

KINETIC MODELING OF HYDROPROCESSING PROCESS

KUNCHE BABU SRINIVAS



**DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
MAY 2019**

KINETIC MODELING OF HYDROPROCESSING PROCESS

by

KUNCHE BABU SRINIVAS

DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

Submitted

in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

JANUARY 2019

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**KINETIC MODELING OF HYDROPROCESSING PROCESS**” submitted by **Mr. Kunche Babu Srinivas** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi for the award of degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** is a record of original bonafide research work carried out by him under my guidance and supervision. The thesis has reached the standards of fulfilling the requirements of the regulations of Indian Institute of Technology Delhi for awarding the degree.

The research report and results presented in the thesis have not been submitted, in part or full, to any other university or institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

Date:

Dr. Kamal K.Pant
Professor and Head
Department of Chemical Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India



Dr. S. K. Gupta
Distinguished Professor
Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies,
Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India



Dr. D. N. Saraf
Distinguished Professor
Department of Chemical Engineering, Dehradun Institute of Technology,
Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With all respect and deep gratitude, I wish to express my sincere thanks to my research advisors, **Prof. K. K. Pant**, **Prof. S. K. Gupta** and **Prof. D. N. Saraf**, for their encouragement and invaluable suggestions with kind support for the last few years.

My lead supervisor Prof. Pant has been kind enough to accept me as doctoral student at IITD. His enthusiasm and vast knowledge has inspired me to pursue my research work under his guidance. He has been a steady influence though out my Ph.D journey and has supported me with promptness and care. Despite of his busy schedules he used to review all the results, journal papers, progress reports, thesis and keeps track of all admin requirements. Without his unconditional support, the reported work wasn't so easy for me to complete and to overcome some hurdles in this journey. Every time I met him at IITD he always received me with a smiley face and I felt fully rejuvenated and motivated after every interaction. From the bottom of the heart I wish to thank him for providing a friendly and non pressurizing environment throughout my research time.

My acknowledgements shall definitely fall short of words in respect of my co supervisors Prof. S. K. Gupta and Prof. D. N. Saraf for their inspiration, guidance, interest and valuable suggestions throughout my work. I have been lucky enough to work with one of the renowned experts in the area of multi objective optimization. Despite of their busy schedules they used to go through every minute details of the work and the discussions with them made me to think altogether in a different direction. They used to chisel my write-ups in crude form to make them refined papers for publication. I feel privileged to meet them at their residences in Dehradun for discussions and guidance. Whenever I met them personally, I always felt I should learn from them especially enthusiasm for research, perfectness in the work, book keeping of the results and time management to excel in my professional life. I am interested to work with them further in the areas of multi objective optimization for refinery processes.

I would like to thank my SRC committee members Dr. Munawar A. Sheik, Dr. James Gomes, Dr. M. Ali Haider for their assistance and guidance during the progress report discussions. I am also thankful to Prof. S. Basu and Prof. R. Khanna, Head of Chemical Engineering Department

during my work and all the faculty members for providing all the necessary facilities during the course of my work at IIT Delhi.

Thanks to my entire lab mates in the Catalytic Reaction engineering Laboratory for their support and help. Special thanks to my lab mate Rohit for the support, providing literature papers immediately whenever I require and keeping track of all my department requisites and informing me at correct times made my life simpler.

A special tribute to all my colleagues in IOCL R&D who helped me in running pilot plants, for their technical support and encouragement. Many thanks to Dr. Pravesh Kumar for helping me in doc formatting.

I owe special thanks to Indian Oil Corporation, Research & Development Centre management for giving permission to pursue Ph.D at IIT Delhi.

Last but not the least I would like to express my indebtedness towards my loving wife Srilakshmi who has always been a source of strength. Without her help, caring, understanding, I would not have kept round the clock schedule for thinking about the code. I appreciate my little angel's Shriya and Shalvi's patience and support who are the stress busters in my life. I thank my parents and sisters for being a great source of inspiration.

Everything happens only with the grace of God. I thank the almighty Lord Sri Venkateswara for providing me an opportunity, strength and ambience to successfully complete this work.

