Combined use of anaerobic digestion and Fischer-Tropsch reaction to convert organic wastes into biodiesel
Abstract

Transportation sector consumes a high amount of energy (e.g., gasoline and diesel) and is the main responsible for a large part of the CO\textsubscript{2} and other pollutants emissions. Replacing the energy derived from fossil fuel required in this sector with that derived from a renewable resource, such as biomass, is a solution that can relieve global warming and other environmental problems.

This work focuses the attention on the overall process that includes the anaerobic digestion of organic wastes, and the conversion of the biogas produced to Biofuels by Fischer-Tropsch (FT) synthesis.

The first aim of the present work is the optimization of the anaerobic digestion processes for biogas production from Municipal Solid Wastes (MSW) under mesophilic conditions, the anaerobic co-digestion of Municipal Solid Wastes (MSW) with lignocellulosic biomasses from Giant reed (GR), the effect of mineral solution "M9 10x" and 400x salts addition, and the effect of trace metals addition in individual and mixed form.

The results show that the highest amount of biogas as well as the highest methane fraction were obtained adopting a suitable combination of the operating parameters (15 wt. % of TS, 10 V/V% of inoculum, co-digestion of 75% GR and 25% MSW, with the addition a mineral and salt solution and addition of 5mg/L from individual elements of Ni, Co and Zn, however higher production was with the addition a mixture of three above elements at concentration 5mg/L for each one).

The second aim is the optimization of the FT synthesis reaction for the exploitation of the synthesis gas (H\textsubscript{2} and CO) obtained by a reforming step of the methane produced by anaerobic digestion. Under the operating conditions adopted, the main product of the FT reaction were liquid hydrocarbons.
Abstract

The FT reaction was studied under diluted conditions with $\text{H}_2/\text{CO}$ ratio equal to 2 and extruded cylindrical pellets ($d = 2$ mm) of Cobalt-Alumina based catalyst. Working with diluted condition ($4\% \text{ H}_2$, $2\% \text{ CO}$, $94\% \text{ He}$) drastically reduces the influence of the temperature, since the FT reactions are highly exothermic, allowing to hypothesize a kinetic mechanism at isotherm conditions.

The catalyst was prepared by impregnation technique under vacuum condition with $15\%$ wt. of Cobalt, and it has been characterized using a temperature-programmed reduction (TPR) technique and a $\text{N}_2$ adsorption isotherm.

The experimental investigation on FT reaction was conducted varying the GHSV, from 370 to 820 $\text{h}^{-1}$, and the temperature from 220 to 250 °C, using a fixed bed reactor with 5 g of catalyst. Liquid and gaseous phases products were analyzed by gas-chromatography techniques, in the range $\text{C}_1$, $\text{C}_2-\text{C}_4$, $\text{C}_5-\text{C}_{11}$, $\text{C}_{12}-\text{C}_{20}$ and $\text{C}_{21+}$ according to the number of C atoms in the chains.

The results indicated that changes in the temperatures and GHSV do not have a significant effect on the conversion of diluted syngas. On the other hand, the results show that the value of CO conversion obtained at steady state with lowest temperatures and GHSV is about 27%, which is higher than the values reported in the literature with the same $\text{H}_2/\text{CO}$ ratio for a not diluted condition.

The optimum conditions were obtained adopting the lowest values of temperatures and GHSVs. Under these conditions, the liquid hydrocarbon yield at steady state was about 26% and the selectivities towards gasoline and diesel hydrocarbons were about 40.30% and 47.18% respectively.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Molarity (mol/L)</td>
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<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S %</td>
<td>Selectivity percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Temperature (K and °C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBR</td>
<td>Tubular reactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>Temperature programmed reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPD</td>
<td>Temperature programmed desorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGA</td>
<td>Thermo-gravimetric analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCD</td>
<td>Thermal conductivity detector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS %</td>
<td>Total solid percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVS%</td>
<td>Total volatile solids percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Reactor Volume (m³, L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&lt;sup&gt;·&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Volumetric flow rate of feed (m³/h, L/h, m³/d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&lt;sub&gt;Cat.&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Volume of reactor or catalyst (m³, cm³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Working volume (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vs.</td>
<td>Versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt. %</td>
<td>Weight percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGS</td>
<td>Water gas shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/F</td>
<td>Weight of catalyst /molar flow rate (g.h/mol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wn</td>
<td>Weight fraction of the products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Required weight of compound (mg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x, y, n, m</td>
<td>Stoichiometric coefficient (mol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;%</td>
<td>Conversion percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y%</td>
<td>Yield percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>Chain growth probability or growth factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µg</td>
<td>Microgram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>µl</td>
<td>Microliters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 General Introduction.

The increase of emissions of greenhouse gases derived from fossil fuel combustion processes is leading to global warming. Consequently, this problem raises public health issues, and is a topic of concern for scientists and governments.

Currently, a large part of the world’s energy is satisfied by traditional fossil fuels (petroleum and natural gas), and it has been forecasted that the global energy requirement will continue to grow because of the world’s increasing population (Kaygusuz K., 2012) and the expansion of emerging countries. It is well known that the supply of traditional fossil fuels will be exhausted in the near future and this stimulates the search for alternative energy sources. Moreover, the use of traditional fossil fuels also leads to the emission of greenhouse gases into the environment and induces serious environmental issues (Alaswad A. et al., 2015). In particular, the transportation sector consumes a high amount of energy (e.g., gasoline and diesel) and is the main responsible for the CO₂ and other pollutants emissions. In order to satisfy the increased energy needs, ensure energy security and assist with environmental protection, many attempts have been done to produce renewable biofuels (Hammond G.P. et al., 2008).

Biofuels include many types of fuels prevalently delivered from waste and biomass by biological or thermochemical processing approach, both liquid (ethanol, methanol, biodiesel and Fischer-Tropsch diesel) or gaseous
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(biomethane and biohydrogen), that can be used in vehicles and in different industrial processes (Demirbas A., 2008, Nigam and Singh, 2011).

Organic wastes from agricultural and industrial sectors, animal manure, sewage sludge, as well as the biodegradable fraction of municipal solid waste (MSW), represent an important source of biomass for the production of biofuels (Naik S.N. et al., 2010, Campuzano and González-Martínez, 2016).

In this contest, Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is gaining great interest for production of biofuels starting from biogas obtained by gasification or digestion of renewable sources. The present study focuses the attention on the overall process that converts wastes and cheap biomass to liquid for the production of green fuels. A way to produce liquid fuels such as diesel and gasoline could consist of an anaerobic digestion of biomass for the production of methane, a reforming step to obtain H₂ and CO, and a Fischer-Tropsch (FT) synthesis (Galadima and Muraza, 2015, Park M.H.et al., 2015).

Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is a catalytic process that includes a great number of simultaneous reactions and a wide spectrum of products consisting of a complex multi component mixture of linear and branched hydrocarbons and oxygenated products (Choudhury and Moholkar, 2013). The products composition depends on the reaction conditions, such as reactor temperature, pressure, feed gas composition (H₂ to CO ratio), space velocity and the types of catalysts and promoters used (Dry M. E., 1996).
1.2 Objective of Thesis.

The Fischer–Tropsch (FT) process converts syngas (i.e. a mixture of CO and H₂, usually derived from coal, natural gas and biomass), into a range of hydrocarbons. FT offers an alternative to crude oil for the production of liquid fuels (gasoline and diesel) and chemicals (in particular, 1-alkenes).

The aim of this Ph.D. thesis is the production of liquid fuel by integration of anaerobic digestion for Municipal solid waste and Fischer-Tropsch process, as summarized in Figure 1.1.

![Figure 1.1 Short flow chart of experimental activity.](image)

Specific objectives of this thesis are as follows:

1-Optimization of anaerobic digestion processes for biogas production (methane) as follows:

a) Optimization of a total solid percentage.

b) Optimization of the inoculum percentage.

c) Optimization of anaerobic co-digestion of Municipal Solid Wastes (MSW) with lignocellulosic biomasses from Giant reed (GR).
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d) Study the effect mineral solution "M9 10x" and 400x Salts addition on a performance of anaerobic digestion process.
e) Optimization of trace metals addition on anaerobic digestion process.

2-Optimization of Fischer-Tropsch synthesis reaction for liquid fuel production as follows:

a) Preparation and characterization of cobalt-based catalyst.
b) Analysis of the main parameters of the FT reaction (such as temperature and space velocity) for liquid fuel production.

1.3 Thesis Outline.

Chapter one is a general introduction and describes the objectives of this thesis. Chapter two is focused on a literature review of main techniques or methods used for the production of gaseous and liquid fuels (Clean fuel) in this Ph.D. thesis. Chapter three describes the experimental equipments as well as the analytical methods and procedures used. Chapter four describes the results obtained from the laboratory scale experiments of anaerobic digestion, catalyst characterization and FT reaction. Lastly, Chapter five highlights the most important conclusions and findings obtained from the experiment activity.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

2 Introduction.

Fischer-Tropsch reaction is a conversion of synthesis gas (CO and H\textsubscript{2}) that was produced from the methane reforming into a broad range of hydrocarbons, in this chapter the literature review reports the theoretical background of main processes included in this approach related to this thesis such as anaerobic digestion processes for creating biogas with main product is a methane, Upgrading of Biogas, production of Synthesis gas and Fischer-Tropsch technology.

2.1 Anaerobic Digestion.

Anaerobic digestion (AD) is a synergistic process carried out by a consortium of microbes in an oxygen free environment to generate methane (CH\textsubscript{4}), hydrogen(H\textsubscript{2}) and carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}), called biogas(Macias-Corral M. et al.,2008, Mudhoo and Kumar,2013). The AD process involves the steps of hydrolysis, acidogenesis, acetogenesis and methanogenesis as explain by the details below (Borja R. et al., 2005). A scheme of the AD process is shown in Figure 2.1. Many types of biomass can be used as substrates for the production of biogas from anaerobic digestion such as organic fraction municipal solid waste, sewage sludge, cow manure and energy crops (Mata-Alvarez et al., 2011). If the substrate for anaerobic digestion is a mix of two or more types of biomass, the process is called “Co–digestion” is a most common applications for biogas production(Cuetos et al.,2011), biogas is an alternative source of energy that can be used in different applications (Levis J.W. et al., 2010). It can be compressed to be used as a source of car fuel
similar to that of compressed natural gas (CNG). Alternatively, it can be burned to generate heat or electricity, or liquefied to produce methanol. It can also be used as feedstock for the catalytic steam methane reforming (SMR) to produce Syngas ($H_2$ and CO). Refined biogas can be fed into gas distribution grids. (Roubaud and Favrat, 2005, Ghosh S. et al., 2000).

![Figure 2.1 Anaerobic Digestion Flow Scheme.](image)
2.1.1 Hydrolysis.

At the beginning of the process, extracellular enzymes catalyze the hydrolysis of the complex organic substrates (carbohydrates, lipids and proteins), that are degraded and split into simpler products such as amino acids, fatty acids and simple sugars as shown in equations (2.1 and 2.2) (Michael H., 2003, Demirel and Scherer, 2008). These products are soluble and consequently more accessible to the bacteria involved in the following steps. Hydrolysis have been often the rate-limiting step of the whole process, in particular when lignocellulosic materials are used as feedstock. In this case, cellulolytic bacteria, such as Cellulomonas, Clostridium, Bacillus, Thermomonospora, Ruminococcus, Bacteriodes, Erwinia, Acetovibrio, Microbispora, and Streptomyces can produce cellulose enzymes that are able to hydrolyze cellulolytic biomass (Lo Y.C. et al., 2009).

\[
\text{Cellulose} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{\text{Hydrolysis}} \text{Soluble sugars} \quad (2.1)
\]

\[
\text{Proteins} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \xrightarrow{\text{Hydrolysis}} \text{Soluble amino acids} \quad (2.2)
\]

The hydrolysis rate is a function of many parameters, such as pH, temperature, culture sources, hydraulic retention time (HRT) and particle size (Borja R. et al., 2005, Vavilin V.A. et al., 2008).
2.1.2 Acidogenesis.

Acidogenesis is the subsequent step. During this phase, a further division of the products is carried out, to obtain volatile fatty acids (VFAs) (with a consequent pH decrease) and other minor products such as carbon dioxide, hydrogen and acetic acid as shown in equations (2.3,2.4,2.5,2.6 and 2.7) (Batstone D. J. et al.,2002). Fermentative bacteria involved in this step may follow different metabolic pathways. The major pathways lead to are acetate (Acetobacterium, Clostridium, and Sporomusa), alcohols (Saccharomyces), butyrate (Butyribacterium, Clostridium), lactate (Lactobacillus, Streptococcus), propionate (Clostridium) (Michael H., 2003).

