Energy

F
O
S
S
I
L

240
9/25/84
mfr

DR- 0425-1

DOE/PC/30209-T9
(DE84014514)

SOLVENT TAILORING IN COAL LIQUEFACTION

Quarterly Report for the Period July–September 1983

By
A. R. Tarrer
Christine W. Curtis
James A. Guin
Dennis C. Williams

Work Performed Under Contract No. FG22-80PC30209

Auburn University
Auburn University, Alabama

MASTER

Technical Information Center
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
United States Department of Energy

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available from the National Technical Information Service, U. S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

Price: Printed Copy A03
Microfiche A01

Codes are used for pricing all publications. The code is determined by the number of pages in the publication. Information pertaining to the pricing codes can be found in the current issues of the following publications, which are generally available in most libraries: *Energy Research Abstracts (ERA)*; *Government Reports Announcements and Index (GRA and I)*; *Scientific and Technical Abstract Reports (STAR)*; and publication NTIS-PR-360 available from NTIS at the above address.

Solvent Tailoring in Coal Liquefaction

Quarterly Report for the Period

July 1983 - September 1983

A. R. Tarrer
Christine W. Curtis
James A. Guin
Dennis C. Williams

Coal Conversion Laboratory
Auburn University
Department of Chemical Engineering
Auburn University, AL 36849

MASTER

Prepared for the United States Department of Energy

Under Contract No. DEFG2280PC30209

Objective. The objective of this project is to identify mechanisms whereby the solvent functions to allow tailoring of the process solvent composition for improved coal liquefaction and product selectivity. The physical and chemical role played by the solvent is important for achieving effective liquefaction. To this end, the role of hydrogen donation or the transfer of hydrogen from the solvent to the coal during liquefaction from specific model compounds of differing degrees of hydroaromaticity has been explored.

Summary of Previous Work. A series of twenty-three model donor solvents were used to rank their efficacy for the dissolution of Western Kentucky # 9/14 coal. The transfer of hydrogen from the solvent to the coal fragments, as measured by coal conversion, was examined at three levels of available hydrogen. The hydrogen donors are ranked according to their ability to convert coal to THF solubles. Aromatic analogs of the model donors showed little ability to convert coal to THF solubles. Factors which influence hydrogen donation include the presence of heteroatoms or substituents both internal and external to the aromatic or hydroaromatic rings, the degree of hydrogenation, the aromaticity or nonaromaticity of the hydroaromatics, and the presence of five-membered rings. A relationship between heats of formation and hydrogen donor ability is shown for hydroaromatics within two ring or three ring homologous series. A model hydrogen acceptor, benzophenone, is also used to rank model donors. No correlation exists in the ranking of hydrogen donors by the model acceptor used in this work and in other experimental studies and that obtained by conversion of Western Kentucky coal at typical liquefaction conditions.

Work Performed During This Quarter. A significant amount of time was spent this quarter in revising the manuscript "Coal Solvolysis in a Series of Model Compound Systems". This manuscript has been accepted for publication in Fuel. A copy of the revised manuscript is included in this report.

A number of clarifications and some deletions and compacting of data and figures was required. No major changes in content or conclusions were required. The reviewers asked if the solvent was recovered and analyzed after each of the reactions and if the stability of the donors at 400°C had been addressed. These points had not been addressed in this work; in related, and somewhat preliminary work performed on this contract, these questions had been addressed. In the related work, the yields of recovered solvent and the chemical change undergone by the solvent was examined. The conversion of eight hydroaromatics in the presence of coal at 350°C was examined and the results are given in Table 1. As shown in the table, the conversion of 1,4-dihydronaphthalene, 9,10-dihydroanthracene, and THQ is essentially complete in the in the presence of coal in 15 minutes at 350°C. The well-known model donor compound, tetralin, does not react as fast as most of the other compounds, although it is considerably more active than indan. The compound 1,4-dihydronaphthalene appears to be significantly more active than the 1,2 isomer in the presence of coal.

In some cases, the stability of hydroaromatic compounds at 400°C had been addressed in the present work. In related work, this subject has been also addressed. The stability of nine hydroaromatics at 300°C was examined. Table 2 shows the conversion of each hydroaromatic. The dihydronaphthalenes and 9,10-dihydroanthracene were the most unstable. Of the 31.4 percent conversion

of 1,4-dihydronaphthalene as shown in Table 2, approximately 2 percent was disproportionation⁽¹⁾, 5.4 percent was isomerization⁽²⁾, and 25 percent was dehydrogenation⁽³⁾. Corresponding approximate figures for 1,2-dihydronaphthalene were 1 percent disproportionation, 7.7 percent dehydrogenation and no isomerization.

More work is planned in this area.