K.B.Srinivas

ABSTRACT

Hydroprocessing has emerged as the key refining process equal in importance to distillation in the refinery. The goals for fuels with higher hydrogen, lower aromatics and with low hetero-atoms (e.g. Sulfur, Nitrogen, etc.,) have been a key factor for the development of new grass root refineries as well as for revamps. Almost all countries in the world have now adopted Euro-V specifications that mandate the gasoline/diesel fuels to have 10 ppm or less of elemental sulfur. This has tended to favor hydroprocessing technologies in the refineries. Hydroprocessing is a family of process which includes hydrotreatment of light and middle distillates, vacuum gas oil (VGO) and VGO hydrocracking. A process model is vital requirement for any process optimization process.

The feed (naphtha/ diesel/ VGO) to the hydrotreaters consists of enormous number of molecules in the order of 10^4 - 10^5 from carbon number ranging from C_5 - C_{33} . A laboratory assay doesn't provide information on number and type of compounds. So far, the hydrotreating of naphtha and gas oils has been studied in terms of kinetic lumps of sulfur components which are converted by first or second order reactions. These lumped models do not reveal the underlying reaction mechanisms and mask the true kinetics since the actual composition of the lumps in terms of molecular components may differ with changes in the kind of feed. Because of the lack of molecular level details as input to these models, the model output cannot be able to predict the composition of the product and its properties. Hence there is a need to develop a more realistic kinetic model based on detailed feed description to predict product composition and properties. This motivated the present approach aimed at the development of feed characterization module that will allow the prediction of molecular composition of petroleum fractions. This molecular composition information is a direct input for molecular reaction models in the reactor simulation

which can subsequently be used to predict the product molecular composition and properties for various operating scenarios.

The main objectives of the present work are as follows:

1. *Develop a feed characterization module:* The first step in the development of the (pure) molecule-based kinetic model is the molecular characterization and representation of the feed stream. The main aim of the present work is to transform the analytical information into a *molecular* representation that represent the feed using an optimization algorithm and use this molecular composition to model the reactions in the industrial hydrotreating reactor.
2. *Kinetic modeling and parameter estimation:* To model the important reaction pathways in the hydrotreating process. The reaction pathways considered in this study are hydro desulfurization (HDS), hydro denitrogenation (HDN), olefin saturation (OSAT) and aromatic saturation (ASAT). To conduct experiments for kinetic studies and to estimate the kinetic parameters from pilot plant studies.
3. *Reactor simulation:* To frame a set of model equations for the simulation of *industrial* reactors and solving these model equations to predict the boiling point distribution, composition, temperature, pressure, etc., at the exit of the reactor.

In the present feed characterization model, the optimal composition of the *pure* components representing the feed is generated from a given true boiling point (TBP) data and *a few* global properties of the feed. An appropriate number of *pure* molecules are selected to represent the feed, such that the experimental properties of the latter, e.g., the true boiling point, specific gravity, refractive index, etc., match those computed from the selected set of pure molecules (using appropriate mixing rules) representing it. From among *all* the available

molecules of various detailed hydrocarbon analysis (DHA), commonly occurring paraffins, naphthenes, aromatics and olefins are taken as representative molecules for the naphtha feed constituting the carbon numbers from C_5 - C_{11} . VGO feed is represented by molecules from carbon number ranging from C_{14} - C_{33} . For naphtha feed, the criterion followed for the selection of components was the difference in boiling points between them should be around 1°C in any one group. For heavier fractions we have used the criteria that each group (PNA) should be represented by only one carbon number to limit the number of molecules. With this criterion, a data base with important physical properties has been built for naphtha comprising 95 components and VGO comprising 120 components. The composition of the pure compounds in the mixture is found by an optimization routine (real-coded Genetic Algorithm (GA) in MatlabTM). This component data base has been tested for several feeds with different boiling ranges and found to be satisfactorily matching with the TBP curve and other properties.

Hydrotreating modeling at the pathways level has four reaction families: desulfurization, denitrogenation, olefin saturation and aromatic saturation. Development of detailed kinetic model requires modeling of HDS/HDN/OSAT/ASAT chemistry at the reaction pathways level for each molecule in the process. Langmuir-Hinshelwood-Hougen-Watson (LHHW) formalism type rate expressions were used for the four reaction families considered in the study. A steady state isothermal kinetic model has been developed to estimate the product composition in the pilot plant reactor. The kinetic parameters for these reactions have been estimated from a comprehensive set of experimental pilot plant data spanning a wide range of process conditions. Experiments were conducted at various process parameters namely temperature, pressure, gas to oil ratio and liquid hourly space velocity. The values of the kinetic parameters were calculated as a function of reaction temperature by minimizing an objective function based on sum of square

deviations between the model-predicted and experimental values of the total sulfur, total nitrogen, olefin and aromatic contents. The minimization is done using the Genetic Algorithm (GA) code in MatlabTM.