Acetate:

\[ C_6H_{12}O_6 + 2H_2O \rightarrow 2CH_3COOH + 2CO_2 + 4H_2 \quad (2.3) \]

Propionate + Acetate:

\[ 3C_6H_{12}O_6 \rightarrow 4CH_3CH_2COOH + 2CH_3COOH + 2CO_2 + 2H_2O \quad (2.4) \]

Butyrate:

\[ C_6H_{12}O_6 \rightarrow CH_3CH_2CH_2COOH + 2CO_2 + 2H_2 \quad (2.5) \]

Lactate:

\[ C_6H_{12}O_6 \rightarrow 2CH_3CHOHCOOH \quad (2.6) \]

Ethanol:

\[ C_6H_{12}O_6 \rightarrow 2CH_3CH_2OH + 2CO_2 \quad (2.7) \]
2.1.3 Acetogenesis.

Acetogenesis is the transformation of Volatile Fatty Acids (VFAs) by acetogenic bacteria into acetic acid by the Wood-Ljungdahl pathway (Ragsdale S.W., 2008). Bacteria as Acetobacterium and Sporomusa are exclusively acetogenic, even though some among these can be both acetogenic and nonacetogenic (Clostridium, Ruminococcus, and Eubacterium). In this phase CO$_2$, H$_2$S and H$_2$ are also produced. High hydrogen concentrations inhibit acetogenic bacteria. Typical reaction equations in acetogenesis are shown in equations (2.8, 2.9 and 2.10) (Deublein and Steinhauser, 2008).

Propionic acid:

\[
\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{COOH} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{COOH} + \text{CO}_2 + 3\text{H}_2
\]

Butyric acid:

\[
\text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_2\text{COO}^- + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow 2\text{CH}_3\text{COO}^- + \text{H}^+ + 2\text{H}_2
\]

CO$_2$ and H$_2$:

\[
2\text{CO}_2 + 4\text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{COO}^- + \text{H}^+ + 2\text{H}_2\text{O}
\]
2.1.4 Methanogenesis.

Methanogenesis is the final step of AD, leading to the transformation of acetate, carbon dioxide, and hydrogen into methane. A fast removal of the produced hydrogen is essential to reduce the inhibition of acetogenic bacteria. Consequently, it results that methanogenic bacteria act in symbiosis with acetogenic bacteria (Shankaranand V.S. et al., 1992).

Methane can be produced by two different pathways:

- Hydrogenotrophic bacteria produce methane in anaerobic condition by hydrogen oxidation and using the CO₂ as final electron acceptor (Kral T.A. et al., 1998):

  \[
  \text{CO}_2 + 4\text{H}_2 = \text{CH}_4 + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \quad (2.11)
  \]

- Degradation of acetic acid into methane and carbon dioxide by the acetoclastic pathway (Ho N. C. et al., 2010):

  \[
  \text{CH}_3\text{COOH} = \text{CH}_4 + \text{CO}_2 \quad (2.12)
  \]
2.2 Parameters Effect on Anaerobic Digestion Process.

Several Parameters have been seen that effect on the carrying out of AD process such as pH value, Temperature, Substrate Characteristics, Mixing, Carbon/Nitrogen ratio, Volatile Fatty Acids and Retention time. AS describe below.

2.2.1 pH value.

Anaerobic digestion reactions are highly pH dependent. A suitable range of pH values for anaerobic digestion has been stated by many studies, but the optimal value for methanogenesis has been found to be about 7.0 (Yang and Okos, 1987). (Ward A. et al., 2008) reported that a pH range of 6.8–7.2 was perfect for anaerobic digestion. (Kim J. et al., 2003) found the appropriate pH range for thermophilic acidogens was 6-7 From the batch experiments (Lee D. et al., 2009) showed that methanogenesis in an anaerobic digester occurs efficiently at pH 6.5–8.2, while (Park et al., 2008) reported the hydrolysis and acidogenesis happens at pH 5.5 and 6.5, respectively. (Liu C. et al., 2008) found that the best range of pH to achieve maximal biogas production in anaerobic digestion is 6.5–7.5.

Therefore, the pH value of an anaerobic digestion system is normally kept between methanogenic limits to ensure the continued operation of the digestion process to avoid the triumph of the acid-forming bacteria, which may cause Volatile Fatty Acids accumulation (Agdag and Sponza, 2007).
2.2.2 Temperature.

One of the most main parameters affecting microbial activity in an anaerobic digester and methane production is a temperature. There are three ranges of temperature operation in digestion process: psychrophilic (15-20°C), Mesophilic (30-40°C) and thermophilic (50-60°C) (Zupancic and Jemec, 2010). (Trzcinski and Stuckey, 2010) founds the lower temperatures through the process will decrease microbial growth, substrate consumption rates, and biogas yield. (Kashyap D.R. et al., 2003) showed the lower temperatures may also effect in an exhaustion of cell energy, a leakage of intracellular substances or complete hydrolysis. While, (Fezzani and Cheikh, 2010) found high temperatures will cause lower biogas production due to the increasing of volatile gas production such as ammonia which destroys methanogenic activities.

Usually, anaerobic digestion is carried out at Mesophilic temperatures (El-Mashad et al., 2003). The AD process at Mesophilic condition is more stable and needs a reduced energy cost (Zaher U. et al., 2007).

2.2.3 Substrate Characteristics.

The AD process is powerfully affected by the kind, accessibility and complexity of the substrate (Ghaniyari-Benis et al., 2009). (Fernandez et al., 2008) showed the initial concentration and total solid content of the substrate in the bioreactor can be effect on the performance of the digestion process and the amount of methane produced during the process. Many kinds of carbon source support many groups of microbes. Before the beginning of the digestion process, the substrate must be categorized for carbohydrate, lipid, protein and fiber contents (Lesteur et al., 2010). In addition, the substrate
should also be categorized for the amount of methane that can possibly be produced under anaerobic conditions. Carbohydrates are considered the greatest essential organic component of municipal solid waste for biogas production (Dong et al., 2009).

2.2.4 Mixing (Agitation).

Mixing generates a homogeneous substrate avoiding stratification and the formation of a surface crust, and confirms solids remain in suspension. An Addition, prevents the development of localized pockets of temperature variation, particle size reduction in digesting and release the produced gas (Michael H., 2003). Mixing and stirring equipment, and the way it is performed, varies according to reactor type and total solid content in the digester (Deublein and Steinhauser, 2011). (Gomez et al., 2006) shown the low speed mixing conditions permitted a digester to better absorb the disturbance of shock loading than did high speed mixing conditions. The effect of three mixing strategies (continuous, minimal and intermittent) on methane production from anaerobic digestion of manures was investigated in lab-scale and Pilot-scale continuously stirred tank reactors at thermophilic conditions by (Kaparaju P. et al., 2008), they founded , intermittent and minimal mixing strategies improved methane productions compared to continuous mixing.
2.2.5 Carbon/Nitrogen ratio.

The C/N ratio in the organic material plays a critical part in anaerobic digestion process. The unstable nutrients are observed as an important factor limiting anaerobic digestion of organic wastes. Where carbon constitutes the energy source for the microorganisms, nitrogen assists to improve microbial growth (Yadvika et al., 2004, Hong and David, 2007). For the enhancement of nutrition and Carbon/Nitrogen ratio, co-digestion of organic mixtures is used (Cuetos et al., 2008). (Zhang P. et al, 2008) studied the effect of Addition of organic fraction of municipal solid waste to improved carbon-to-nitrogen (C/N) ratio from 8.10 to 20.55 in the feedstock, they found a biogas yield increased by increased (C/N) ratio in feedstock. (Bouallagui et al., 2009a) reported the C/N ratio between 22/1 and 25/1 appeared to be best for anaerobic digestion of fruit and vegetable waste, while, (Lee et al., 2009) reported the optimum C/N ratio for anaerobic degradation of organic waste was 20-35.

2.2.6 Volatile Fatty Acids (VFAs).

Volatile Fatty Acids are important intermediary compounds in the production of methane (Cabbai V.et al., 2013). The major intermediate of anaerobic digestion products are acetic acid, propionic acid and butyric acid. Formulae and Structure as shown in table (2.1) (Wang Q. et al., 1999). However, two VFAs (acetic acid and butyric acid) are among the most favorite for methane formation, whereas, acetic acid contributes more than 70% to the methane formation (Wijekoon K. et al., 2011). If the present high concentrations of volatile fatty acid (VFA) in the system cause leads to a decrease of the pH. Non-methanogenic microorganisms responsible for
hydrolysis and fermentation adapt to low pH. On the contrary methanogens can be inhibited significantly at low pH (Mrafkova et al., 2003, Agdag and Sponza, 2007). (Lee D. et al., 2015) investigated the effect of volatile fatty acid concentration on the anaerobic degradation rate of food waste leachate, they showed the concentrations of VFAs should remain below 4,000mg/L, while (Siegert and Banks, 2005) reported the concentrations of VFAs above 2000 mg/L led to inhibition of cellulose degradation. (Wang Y. et al., 2009) studied the effects of different concentration of VFAs (acetic acid, propionic acid and butyric acid) and ethanol on the efficiency of fermentation, they found the highest concentrations of ethanol, acetic acid and butyric acid were 2400, 2400 and 1800 mg/L, respectively, there was no significant inhibition of the activity of methanogenic bacteria. However, when the propionic acid concentration was increased to 900 mg/L, significant inhibition appeared.

**Table (2.1):** Formulae and structure of major AD intermediate products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Formulae</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acetic Acid</td>
<td>CH₃COOH</td>
<td><img src="attachment" alt="Acetic Acid Structure" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propionic acid</td>
<td>CH₃CH₂COOH</td>
<td><img src="attachment" alt="Propionic Acid Structure" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butyric acid</td>
<td>CH₃CH₂CH₂COOH</td>
<td><img src="attachment" alt="Butyric Acid Structure" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.7 Retention time (RT).

Retention time (RT) is an important parameter for dimensioning a plant for biogas production. The (RT) can be accurately set in batch operation mode. While, for continuously operated it expressed as a hydraulic retention time (HRT) is approximated estimated by dividing the digester volume by the daily influent rate as shown in equation (2.13) (Avraam K., 2012). The retention times are mainly dependent of operation temperature and type of substrates (Alexopoulos S., 2012).

\[
\text{HRT} = \frac{V_r}{\dot{V}} \tag{2.13}
\]

Where:

HRT= hydraulic retention time (d).

\(V_r\) = Reactor Volume (m\(^3\)).

\(\dot{V}\) = Daily volume flow rate (m\(^3\)/d).
2.3 Types or Operation Modes of Anaerobic Digestion Processes.

Many operation modes were used for AD processes that depend on substrate properties (Liquid or Solid State), treatment mode of substrate (Batch and Continuous) and process arrangement (Single or Two stage). AS describe below.

2.3.1 Liquid and Solid-State Anaerobic Digestion Processes.

Depend on the substrate properties, liquid and solid-state fermentation processes are convenient for anaerobic digestion (Weiland P., 2003). If a total solid concentration of 15 %wt. or more was adopted to carry out the so-called solid-state AD (Li Y. et al., 2011). This is usually done when the organic fractions of MSW and lignocellulosic biomass are processed. On the contrary, liquid AD (i.e. at a solid concentration lower than 15 %wt.) is preferred to treat animal manure and sewage sludge (Guendouz J. et al., 2010). Solid-state AD has several advantages over liquid AD, including higher volumetric organic loading rate, a smaller reactor volume for the same solids loading; fewer moving parts; lower energy requirements for heating and mixing; easier to handle end product and a greater acceptance of inputs containing glass, plastics, and grit (Jha A. K. et al., 2011, Li Y. et al., 2011)

A critical aspect of the solid-state AD stems from the heterogeneous nature of the substrate that generates different micro-environments, requiring different bacterial consortia for their degradation. Consequently, the dynamics of solid-state AD can be more complex in comparison to liquid AD (Shankaranand V.S. et al., 1992). (Brown D. et al., 2012). Studied the effect of liquid (L-AD) and solid state (SSAD) on methane yields by using eight lignocellulosic feedstocks (switch
grass, corn Stover, wheat straw, yard waste, leaves, waste paper, maple, and pine), they founded no significant difference in methane yield between LAD and SS-AD, except for waste paper and pine. But, the volumetric productivity was two to seven times greater in the SS-AD system compared with the L-AD system. (Lianhua L. et al., 2010). Investigated the effects of solid concentration in different temperatures on AD for rice straw conversion to biogas, they showed that higher biogas production was achieved in the dry mesophilic conditions. (Fernandez J. et al., 2008). Reported when the total solid concentration of organic fraction of municipal solid waste (OFMSW) increased from 20% to 30%, the COD removal of the SS-AD decreased from 80.69% to 69.05%. Then methane yield was less by 17%.

2.3.2 Batch and Continuous Anaerobic Digestion Processes.

Depending on the substrate being treated, AD process can be done as a batch process or a continuous process (Forster-Carneiro T. et al., 2008). During batch operation the reactors are filled just the once with feedstock, and closed for the complete retention time, after which it is opened and the effluent removed and recharged. The advantage of batch reactor is uncomplicated, inexpensive and less equipment requirement. However, batch reactors need a larger volume due to longer retention time than continuously fed reactors. Where, the continuous digestion reactor is continuously fed feedstock, allowing a steady state to be reached in the reactor with a constant gas production. But, it has higher operating costs due to pumping requests (El-Mashad and Zhang, 2010, Nalo T. et al., 2014). Both batch and
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Continuous anaerobic digestion processes are in use to treat organic fractions of municipal solid waste (OFMSW) (Li Y. et al., 2011).

