catalyst.

All three catalysts tested in the flow reactor, calcined Raney Ni, NiCu/Al₂O₃, and calcined 5% Raney NiCu, represent significant advances in hydrothermal HDO catalysts because each catalyst produced moderate to high yields of liquid hydrocarbons while minimizing the production of gaseous products. Furthermore, each catalyst appeared to be free of any rapid deactivation, suggesting the catalyst lifetime is significantly longer than the 24 hr time period tested. Last, these catalysts do not contain noble metals and do not require the addition of a separate acid catalyst (i.e. Nafion or H₃PO₄) to produce liquid hydrocarbons. Both of these factors have significant commercial implications because the catalyst is inexpensive and additional separation steps are not necessary to remove a homogenous acid catalyst.

3.2.3 Catalyst characterization

We performed XRD on the Ni/Al₂O₃, NiCu/Al₂O₃ and calcined Raney Ni catalysts. Fig. 12 shows the XRD patterns of the γ -AlOOH, the calcined 10% Ni/AlOOH, the reduced 10% Ni/Al₂O₃, and the reduced 10%, 0.5% NiCu/Al₂O₃ catalysts. The calcined Ni/AlOOH catalyst diffraction pattern contains NiO, AlOOH, Al₂O₃ peaks, indicating that the AlOOH support is starting to convert to Al₂O₃. Reduction of the Ni/AlOOH catalyst converts the NiO to Ni and the remaining AlOOH to Al₂O₃. This outcome is evident by the absence of NiO and AlOOH peaks and presence of Ni and Al₂O₃ peaks in the reduced Ni/Al₂O₃ pattern. In the 10%, 0.5% NiCu/Al₂O₃ catalyst diffraction pattern, only NiCu and Al₂O₃ phases appear. This result differs from the Raney NiCu catalysts where both Ni and NiCu phases were observed. This result is likely because both the Ni and Cu were impregnated on the catalysts at the same time, whereas with the Raney NiCu catalysts, the Cu was added on top of the base Raney Ni catalyst.




Fig. 12. X-ray diffraction patterns of the γ -AlOOH, 10% Ni/Al₂O₃ and 10%, 0.5% NiCu/Al₂O₃ catalysts (passivated in 1% O₂ at 70 °C overnight, Cu K α source, 40 kV, 15 mA, 1.25°/min).




Fig. 13. X-ray diffraction patterns of the Raney Ni catalysts (passivated in 1% O_2 at 70 °C overnight, Cu $K\alpha$ source, 40 kV, 15 mA, 1.25°/min).

Fig. 13 shows the XRD patterns of the reduced Raney Ni, the calcined Raney Ni, and the calcined then reduced Raney Ni catalysts. The top two XRD patterns in fig. 13 zoom in on the baseline of the reduced Raney Ni and calcined/reduced Raney Ni patterns. The reduced Raney Ni pattern shows only Ni peaks as expected. Upon calcination, much of the Ni in the original catalyst is converted to NiO, which is evident by the appearance of NiO peaks in this pattern. Reduction of the calcined Raney Ni catalyst returns the catalyst, upon initial inspection, to a very similar XRD pattern as the reduced Raney Ni catalyst. The expanded patterns at the top of fig. 13, though, do indicate a slight difference between these catalysts. Upon careful inspection, one observes two new peaks at $\sim 37^\circ$ and $\sim 67^\circ$ in the calcined/reduced Raney Ni catalyst. These peak locations correspond to $\gamma\text{-Al}_2\text{O}_3$. This correspondence provides a strong indication that the calcination and reduction of the

Raney Ni catalyst did result in the formation Al_2O_3 , and provides further supporting evidence that it is the presence of Al_2O_3 that increases the HDO activity of these catalysts. We also examined several expanded XRD patterns of the Raney NiCu catalysts shown in fig. 6 to be sure that the peaks seen in the expanded calcined/reduced Raney Ni catalyst pattern were not simply a shift in the baseline, and no evidence of the Al_2O_3 peaks was observed. Last, although not tested here, previous work with a Raney NiCu catalyst ²¹ indicated no change in the catalyst particle size between the fresh and used catalyst after a 24 hr TOS reaction, thereby agreeing with the reaction results presented above.