Industrial hydrotreating reactors are adiabatic fixed bed reactors. Modeling of temperature rise in the industrial reactors is carried out by considering an energy balance equation for the reactor. As the present model deals with pure molecules, standard heat of reaction with reaction temperature is calculated from the individual component specific heats and standard heat of formation. In this work industrial naphtha and VGO hydrotreaters were modeled and configured for one of the Indian operating refineries. A detailed molecule-level reactor model (a one dimensional steady state non isothermal pseudo homogenous plug flow model) for naphtha hydrotreating with 95 components, from carbon numbers C_5 to C_{11} and 36 reactions, has been developed. A three phase one dimensional plug flow non isothermal trickle bed reactor model for VGO hydrotreating with 120 components, from carbon numbers C_{14} to C_{33} and 48 reactions has been developed.

The present reactor models with a feed characterization module prove to be a powerful tool for simulating industrial naphtha/VGO hydrotreating reactors. Simulation results showed that the model is capable of generating detailed product composition, boiling point distribution of the reactor effluent and major process trends for a wide range of operating conditions. Moreover, the model can be used to calculate the physical properties of interest (e.g., specific gravity, average molecular weight, etc.). Therefore, this model can be used as a good computational tool for process development, operation and optimization of existing naphtha/VGO hydrotreating units.

सार

रिफाइनरी में आसवन के लिए हाइड्रोप्रोसिंग महत्वपूर्ण शोधन प्रक्रिया के समान है। पिछले कुछ दशकों में पर्यावरण की चिंता ने शोधन उद्योग में हाइड्रोप्रोसेसिंग विकास के लिए रूपरेखा तैयार की है। उच्च हाइड्रोजन, कम एरोमेटिक्स और कम हेट्रो-परमाणुओं (जैसे सल्फर, नाइट्रोजन, आदि) के साथ ईंधन के लिए लक्ष्य, नए घास रूट रिफाइनरियों के विकास के साथ-साथ सुधारों के लिए एक महत्वपूर्ण कारक रहा है। सल्फर को निकालना अब अनिवार्य है गैसोलीन/आसुत ईंधन पर कड़े पर्यावरणीय नियमों को पूरा करना। हाइड्रोप्रोसेसिंग प्रक्रिया का एक परिवार है जिसमें प्रकाश और मध्य डिस्टिलेट्स, वैक्यूम गैस ऑयल (वीजीओ) और अवशेषों, हल्के हाइड्रोकार्बन, वीजीओ हाइड्रोकार्बन, अवशेष हाइड्रोकार्बन और हाइड्रोजनीकरण का हाइड्रोट्रिप्ट शामिल है। एक प्रक्रिया मॉडल किसी भी प्रक्रिया अनुकूलन प्रक्रिया के लिए महत्वपूर्ण आवश्यकता है। यह प्रक्रिया मॉडल से है, जिसके कारण और प्रभाव संबंधों के सटीक अनुमान प्राप्त होते हैं जो प्रक्रिया अनुकूलन के लिए आवश्यक है।

इस शोध प्रबंध का उद्देश्य एक फीड कैरेक्टराइजेशन मॉड्यूल (FCM) विकसित करना था, जो फीड को एक आणविक प्रतिनिधित्व में चिह्नित कर सकता है, जिसका उपयोग औद्योगिक रिएक्टर सिमुलेशन के लिए हाइड्रोट्रीटिंग रिएक्शन पाथवे के निर्माण के लिए किया जाएगा। एक च ईद वर्णकरण मॉड्यूल विकसित किया गया है किसी भी विस्तृत प्रयोगात्मक घटक विश्लेषण के बिना फीड गुणवत्ता का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले पूर्व-परिभाषित शुद्ध अणुओं की संरचना की गणना करने के लिए अभी तक इनपुट के साथ प्रयोगशाला में नियमित रूप से मापा केवल फीड गुणों का उपयोग करें। फीड वर्णकरण मॉड्यूल स्वचालित रूप से फीड के कथनांक वितरण के आधार पर डेटाबैंक से घटकों का चयन करता है और शुद्ध अणुओं की संरचना की गणना करेगा एक अनुकूलन एल्गोरिथ्म का उपयोग करना ताकि फीड के साथ मिश्रण के भौतिक-रासायनिक गुणों से मेल खा सके, जैसा कि प्रयोगशाला में मापा गया है। डेटा बैंक में C_5 से C_{33} तक की कार्बन संख्या के 215 घटक शामिल हैं जिन्हें आगे पैराफिन, नैफ्थेन, मोनो / डाय / पॉली-एरोमेटिक्स, सल्फर और नाइट्रोजन घटकों में वर्गीकृत किया गया था।