2.3.3 Single and Two Stages Anaerobic Digestion Process.

The arrangement of anaerobic digestion process is too essential for the efficiency of the methane production. A single-stage anaerobic digestion process has been commonly utilized for municipal solid waste treatment. As all AD steps (hydrolysis, acidogenesis, acetogenesis, and methanogenesis) happen with each other in a single reactor (Forster-Carneiro T. et al., 2008). However, the two-stage anaerobic digestion process has been developed based on the separation of hydrolysis/acidogenesis and acetogenesis/methanogenesis in two separate reactors (Chu C. et al., 2008), in such a system, fast-growing acidogens and hydrogen producing microorganisms are enriched for the production of hydrogen and volatile fatty acids (VFAs) in the first reactor, then, A slow-growing acetogens and methanogens are built-up in the second reactor, where VFAs are converted to methane and carbon dioxide (Kongjan P. et al., 2013).
2.4 Inhibition /toxicity of anaerobic digestion process.

A broad variety of inhibitory substances are the main reason of the anaerobic process upset or failure since they are present in significant concentrations in wastes. The inhibitors, usually present in anaerobic digesters include ammonia, sulfide, light metal ions, heavy metals, and organics (Chen Y. et al., 2008).

2.4.1 Ammonia.

Ammonia is one of the hydrolysis products formed during biological degradation of the nitrogenous matter, commonly in the form of proteins and urea that are present in significant concentrations in wastes (Kayhanian M., 1999), the free ammonia may be inhibit of anaerobic fermentation and toxic the methanogenic bacteria (Gallert and Winter, 1997, Chiu S. et al., 2013.). The free ammonia concentration depends mainly on three parameters: the total ammonia concentration, temperature and pH. The wastes containing a high ammonia concentration are more easily inhibited at thermophilic conditions than at Mesophilic conditions (Hansen K.H. et al., 1998). In general, if the concentrations of ammonia less than 200 mg/L are useful to the fermentation process since nitrogen is a necessary nutrient for anaerobic microorganisms (Liu and Sung, 2002, Yenigün and Demirel, 2013).

2.4.2 Sulfide.

Sulfate is a common element of many waste stream industries (Cai J. et al., 2008), that will be converted into hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) by sulfate reducing bacteria (SRB). The Sulfate reducing bacteria produce sulfides which perhaps inhibitory and/or toxic to SRB and methane producing bacteria.
(MPB), reduce the rate of methanogenesis and decrease the amount of methane produced by competing for the available carbon and/or H2 (Chen J. L. et al., 2014). The decrease is done by two main combination of Sulfate reducing bacteria, including incomplete oxidizers, which oxidize compounds such as lactate to acetate and CO2 and complete oxidizers (acetoclastic SRB), which quite convert acetate to CO2 and HCO3- together combination use hydrogen for sulfate reduction. Inhibition produced by sulfate reduction can be separated into two phases. Prime inhibition is specified by lower methane production by reason of competition of SRB and methanogenic bacteria to find communal organic and inorganic substrates. Secondary inhibition results from the toxicity of sulfide to numerous anaerobic bacteria combination. The hydrogen sulfide formed has an inhibitory effect on methanogens even at low concentrations (Chen Y. et al., 2008, Michael H., 2003).

2.4.3 Light metals ions.

Light metal ions are sodium (Na), potassium (K), calcium (Ca) magnesium (Mg) and aluminum (Al) are normally existing in influents of anaerobic digesters (Grady J. et al., 1999). They may be brought forth by the degradation of organic matter in the feeding substrate or by chemical adding for pH correction (Nayono S. E. et al., 2010). At moderate concentrations, light metal ions are necessary for the growth bacteria. However, immoderate concentrations will slow down a bacterial growth and the inhibition or toxicity will be accorded (Soto M. et al., 1993). The optimum concentration of (Na and Mg) is (350 and 720 mg/L), respectively, where the concentration of (K, Ca and Al) must be less than (400, 7000 and 2500 mg/L), respectively to avoid process inhibition (Appels L. et al., 2008, Chen Y. et al., 2008).
2.4.4 Heavy metals.

The term of heavy metals denotes to metals and metalloids having densities more than 5 g/cm$^3$ are predominantly existing in industrial wastewaters and municipal sludge in significant concentrations such as copper (Cu), zinc (Zn), lead (Pb), mercury (Hg), chromium (Cr), cadmium (Cd), iron (Fe), nickel (Ni), cobalt (Co) and molybdenum (Mo) and is commonly correlating with contamination and toxicity (Peng K. et al., 2006, Altaş L., 2009). Heavy metals may be stimulatory, inhibitory, or even toxic to anaerobic reactions and the range of these effects relies on the metal species and its concentration (Mudhoo and Kumar, 2013), some of these elements are needed by microorganisms at low concentrations. However, excessive quantities of heavy metals can lead to inhibition or toxicity (Li and Fang, 2007).

2.4.5 Organics.

An extensive kind of organic chemicals were mentioned can inhibit anaerobic bacteria, such as halogenated benzenes, halogenated phenols, phenol and alkyl phenols, halogenated aliphatic and long chain fatty acids (LCFAs) (Chen J. L. et al., 2014).
2.5 Improvement of AD process.

There are many way can be follow to improve the efficiency of AD process as describe below.

2.5.1 Co-digestion.

The co-digestion technology can be defined as the simultaneous treatment of two or more organic biodegradable waste streams by anaerobic digestion display considerable possibility for the suitable behavior of the organic fraction of solid waste advent from a source or separate gathering systems such as organic fraction municipal solid waste, sewage sludge, cow manure and energy crops (Mata-Alvarez J. et al., 2011, Alvarez and Liden, 2008). Co-digestion of different organic component is a popular practice to improve the performance of anaerobic digestion yields and requires accurate selection of substrates to improve the efficiency of the process (Alvarez J.A., et al., 2010, Cuetos M.J. et al., 2011). The main advantages of this technology are: enhanced balance nutrient and digestion, dilution of inhibitory and/or toxic compounds, well utilization of the digested volume, synergistic effects of microorganisms, improved load of biodegradable organic matter and better biogas produce (Hong-Wei and David, 2007, Sosnowski P. et al., 2003, Zhang L. et al., 2011). It has been found (Kaparaju P. et al., 2008) that biogas production is increased by co-digestion because of the more balanced nutritional composition and the increased buffering capability that improves the stability of the overall AD process. Consequently, the co-digestion permits the use of current installations increasing significantly the biogas yields and the global efficiency (Converti A., 1999, Poggi-Varaldo H.M., 1999).
2.5.2 Pretreatment of substrates.

Many types of substrates used for biogas production by anaerobic digestion process such as industrial waste, agricultural waste, organic fraction of municipal solid wastes (OFMSW) and energy crops. While, the hydrolysis is the rate-limiting step during the whole anaerobic process. Therefore, it is important to enhance hydrolysis for improving the performance of AD some substrates can be very slow to break down for several reasons, molecular structure is poorly accessible to microorganisms and their enzymes due to it has highly crystalline structure or low surface area in addition they have chemicals material that inhibit the growth and activity of the microorganisms (Carlsson M. et al, 2012). Various pretreatment technologies include mechanical, thermal, chemical, biological, and Physicochemical pretreatment (He W.Z., et al., 2008, Shahriari H., et al., 2012, Masse L., 2003, Nah I. W. et al., 2000, Menardo S. et al., 2015, Lo Y.C. et al., 2009) have been developed to overcome some of these problems to cause one or more of these changes in biomass (size reduction, degradation of one or more of the main components of biomass (cellulose, hemicellulose, or lignin), increase in surface area and porosity of biomass, change in crystallinity and degree of polymerization of cellulose and prevent processing problems such as high electricity requirements for mixing or the formation of floating layers (Zhang C. et al., 2014).
2.5.2.1 Mechanical pretreatment.

Mechanical pretreatment is executed by mills, shredding, screening, sorting, squeezes and separation of ferrous components are some of the most commonly available process which reduce the size of material and degree of crystallinity of lignocelluloses as a result greater possibility for enzymatic degradation of these materials towards biogas production (Leikam and Stegmann, 1999, Heo N.H. et al., 2003), additionally the size reduction easier mixing in disasters because of reducing the viscosity also can reduce the problems of floating layers (Schell and Harwood, 1994).

2.5.2.2 Thermal pretreatment.

In the thermal pretreatment, the substrate is heated under pressure and applied at that temperature for up to one hour (Garrote G. et al., 1999). The effects of thermal pretreatment depend on the substrate type and temperature range (Ariunbaatar J. et al., 2014). The general advantages of thermal treatment are particle size reduction, to increase the porosity of the materials, break down lignin and hemicellulose, to increase the bioavailability of organic matter, as well as improving dewatering performance and reduces viscosity of the digestive and an increase in pathogen reduction (Rincon B. et al., 2013, Tampio E. et al., 2014).

2.5.2.3 Chemical Pretreatment.

Chemical pretreatment has been accomplished by utilizing a scope of different chemicals, mainly acids, alkalis or oxidants under different conditions to modify the physical and chemical characteristics of lignocellulosic (Zheng Y. et al., 2014). In comparing acidic with alkaline
treatment, the second is the more favored chemical method because of during the anaerobic digestion process pH should an adjustment by the alkalinity addition (Li H. et al., 2012), the first reactions that happen during alkali treatment are solvation and saphonication, which motivate the swelling of substrates, under those circumstances the specific surface area is increased and the substrates are readily attainable to anaerobic microbes (Kong F. et al., 1992), otherwise the main reaction that happens through acid treatment is the hydrolysis of hemicellulose into perspective monosaccharaides, whilst the lignin condensates and precipitates (Ariunbaatar J. et al., 2014). Oxidative pretreatment such as ozonation are also utilized to enhance the biogas production and improve the hydrolysis rate (Zheng Y. et al., 2014).

2.5.2.4 Biological pretreatment.

Biological pretreatment for improvement of anaerobic digestion process have been predominately associated with the act of fungi capable of producing enzymes that can degrade lignin, hemicellulose, and polyphenols or by enzyme addition to enhance the break down biomass that are already existent in digesters (Parawira W. et al., 2005). By comparison with other pretreatment methods, biological pretreatment, not simply less energy requirement and without chemical addition but also it is conducted under moderate environmental conditions consequently that few inhibitors, which could negatively effect on anaerobic digestion (Taherzadeh and Karimi, 2008). The main advantages of biological treatment are: enhancing the hydrolysis process, minimize the loss of carbohydrates and maximize the lignin removal for AD feedstocks with high digestibility (Carrere H. et al., 2010, Zheng Y. et al., 2014). Fungi such as (white, brown and soft-rot fungi) are practiced in this treatment to degrade lignin and hemicellulose in waste
materials (Galbe and Zacchi, 2007). White and soft rots have been reported to degrade cellulose and lignin, while brown rots generally attack cellulose, white-rot being the most effective at biological pretreatment of biomass (Sun and Cheng, 2002).

2.5.2.5 Physicochemical pretreatment.

Steam explosion is physicochemical pretreatment the most common technology used for the pretreatment of lignocellulosic materials, a method that opens up the fibers, and makes the biomass polymers more accessible for successive treatment (Fengel and Wegner, 1983). Generally in the steam explosion process the biomass are treated by hot steam (from 180 to 240 °C) at pressure (from 1 to 3.5 MPa) then followed by an explosive decompression of the biomass leading to a rift of the rigid structure of biomass fibers. The rapid pressure relief fraying the cellulose bundles and this results in an improved accessibility of the cellulose for enzymatic hydrolysis and fermentation (Tanahashi M., 1990).

Pre-treatments of lignocellulose by steam explosion offer different advantages (Garrote G. et al, 1999):

- No chemical materials are used except water;

- A low amount of unwanted byproducts is generated;

- No acid handling and recycling and consequently a reduced corrosion tank to the mild pH of reaction media.
2.5.3 Trace Metals Addition.

The influence of the adding of trace metals on the performance of bioreactors has been an important subject area field in anaerobic processes, as metals are required in the enzymatic activities of acidogenesis and methanogenesis (Qing-Hao H. et al., 2008). Minuscule quantities of the trace elements such as zinc, nickel, cobalt, copper, selenium, chromium, tungsten, molybdenum, manganese are required in anaerobic digestion processes were labeled essential trace elements (Franzle and Markert, 2002). Positive effects have been obtained mainly by the addition of single or more trace elements in anaerobic digestion processes because the trace components are an essential co-factor of the enzymes involved in the biochemical pathway of methane production (Zandvoort M.H. et al., 2006, Fermoso F.G. et al., 2009, Karlsson A. et al., 2012). Table (2.2) shows a functions of elements was used in AD experiment adapted from (Kayhanian and Rich, 1995).
Table (2.2): Functions of elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cobalt. Co</td>
<td>Corrinoids, CODH</td>
<td>Cobalt is present in specific enzymes and corrinoids. The common enzyme carbon monoxide dehydrogenase (CODH) uses cobalt. CODH plays an essential role in Acetogenic (acetate-forming) activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickel, Ni</td>
<td>CODH, synthesis of F_{430}, essential for sulfate reducing bacteria, aids CO_{2}/H_{2} conversion.</td>
<td>Many anaerobic bacteria are dependent on nickel when carbon dioxide (CO_{2}) and hydrogen (H_{2}) are the sole sources of energy. Most nickel is taken up by cells in a compound named F factor 430 (F_{430}). F_{430} has been found in every methanogenic bacterium ever examined. In addition, CODH is a nickel protein and may aid sulfur-reducing bacteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc, Zn</td>
<td>FDH, CODH, hydrogenase</td>
<td>Zinc is present in relatively large concentrations in many methanogens. It may be part of formate dehydrogenase (FDH), super dismutase (SODH) and hydrogenase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Composition of Biogas.