Table 1

Percentage Conversion of Hydroaromatics in Presence of Coal

Reaction Conditions: 0.02 mole transferable hydrogen
1-Methylnaphthalene = 6 gms
Kentucky 9/14 Coal = 3 g
Reaction Temperature = 350°C
Reaction Time (min) = 15
Agitation Speed (RPM) = 860-
3/4 in. O.D. Tubing-Bomb Reactor
PN₂ (psig) = 50

Compound	% Conversion of HA
tetrahydroquinoline	99.3
1,4-dihydronaphthalene	96.8
9,10-dihydroanthracene	93.8
9,10-dihydrophenanthrene	63.9
1,2-dihydronaphthalene	55.2
tetrahydroacenaphthene	53.0
tetralin	27.6
indan	6.8

Table 2

Percentage Conversion of Hydroaromatics in Absence of Coal

Reaction Conditions: Experiments contain 0.02 mole transferable hydrogen

1-Methylnaphthalene = 6 gms

Reaction Temperature = 350°C

Reaction Time (min) = 15

Agitation Speed (RPM) = 860-

3/4 in. O.D. Tubing-Bomb Reactor

PN₂ (psig) = 50

Compound	% Conversion of HA
1,4-dihydronaphthalene	31.4
9,10-dihydroanthracene	23.8
1,2-dihydronaphthalene	8.7
indan	3.5
9,10-dihydrophenanthrene	2.1
tetralin	2.1
tetrahydroquinoline	0.0
tetrahydroacenaphthene	-2.0

COAL SOLVOLYSIS IN A SERIES
OF MODEL COMPOUND SYSTEMS

Christine W. Curtis
James A. Guin
K. C. Kwon

Department of Chemical Engineering
Auburn University
Auburn University, Alabama 36849

PAGES 7 to 8
WERE INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Abstract

A series of twenty-three model donor solvents were used to rank their efficacy for the dissolution of Western Kentucky # 9/14 coal. The transfer of hydrogen from the solvent to the coal fragments, as measured by coal conversion, was examined at three levels of available hydrogen. The hydrogen donors are ranked according to their ability to convert coal to THF solubles. Aromatic analogs of the model donors showed little ability to convert coal to THF solubles. Factors which influence hydrogen donation include the presence of heteroatoms or substituents both internal and external to the aromatic or hydroaromatic rings, the degree of hydrogenation, the aromaticity or nonaromaticity of the hydroaromatics, and the presence of five-membered rings. A relationship between heats of formation and hydrogen donor ability is shown for hydroaromatics within two ring or three ring homologous series. A model hydrogen acceptor, benzophenone, is also used to rank model donors. No correlation exists in the ranking of hydrogen donors by the model acceptor used in this work and in other experimental studies and that obtained by conversion of Western Kentucky coal at typical liquefaction conditions.

Introduction

Recent studies have shown the importance of hydrogen donors and hydrogen transfer reactions in the dissolution of coal.¹⁻⁴ Curran et al³ has postulated that hydrogen transfer from solvent to coal during liquefaction proceeds via a free radical mechanism. By comparing the dissolution of a HVC bituminous coal in tetralin, naphthalene and dodecane, Neave⁴ has demonstrated that the presence of hydrogen donors substantially enhances coal conversion at reaction times greater than four minutes. Derbyshire and Whitehurst⁵ have examined the stabilization of dissolving coal fragments by hydrogen transfer from the hydroaromatic fraction of the coal to an aromatic which, in turn, donates hydrogen to a coal free radical.

The basic premise that hydrogen transfer reactions play an important role in the dissolution of coal is generally well-accepted and serves as a starting point for this study. Many researchers⁶⁻¹⁴ have attempted to qualitatively and quantitatively determine the hydrogen donors present in liquefaction solvents as well as to predict the efficacy of specific donors. Several spectroscopic methods for determining the hydroaromaticity of process solvents have been developed in recent years.⁶⁻⁸ In addition, catalytic dehydrogenation has been used to determine the hydroaromatic content of coals⁹⁻¹⁰ and of process solvents.¹¹ Model hydrogen acceptors have been employed to rank the efficacy of process solvents as well as to rank the reactivity of individual hydrogen donor compounds. Comparisons of the stability of radical anions formed during hydrogen abstraction has also been used to evaluate the relative propensity of hydrogen donation from different model donors.¹²⁻¹³ Thermodynamic

considerations involving resonance energies of hydroaromatics and their aromatic analogs have been used to predict the hydrogen donor abilities of different hydroaromatics.¹⁴