अध्ययन का 2^{एनबी} उद्देश्य, रिफाइनरी में उनके महत्व के कारण नेफ्था और वीजीओ फीड स्ट्रीम के लिए एक औद्योगिक हाइड्रोट्रीटिंग रिएक्टर मॉडल विकसित करना है। एक विस्तृत अनु स्तर के रिएक्टर मॉडल कार्बन संख्या C_5 से C_{11} तक, 95 घटकों के साथ नेफ्था हाइड्रोट्रीटिंग के लिए और 36 प्रतिक्रियाओं को विकसित किया गया है। वीजीओ के लिए एक तीन चरण ट्रिक्ल बेड रिएक्टर मॉडल कार्बन संख्या C_{14} से 120 घटकों के साथ हाइड्रोट्रीटिंग C_{33} और 48 प्रतिक्रियाओं को विकसित किया गया है। फीड रिएक्टराइजेशन मॉड्यूल के साथ वर्तमान रिएक्टर मॉडल एस औद्योगिक जल उपचार का अनुकरण करने के लिए एक शक्तिशाली उपकरण साबित होता है रिएक्टरों। चूंकि फीड वर्णकरण योजना गांठ वाले घटकों के बजाय सीधे (शुद्ध) अणुओं के साथ काम करती है, इसलिए मॉडल प्रत्येक फीड घटक की प्रतिक्रिया नेटवर्क को बनाए रखता है और उत्पाद वितरण में व्यक्तिगत घटकों को पकड़ने में सक्षम होता है। सिमुलेशन के परिणामों से पता चला कि मॉडल विस्तृत उत्पाद संरचना बनाने में सक्षम है, रिएक्टर के प्रवाह का कथनांक वितरण और परिचालन स्थितियों की एक विस्तृत श्रृंखला के लिए प्रमुख प्रक्रिया रुझान।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No
Certificate	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	viii
List of Figures	xii
List of Tables	xv
Nomenclature	xvi
1. Introduction	1
1.1.Hydrotreating process	2
1.1.1. Hydro desulfurization	3
1.1.2. Hydro denitrogenation	3
1.1.3. Olefin saturation	4
1.1.4. Aromatic saturation	4
1.1.5. Hydro demetallization	4
1.2.Catalyst	5
1.3.Process description	5
1.4.Modeling of hydroprocessing process	7
1.5.Scope of work and thesis organization	8
2. Literature review on feed characterization	13
3. Development of feed characterization module	
3.1.Modeling approach	17
3.1.1. Feed stock representation	21
3.1.2. Methodology	23
3.1.3. Optimization technique (Genetic Algorithm, GA)	28

3.2.Naphtha feed characterization	30
3.2.1. Naphtha feed characterization module results	33
3.3.VGO feed characterization	38
3.3.1. VGO feed characterization module results	43
3.4.Conclusions	49
4. Literature review on Hydrotreating	
4.1.Introduction	51
4.2.Importance of Hydro desulfurization	52
4.2.1. HDS reactions	53
4.2.2. HDN reactions	55
4.2.3. Aromatic saturation	57
4.2.4. Hydrogenation of olefins	59
4.3.Catalysts in hydro processing	59
4.4.Literature review on kinetic modeling of hydrotreating process	62
5. Experimental setup and parameter estimation for naphtha hydrotreating	
5.1.Introduction	64
5.2.Reactions of compounds: desulfurization and saturation	65
5.2.1. Sulfur compound reaction pathways and networks	66
5.3.Olefin saturation	68
5.4.Aromatic saturation	68
5.5.Hydro denitrogenation	69
5.6.Reaction families and kinetics	69
5.6.1. Hydro desulfurization kinetics	70
5.6.2. Olefin hydrogenation kinetics	71
5.7.Reaction lumps considered in pilot plant studies	72
5.8.Pilot plant setup	73
5.8.1. Reactor loading	74
5.9. Experimental studies (Naphtha hydrotreating)	75
5.10. Experimental results (Naphtha hydrotreating)	78
5.10.1. Effect of LHSV on product sulfur and olefin	80
5.10.2. Effect of gas/oil ratio on product sulfur and olefin	81