Biogas produced by anaerobic degradation through bacterial reactions of organic material consisting mainly of two major components methane (CH\(_4\)) and carbon dioxide (CO\(_2\)). Additionally, small traces of other gases, including hydrogen sulfide (H\(_2\)S), water vapor (H\(_2\)O), ammonia (NH\(_3\)), hydrogen (H\(_2\)), oxygen (O\(_2\)) and nitrogen (N\(_2\)) (Yadvika S. et al., 2004, Geo J. et al., 2014). Typical composition of biogas in volume fractions as obtained from various sources as shown in table (2.3), the great variation happens in the composition of biogas, predominantly caused by differences in feedstocks and operating conditions (Massoud K. et al., 2007, Alexopoulos S., 2012).

**Table (2.3):** Typical Composition of biogas in volume fraction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Volume Fraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>CH(_4)</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon dioxide</td>
<td>CO(_2)</td>
<td>25-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen</td>
<td>H(_2)</td>
<td>0-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen sulfide</td>
<td>H(_2)S</td>
<td>20-20,000ppm (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia</td>
<td>NH(_3)</td>
<td>0-0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water vapor</td>
<td>H(_2)O</td>
<td>2-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxygen</td>
<td>O(_2)</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>N(_2)</td>
<td>0-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7 Upgrading of Biogas.

To achieve a biogas enriched in a methane (CH\textsubscript{4}) the upgrading technologies are required to eliminate the percentage of carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}), hydrogen sulphide (H\textsubscript{2}S) and water vapor to allowed value be used in many application (Harasimowicz M. et al., 2007). There are four main technologies used for upgrading a biogas such as adsorption, absorption, cryogenic separation and membrane separation (Starr K. et al., 2012).

2.7.1 Adsorption technology.

Adsorption technology accomplished by feeding the biogas on the surface of molecular sieves at high temperature and pressure such as, silica, alumina, activated carbon or silicates, the CO\textsubscript{2}, H\textsubscript{2}S, moisture and other impurities simultaneously removed from biogas by transfer it to surface of molecular sieves as a result of physical or Vander wall forces (Kapdi S.S. et al., 2005).

2.7.2 Absorption technology.

Absorption technology is classified to physical and chemical absorption, the easiest and cheapest method in physical absorption is the feeding the compressed biogas to bottom of packed bed column and pressurized water used as an absorbent is sprayed from the top, the CO\textsubscript{2} as well as H\textsubscript{2}S are dissolved in water and collected at the bottom of the column, whilst, chemical absorption based on used chemical solvents such as aqueous solutions of amines or alkaline salts (Kapdi S.S. et al., 2005).
2.7.3 Cryogenic separation technology.

Cryogenic separation includes separation of biogas composition by fractional condensations and distillations at low temperatures, the biogas is cooled until the CO$_2$ changes to a liquid or solid phase while the methane remains in multiple stages compression to high pressure with drying to avoid freezing in inter-cooling, and the CO$_2$ will condensate and removed by a separator (Ryckebosch E. et al., 2011).

2.7.4 Membrane separation technology.

Membrane separation technology have been known as one of the most efficient methods for upgrading biogas from the carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulfide by using gas permeation membranes (Favre E. et al., 2009).
2.8 Production of Synthesis gas.

For the application of Fischer - Tropsch synthesis reaction to liquid fuel production the gas mix is required as the main reactant material called synthesis gas, the synthesis gas is a mix of hydrogen (H₂) and carbon monoxide (CO), may be created by reforming, partial oxidation or autothermal reforming of methane gas generated from many types of material such as natural gas, petroleum coke, coal, and biomass (Wilhelm D.J. et al., 2001, Lavoie JM., 2014).

The reforming process is classified to steam and dry reforming, the steam reforming (SR) is a highly endothermic reaction as shown in equation (2.14), in this process the methane gas is mix with excess amount of steam in presence of metal based catalysts in the reformer at temperature about 900 °C and pressure 30 bar to generate a high ratio of syngas (H₂/CO = 3), appropriate for ammonia production, the produced carbon monoxide (CO) have additional reaction with steam to generate further hydrogen and carbon dioxide by the water gas shift (WGS) reaction as shown in equation (2.15)(Gangadharan P. et al., 2012). While, the dry reforming (DR) is performed by mix of CH₄ with CO₂ as shown in equation (2.16) the reaction also is a highly endothermic like steam reforming and accorded in existence of metal based catalysts at high temperature more than 750°C, the produced syngas ratio (H₂/CO =1) appropriate for Fischer–Tropsch synthesis reaction. (Goula M. A. et al. 2015, Charisiou N.D. et al, 2016).

\[ CH_4 + H_2O \rightarrow CO + 3H_2 \quad \Delta H^\circ = 241 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \quad (2.14) \]
\[ CO + H_2O \leftrightarrow CO_2 + H_2 \quad \Delta H^\circ = -41 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \quad (2.15) \]
\[ CH_4 + CO_2 \rightarrow 2CO + 2H_2 \quad \Delta H^\circ = 247 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \quad (2.16) \]
In general, the partial oxidation reaction is a slightly exothermic reaction carried out by reacting a methane and oxygen with or without presence of metal catalyst as shown in equation (2.17), the reaction temperatures more than 1127 °C for the reaction without catalyst, whilst 727-927°C with catalysts the product synthesis ratio (H₂/CO= 2) appropriate for Fischer–Tropsch synthesis reaction (Kleinert A. et al, 2006).

$$\text{CH}_4 + \frac{1}{2} \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO} + 2\text{H}_2 \quad \Delta H^\circ = -36 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \quad (2.17)$$

The integration of steam and dry methane reforming with partial oxidation (POX) of methane in a single reactor to produce a syngas as shown in equation (2.18) the processes is known as autothermal reforming (ATR), the partial oxidation happens in an upper zone at the inlet of the reactor for providing heat to the steam reforming reaction that happening in a lower zone packed with metal catalyst, the product synthesis ratio (H₂/CO) in the range from about 2 to 3.5 appropriate for Fischer–Tropsch synthesis reaction (Araki S., et al, 2010).

$$\text{CH}_4 + \frac{1}{2} x \text{O}_2 + y \text{CO}_2 + (1 - x - y)\text{H}_2\text{O} \leftrightarrow (y + 1)\text{CO} + (3 - x - y)\text{H}_2 \quad (2.18)$$
2.9 Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis (FTS).

Fischer–Tropsch synthesis was developed in the 1920s by Franz Fischer and Hans Tropsch, is a set of catalytic processes that can be used to produce fuels and chemicals from synthesis gas (syngas) which is a mixture of carbon monoxide (CO) and hydrogen (H₂) (Iglesia E., 1997). Syngas can be derived from natural gas, coal, or biomass, the raw material is converted first into syngas, then subsequently reacted to form hydrocarbons via Fischer-Tropsch synthesis as shown scheme diagram in **Figure 2.2**, the process is named according to the feedstock: Gas-To-Liquid (GTL), Biomass-To-Liquid (BTL) and Coal-To-Liquid (CTL) (Dry E. M., 2002, Rostrup-Nielsen J.R., 2000, Vliet O.P.R. et al., 2009).

![Scheme diagram of overall Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis process.](image-url)

**Figure 2.2** Scheme diagram of overall Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis process.
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The fuels and chemical feedstock produced from Fischer-Tropsch synthesis not produce environmentally destructive compounds encountered in direct hydrogenation (Rofer-Depoorter C.K., 1981).

A various types of reactors (multi-tubular fixed-bed reactor; bubble column slurry reactor; bubbling fluidized-bed reactor; three-phase fluidized bed reactor; and circulating fluidized-bed reactor), have been considered in the history of FTS process development. (Rahimpour and Elekaei, 2009a, Rahimpour and Elekaei, 2009b).

Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is technically classified into two categories, the High Temperature Fischer-Tropsch (HTFT) and the Low Temperature Fischer-Tropsch (LTFT) processes. The standard for this categorization is the operating temperature of the synthesis (Leckel D., 2009, Dry M.E., 1999).
2.9.1 Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis reactions.

Fischer-Tropsch synthesis process includes a simultaneous great number of reactions and the product spectrum involving of a complex multi component mixture of linear and branched hydrocarbons and oxygenated products (Choudhury and Moholkar, 2013a). These products can be a mixture of alkanes, alkenes, aromatics, ring compounds and the oxygenated compounds are comprised of mainly alcohols as well as some acids, ketones and aldehydes (Liu Y. et al., 2007a) the general reactions of FTS are summarized as follows:

Paraffins:

\[(2n + 1)H_2 + nCO \rightarrow C_nH_{(2n+2)} + nH_2O \quad (2.19)\]

Olefins:

\[2nH_2 + nCO \rightarrow C_nH_{2n} + nH_2O \quad (2.20)\]

Oxygenates:

\[2nH_2 + nCo \rightarrow C_nH_{2n}O + (n − 1)H_2O \quad (2.21)\]

Water gas shift reaction (WGS) as a side reaction:

\[CO + H_2O \leftrightarrow CO_2 + H_2 \quad (2.22)\]

A simplified represent for overall stoichiometry F-T synthesis reaction is:

\[CO + \left(1 + \frac{m}{2n}\right)H_2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{n}C_nH_m + H_2O \quad (2.23)\]

The mixture of products depends on the reaction and operating conditions, such as reactor temperature, pressure, feed gas composition (H$_2$ to CO ratio), space velocity and the types of catalysts and promoters used (Dry M. E., 1996).
2.9.2 Catalysts for Fischer-Tropsch synthesis.

The most common Fischer-Tropsch catalysts are Co, Fe, Ru, and Ni (Rafiq M. H. et al., 2011). Mainly iron- and cobalt-base catalyst are employed in industrial applications. Iron catalyst is inexpensive, has a high water–gas shift (WGS) activity and so it is best suitable for CO rich syngas. Though, it is prone to exhaustion and the water produced by the F-T synthesis may decrease its activity, whilst, the cobalt-based catalyst has more activity and longer life than iron catalyst due to it is not inhibited by water more resistant to exhaustion as well as has a little WGS activity and so it is best suitable for H2-rich syngas (Dry E. M., 2002).

Nickel is the typical FT catalyst for producing higher molecular weight hydrocarbons, but at high pressure it tends to form nickel carbonyl, and with increasing the reaction temperature the selectivity changes mostly to methane. This trend is found also with Cobalt and Ruthenium but less immoderate, Ruthenium shows the highest catalytic activity for producing long chain hydrocarbons at low reaction temperature, but, it is very expensive and a limited world resource and so it is not considered a sustainable option for use in industrial (Schulz H., 1999).

The most common supports used for cobalt and Iron based catalyst were alumina (Al2O3), zeolites, silica (SiO2), titanium (TiO2), activated carbon (C) and magnesia (MgO) (Zhang J. et al., 2002).