Process solvents are comprised of a number of different chemical entities with the compositions being dependent upon coal feed type and process conditions. It is highly desirable for such solvents to contain the optimal blend of hydrogen donors as well as compounds which are good solvating agents for coal for maximal coal conversion. The objective of this study is to determine the ability of different model donors to convert coal to THF solubles during liquefaction and, thereby, rank their effectiveness. Although a number of hydrogen donors as well as aromatic compounds have been tested previously for their coal dissolution ability, their reactivity is difficult to compare due to the differing reaction conditions and coals used by the various investigators. This comprehensive study offers a systematic comparison of many hydrogen donors and their aromatic analogs under a single prescribed set of reaction conditions using the same bituminous coal. It is not suggested that the results obtained with this single coal will apply to all coals; however, by using the same coal for all donors, a significant variable in testing donor ability is eliminated. Determining the chemical characteristics of hydrogen donors most effective for coal conversion may elucidate the hydrogen donors desirable for maximal coal dissolution and may provide insight into the mechanism of hydrogen donation.

A related aspect of hydrogen transfer reactions explored in this study is to determine if model acceptor experiments effectively mimic the behavior of coal in liquefaction, and, if so, can they be utilized to rank solvents for their coal liquefaction effectiveness. A brief review of the literature shows that a number of model acceptor systems have been studied including

bibenzyl¹⁵⁻¹⁶, benzophenone¹⁷, 1,1'-binaphthyl¹⁸, and aromatics¹⁴ such as anthracene and phenanthrene. The benzyl radical, generated thermally, has been used by Cronauer et al¹⁵ to study hydrogen transfer in model solvents such as tetralin, decalin and mesitylene and to determine the reactivity of various C-C bonds and C-O functional groups likely to be encountered during liquefaction. Bockrath and Noceti¹⁶ have also used the benzyl radical to study the effectiveness of both model donor and liquefaction process solvents. Raaen and Roark¹⁷ have used benzophenone as a model acceptor to rank hydrogen donors, to determine the effect of hydroxyl substituents on the rate of hydrogen donation, and to measure the hydroaromaticity of coal. Ten hydrogen donors have been ranked by Kline and Harrison¹⁸ using 1,1'-binaphthyl as an acceptor. This use of model acceptors is based on the hypothesis that the model acceptor reacts in a manner similar to that of coal at liquefaction conditions. The direct measurement of coal conversion for model donors in this work permits comparison with model acceptor results.

Experimental

Equipment. A 15 cc stainless steel tubing bomb reactor described previously¹⁹ was immersed in the temperature controlled fluidized sandbath and agitated vertically at 700 CPM during the reaction.

Coal Reactions. Reactions of Western Kentucky 9/14 coal with hydroaromatic and aromatic compounds were performed in a tubing bomb reactor for 30 minutes at 400°C in a nitrogen atmosphere while agitating at 700 CPM. These reactors allowed for rapid heatup and quick cooldown of the reaction mixture. At reaction temperature, the reaction proceeded under its own vapor pressure. A significant portion of the reactants remained in the liquid phase. For each reaction, two grams of Western Kentucky 9/14 coal (Table 1), ground to 200-270

mesh and dried in vacuo overnight, and 4 grams of solvent were used. The solvent was composed of either the hydroaromatic or aromatic compound of interest and 1-methylnaphthalene as a diluent. The moles of hydrogen donor model compound charged to the bomb was varied so that an equal amount of donor hydrogen was charged in each experiment. Experiments were performed using three levels of donor hydrogen, being one, two, or four times 9.78×10^{-3} grams. These hydrogen donor levels correspond to 0.25 to 1% hydrogen in the reaction mixture. This level was chosen to represent that of a typical recycle solvent. The aromatic compounds were typically introduced at the same number of moles as the moles of hydroaromatic compound introduced at the second concentration level. Coal conversion was measured by an ash balance using tetrahydrofuran as the wash solvent. The error obtained from duplicate analyses was generally between 1 and 5%.

Chemicals. The model compounds used in this study and their respective sources are acenaphthene, acenaphthylene, anthracene, benzophenone, carbazole, cholesterol, 4-n-decyl-1,2,3,6,7,8-hexahdropyrene (API-Penn State), 9,10-dihydroanthracene, 2,3-dihydro-1H-cyclopenta (L) phenanthrene, 1,2-dihydronaphthalene, 1,4-dihydronaphthalene (Pfaltz & Bauer), 9,10-dihydrophenanthrene, dodecahydrotriphenylene, 1,4,5,8,9,10-hexahydroanthracene, 1,2,3,6,7,8-hexahdropyrene, 1,2,3,3a,4,5-hexahdropyrene (API-PSU), indan, 1-indanol, indene, 1,4,5,8-tetrahydronaphthalene(isotetralin), 1-methylnaphthalene, naphthalene (Fisher), 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8-octahydroacridine, 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8-octahydroanthracene, perhydropyrene, phenanthrene, pyrene, quinoline, 2a,3,4,5-tetrahydroacenaphthene, 1,2,3,4-tetrahydrocarbazole, 1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline, 1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-1-naphthol, 5,6,7,8-tetrahydro-2-naphthol, 1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline (Alfa), 5,6,7,8-tetrahydroquinoline, and tetralin. All chemicals were obtained from Aldrich except those indicated.