5.10.3. Effect of temperature on product sulfur and olefin	82
5.11. Kinetic model (Naphtha hydrotreating)	83
5.12. Parameter estimation	88
5.13. Parity plots (Naphtha hydrotreating)	89
6. Modeling and Simulation of Industrial Naphtha Hydrotreater	
6.1.Introduction	91
6.2.Modeling of Industrial unit	94
6.3.Modeling the quench zone	98
6.4.Numerical method for solving the equations for bed-2	99
6.5.Results and discussion for the industrial reactor	100
6.6.Conclusions	107
7. Experimental setup and parameter estimation for VGO hydrotreating	
7.1.Introduction	108
7.2.Kinetics and Reactor Modeling	110
7.2.1. Model description	110
7.2.2. Reactions modeled and reaction kinetics	111
7.3.Model equations	116
7.4.Pilot plant setup	119
7.4.1. Reactor loading	120
7.5.Experimental results and discussion	124
7.5.1. Effect of LHSV on HDS, HDN, ASAT reactions	125
7.5.2. Effect of pressure on HDS, HDN, ASAT reactions	126
7.5.3. Effect of gas/oil ratio on HDS, HDN, ASAT reactions	128
7.5.4. Effect of temperature on HDS, HDN, ASAT reactions	129
7.6.Parameter estimation	132
7.7.Parity plots (VGO hydrotreating)	134
8. Modeling and Simulation of Industrial Naphtha Hydrotreater	
8.1.Introduction	137
8.2.Modeling of Industrial unit	138
8.3.Details of the industrial unit	143
8.4.Results and discussion for the industrial reactor	145

8.5.Conclusions	152
9. Conclusions and recommendations	
9.1.Conclusions	154
9.2.Recommendations for future work	158
References	160
Acroynms	167
Appendices	170
List of Publications	181
Bio data	182

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Fig. 1.1	Flow diagram for the industrial naphtha hydro treating	6
Fig. 1.2	Graphical abstract for the reactor simulation	11
Fig. 3.1	A typical True Boiling Point (TBP) curve of a petroleum fraction	21
Fig. 3.2	Flow diagram for the development of feed characterization model	24
Fig. 3.3	A TBP vs. cumulative weight fraction, Ω , curve, being approximated by <i>pure</i> compounds with their individual boiling points and weight fractions	28
Fig. 3.4	Spline-fitted (continuous) TBP curve of one naphtha fraction with the experimental (filled circles) data	34
Fig. 3.5	Comparison of the spline-fitted TBP curve (filled circles) of the naphtha feed being studied with the optimal TBP curve (continuous curve) using <i>pure</i> components	35
Fig. 3.6	Optimal values of $x_{w,i}$ vs. i (rearranged) for the system in Fig. 3.5 (filled diamonds correspond to the left-hand side scale, primary axis, while the filled squares to the right hand side scale, secondary axis)	35
Fig. 3.7	Optimal values of $x_{w,i}$ vs. i (rearranged) for the naphtha sample (filled diamonds correspond to the left-hand side scale, primary axis, while the filled squares to the right hand side scale, secondary axis)	36
Fig. 3.8	Spline-fitted (continuous) TBP curve of one VGO fraction with the experimental (filled circles) data	43
Fig. 3.9	Comparison of the spline-fitted TBP curve (filled circles) of the VGO feed being studied with the optimal TBP curve (continuous curve) using <i>pure</i> components	44
Fig. 3.10	Optimal values of $x_{w,i}$ vs. i (rearranged) for the system in Fig. 3.9 (filled diamonds correspond to the left-hand side scale, primary axis, while the filled triangles to the right hand side scale, secondary axis)	45
Fig. 3.11	Optimal values of $x_{w,i}$ vs. i (rearranged) for the VGO sample (filled diamonds correspond to the left-hand side scale, primary axis, while the filled triangles to the right hand side scale, secondary axis)	46
Fig. 3.12	Simulated overall carbon number distribution (all components for any component) for the feed	47
Fig. 4.1	Type of nitrogen compounds present in petroleum factions	55
Fig. 4.2	HDN reactions of pyridine and quinoline	56
Fig. 4.3	Typical shapes of catalyst particles	61
Fig. 5.1	Structures and carbon numbering of thiophene, BT and DBT compounds	65
Fig. 5.2	Hydro desulfurization reaction schemes for thiophene and alkyl substituted thiophenes	67
Fig. 5.3	Hydro desulfurization reaction scheme for benzothiophene and alkyl substituted benzothiophene	67
Fig. 5.4	Olefin saturation reaction of octane	68
Fig. 5.5	Structures of basic and non basic nitrogen compounds	69