Iron catalysts are used for High Temperature Fischer-Tropsch (HTFT) processes, whereas both Fe and Co are appropriate for Low Temperature Fischer-Tropsch (LTFT) processes (Dry E. M., 2002). Tables (2.4 and 2.5) summarizing parameter studies by using Iron and Cobalt based catalyst.
Table (2.4): Summary Parameter studies by using Iron–based catalysts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Reactor</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>H₂/CO</th>
<th>Flow Rate</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe–Cu–K</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>493–542 K</td>
<td>10.9–30.9 bar</td>
<td>0.98–2.99</td>
<td>SV= 4000 –10 000 h⁻¹</td>
<td>Wang Y.N.  et al.,2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/Cu/K/Sio₂</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>250°C</td>
<td>1.48 Mpa</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2NL/gcat. h</td>
<td>Bukur D. B.  et al.,2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/Mn/Cu/K/Sio₂, Fe/Mn/K/Sio₂, Fe/Mn/Sio₂</td>
<td>CSTR</td>
<td>543K</td>
<td>1.5 Mpa</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2000-4000 h⁻¹</td>
<td>Zhang C.H. et al., 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/Cu/K/Sio₂</td>
<td>SBO</td>
<td>240-270 °C</td>
<td>20-30 atm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farias F.E.M.  et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/Sio₂</td>
<td>CSTR</td>
<td>513-553 K</td>
<td>1-2.85 Mpa</td>
<td>0.4-2</td>
<td>W/F=7.5 gcat. h/mol</td>
<td>Hayakawa H.  et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100Fe,FeCr,,FeMn,FeMo,FeTa ,FeV,FeW,FeZr</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>280 °C</td>
<td>1.8 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60 cm³/min (STP)</td>
<td>Lohitharn N.  et al., 2008a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td>Reactor</td>
<td>Temperature/Pressure</td>
<td>Gas Velocity</td>
<td>Conversion/Selectivity</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100Fe,100Fe1.5K,100Fe2.5K,100Fe4K,100Fe9K,FeMn,FeMn2.5K,FeMn4K,FeMn6.5K,FeMn9K</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>280 °C</td>
<td>1.8 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60 cm³/min (STP)</td>
<td>Lohitharn N. et al., 2008b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe-Cu-La/SiO₂</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>290 °C</td>
<td>17 bar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GHSV = 4.0 NL·h⁻¹·g⁻¹Fe.</td>
<td>Pour A. N. et al., 2008b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/Cu/SiO₂,Fe/Cu/La/SiO₂,Fe/Cu/Mg/SiO₂,Fe/Cu/Ca/SiO₂</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>563K</td>
<td>1.7Mpa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.86&amp;13.28 NLh⁻¹gcat⁻¹</td>
<td>Pour A. N. et al., 2008c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/K-free,Fe/K–ZSM-5,Fe/K–SiO₂,Fe/K–Al₂O₃</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>250 °C</td>
<td>1.50MPa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV= 4000 h⁻¹</td>
<td>Zhao G. et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe100/K1.4/Si4.6/Cu2.0</td>
<td>CSTR</td>
<td>270 °C</td>
<td>1.3 MPa</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.0 SL/(h g Fe)</td>
<td>Luo M. et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe–Cu–K/SiO₂</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>553 K</td>
<td>1.0 MPa</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>W/F = 5 g h/mol.</td>
<td>Zhang Y. et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/K/Al₂O₃</td>
<td>CSTR</td>
<td>240-270 °C</td>
<td>20-30 atm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50Nml/min.</td>
<td>Farias F.E.M. et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>SV/WF</td>
<td>Reaction Conditions</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/K₂O/SiO₂</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>275°C</td>
<td>10 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2ml/min</td>
<td>Wonga and Coville, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe, Fe/Cu, Fe/Ca, Fe/Mg, Fe/K</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>533-573 K</td>
<td>3Mpa</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>SV(W/F)=13-20gm h/mol.</td>
<td>Kumabe K. et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/Cu/K/SiO₂</td>
<td>SBCR</td>
<td>265°C</td>
<td>2.5Mpa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.61-3.92L/g cat.</td>
<td>Jung H. et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe/Mn with promoter (Zn, Rb, Cs, K and Ce)</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>230, 240, 250, 260, 270, 280, 290 and 300</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 20 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV = 1000, 1100, 1200, 1300, 1400, 1500 and 1600(h⁻¹)</td>
<td>Feyzi M. et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fe, Mn)/SiO₂</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>250 and 260 °C</td>
<td>1 bar</td>
<td>1.5 and 2</td>
<td>GHSV = 1000 and 1100 h⁻¹</td>
<td>Feyzi M. et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>593 K</td>
<td>1, 1.5 and 2 MPa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV = 1800 - 3600 h⁻¹</td>
<td>Choudhury and Moholkar, 2013b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (2.5): Summary Parameter studies by using cobalt-based catalysts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Reactor</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>H$_2$/CO</th>
<th>Flow Rate</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co/Rurchemie</td>
<td>SLR</td>
<td>220-240 °C</td>
<td>0.5-1.5 MPa</td>
<td>1.5 to 3.5</td>
<td>SV=0.085 and 0.008 L (STP)/min/g$_{cat}$</td>
<td>Yates and Satterfield, 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Co/Al$_2$O$_3$  
Pt/ Co/Al$_2$O$_3$  
Ru/Co/Al$_2$O$_3$ | CSTR | 493 K | 1.8MPa | 2 | - | Jacobs G. et al., 2002 |
<p>| CoN373, CoN423, CoN673, CoAc443, CoAc493,CoAc673 | FBR | 463 K | 1 atm. | 2 | - | Girardon J.S. et al., 2005a |
| CoAc673, CoAc443, CoN673, CoN423, RuCoN673, RuCoAc673, RuCoAc443, ReCoAc673 | FBR | - | 1 atm. | 2 | - | Girardon J. S. et al., 2005b |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst(s)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Pressure</th>
<th>Flow rate/GHSV</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co/TiO$_2$, Co/Mn/TiO$_2$</td>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>220 °C</td>
<td>1, 4, 8, 18 bars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flow rate=1, 4, 8, and 18 ml/min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPtZrO$_2$/Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>473-493 K</td>
<td>0.5-2.5 MPa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV = 200, 500 and 1000 mL.h$^{-1}$.g$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al$_2$O$_3$-473, CoPt/Al$_2$O$_3$-473</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>443-483 K</td>
<td>1 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV = 1800 cm$^3$/g/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al$_2$O$_3$-613, CoPt/Al$_2$O$_3$-613</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>463 K</td>
<td>1 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al$_2$O$_3$-673, CoPt/Al$_2$O$_3$-773</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>483 K</td>
<td>20 bar</td>
<td>1 to 2.1</td>
<td>(GHSV)=3, 6, 3 and 12Ndm$^3$/gcat. h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/γ-Al$_2$O$_3$, Co-Re/γ-Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>220 °C</td>
<td>1 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(GHSV)=3010 h$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/SiO$_2$</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>503 K</td>
<td>0.2 to 2 Mpa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td>Reactor</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>W/F (CO+H₂)</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/SiO₂</td>
<td>TBR</td>
<td>230 °C</td>
<td>2.1 MPa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Liu X. et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/SiO₂</td>
<td>CSTR</td>
<td>230°C</td>
<td>10 bars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2SL h⁻¹ g⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Zn/TiO₂</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>220 °C</td>
<td>8 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV= 400 h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al₂O₃</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>212 °C</td>
<td>20 bars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV= 5000 h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al₂O₃(SiO₂)</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>210 °C</td>
<td>2.0 MPa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV= 8000 h⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%Co/SBA-15</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>210 °C</td>
<td>2 atm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GHSV= 1800 ml/g_cat . h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%Co/0.5Ru/SBA-15</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>190 °C</td>
<td>1 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%Co/0.1Ru/SBA-15</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>220 °C</td>
<td>20 bars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoSi1</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>190 °C</td>
<td>1 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoRuSi1</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>190 °C</td>
<td>1 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoSi2</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>190 °C</td>
<td>1 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoRuSi2</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>190 °C</td>
<td>1 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoSi3</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>190 °C</td>
<td>1 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoRuSi3</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>190 °C</td>
<td>1 atm.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mnqanqeni and Coville, 2008
Marie A. J. et al., 2009
Karaca H. et al., 2009
Xiong H. et al., 2009
Hong J. et al., 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalysts</th>
<th>Reaction Conditions</th>
<th>Catalyst Yields</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoMCM-41, CoZrMCM-41, CoZrMCM-41, CoZrMCM-41, CoZrSBA-15, CoZrSBA-15, CoZrSBA-15, CoZrSBA-15</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>473K</td>
<td>1 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/γ-Al2O3</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>488, 492, 494 and 513K</td>
<td>2000 kPa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/γ-Al2O3, Co-foam</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>203, 217,223 and 240 °C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al2O3, Ca-Co/Al2O3, Mg-Co/Al2O3, K-Co/Al2O3, Na-Co/Al2O3</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>210–300 °C</td>
<td>20 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPt/Al2O3-N1, CoPt/Al2O3-N2, CoPt/Al2O3-A</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>493 K</td>
<td>20 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al2O3, Co/bentonite, Co/TiO2, Co/SiC</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>210–300 °C</td>
<td>20 bars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td>Reaction Conditions</td>
<td>GHSV</td>
<td>Conversion (%)</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPt/Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>493 K</td>
<td>0.5, 2, 4</td>
<td>Sadeqzadeh M. et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Sorb(2)/SiO$_2$</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>190 °C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hong J. et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Sorb(5)/SiO$_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Sorb(10)/SiO$_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/SiO$_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>210–300 °C</td>
<td>0.5 to 2</td>
<td>Osa A.R. et al., 2011 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca–Co/Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>473 K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rafiq M.H. et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuO/CoO/Cr$_2$O$_3$ (+ MFI Zeolite)</td>
<td>FBR</td>
<td>225–325 °C</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>Mohanty P. et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CuO/CoO/Cr$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Co/SiC</td>
<td>BSI R</td>
<td>220–250 °C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Osa A.R. et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Co/2Ca/SiC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20Co/SiC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20Co/2Ca/SiC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>WHSV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>CSTR</td>
<td>220°C</td>
<td>2.2 MPa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/γ-Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>FPR</td>
<td>220–240 °C</td>
<td>25 bar</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10Co/ TiO$_2$</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>220°C</td>
<td>25 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5% Pt–25% Co/Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>CSTR</td>
<td>220°C</td>
<td>1.9 MPa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPt/C-SiO$_2$</td>
<td>PFR</td>
<td>220°C</td>
<td>20 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/γ-Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>PTR</td>
<td>220°C</td>
<td>1 bar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.9.3 Mechanisms of Fischer –Tropsch Synthesis.

Fisher- Tropsch synthesis mechanisms of different types of catalysts have been the primary aim of many studies for the formation of the products, the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis is a polymerization reaction with the following steps (Adesina A.A., 1997, Rofer-Depoorter C.K., 1981).

1- Reactant adsorption.

2- Chain initiation.

3- Chain growth.

4- Chain termination.

5- Product description.

6- Readesorption and further reaction.

In general, four mechanistic (Alkyl , Alkenyl, Enol mechanism and CO-insertion mechanism )were established for the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis, which differs in their path to demonstrate activation of CO, formation of monomer species, and adding of monomers to growing chains (Overett M.J. et al., 2000, Davis B.H., 2001, Gaube and Klein, 2008, Teng B. et al., 2005).
2.9.3.1 Alkyl mechanism.

The most common mechanism accepted for chain growth in Fischer-Tropsch synthesis reaction is a Alkyl mechanism as shown in the Figure 2.3, in this mechanism the chain initiation occurs by dissociation of adsorbed CO to surface C and O atoms, Surface C hydrogenate by adsorbed H$_2$ to yielding in a successive reaction CH$_2$ and CH$_3$ surface species, Where the chain initiator is CH$_3$ surface species and the monomer for reaction scheme is CH$_2$ surface species, Then the Chain growth is thought to take place by consecutive combination of methylene surface species (CH$_2$),then, α-olefins is generate by elimination of β-hydride, or alkanes generation by reduction of surface hydride at termination (Overett M.J. et al., 2000).

![Figure 2.3 Alkyl mechanism.](image-url)
2.9.3.2 Alkenyl mechanism.

In the alkenyl mechanism as shown in Figure 2.4, the surface methylene species is taken into account as a monomer unit which reacts with surface methyne to generate surface vinyl species (−CH = CH₂) by reaction initiated, then the chain growth occurs by reaction of vinyl species with the monomer unit (=CH₂) to generate an allyl species (−CH₂CH=CH₂), then Alkenyl species (−CH=CHCH₃) formed as a result of allyl species isomerization. Sequentially the reaction between surface hydrogen and the surface alkenyl species generating α-olefins at Chain termination (Ail and Dasappa, 2016).

![Figure 2.4 Alkenyl mechanism.](image-url)
2.9.3.3 Enol mechanism.

In this mechanism as shown in Figure 2.5, the adsorbed CO Hydrogenate by adsorbed hydrogen to form enol surface species (HCOH), Chain growth ensues by a collection of two reactions, condensation reaction between enol species and by the elimination of water, the branched hydrocarbons are produced as a result of existence of a CHROH surface species (Davis B.H., 2001).

**Initiation:**

![Initiation Diagram](image)

**Propagation:**

![Propagation Diagram](image)

**Termination / desorption:**

![Termination Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.5** Enol mechanism.
2.9.3.4 CO-insertion mechanism.

In this CO-insertion mechanism as shown in Figure 2.6, the adsorbed CO is proposition as the monomer and the surface methyl species as a chain initiator, as a result insertion of CO in the metal-alkyl bond the surface acyl species is formed and lead to growth of chain, enlarged alkyl species are formed will causing removal of O\textsubscript{2} from the surface species, the chain termination is occur, and the aldehydes and alcohols were formed due to existence of oxygenated compounds in this step (Teng B. et al., 2005, Ail and Dasappa, 2016).

**Figure 2.6** CO-insertion mechanism.
2.9.4 Product distribution or (product selectivity).

The distribution of the resultant carbon containing products in FT synthesis is usually denoted to as the product selectivity (Steynberg and Dry, 2004). In the latest period, several studies on FTS were focused on the dependence of the chain length distribution of hydrocarbons on catalyst type and reaction conditions. If the hydrocarbon chain is formed stepwise by insertion or addition of C\(_1\) intermediates with constant growth probability, then the chain length distribution is given by the ASF distribution equation (2.24) (Patzlaff J. et al., 1999). The products can be described by a single parameter, the chain growth probability or growth factor or \(\alpha\) (Rafiq M.H. et al., 2011, Schulz and Claeys, 1999):

\[
W_n = (\ln^2 \alpha) n \alpha
\]

(2.24)

Where:

\(W_n\) = weight fraction of the products.
\(n\) = carbon number.
\(\alpha\) = chain growth probability or growth factor.