Benzophenone Reactions. Reactions of benzophenone with hydrogen donor compounds were performed in the above mentioned pressurized reactor using 5.5×10^{-4} moles of hydroaromatic compound, 5.5×10^{-4} moles of benzophenone, 1 gram of 1-methylnaphthalene as solvent and a nitrogen atmosphere. The reactions were performed in duplicate for 60 minutes at 400°C while agitating at 700 CPM. Reaction products from benzophenone and the different hydrogen donors were analyzed by gas chromatography. Chromatographic analyses were performed on a Varian Model 3700 gas chromatograph using a flame ionization detector, an eight foot, 1/8 inch O.D. stainless steel column packed with SP 2250 obtained from Supelco. Temperature programming was used for some analyses.

Results and Discussion

Reactions of Hydrogen Donors with Coal. A series of twenty-three model donor solvents were used to rank their efficacy for the dissolution of Western Kentucky #9/14 coal. Compounds with two, three and four rings with different degrees of hydrogenation were selected. In addition, some compounds with five-membered rings such as indan and acenaphthene were also used. Also included among these donors were compounds with ring nitrogens and with hydroxyl substituents. The ranking of model donors according to their reactivity for coal conversion at three levels of donable hydrogen is given in Table 2. At the lowest level of donable hydrogen, coal conversion varied from a low of 26% using 2,3-dihydro-1H-cyclopenta(L)-phenanthrene to a high of 48.6% conversion for 1,2,3,4-tetrahydrocarbazole. The low level of coal conversion obtained at this concentration indicates hydrogen deficiency in the reaction. Increased levels of donable hydrogen produced increased levels of coal conversion with the low conversion being 29.9% and 33.0% for 2,3-dihydro-1H-cyclopenta (L) phenanthrene for the second and third concentration levels, respectively, and

the high being 67.8% for 1,2,3,4-tetrahydrocarbazole for the second level and 84.9% for 9,10-dihydrophenanthrene for the third level. Comparison of the ranking of the intermediate compounds shows few changes in reactivity at the three concentration levels.

In these reactions with coal, all solvents were compared at the same level of donatable hydrogen. A wide variation in coal conversion in solvents containing the same amount of donor hydrogen is observed. These results indicate that the hydrogen donor content of a solvent alone would not be sufficient to completely define its effectiveness as a coal liquefaction solvent. As a general rule, though, increased conversion resulted from increased hydrogen donor content for a particular solvent. Comparison of the donor ranking demonstrates certain chemical and functional group characteristics which are beneficial to coal dissolution. Comparison of 1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinoline and 1,2,3,4-tetrahydroisoquinoline to tetralin and 5,6,7,8-tetrahydroquinoline indicates that a donor with nitrogen in a saturated ring increases coal conversion over a donor with nitrogen in the aromatic ring or the hydrocarbon counterpart. Position of the nitrogen in the saturated ring and associated electronic effects may also influence the donor reactivity in that the tetrahydroisoquinoline isomer converts less coal than does tetrahydroquinoline. Non-aromatic hydroaromatic isomers such as isotetralin and 1,4,5,8,9,10-hexahydroanthracene are compounds which are hydroaromatic but do not contain an aromatic ring.²¹ Coal reactions with these compounds show that they readily donate hydrogen. Isotetralin compared to tetralin is particularly illustrative of the increased reactivity with isotetralin yielding 80.6% conversion at the high concentration level while tetralin yields 58%.

Compounds containing saturated five-membered rings such as acenaphthene, indan, and 2,3-dihydro-1H-cyclopenta (L) phenanthrene show low conversions for each hydrogen concentration level. The hydrogen donor ability of indan is of

interest in coal liquefaction due to the fact that tetralin, a compound commonly used as a hydrogen donor, can isomerize to form 1-methylindan whose hydrogen donor ability is questionable. Indan has been used in model acceptor experiments; its reactivity varied according to the model acceptor used. With benzophenone, indan gives no conversion, but with the benzyl radical indan donates hydrogen readily to form toluene. In a recent study using ESR spectroscopy by Kim et al¹³, indan quenches free radicals generated from bibenzyl more readily than does either hydrophenanthrene or tetralin. At all three donor levels, low levels of coal conversion were observed for indan, increasing from 26.9% to 38.4% with increasing concentration of indan. In this case, the ranking using the bibenzyl acceptor can lead to erroneous conclusions concerning indan's ability to dissolve coal. At the second concentration level, the unsaturated analog, indene, showed even lower conversion (Figure 1). The addition of an hydroxyl substituent on the unsaturated five-membered ring of indene has little effect on coal conversion.