Fig. 5.6	Reactions considered for estimating the base kinetic parameters in pilot plant for naphtha hydrotreating	72
Fig. 5.7	An experimental hydroprocessing micro reactor unit (MRU)/pilot plant for naphtha hydrotreating	73
Fig. 5.8	Micro reactor loading diagram for naphtha hydrotreating	76
Fig. 5.9	Variation of product density with time	79
Fig. 5.10	Variation of product sulfur and olefin contents with time	79
Fig. 5.11	Effect of LHSV on product sulfur and olefin content	80
Fig. 5.12	Effect of gas/oil ratio on product sulfur and olefin content	82
Fig. 5.13	Effect of temperature on product sulfur and olefin content	83
Fig. 5.14	Catalytic centers for hydrogenation and hydrogenolysis on CoMo catalyst	86
Fig. 5.15	Comparison of model predictions against the 17 experimental data (in Table 5.4) on the PP for the total sulfur content, S (ppm), in the product	90
Fig. 5.16	Comparison of model predictions against the 17 experimental data (in Table 5.4) for the total olefin content (wt %) in the product	90
Fig. 6.1	Process Flow diagram for the industrial naphtha hydro treating <i>reactor</i>	92
Fig. 6.2	Industrial reactor (Naphtha hydrotreater) modeled and simulated in the present work	94
Fig. 6.3	Temperature profile along the length of the industrial reactor	101
Fig. 6.4	Pressure along the length of the industrial reactor	102
Fig. 6.5	Sulfur profile along the length of the industrial reactor	102
Fig. 6.6	P, O, N and A profiles along the length of the industrial reactor	103
Fig. 6.7	Validation of the model for sulfur (at the exit of Bed-2) for the Case-A industrial reactor	105
Fig. 6.8	Validation of the model for olefin (at the exit of Bed-2) for the Case-A industrial reactor	106
Fig. 7.1	A schematic representation of the trickle bed reactor and the mass transfer scheme	110
Fig. 7.2	Reactions considered in the pilot plant model (VGO HDT)	112
Fig. 7.3	Equilibrium constants for the hydrogenation of mono/di/poly-aromatics <i>versus</i> reactor temperature	116
Fig. 7.4	Reactor loading diagram for VGO hydrotreating pilot plant	122
Fig. 7.5	Effect of LHSV on concentration of sulfur and nitrogen in product	125
Fig. 7.6	Effect of LHSV on concentration of mono/di/poly-aromatics in product	126
Fig. 7.7	Effect of pressure on concentration of sulfur and nitrogen in product	127
Fig. 7.8	Effect of pressure on concentration of mono/di/poly-aromatics in product	127
Fig. 7.9	Effect of gas/oil ratio on concentration of sulfur and nitrogen in product	128
Fig. 7.10	Effect of gas/oil ratio on concentration of mono/di/poly-aromatics in product	129
Fig. 7.11	Effect of temperature on concentration of sulfur and nitrogen in product	130
Fig. 7.12	Effect of temperature on total aromatics concentration in product	131
Fig. 7.13	Effect of temperature on mono/do/poly-aromatics concentration in the product	131
Fig. 7.14	Sequence of steps for solving the model equations	133

Fig. 7.15	Comparison of model predictions against the 17 experimental data (in Table 7.2) on the PP for the mono/di/poly-aromatic content (wt %) in the product	135
Fig. 7.16	Comparison of model predictions against the 17 experimental data (in Table 7.2) on the PP for the total sulfur content, S (ppm), in the product	135
Fig. 7.17	Comparison of model predictions against the 17 experimental data (in Table 7.2) on the PP for the total nitrogen content, Nt (ppm), in the product	136
Fig. 8.1	Flow diagram for the <i>industrial</i> VGO hydrotreating reactor.	137
Fig. 8.2	Composition profiles of mono/di/poly-aromatics and saturates (paraffins and naphthenes) along the industrial reactor beds (1-3)	145
Fig. 8.3	Concentration profiles of total sulfur and total nitrogen along the industrial reactor beds (1-3)	146
Fig. 8.4	Partial pressure profiles of H ₂ , H ₂ S, and NH ₃ along the industrial reactor beds (1-3)	146
Fig. 8.5	Comparison of temperature profile along the length of the catalyst beds with plant values	149
Fig. 8.6	Comparison of calculated boiling point distribution with the TBP distillation of the industrial reactor effluent	150
Fig. 8.7	Validation of the model for mono/di/poly-aromatics content at the exit of bed-3 for case-A industrial reactor	151
Fig. 8.8	Validation of the model for total sulfur content at the exit of bed-3 for case-A industrial reactor	151
Fig. 8.9	Validation of the model for total nitrogen content at the exit of bed-3 for case-A industrial reactor	152