The logarithmic form of this kinetic expression is shown below in equation (2.25):

\[
\log W_n/n = \log(\ln^2 \alpha) + n \log \alpha
\]

(2.25)

Where:

\(W_n/n\) = mole fraction.
According to the equation (2.25), a plot of logWn/n versus n should give a straight line (ASF plot). Nevertheless, in practice, the “ideal” molecular weight distributions were ever detected. The common studies on ASF plots showed a nearly straight line only in the C₄–C₁₂ region (Rafiq M.H. et al., 2011). The most common parameter effect on product distribution are temperature, pressure, GHSV or WHSV and H₂/CO as describes below (Pour A. N. et al., 2008a).
2.9.4.1 Parameter Effect on the catalyst activity and product selectivity of F-T Reaction.

The catalyst activity (CO conversion) and product selectivity of Fischer-Tropsch reaction are influenced by the process conditions, such as reactor temperature, space velocity, feed gas composition (H\textsubscript{2} to CO ratio), and pressure (Dry M. E., 1996). These parameters are discussed below.

2.9.4.1.1 Temperature.

One of the most significant parameters influenced on Fischer–Tropsch process is temperature because of the exothermic nature of its reaction. In this way, the temperature should be deliberately controlled and kept up within a constant range in order to stay away from temperature runaways that can prompt the transcendent arrangement of methane and fast catalyst deactivation (Steynberg A. and Dry M., 2004). It has been reported the conversion of Carbone monoxide (CO) was increased as a result reaction temperature was increased, which will lead to growth of reaction rate. As well as, the composition product shifts towards the production of methane and low molecular weight compounds, i.e. the average chain length of the products decreases (Osa A.R. et al., 2011c, Osa A.R. et al., 2012, Najafabadi A., 2016).

2.9.4.1.2 Pressure.

Pressure is an important parameter as it delivers a significant effect on product selection, increase of reaction pressure, leading to an increase in the CO conversion and the long chain hydrocarbons is likely to form that could possibly condense and saturate the catalyst pores by liquid product
(Choudhury and Moholkar, 2013b). The increase in pressure preferred to the formation of \( \text{C}_{8+} \) to \( \text{C}_{11+} \), while methane and other gaseous hydrocarbons decreased with an increase in pressure (Mohanty P. et al., 2011). In general, \( \text{C}^{5+} \) hydrocarbon selectivity increases obviously with increasing reaction pressure (Hayakawa H. et al., 2007, Farias F.E.M. et al., 2010).

2.9.4.1.3 H\(_2\)/CO Feed Ratio.

The \( \text{H}_2/\text{CO} \) ratio plays a vital role in higher hydrocarbon synthesis, it can affect both reaction rates and activity (Mohanty P. et al., 2011). At high \( \text{H}_2/\text{CO} \) ratio lead to decreases the yield of high molecular-weight hydrocarbons and low-molecular-weight hydrocarbons are increasing, chiefly methane (Yates and Satterfield, 1992). though, at lower ratio the conversion and the CH\(_4\) selectivity decreased, however the \( \text{C}^{5+} \) selectivity and the olefin/paraffin ratio for \( \text{C}_2-\text{C}_4 \) increased. (Tristantini D. et al., 2007, Najafabadi A., 2016 ), the \( \text{H}_2/\text{CO} \) equal 2 is most commonly used for cobalt based catalysts in order to reach a good activity in the Fischer-Tropsch reaction, while, the much lower than 2 used iron based catalysts due to their high WGS activity (Steynberg and Dry, 2004).

2.9.4.1.4 Space velocity.

Space velocity (SV) one of the main process conditions in Fisher-Tropsch reaction was focused about its influence by many studies, space velocity can be specified in terms of gas hourly space velocity (GHSV) or weight hourly space velocity (WHSV), which can be calculated as follows.

\[
\text{GHSV} = \frac{\dot{V}}{V_r \text{ or } V_{\text{cat}}} \quad \text{Unit is (h}^{-1} \text{)}
\]

(2.26)
Where:

\[ \dot{V} = \text{Volumetric flow rate of feed (m}^3/\text{h)} \]

\[ V_r \text{ or } V_{\text{Cat}} = \text{Volume of reactor or catalyst (m}^3) \]

\[ \text{WHSV} = \frac{\dot{m}}{m_{\text{cat.}}} \quad \text{Unit is} \quad (\text{h}^{-1}) \quad (2.27) \]

Where:

\[ \dot{m} = \text{mass flow rate of feed (Kg /h)} \]

\[ m_{\text{cat.}} = \text{mass of catalyst} \]

Since, space velocity has inverse proportionality with a residence time of reaction, conversion of carbon monoxide was decreased at increased GHSV, where, the selectivity to C\text{1–C}4 light hydrocarbons were increased and the selectivity to C\text{5+} decrease (Osa A.R. et al., 2011 c), while (Rafiq M.H. et al., 2011) described the conversion of synthesis gas, selectivity of methane and C\text{1–C}4 light decreased, while the selectivity and productivity to C\text{5+} increased with an increase of GHSV. On the other hand, (Mohanty P. et al., 2011) who noted carbon monoxide conversion decreases and hydrocarbon selectivity increased as result space velocity was increased at a specific value, then liquid hydrocarbon fraction (C\text{8+}) decreased as the space velocity was further increases in space velocity.
2.9.5 Fischer-Tropsch Reactors.

A various types of commercial scale reactors (multi-tubular fixed-bed reactor; bubble column slurry reactor; bubbling fluidized-bed reactor; three-phase fluidized bed reactor; and circulating fluidized-bed reactor), have been considered in the history of FTS process development. (Rahimpour and Elekai, 2009a, b). These early reactor types are the following (Sie and Krishna, 1999).

- A fixed-bed reactor with internal cooling operated at high conversion in a once-through mode. The catalyst was packed in a rectangular box and water-cooled tubes fitted with cooling plates at short distances were installed in the bed to remove the reaction heat. This type of reactor was applied in the atmospheric synthesis process.
- A multitubular reactor with sets of double concentric tubes, in which the catalyst occupied the annular space, surrounded by boiling water. This type of reactor was applied to gas at medium pressure.
- Adiabatic fixed-bed reactor with a single bed, large recycle of hot gas which was cooled externally.
- A fixed-bed reactor with multiple adiabatic beds, inter-bed quenching with cold feed gas, recycle of hot gas and external cooling.
- Adiabatic fixed-bed reactor with large recycle of heavy condensate passing in up flow through the bed. The liquid recycles stream was cooled externally.
- Slurry reactor with entrained solid catalyst, large recycle of hot oil and external cooling.
2.9.6 Catalyst Preparation Methods.

The Catalyst can be prepared by numerous sequential steps. Different supported metal and oxide catalysts are prepared by the sequence of impregnation, drying, calcination and activation. A solid catalysts can be prepared by the following methods (Haber J. et al., 1995, Perego and Villa, 1997, Regalbuto J., 2007, Schwarz J.A. et al., 1995).

2.9.6.1 Impregnation.

Impregnation is the most common methods involves in contacting a solid with a liquid containing the components to be deposited on the surface. During impregnation many different processes occur with different rates.

- Selective adsorption of species (charged or not) by coulomb force, van der Waals forces or H-bonds;
- Ion exchange between the charged surface and the electrolyle;
- Polymersation/depolymerisation of the species (molecules, ions) attached to the surface;
- Partial dissolution of the surface of the solid.

Impregnation can be ended by at least 8 different ways.
1-Impregnation by soaking, or with an excess of solution, 2-Dry or pore volume impregnation, 3-Incipient wetness impregnation, 4-Deposition by selective reaction with the surface of the support, 5-Impregnation by percolation, 6-Co-impregnation, 7-Succeasive impregnation and 8-Precipitation-deposition.
2.9.6.2 Precipitation and co-precipitation.

In all precipitations it is essential to wisely control all the details of the process including:

- The order and rate of addition of one solution into the other.
- The mixing procedure.
- The pH and variant of pH during the process.
- The ripening process.

Precipitation includes two distinctive processes, namely nucleation and growth.

In the co-precipitation of a phase connecting two (or several) elements, if one of them is contained in an anion and the second in a cation, the precipitate will have a fixed or at least very inflexible compositions. If both are cations (or both anions) the characteristics of the reactions with a common anion (or cation) of the solution, the solubility constants, and the super saturation values will all be different, and the properties of the precipitate will change with time.

2.9.6.3 Gel formation and related processes.

The gel can be done by a variety of different methods as follow as:

- Chemical reaction, e.g. formation of a tridimensional polymer by alkoxide hydrolysis (sol-gel process) and, more generally, by polymerisation (of an anion, such as molybdatc);
- complexation, e.g. with an acid-alcohol such as citric acid;
- Freeze drying;
- Addition of a gum or a gelling agent (hydroxymethyl cellulose, etc.).
2.9.6.4 Selective removal.

Selective removal is a method used for very few, but important catalysts. Raney Ni is a representative of this group. Starting from a relatively coarse powder of an alloy (e.g. NiAl\textsubscript{x}, constituted of several phases in the present practice), one component (Al) is removed by a leaching agent (NaOH) leaving the active agent (Ni) in a relatively highly dispersed form.

2.9.7 Catalyst Characterization.

The characterization of catalyst is carried out to determine catalyst properties such as the surface area and pore size, active phase in the catalyst, moisture retention, and suitable reduction temperatures for the catalyst activation procedures, extent of coke and wax deposition during reaction, etc. Many techniques are used to studied the characterization of catalyst, such as BET surface area, pore diameter and volume determination, and scanning electron microscopy (SEM), X-ray diffraction (XRD), temperature programmed reduction (TPR), temperature programmed desorption (TPD) and thermo-gravimetric analysis (TGA) (Fei J.H. et al., 2004).

2.9.8 Operating Modes.

As mentioned, FTS is technically classified into two categories: HTFT and LTFT processes. The standard for this categorization is the operating temperature of the deduction, which runs between 310-340 °C for the HTFT process and 210-260 °C for the LTFT process (Leckel D., 2009). The mode of FT operation has a significant influence on the nature and composition of the products obtained from the synthesis reaction. LTFT’ products are mainly diesel and waxes, whereas HTFT products are mainly alkenes and gasoline (Dry M. E., 1999, 2001).
Chapter Three: Materials and Methods

This chapter describes the strategy that was planned for the experimental work, experiment and analysis laboratory equipment, analytical methods and procedures that are followed for optimization of biogas production by anaerobic digestion process, catalyst preparation and Fischer-Tropsch synthesis reaction.

3.1 Raw materials, experimental and analysis equipment, analytical methods and procedures for biogas production anaerobic digestion Process.

3.1.1 Municipal Solid Wastes (MSW).

MSW typically consists of food waste, garden waste, paper products, plastics, textiles, wood, metals, construction demolition waste and soils. The composition of MSW varies from region to region as it depends upon lifestyle, demographic features and legislation. Table (3.1) shows the different types of materials and their proportions selected to simulate a MSW for laboratory applications at reference percentage 60% and corrected percentage to 100 % degradable material. The MSW was prepared weighting the required amount of the fresh individual, adding a volume of deionized water equals to 24 %wt. of the total amount, and mixing until the moisture distribution appears homogenous (Krishna et al., 2009).
Table (3.1): Materials used for simulating the MSW and its composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>60 % by Weight</th>
<th>100 % by Weight</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden waste</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Branch and leaves size less than 1 mm wide and 12 mm long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Waste</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Greens (approximately cut into 6.33 mm size)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Ground beef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellulose Non-paper Material</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>White wheat bread (size less than 7-10 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Waste</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Plain paper shredded (Approximately less than 3 mm wide by 25 mm long)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Giant reed (GR).

Giant reed (Arundo donax) was collected from Torre Lama (Campania, Italy) agro-land. The leaves were separated from stems, washed, dried overnight at 80\(^\circ\)C and minced with a chopper. The powder was perpetrated in by steam explosion at 210 \(^\circ\)C for 6 min in the ENEA Research Center of Trisaia (Matera, Italy).
3.1.3 Inoculum.

Sewage sludge was obtained from a primary sludge digester of a municipal wastewater treatment plant of Nola (NA), Italy. Firstly, the anaerobic consortium was adapted to a synthetic medium containing D-glucose 10 g/L as sole carbon source, supplemented with (Na$_2$HPO$_4$ 7.0 g/L, KH$_2$PO$_4$ 3.0 g/L, NaCl 0.5 g/L, NH$_4$Cl 1.0 g/L), the two phosphate salts Na$_2$HPO$_4$ and KH$_2$PO$_4$, in addition to being a source of phosphorus, acting as a buffer for pH fluctuations to maintain the values close to neutrality, while sodium chloride instead serves to adjust the osmotic pressure to maintaining the solution isotonic and the ammonium chloride is the source of nitrogen, then the saline solution (CuSO$_4$ . 5H$_2$O 0.125 g/L, ZnSO$_4$ . 7H$_2$O. 0.72 g/L, MnCl$_2$ . 4H$_2$O 0.50 g/L, CaCO$_3$ 1.0 g/L, MgSO$_4$ 62.09 g/L, FeSO$_4$ . 7H$_2$O 4.75 g/L, CoSO$_4$ . 7H$_2$O 0.14 g/L, H$_3$BO$_3$ 0.03 g/L and 37% HCl 25.6 mL) provides the trace elements were added that is necessary for microbial growth. Resazurin (0.025% w/v) was also added as anaerobiosis indicator (Toscano et al, 2013). The microbiological consortium obtained was used as inoculum.
3.1.4 Trace elements.