Addition of hydroxyl substituents to donor compounds have in some cases shown increased liquefaction yields for some coals.²⁰ In this study, a comparison of the dissolution behavior for Western Kentucky #9/14 coal is made among tetralin, 1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-1-naphthol with the hydroxyl on the saturated ring and 5,6,7,8-tetrahydro-2-naphthol, on the aromatic ring. The coal dissolution ability of 1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-1-naphthol is essentially equivalent to tetralin; in contrast, the 2-naphthol shows an increase in conversion compared to the tetralin for the second and third concentration levels. Position of the hydroxyl evidently affects the chemical interactions between the coal and donor causing this increase in conversion.

Thermodynamic Considerations. The stability of different model donors can be examined thermodynamically by comparing their heats of formation. A number of heats of formation for hydrogen donors and aromatics have been developed and

catalogued by Shaw et al.²¹ Comparison of the heats of formation between either the two or three ring groupings may give an indication of reactivity and hence donor effectiveness.

Comparison of the stabilities of two-ring hydrogenated compounds listed in Table 3 ranks the reactivity of these compounds as

The ranking of two ring donors based upon experimental coal conversion shows the same order of reactivity. The dihydronaphthalene and tetralin were reacted with benzophenone and gave the same ranking as stated above as will be described later.

According to heats of formation of the hydrogenated three ring compounds given in Table 3, 9,10-dihydroanthracene should be a better donor than octahydroanthracene. The coal conversions obtained from these donors are in agreement with the stability ranking. The high reactivity of 1,4,5,8,9,10-hexahydroanthracene in the experimental coal conversion is most likely due to the fact it is a nonaromatic hydroaromatic. The heats of formation of nonaromatic hydroaromatics are typically 20 to 30 kcal/mole²¹ higher than that of the next least stable hydroaromatic, rendering the nonaromatic hydroaromatic to be highly unstable. Extrapolating from the heats of formation of similar compounds, it is likely that 1,4,5,8,9,10-hexahydroanthracene is less stable than 9,10-dihydroanthracene. The ranking according to reactivity then is

which is in accordance with experimental coal conversion. In reaction with benzophenone, 9,10-dihydroanthracene is more reactive than octahydroanthracene.

Of the three ring phenanthrene series only 9,10-dihydrophenanthrene was used and has a similar heat of formation as its isomer, 9,10-dihydroanthracene. Comparison of the coal conversions of these isomers shows that 9,10 dihydro-phenanthrene converts more coal, ~84.5%, than 9,10-dihydroanthracene ~70.4% at the highest donor level. The conversion of benzophenone by these isomers is also quite similar. The order of reactivity of the compounds is

Although the reactivity of the hydrogen donors for coal conversion within a homologous ring series appears to correlate with the heats of formation, comparison of different homologous ring series such as the four ring series with the two ring series does not correlate.

Reaction of Aromatics with Coal. The aromatic analogs of selected hydroaromatics were tested for their ability to convert coal to THF solubles. Comparison of coal solubility with the hydrogen donor and their aromatic analogs is given in Figure 1. The aromatics do not raise coal conversion significantly above that of the coal in 1-methylnaphthalene. As can be seen from Figure 1, the coal conversion by aromatics are essentially the same ranging from 17.7% to 22.7%. The reactivity of the different aromatics may show more differences if a freshly mined coal or a coal of different rank had been used.

Derbyshire and Whitehurst⁵ have studied the conversion of a number of coals in pyrene using both argon and hydrogen atmospheres. In their investigation, they determined that coals of different rank convert to varying extents in pyrene with coals having carbon contents of 82-88 wt% maf dissolving most readily. However, weathering of coal is detrimental for good dissolution

in pyrene. Coal, that has been freshly mined and stored in argon, gave high dissolution while coal that had been oxidized by contact with air gave lower values. The difference in liquefaction behavior becomes appreciable at a carbon content above 80% as the more reactive coals have a greater sensitivity to mild oxidation conditions.

Benzophenone as a Model Acceptor. Benzophenone was chosen as a model acceptor for this work due to its several inherent advantages which include thermal stability, ease of analysis of the reaction products, and quantitative conversion into diphenylmethane and water. Thirteen model hydrogen donors were reacted with benzophenone at 400°C. The reactivity of each donor is ranked in Table 4 according to the amount of benzophenone conversion obtained. The conversion of the hydroaromatic species which occurred during the reaction is also given. These experiments were performed on an equivalent mole basis which caused the amount of donable hydrogen to vary with the degree of hydrogenation of each model donor. The third column in Table 4 gives the minimal amount of hydroaromatic required to convert benzophenone. These amounts are based upon stoichiometry and on the assumption that the hydroaromatics form their aromatic analogs in the reaction. For example, 1,2,3,3a,4,5-hexahdropyrene dehydrogenates to form pyrene, 4-n-decyl-1,2,3,6,7,8-hexahdropyrene forms 4-n-decylpyrene and cholesterol is assumed to form 3'-methyl-1,2-cyclopenteneophenanthrene.