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 3.1	Global properties and their characterization methods (experimental or correlations) used for describing the petroleum stream	20
Table 3.2	Parameters used in the present GA study	30
Table 3.3	Ninety five representative molecules used to characterize naphtha in this study	32
Table 3.4	TBP distillation and properties of naphtha stream	33
Table 3.5	Comparison between the experimental (measured using NMR and UV) composition and the optimal values	37
Table 3.6	One hundred and twenty representative pure molecules used to characterize VGO	39
Table 3.7	TBP distillation and properties of VGO stream	40
Table 3.8	Comparison between the experimental (measured using GC-MS and UV) composition and the optimal values	48
Table 4.1	Summary of hydrotreating process conditions for different feed stocks	52
Table 4.2	Ranking of sulfides and sulfide catalyst couples of metals of group VIA and VIII by order of activity	60
Table 5.1	Typical distribution of various sulfur compounds in the naphtha feed	66
Table 5.2	Properties of the two naphtha feed stocks	77
Table 5.3	ASTM D-86 distillation results for the two naphtha feeds	77
Table 5.4	Experimental conditions used in the pilot plant runs (pressure=2 MPa)	78
Table 5.5	Adsorption parameters used in naphtha hydrotreating study	87
Table 5.6	Stoichiometric coefficients for the reactions in Fig. 5.6	88
Table 5.7	Estimated <i>base</i> kinetic parameters from the naphtha hydrotreater pilot plant	89
Table 6.1	Reactions considered in the industrial reactor model	96
Table 6.2	Summary of the number of mole balances in the naphtha hydrotreater reactor model	98
Table 6.3	Overall information for naphtha hydrotreater model	100
Table 6.4	Details of the two industrial plants and model predictions	104
Table 7.1	Stoichiometric coefficients for the reactions in Fig. 7.2	119
Table 7.2	Experimental conditions used in the pilot plant runs (VGO hydrotreating)	121
Table 7.3	VGO feed distillation and properties	123
Table 7.4	VGO component analysis (HC-22)	124
Table 7.5	Estimated <i>base</i> kinetic parameters from the VGO hydrotreater pilot plant	134
Table 8.1	Reactions considered in the industrial VGO hydrotreater reactor model	140
Table 8.2	QSRC parameters for adsorption and equilibrium constants for aromatic compounds	140
Table 8.3	Summary of the number of mole balances in the VGO hydrotreater reactor model	142
Table 8.4	Overall information for VGO hydrotreater model	143
Table 8.5	Details of the industrial unit and operating conditions of VGO hydrotreater	144
Table 8.6	Comparison of model results with industrial data	147

NOMENCLATURE

$A_i - D_i$ – Constants for spline-fitting

A – Aromatic content [wt. %]

A_c – Cross sectional area of the reactor [m^2]

a_s – Specific surface area of the catalyst [m^{-1}]

a_L – Gas- liquid interfacial area [m^2]

C_p^L – Heat capacity of liquid [kJ/kmol-K]

C_p^G – Heat capacity of gas [kJ/kmol-K]

C_p^q – Heat capacity of quench gas [kJ/kmol-K]

CCR – Conradson carbon number

C_p – Heat capacity [kJ/kmol-K]

C_A – Aromatic carbon atoms

C_P – Paraffinic carbon atoms

C_N – Naphthenic carbon atoms

C_i^L – Concentration of specie i in liquid phase [kmol/ m^3]

C_i^S – Concentration of specie i on catalyst (solid) surface [kmol/ m^3]

C_{H_2} – Concentration of H_2 in liquid phase [kmol/ m^3]

C_{H_2S} – Concentration of H_2S in liquid phase [kmol/m³]

C_{Nt}^s – Concentration of Nitrogen on catalyst (solid) surface [kmol/m³]

diA – Di aromatic content [wt. %]

d_p – Equivalent diameter of the catalyst particle [m]