Metal compounds (NiCl$_2$.6H$_2$O, ZnSO$_4$.2H$_2$O and CoSO$_4$.7H$_2$O) were weighted and added directly into the batch bioreactors, according to the desired amount of elements Ni, Zn and Co, the weight of each compound was calculated based on the following equation:

\[
C_E = \frac{WC \times \left(\frac{Mi}{Mc}\right)}{V}
\]  

(3.1)

Where:

$C_E =$ Concentration of desired elements (mg/L).

$WC =$ Required weight of compound (mg).

$Mi =$ Molecular weight of the element (g/mole).

$Mc =$ Molecular weight of the compound (g/mole).

$V =$ Working volume (L).
3.1.5 Chemical analysis of the liquid phase producing from anaerobic digestion processes.

The chemical analysis for the liquid phase production from anaerobic digestion after the sample centrifugation at 2200 RPM for 10 minutes and filtration with 0.2 μm cut-off filters, concerns on the estimation of biomass growth (microbial biomass), reducing sugars (colorimetric method) or glucose (enzymatic) and volatile fatty acids and alcohols.

3.1.5.1 Measurement of biomass growth (microbial biomass).

The concentration of biomass is monitored by measuring the optical absorbance of liquid samples at wavelength 600 nm. The concentration of microbial biomass in culture medium, after measurement of the optical absorbance, is calculated in terms of dry biomass (mg/mL) by using a calibration curve relating dried biomass to absorbance at 600 nm as shown in (Appendix C).

3.1.5.2 Measurement of reducing sugars (colorimetric method) or glucose (enzymatic).

The concentration of glucose was measured following a modified Nelson-Somogyi method for reducing sugars (Pirozzi et al., 2013). In the first a standard glucose solution (Stock solution) was prepared by dissolving 100 mg glucose in 100 mL of distilled water in a volumetric flask (to obtaining a concentration of 1 mg / mL). Then 10 mL of a Stock solution diluted by adding 90 mL of water (to obtaining a concentration of 0.1 mg / mL or 100µg/mL). Subsequently, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4 and 0.5 mL of this solution were taken and placed in test tubes, and in each was added distilled water to obtain
a final volume of 2 mL. Then, after adding 1 mL of alkaline copper tartrate solution (see composition in appendix A), the tubes were vortex and placed in a boiling water bath for 10 min. After the tubes were cooling down it was added 1 mL of arsenomolybdate reagent (see composition in appendix A) and then distilled water added to obtain a final volume of 10 mL. Finally, for each sample it was measured the optical density at 620 nm. Then plot a standard calibration curve of OD at 620nm vs. glucose concentration (µg/µl) as shown in (Appendix A).

In each test, 0.1 mL sample from the batch reactor was taken and diluted 10 times. Then, 0.2 mL of the diluted sample was placed in a test tube, then distilled water was added to obtain a final volume of 2 mL. Subsequently, after adding 1 mL of alkaline copper tartrate solution, the tube was vortex and placed in a boiling water bath for 10 min. After cooling down it was added 1 mL of arsenomolybdate reagent and then distilled water added to obtain a final volume of 10 mL. Finally, the optical density was measured at 620 nm.
3.1.5.3 Analysis of Volatile Fatty Acids (VFAs) and Alcohols.

The concentration of VFAs (acetic acid, butyric acid, and propionic acid), ethanol and liquid phase composition produced from Fischer-Tropsch synthesis reactions, were determined by GC analysis, using a Shimadzu GC-17A equipped with a FID detector and a capillary column with a PEG stationary phase (BP20, 30 m by 0.32 mm i.d., 0.25 μm film thickness, from SGE). Samples of 1μL were injected with a split-ratio of 1:10. Helium was fed as carrier gas with a flow rate of 6.5 mL/min. Injector and detector temperatures have been set to 320 °C and 250 °C, respectively. The initial column temperature was set to 30 °C, kept for 3 min, following a ramp of 10 °C/min till 140 °C, and kept constant for 1 min. The calibration (see in appendix B) of each species we were made by analyzing of different concentration solutions (mg / mL). Each solution was prepared by mixing: 500 μL of sample and 50 μL standard solutions (3.6 mL of distilled water and 40μL of 1-pentanol). For each sample three tests were carried out.

3.1.5.4 Power of Hydrogen (pH).

pH was measured by using a pH-meter (WTW, Germany). The probe of pH meter was calibrated before each days of pH measurement, by using buffer solutions of pH 4.0, 7.0 and 9.
3.1.6 Chemical analysis of the gas phase (Biogas) production anaerobic digestion processes and gas phase products from FT reaction.

The composition of the biogas (CH₄, H₂ and CO₂), synthesis gas and produced gas phase from FTS reaction were determined by using gas chromatography analysis, using a HP 5890 (GC) equipped with a thermal conductivity detector (TCD), flame ionization detector (FID) and a molecular sieve capillary column. The calibration curves (see in appendix B) of each species we were made by analyzing a different volume percentage (V/V).

3.1.7 Analysis of Total solid (TS), Total volatile solids (TVS), Moisture content and Ash percentage.

TS and TVS, Moisture and Ash percentage of raw material used as degradable material for anaerobic digestion process. Were measured by standard methods 2540B, 2540E (APHA, 2005) as follow as.

The characterization of raw materials (MSW and GR) is shown in table (3.2).

**Table (3.2):** Characterization of raw materials (MSW and GR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Municipal Solid Waste</th>
<th>GR (Arundo donax)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moisture %</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total solid (%)</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volatile solid (%)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash %</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.7.1 Total solid percent (%TS).

A well-mixed sample is evaporated in a weighed dish and dried to constant weight in an oven at 103 to 105°C. The increase in weight over that of the empty dish represents the total solids. The total solids in percentage of wet samples are calculated as:

\[
\% \text{TS} = \frac{(A-B)}{(C-B)} \times 100
\]  (3.2)

Where:

- \(A\) = weight of the dish (g) + weight of dried residue (g).
- \(B\) = weight of the dish (g).
- \(C\) = weight of the dish (g) + weight of wet sample (g).

3.1.7.2 Total volatile solids (%TVS).

The residue from the total solids determination is ignited to constant weight at 550°C. The remaining solids represent the fixed total, dissolved, or suspended solids while the weight lost on ignition is the volatile solids. Total volatile solids are determined as per calculation below. Its determination is useful in the control of biological treatment plant operation because it offers a rough approximation of the amount of organic matter present in the solid fraction of wastes.

\[
\% \text{TVS} = \frac{(A-D)}{(A-B)} \times 100
\]  (3.3)

Where:

- \(D\) = weight of residue (g) + dish after ignition (g).
3.1.7.3 Moisture content.

The moisture content is the loss of weight after drying a sample to a constant value in an oven at 103°C to 105°C. The expression for calculating moisture content as per below is on a wet basis.

\[
\% \text{ Moisture} = \frac{(w-d)}{(w)} \times 100
\]  

(3.4)

Where:

\(w\) = initial (wet) weight of sample (g).

\(d\) = final (dry) weight of sample (g).

3.1.7.4 Ash.

Its represent the amount of remaining solids percentage in dish after ignited to constant weight at 550°C. The Ash percentage of dry samples are calculated as deference between total solid and total volatile solids percentage as show below:

\[
\text{Ash \%} = \%TS - \%TVS
\]  

(3.5)
3.1.8 Batch anaerobic digestion experiments.

Crimped Pyrex bottles with preferable butyl rubber septa, with a working volume of 100 mL, were used as batch reactors. The reactors were filled with substrate, inoculated with specific volume amount of inoculum, then distilled water was added to obtain a total liquid volume of 100 mL. Figure 3.1 shows a view of the experimental apparatus of the batch anaerobic digester. Anaerobic conditions were ensured by flushing the medium with nitrogen for 20 min, after that the reactors were placed in an electrical furnace at 37°C and 150 rpm.

**Figure 3.1** Experimental apparatus of the batch anaerobic digester.
3.1.9 Collection of Producing Biogas.

Each anaerobic digester was connected by a capillary tube to an inverted 125 mL glass bottle, filled with (100mL) water and sealed in the same way as the digesters. To enable gas transfer through the two connected bottles, the capillary tube was equipped at both ends with a needle. Figure 3.2 shows a view of the experimental apparatus, while, Figure 3.3 shows the schematic diagram of a biogas collection unit. The biogas volume was measured by weighing the water displaced through a second needle from the inverted glass bottle, the collection glass bottle that was periodically replaced.

![View of experimental equipment used to measure of biogas production by anaerobic fermentation.](image)

**Figure 3.2** View of experimental equipment used to measure of biogas production by anaerobic fermentation.
Figure 3.3 Schematic diagram of experimental equipment used to measure of biogas production by anaerobic fermentation.
3.2 Catalyst preparation, experimental and analysis equipment, analytical methods and procedures for Fisher-Tropsch Process.

3.2.1 Fischer –Tropsch catalyst preparation method.

Catalyst is made by 15% wt. of Cobalt dispersed on Alumina support (Yang J. H., et al., 2010) and it was prepared by impregnation technique under vacuum condition according to the following procedure. About 5 g of extruded cylindrical pellets (d = 2 mm) of Al$_2$O$_3$ were thermal treated in 100 mL/min helium flow at 250 °C for 2 h, then cooled to room temperature and followed by dynamic vacuum for 15 min in a flask of 100 mL. The impregnation was carried out under vacuum to favor the solution penetration into the Alumina pores and to obtain a more uniform dispersion (Micoli L. et al., 2013). After that, an aqueous 4 M Cobalt (II) nitrate hexahydrate (Co(NO$_3$)$_2$ 6H$_2$O) solution at T = 40 °C, was dripped up to complete wetting of the support, with no excess solution as shown in Figure 3.4. Afterwards the impregnated support was dried at 120 °C for 12 h and then heated at 400 °C in air flow (6 L/h) for 4 h (Jung I. Y. et al., 2010) favoring the Cobalt oxidation. Then the catalyst was reduced in situ using 6 NL/h of diluted H$_2$/Ar (2 and 98 % v/v) at 400 °C for 10 h heating rate of 10°C /min and atmospheric pressure.
Figure 3.4 Experimental apparatus and procedure for catalyst preparation by vacuum impregnation.
3.2.2 Catalyst characterization techniques.

The characterization of catalyst is carried out to determine catalyst properties such as the surface area and pore size, active phase in the catalyst, moisture retention, suitable reduction temperatures for the catalyst activation procedures, extent of coke and wax deposition during reaction, etc. Many techniques are used to studied the characterization of catalyst, such as BET surface area, pore diameter and volume determination, and scanning electron microscopy (SEM), X-ray diffraction (XRD), temperature programmed reduction (TPR), temperature programmed desorption (TPD) and thermo-gravimetric analysis (TGA) (Fei J.H. et al., 2004).

3.2.2.1 Temperature Programmed Reduction (TPR).

Average Co oxidation state was evaluated by Temperature Programmed Reduction (TPR) measurement using a flow apparatus equipped with a TCD detector (Turco et al., 2011) and a quartz down-flow cell that contained about 100 mg of powder sample (size 90-125 µm), using 2 % H₂/Ar flow (100 mL/min) and heating rate of 10 °C/min up to 850 °C.

3.2.2.2 Nitrogen adsorption measurement.

The BET surface area and pore volume for the support and the catalysts were measured by N₂ adsorption at -196 °C by using Micromeritics ASAP 2020 instrument through BET equation. The N₂ adsorption isotherm has been obtained using 50 mg of samples treated at 250 °C under vacuum condition for 2 hours.
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3.2.3 Fischer-Tropsch Experimental setup.