Examination of the ranking of model donors by benzophenone conversion shows that benzophenone conversion does not correlate with the amount of available hydrogen present. Several comparisons of benzophenone conversions by donors with different degrees of hydrogenation illustrate this point: 22.3% conversion of benzophenone by 1,2,3a,3,4,5-hexahdropyrene, 19.2% by 1,4-dihydronaphthalene and no conversion of benzophenone by either tetralin or

octahydroanthracene. At increased reaction times, 120 and 180 minutes, tetralin yielded measurable conversions of benzophenone of 2.0% and 3.7% respectively. With the exception of 1,4-dihydronaphthalene, the hydrogen donors with four rings give up their hydrogen more readily than two or three ring donors.

Comparison of the conversion of hydroaromatic with benzophenone conversion indicates that some of the model donors are unstable at liquefaction conditions in that the conversion of some hydroaromatics far exceeds that of benzophenone. The products of the hydroaromatics were not determined in this study; however, in cases with the highest discrepancy between the two conversions an explanation can be given. Cholesterol is highly unstable at high temperatures, undergoing facile dehydrogenation¹⁷ and decomposing at 360°C. Both dihydronaphthalenes are nearly totally converted, showing over twice the conversion required for the reaction with benzophenone indicating that other reactions or disproportionation into tetralin and naphthalene is occurring.²² The conversion of benzophenone is quite different for the two isomers with the conversion of the 1,4 isomer being more than double that of the 1,2 isomer. Tetralin, one of the disproportionation products of dihydronaphthalene, by itself yields no conversion of benzophenone under these reaction conditions. Thus, an active donor can be converted to an inactive donor. The high conversion of decylhexahydropyrene may well result from partial dealkylation at high reaction temperature.

The literature is replete with model acceptor experiments which give the reactivity of model donors considered to be important in coal liquefaction. A comparison of model donors reactivity ranked by several model acceptors are given in Table 5. In the first two columns, the ranking using benzophenone from this work and that from work by Raaen and Roark are compared. Although the reaction conditions are similar in the two series of experiments, they are not equivalent with the primary differences being that the donor was added in

excess in Raaen's work compared to equal molar amounts of donor and acceptor in this work. Furthermore, the reaction time was 90 minutes in Raaen's experiments, 30 minutes longer than this work. Under those conditions of excess donor and longer reaction time, higher conversions of benzophenone were achieved. In both cases, however, cholesterol produced the highest conversion of benzophenone of any of the donors used; also, in both cases, tetralin was one of the least reactive compounds. The ranking of the intermediate compounds varied between the two studies. Ranking with 1,1-binaphthyl also showed tetralin to be less reactive than most of the other model donors.

Bockrath¹⁶ estimated the ability of hydrogen donors to donate hydrogen to coal, by measuring the hydrogen acceptor ability of benzyl radicals generated by the thermolysis of dibenzylmercury and dibenzyl diazene. Bockrath²³ used a second method of estimating hydrogen donor ability by determining relative reaction rates by allowing the donor in question to compete with a reference donor for the benzyl radical. The ranking of the former are listed under column I of the bibenzyl group in Table 5 and the latter under column II. Comparison of the donor ability of the benzyl radical to the other model acceptors indicates little correlation with either the benzophenone or binaphthyl work. The donor index using bibenzyl shows tetrahydroquinoline to be a very poor solvent and also shows indan to have in one case good donor ability and in the second to be a poor donor. Tetrahydroquinoline has been shown to be an effective donor for the dissolution of coal, in fact, being far more reactive than tetralin.²⁴

A comparison of coal conversion and benzophenone conversion by model hydrogen donors obtained in this study is presented in Table 6. No correlation is observed between the two rankings. Coal conversion shows a differentiation

among each of the donors whereas benzophenone conversion ranks four compounds, octahydroanthracene, tetralin, acenaphthene, and indan, equivalently and as being poor, even though their coal conversions are quite different. Benzophenone is readily hydrogenated in presence of cholesterol at these reaction conditions, whereas coal is not.

Summary

The ranking of hydrogen donors at the same donable hydrogen level for their ability to convert coal to THF solubles demonstrates that different donors have different abilities to liquefy coal. The presence of donable hydrogen constitutes a necessary and important component of coal conversion as evidenced by comparison with the conversion of aromatic analogs. However, properties of the model donors other than the concentration of available hydrogen can affect THF solubles. The ease with which hydrogen is abstracted from a particular donor as well as the functional groups and heteroatoms present are significant factors affecting reactivity of the hydrogen donors during liquefaction. Ranking of hydrogen donor reactivity by coal conversion and by model acceptor experiments shows no direct correlation between the two.