4. Conclusion

This article demonstrates two approaches for improving the hydrothermal HDO activity and selectivity of Ni catalysts, that when combined, provide the only known stable and high liquid hydrocarbon yield for non-noble metal catalysts. The first approach is to dope the Ni catalysts with Cu to reduce the gasification activity. Between 7 and 25 wt% Cu added to the Raney Ni catalyst shifts the selectivity of the catalyst from gas to liquid products. Unfortunately, this shift in selectivity did not increase the liquid hydrocarbon yield. The second approach is to add acid sites, as recent reports suggest that acid sites are important for the dehydration step in HDO ^{31,42}. Acid sites were added via an acidic support (Al_2O_3) for Ni and NiCu catalysts, and via calcination of the Raney Ni catalyst to produce an Al_2O_3 phase within the catalyst. In flow reactor experiments, both the 10%, 0.5% NiCu/ Al_2O_3 and the calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalysts produced liquid hydrocarbon yields over 60% and showed no activity loss over the 24 hr reaction, indicating that these catalysts may have industrial relevance. In particular the calcined 5% Raney NiCu catalyst represents an interesting hydrothermal HDO catalyst due to its novelty, activity, cost, and

selectivity. Future research should focus on characterizing the metal surface of the fresh and used calcined Raney NiCu catalyst (e.g., temperature programmed reduction, thermogravimetric analysis, x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy) and the acid sites (e.g., NH₃-TPD, pyridine infrared spectroscopy).

Acknowledgements

We thank Thomas Yeh for performing the TEM/STEM imaging and Erin Branton for assisting with the reaction experiments. J.G. Dickinson acknowledges financial support from a NSF Graduate Research Fellowship. We gratefully acknowledge the National Science Foundation (Grant EFRI-0937992) and the College of Engineering for their financial support.

Supporting Information

Tables of product yields for all of the experiments performed are available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

References

1. Furimsky, E. *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* **2000**, 124, 470-477.
2. Furimsky, E. *Catal. Today* **2013**, 217, 13-56.
3. Wang, H.; Male, J., Wang, Y. *ACS Catal.* **2013**, 3, 1047-1070.
4. Bridgwater, A. V.; Meier, D., Radlein, D. *Org. Geochem.* **1999**, 30, 1479-1493.
5. Yeh, T. M.; Dickinson, J. G.; Franck, A.; Linic, S.; Thompson, L. T., Savage, P. E. *J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol.* **2013**, 88, 13-24.
6. Valdez, P. J.; Dickinson, J. G., Savage, P. E. *Energy Fuels* **2011**, 25, 3235-3243.
7. Brown, T. M.; Duan, P., Savage, P. E. *Energy Fuels* **2010**, 24, 3639-3646.
8. Elliott, D. C.; Sealock Jr, L. J., Baker, E. G. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **1993**, 32, 1542-1548.