E_i – Activation energy of reaction, i

F_{obj} – Objective function for optimization

$F_{obj,1}$ – First part of objective function, F_{obj}

$F_{obj,2}$ – Second part of objective function, F_{obj}

F_j – Molar flow rate of component, j

F_j^o – Inlet molar flow rate of component, j

f – Ergun friction factor

f_r – Relative reactive factor with respect to base component

F_j^{in} – Molar flow rate of pure component, j , in the stream entering bed-2 [kmol/hr]

F_{1j} – Molar flow rate of species, j , in the outlet stream from bed-1[kmol/hr]

F_j^{out} – Molar flow rate of species, j , in the effluent from bed-2 [kmol/hr]

G_{out} – Liquid molar flow rate [kmol/hr]

ΔH_i – Net heat of reaction, i [kJ/kmol]

ΔH_{fj} – Heat of formation of component, j [kJ/kmol]

H – Henry coefficient [bar.m³/kmol]

$k_1 - k_5$ – Rate constants [kmol/kgcat.hr]

K_i – Adsorption constant of component, i [bar⁻¹]

K_m – Adsorption parameter of the ring number based lumps (m³/kmol)

K_{eq} – Equilibrium constant

$k_{i,o}$ – Frequency factor [kmol/kgcat.hr]

k_i^L – Gas- liquid mass transfer coefficient [m/sec]

k_i^S – Liquid- solid mass transfer coefficient [m/sec]

L_{out} – Liquid molar flow rate [kmol/hr]

MMTPA – Million metric tons per annum

MW – Molecular weight

M – Number of reactions

moA – Mono-aromatic content [wt. %]

moA1– Mono-aromatic product lump content [wt. %]

n – Number of weight increments

N – Naphthenic content [wt. %]

N_c – Number of components

N_t – Nitrogen content [wt. %]

O – Olefin content [wt. %]

P – Paraffin content [wt. %]

p_i – Partial pressure of component, i

p_i^G – Partial pressure of gas component, i

P_t – Total pressure [Mpa]

P_o – Inlet pressure [Mpa]

RI – Refractive index of a petroleum fraction

R_j – Net rate of generation of species, j

R – Universal gas constant

R_R – Recycle ratio

RMSE – Root Mean Square Error

R^2 – Correlation coefficient

$r_{T,\sigma}, r_{BT,\sigma}, r_{HBT,\sigma}$ – Rate of thiophene, benzothiophene, di-hydrobenzothiophene desulfurization
on σ sites [kmol/kgcat.hr]

$r_{BT,\tau}, r_{olefin,\tau}$ – Rate of benzothiophene, olefin saturation on τ sites [kmol/kgcat.hr]

r_s, r_{Nt}, r_{ij} – Rate of hydro desulfurization, hydro denitrogenation, aromatics saturation reactions

[kmol/kgcat.hr]

SG – Specific gravity

S – Sulfur content [wt %]

TBP – True boiling point

T_b – Boiling point of any component [$^{\circ}C$]

T – Reaction temperature [$^{\circ}C$]

T_o – Inlet feed temperature [$^{\circ}C$]

$TMTPA$ – Thousand metric tons per annum

u_s – Superficial velocity [m^2]

u_G – Superficial velocity of gas [m^2]

u_L – Superficial velocity of liquid [m^2]

W_o – Weighting factor for the first part of the objective function

W_1 – Weighting factor for the second part of the objective function

x_w – Weight fraction of any component

$x_{w,A}$ – Weight fraction of the aromatic molecule

$x_{w,N}$ – Weight fraction of the naphthenic molecule

$x_{w,O}$ – Weight fraction of the olefin molecule

$x_{w,p}$ – Weight fraction of the paraffin molecule

$x_{w,S}$ – Weight fraction of the sulfur molecule

X_i – Total weight fraction of paraffin/naphthene/olefin/sulfur content

Y_j – Global property of the petroleum fraction

z – Axial location in the reactor [m]

Greek Symbols

α_{ij} – Stoichiometric coefficient of component, j , in reaction, i

θ – Average global physical property

ρ_B – Bulk density of the catalyst [kg/m³]

σ – Sigma site for hydro desulfurization reactions

τ – Tau site for saturation reactions

Ω – Cumulative weight fraction

Subscripts

BT – benzothiophene

DBT – di benzothiophene

EB – ethyl benzene

HBT – dihydrobenzothiophene

H_2 – hydrogen

H_2S – hydrogen sulfide

T – thiophenes

NH_3 – ammonia