References

1. Neavel, R. C., Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., 1981, A 300, 141.
2. Brooks, D. G., Guin, J. A., Curtis, C. W., and Placek, T. D., I & EC, Proc. Des. and Dev., 1983, 22, 343.
3. Curran, G. P., Struck, R. T., and Gorin, E., I & EC, Proc. Des. and Dev., 1967, 6, 166.
4. Neavel, R. C., Fuel, 1976, 55, 237.
5. Derbyshire, F. J. and Whitehurst, D. D., Fuel, 1981, 60, 655.
6. Wright, C. H. and Severson, D. E., ACS Fuel Preprints, 1972, 16, (2), 68.
7. Seshadri, K. S., Ruberto, R. G., Jewell, D. M., and Malone, H. P., Fuel, 1978, 57, 549.
8. Fant, B. T., "EDS Coal Liquefaction Process Development: Phase III A", Annual Technical Report, 1 Jan - 31 Dec, 1976. ERDA No. FE 2353-9 (1977).
9. Reggel, L., Wender, I., and Raymond, R., Fuel, 1968, 47, 373.
10. Raymond, R., Wender, I., and Reggel, L., Science, 1962, 137, 681.
11. Smith, N. L., Masters Thesis, Auburn University, 1982.
12. Stein, S. E. and Golden, D. M., J. Org. Chem., 1977, 42, (5), 839.
13. Kim, S. S., Jarand, M. L., and Durai-Swamy, K., ACS Fuel Preprints, 1982, 27 (3&4), 280.
14. Treblow, M., "Selective Hydrogenation of Coal Related Compounds with Hydrogen Donor Solvents via Catalysis with Octacarbonyl Dicobalt", Research Report at Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center Process Science Division, June-September, 1978.
15. Cronauer, D. C., Jewell, D. M., Shah, Y. T., and Kueser, K. A., Ind. Eng. Chem. Fundam., 1979, 17, 291. Cronauer, D. C., Jewell, D. M., Shah, Y. T., and Modi, R. J., Ind. Eng. Chem. Fundam., 1979, 18, 153.
16. Bockrath, B. C. and Noceti, R. P., ACS Fuel Preprints, 1981, 26 (1), 94.
17. Raaen, V. F. and Roark, W. H., Fuel, 1978, 57, 650.
18. Kline, E. A. and Harrison, M. E., ACS Fuel Preprints, 1982, 27, (3&4), 18.
19. Curtis, C. W., Guin, J. A., Huang, W. H., and Tarrer, A. R., Fuel Processing Technology, 1983, 7, 277.
20. Orchin, M. and Storch, H. H., Ind. Eng. Chem., 1948, 40, 1385.

21. Shaw, R., Golden, D. M., and Benson, S. W., J. of Phys. Chem., 1977, 81, (18), 1716.
22. King, H. H. and Stock, L. M., Fuel, 1981, 60, 748.
23. Bockrath, B. C., "Mechanism of Coal Liquefaction", AR & TD Liquefaction Contractors Conference, September, 1982.
24. Guin, J. A., Curtis, C. W., and Kwon, K. C., Fuel, in press, 1983.

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Department of Energy for this work under contracts no. DEFG2280PC30209 and DEAC2279ET13397.

Table 1

Ultimate and Proximate Analysis of Western Kentucky 9/14 Coal^a

Ultimate Analysis
(wt % maf)

C	80.1
H	5.8
N	1.3
O	9.5
S	3.4

Proximate Analysis
(wt %)

Volatile matter	38.0
Fixed carbon	53.0
Ash	8.9
Mositure	4.2

^aWilsonville SRC Pilot Plant feed coal analyses

Table 2

Coal Conversion in Hydrogen Donor Solvents

Hydrogen Donor Compounds

Coal Conversion

Amount of Donable Hydrogen (x10³ grams)