9. Ravenelle, R. M.; Copeland, J. R.; Kim, W.-G.; Crittenden, J. C., Sievers, C. *ACS Catal.* **2011**, 1, 552-561.
10. Yu, J., Savage, P. E. *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* **2001**, 31, 123-132.
11. Furimsky, D. E. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2013**, 52, 17695-17713.
12. Bond, J. Q.; Alonso, D. M.; Wang, D.; West, R. M., Dumesic, J. A. *Science* **2010**, 327, 1110-1114.
13. Braden, D. J.; Henao, C. A.; Heltzel, J.; Maravelias, C. C., Dumesic, J. A. *Green Chem.* **2011**,
14. Davda, R. R.; Shabaker, J. W.; Huber, G. W.; Cortright, R. D., Dumesic, J. A. *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* **2003**, 43, 13-26.
15. Huber, G. W.; Cortright, R. D., Dumesic, J. A. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed* **2004**, 43, 1549-1551.
16. Kunkes, E. L.; Simonetti, D. A.; West, R. M.; Serrano-Ruiz, J. C.; Gärtner, C. A., Dumesic, J. A. *Science* **2008**, 322, 417.
17. Zhao, C.; Kou, Y.; Lemonidou, A. A.; Li, X., Lercher, J. A. *Angew. Chem.* **2009**, 121, 4047-4050.
18. Zhao, C.; He, J.; Lemonidou, A. A.; Li, X., Lercher, J. A. *J. Catal.* **2011**, 280, 8-16.
19. Zhao, C., Lercher, J. A. *ChemCatChem* **2012**, 4, 64-68.
20. Zhao, C.; Camaioni, D. M., Lercher, J. A. *J. Catal.* **2012**, 288, 92-103.
21. Dickinson, J. G., Savage, P. E. *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem.* **2014**, 388-389, 56-65.
22. Dickinson, J. G.; Poberezny, J. T., Savage, P. E. *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* **2012**, 123-124, 357-366.
23. Duan, P., Savage, P. E. *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* **2011**, 108-109, 54-60.
24. Duan, P., Savage, P. E. *Appl. Catal. B: Environ.* **2011**, 104, 136-143.
25. Duan, P., Savage, P. E. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2011**, 4, 1447-1456.
26. Duan, P., Savage, P. E. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2011**, 50, 52-61.
27. Duan, P., Savage, P. E. *Bioresour. Technol.* **2011**, 102, 1899-1906.
28. Fu, J.; Shi, F.; Thompson Jr, L. T.; Lu, X., Savage, P. E. *ACS Catal.* **2011**, 1, 227-231.
29. Fu, J.; Lu, X., Savage, P. E. *Energy Environ. Sci.* **2010**, 3, 311-317.
30. Fu, J.; Lu, X., Savage, P. E. *ChemSusChem* **2011**, 4, 481-486.
31. Zhao, C.; Kou, Y.; Lemonidou, A. A.; Li, X., Lercher, J. A. *Chem. Commun* **2010**, 46, 412-414.
32. Zhao, C.; Kasakov, S.; He, J., Lercher, J. A. *J. Catal.* **2012**, 296, 12-23.
33. Zhao, C., Lercher, J. A. *Angew. Chem.* **2012**, 124, 6037-6042.
34. Sitthisa, S.; Pham, T.; Prasomsri, T.; Sooknoi, T.; Mallinson, R. G., Resasco, D. E. *J. Catal.* **2011**, 280, 17-27.
35. Mullen, C. A.; Boateng, A. A.; Goldberg, N. M.; Lima, I. M.; Laird, D. A., Hicks, K. B. *Biomass Bioenerg.* **2010**, 34, 67-74.
36. Ross, A. B.; Biller, P.; Kubacki, M. L.; Li, H.; Lea-Langton, A., Jones, J. M. *Fuel* **2010**, 89, 2234-2243.
37. Choe, S. J.; Kang, H. J.; Kim, S.; Park, S.; Park, D. H., Huh, D. S. *Bull. Korean Chem. Soc.* **2005**, 26, 1682.
38. Andersson, M. P.; Abild-Pedersen, F.; Remediakis, I. N.; Bligaard, T.; Jones, G.; Engbæk, J.; Lytken, O.; Horch, S.; Nielsen, J. H., Sehested, J. *J. Catal.* **2008**, 255, 6-19.
39. Huber, G. W.; Shabaker, J. W., Dumesic, J. A. *Science* **2003**, 300, 2075.
40. Shabaker, J. W.; Huber, G. W., Dumesic, J. A. *J. Catal.* **2004**, 222, 180-191.

41. Shabaker, J. W.; Simonetti, D. A.; Cortright, R. D.; Dumesic, J. A. *J. Catal.* **2005**, 231, 67-76.
42. Mortensen, P. M.; Grunwaldt, J. D.; Jensen, P. A.; Jensen, A. D. *ACS Catal.* **2013**, 3, 1774-1785.
43. Cheng, W. C.; Czarnecki, L. J.; Pereira, C. J. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **1989**, 28, 1764-1767.
44. Suchanek, W. L. *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* **2010**, 93, 399-412.
45. Ravenelle, R. M.; Copeland, J. R.; Pelt, A. H.; Crittenden, J. C.; Sievers, C. *Top Catal* **2012**, 55, 162-174.

For table of contents only