	<u>9.78</u>	<u>2 x 9.78</u>	<u>4 x 9.78</u>
9,10 Dihydrophenanthrene	39.8	65.5	84.5
1,2,3,4-Tetrahydroquinoline	36.6	60.6	84.1
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexahdropyrene	39.1	67.4	81.4
1,2,3,4-Tetrahydrocarbazole	48.6	67.8	81.1
Isotetralin	46.8	67.5	80.6
1,4,5,8,9,10-Hexahydroanthracene	48.3	65.4	77.8
Dodecahydrotriphenylene	44.1	59.4	71.0
9,10-Dihydroanthracene	39.0	57.7	70.4
2a,3,4,5-Tetrahydroacenaphthene	36.9	50.2	70.3
1,2,3,4-Tetrahydroisoquinoline	39.7	57.4	68.5
5,6,7,8-Tetrahydro-2-naphthol	39.5	53.1	68.4
5,6,7,8-Tetrahydro-1-naphthol	38.9	56.1	66.5
Octahydroanthracene	43.0	54.3	66.3
Octahydroacridine	40.0	53.6	65.1
1,2-Dihydronaphthalene	36.7	52.2	64.5
1,2,3,4-Tetrahydro-1-naphthol	34.6	44.4	58.7
Tetralin	35.0	43.6	58.0
5,6,7,8-Tetrahydroquinoline	34.6	43.0	46.8
Cholesterol	41.7	38.2	----
Acenaphthene	29.9	38.1	40.1
1-Indanol	28.1	33.4	39.0
Indan	26.9	34.1	38.4
2,3-Dihydro-1H-cyclopenta (L) phenanthrene	26.0	29.9	33.0
None added	18.6	18.6	18.6

Table 3

Stabilities of Selected Hydrogen Donor Compounds

Hydrogen Donors	ΔH_f° (kcal/mole)
<u>Two Ring</u>	
Isotetralin	38.0
1,4-Dihydronaphthalene	32.9
1,2-Dihydronaphthalene	31.6
Tetralin	6.0
<u>Three Ring</u>	
9,10-Dihydroanthracene	38.2
Octahydroanthracene	-8.2
9,10-Dihydrophenanthrene	37.0

Table 4
Reactivity of Model Donors using Benzophenoneone
as an Acceptor

Hydrogen Donor	Conversions		Calculated Amount of Hydroaromatic needed for Benzophenone Conversion (%)
	Benzophenone (%)	Hydroaromatic (%)	
Cholesterol	25	97	50
1,2,3,3a,4,5-Hexahydropyrene	22	36	15
1,4,-Dihydronaphthalene	19	100	38
4-n-Decyl-1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexahydropyrene	18	49	12
1,2,3,4-Tetrahydroquinoline	16	36	16
9,10-Dihydroanthracene	11	38	22
1,2-Dihydronaphthalene	10	83	20
9,10-Dihydrophenanthrene	8	22	16
2a,3,4,5-Tetrahydroacenaphthene	3	19	3
Acenaphthene	0	0	0
Octahydroanthracene	0	0	0
Tetralin	0	0	0
Indan	0	0	0
1-Methylnaphthalene	0	0	0

Table 5

Comparison of Hydrogen Donor Reactivity
Using Different Model Acceptors

Hydrogen Donor Compound	Model Acceptors				
	Benzophenone		Rihenzyl		1,1' Binaphthyl
	This Work	Raaen & Roark ⁽¹⁷⁾	Rockrath et al ^(16,23)		Kline and Harrison ⁽¹⁸⁾
	I	II	I	II	
Cholesterol	25.1	39			
Tetrahydrocarbazole		28			
1,2,3,3a,4,5-Hexahdropyrene	22.3				28.0
1,2,3,6,7,8-Hexahdropyrene					
1,4-Dihydronaphthalene	19.2				3.4
4-n-Decyl-1,2,3,6,7,8 Hexahdropyrene	13.1				
1,2,3,4-Tetrahydroquinoline	15.6	21	0.18	1.65	
9,10-Dihydroanthracene	10.9	13		36.9	17.7
1,2-Dihydronaphthalene	9.8	28			
9,10-Dihydrophenanthrene	3.1	20	0.31	1.67	3.1
2a,3,4,5-Tetrahydroacenaphthene	2.7				
Acenaphthene	0.0			1.36	
Octahydroanthracene	0.0				
Tetralin	0.0	17	0.27	1.17	6.3
Decalin		0.0			1.3
Indan	0.0		0.35	0.57	
1-Indanol			0.28	2.74	
2-Indanol			0.40	3.45	
1-Methylnaphthalene	0.0		0.13	0.15	
Blank					1.4

Table 6
Ranking of Model Donors

<u>Donors</u>	<u>Conversions</u>	
	Coal	Benzophenone
9,10-Dihydrophenanthrene	1	5
1,2,3,4-Tetrahydroquinoline	2	2
9,10-Dihydroanthracene	3	3
2a,3,4,5-Tetrahydroacenaphthene	4	6
Octahydroanthracene	5	7
1,2-Dihydronaphthalene	6	4
Tetralin	7	7
Cholesterol	8	1
Acenaphthene	9	7
Indan	10	7

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Coal Conversion Abilities of Aromatics and Hydrogen Donor Compounds. (The concentration of donor is 19.75×10^{-3} grams of donor H in 4 grams of solvent. 4.9×10^{-3} moles of aromatic compound were used.)