The Fischer-Tropsch reaction is carried out in a single fixed-bed reactor (FBR) (pyres glass pipe, 15 mm internal diameter) as shown a schematic diagram in Figure 3.5. The reactor has one gas supply that was used for fed of reduction gas, synthesis gas mixture (CO and H₂) and inert gas (helium) were fed separately and controlled with mass flow controllers (Brooks Instruments Model 5850S), reactor was heated by electrical furnace (Carbolite Furnaces), and the temperature was regulated by a cascade temperature controller, the oven is placed inside an aluminum jacket. The vapor phase products and unreacted reactant gases exit the reactor at the undermost, and go through a cooled trap, the heavy hydrocarbons (C₅+) and the water were condensed and collected in a condenser working at 0 °C. Since the FT produces a large variety of products, such as paraffins, olefins, alcohols and aldehydes (Liu Y., et al., 2007), a detailed analysis of liquid products results a difficult task. Therefore the liquid phase has been analyzed considering the range C₅-C₁₁, C₁₂-C₂₀, >C₂₀ according to the number of C atoms in the chains (Bukur D. B., et al.,1989, Bukur D. B., et al.,1990, Bukur D. B., et al.,2005, Zimmerman and Bukur, 1990). The uncondensed (Light hydrocarbons) and unreacted gases were leaving the trap and periodically analyzed by on-line gas chromatograph (GC) HP 5890 equipped with a thermal conductivity detector (TCD) and flame ionization detector (FID) (see section 3.1.6), while the condensed liquid in a cooled trap were collected in every end of each test and analyzed through off-line gas chromatograph (GC) Shimadzu GC-17A equipped with flame ionization detector (FID) (see section 3.1.5.3). A sample (five grams) of 15 % calcined Co/AL₂O₃ catalyst were loaded inside the reactor and enclosed between two layers. One of it is glass wool was put at end of the catalyst bed
to prevent the loss of the catalyst and the either is quartz sphere’s (D: 1.5 mm) on top of the catalyst bed for preheating a gas reactant mixture and kept isothermal zone; the height of quartz sphere layer is about (5 cm). Before the reduction and Fischer-Tropsch reaction testing, the reactor was pressed with helium gas to test for leaks. Therefore, the system was decompressed to atmospheric and the catalyst was reduced in situ by 2% of the (H\textsubscript{2}/Ar) gas at a flow rate 6 NL/h. at 400 °C for 10 hours with heating ramp of 10°C /min and atmospheric pressure. Later on in situ reduction the temperature was depressed to the room temperature in the same gas mixture and with the same flow rate as during the reduction. The helium (He) gas was flow through the reactor at flow rate 2.5 NL/h, prior every Fischer-Tropsch reaction test to set the catalyst bed to the desired reaction temperature(220, 235 and 250 °C) at heating ramp of 10°C /min. Then Synthesis gas mixture was introduced into the reactor at a specified space velocity (GHSV from 370 to 820 h\textsuperscript{-1}) and at a constant H\textsubscript{2}: CO ratio of 2:1 with a concentration (4% H\textsubscript{2}, 2% CO, 94% He). Diluted feeding conditions were employed in order to guarantee isothermal profile in the reactor.

Thermal treatment was made for the catalyst bed before every change of reaction condition under helium flow rate 2.5 NL/ h at temperature 400 °C for 3 hours, to remove any deposited of carbone atoms on catalyst surface that causes deactivation of catalyst.
Figure 3.5 Schematic diagram of Fischer – Tropsch reaction System on fixed bed reactor.
3.2.4 Calculation of Fischer-Tropsch Synthesis reactor.

The calculation for Fisher-Tropsch Synthesis reactor include reactant conversion, yield and Selectivity of producing light (C\textsubscript{1}-C\textsubscript{4}) and heavy hydrocarbon (C\textsubscript{5+}) and yield and Selectivity of producing Carbone dioxide. These can be calculated from the analysis of inlet and outlet flow rates.

3.2.4.1 Reactant conversion.

The reactant conversion is estimated by the conversion of carbon monoxide and hydrogen according to the stoichiometry of the reaction equations (3.6 and 3.7).

\[
\%XCO = \frac{n_{\text{CO in}} - n_{\text{CO out}}}{n_{\text{CO in}}} \times 100 \tag{3.6}
\]

Where:
\% = Percent.
XCO = Conversion percent of Carbone monoxide towards products.
n\text{CO in} = Mole flow rate of Carbone monoxide entering the reactor (mole/h).
n\text{CO out} = Mole flow rate of Carbone monoxide leaving the reactor (mole/h).

\[
\%XH_2 = \frac{n_{H_2 in} - n_{H_2 out}}{n_{H_2 in}} \times 100 \tag{3.7}
\]

Where:
XH\textsubscript{2} = Conversion percent of Hydrogen towards products.
n\text{H}_2\text{in} = Mole flow rate of Hydrogen entering the reactor (mole/h).
n\text{H}_2\text{out} = Mole flow rate of Hydrogen leaving the reactor (mole/h).
3.2.4.2 Product yield.

Yield of producing carbons from Fischer-Tropsch synthesis can be estimated from main reaction products and carbon monoxide entering the reactor as follows.

\[
\%Y_{CH_4} = \frac{n_{CH_4}}{n_{CO_{in}}} \times 100 \quad (3.8)
\]

\[
\%Y_{CO_2} = \frac{n_{CO_2}}{n_{CO_{in}}} \times 100 \quad (3.9)
\]

\[
\%Y_{C_{2-4}} = \frac{\sum n_{C_{2-4}}}{n_{CO_{in}}} \times 100 \quad (3.10)
\]

\[
\%Y_{C^{5+}} = \frac{n_{C^{5+}}}{n_{CO_{in}}} \times 100 \text{ or } 100 - Y_{CH_4} - Y_{CO_2} - Y_{C_{2-4}} \quad (3.11)
\]

Where:

- \(Y_{CH_4}\) = Yield of producing methane.
- \(n_{CH_4}\) = Mole of producing methane (mole/h).
- \(Y_{CO_2}\) = Yield of producing Carbone dioxide.
- \(n_{CO_2}\) = Mole of producing Carbone dioxide (mole/h).
- \(Y_{C_{2-4}}\) = Yield of producing hydrocarbon from two to four atoms.
- \(\sum C_{2-4}\) = mole summation of producing hydrocarbon from two to four atoms
- \(Y_{C^{5+}}\) = Yield of producing hydrocarbon from five and more than atoms.
3.2.4.3 Product selectivity.

Selectivity of producing carbons from Fischer-Tropsch synthesis can be estimated from main reaction products and carbon monoxide conversion as follows.

\[
\%\text{SCH}_4 = \frac{n\text{CH}_4}{n\text{CO}_{\text{in}} - n\text{CO}_{\text{out}}} \times 100 
\]

(3.12)

\[
\%\text{SCO}_2 = \frac{n\text{CO}_2}{n\text{CO}_{\text{in}} - n\text{CO}_{\text{out}}} \times 100 
\]

(3.13)

\[
\%\text{SC}_{2-4} = \frac{\sum n\text{C}_{2-4}}{n\text{CO}_{\text{in}} - n\text{CO}_{\text{out}}} \times 100 
\]

(3.14)

\[
\text{SC}^{5+} = 100 - \text{SCH}_4 - \text{SCO}_2 - \text{SC}_{2-4} 
\]

(3.15)

Where:

\text{SCH}_4 = \text{Selectivity of producing methane.}

\text{SCO}_2 = \text{Selectivity of producing Carbone dioxide.}

\text{SC}_{2-4} = \text{Selectivity of producing hydrocarbon from two to four atoms.}

\sum \text{C}_{2-4} = \text{mole summation of producing hydrocarbon from two to four atoms}

\text{SC}^{5+} = \text{Selectivity of producing hydrocarbon from five and more than atoms.}
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion

This chapter describes the results obtained from laboratory scale experiments of biogas production from MSW by a series of sequential operations: anaerobic digestion under mesophilic conditions and conversion of biogas to hydrocarbons by Fisher-Tropsch synthesis.

The first part of the chapter describes the optimization of anaerobic digestion processes in terms of substrate percentage, inoculum percentage, a percentage of co-digestion of MSW with lignocellulosic biomass, the effect of salt solution addition and trace metals addition. The second part describes the results obtained from catalyst characterization such as (Temperature Programmed Reduction, Nitrogen adsorption measurement) and the effect of two operating parameters such as (Temperature and Gas Hourly Space Velocity) on the performance of Fisher-Tropsch synthesis reaction.
4.1 Optimization of Anaerobic Digestion Process.

4.1.1 Optimization of a total solid percentage for biogas production by anaerobic digestion process from Municipal Solid Waste (MSW).

The effect of Total Solid percentage (TS %) to biogas production was studied by performing a series of biodigestion tests at different values of Total Solid percentage in feed. Total solids content is defined as the weight fraction of solids in the digester. In this study, three batch stirred reactors (125 mL glass bottle with a working volume of 100mL) were filled with different amounts of MSW, in order to obtain different values of TS %. Each reactor was inoculated with 5 mL of inoculum and distilled water to obtain a total liquid volume of 100mL, and sealed by rubber stoppers. Anaerobic conditions were ensured by flushing nitrogen for 20 min. Subsequently, the reactors were placed in electrical furnace at 37°C and 150 rpm for 192 hours. The experimental conditions adopted for the batch tests are summarized in table (4.1).

**Table (4.1):** Batch tests conditions for the effect of a total solid percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MSW (gm of TS%)</th>
<th>Inoculum (mL)</th>
<th>Distilled water (mL)</th>
<th>Total volume (mL)</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1.1 VFAs production and pH variation.

Figures 4.1a-b-c present volatile fatty acid (acetic, butyric and propionic) and ethanol concentrations as a function of time for the three different amounts of MSW. The production of alcohol, acetic and butyric acid indicates that acetic and butyric fermentations are occurring, causing a decreasing of the biogas yield. The concentrations of butyric acid and acetic acid increase as higher initial amounts of MSW are adopted, due to more organic matter was hydrolyzed and transformed to VFA in the reactors (Yi J. et al., 2014).

The pH decrease observed during the digestion period was corresponding to an increase of VFA concentration in reactors. Suitable amounts of 1 M Na$_2$HCO$_3$ solution were added to the digester to keep the pH value within the optimum limit (6.5-7.5) (Liu C. et al., 2008), to avoid the inhibition of methanogenesis occurring under acidic conditions. Figure 4.2 shows that the pH variations during the digestion period are not significant, though the VFA concentration progressively increases.
**Figure 4.1a** VFA variation during digestion at $T = 37^\circ\text{C}$, 150 rpm and MSW: 5gm. Products: Ethanol ($\Diamond$), Acetic Acid ($\square$), Propionic Acid ($\Delta$) and Butyric Acid ($\times$), the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

**Figure 4.1b** VFA variation during digestion at $T = 37^\circ\text{C}$, 150 rpm and MSW: 10gm. Products: Ethanol ($\Diamond$), Acetic Acid ($\square$), Propionic Acid ($\Delta$) and Butyric Acid ($\times$), the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
Figure 4.1c VFA variation during digestion at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and MSW: 15gm. Products: Ethanol (◊), Acetic Acid (□), Propionic Acid (Δ) and Butyric Acid (х), the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.2 pH variation during AD tests at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and Feed load: 15 gm. (◊), 10 gm. (□) and 5 gm. (Δ).
4.1.1.2 Biogas yield.

The effect of TS percentage on biogas production is shown in Figure 4.3. Gas production can be significantly affected by the TS content in feedstock and on the biological activity in the anaerobic digester. The best performance for biogas production was obtained when adopting the highest amount of TS (15%). This behavior is in agreement with the results reported in the Literature, and is likely due to the conversion of accumulative VFAs to biogas (Igoni A.H et al., 2008, Duan N. et al., 2012). The highest biogas yield was 272 mL after 192 hrs. While the lowest values were 144 and 155 mL attained when the percentage of TS were 5 and 10 respectively. In order to clarify this result, the composition of biogas (CH\textsubscript{4}, H\textsubscript{2} and CO\textsubscript{2}) was measured daily as shown in the Figures 4.4a-b-c. The maximum fraction of biomethane was obtained during the intermediate phase of the test made with 15% TS percentage.

In the first part of each test, significant volumes of biohydrogen were produced, probably due to the action of the hydrogen-producing bacteria (especially Clostridium) contained in the inoculum. While the CO\textsubscript{2} was continued in produced over a digested period on account of the significant production of VFAs, which are converted to CO\textsubscript{2} by fermentation steps.
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Figure 4.3 Cumulative biogas yield during AD tests at $T = 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm. Feed load: 5g. (◊), 10 gm. (□), and 15gm. (Δ).

Figure 4.4a Biogas composition during digestion at $T= 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm and MSW: 5 gm., the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.4b  Biogas composition during digestion at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and MSW: 10 gm., the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.4c  Biogas composition during digestion at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and MSW: 15 gm., the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.1.1.3 Biomass growth and glucose concentration.

To enhance the efficiency of anaerobic digestion of MSW, it is necessary to grasp the role of the TS contents on the conduct of the microbial community involved in the anaerobic digestion. Figure 4.5 shows the fluctuations in the biomass concentration during the growth, stationary and decline phases of the digestion period. Throughout the growth process the initial biomass concentration were measured to be about (7.13, 6.74 and 9.41 mg/mL) for 5, 10 and 15 % feed load respectively. The stationary phase and maximum biomass concentration was varied with different feed load. In all instances, the biomass concentration arrived near to zero after about 170 hrs.

**Figure 4.5**  Biomass growth during digestion period at T = 37 °C, 150 rpm and feeds load: 5gm. (◊), 10gm. (□) and 15gm. (Δ).
Figure 4.6 describes the profile of glucose concentration during the anaerobic digestion period. Initial glucose concentrations were (6.67, 7.18 and 8.69 g/L) for 5, 10 and 15 TS%, respectively. In all cases the profiles decrease at the beginning the growth cycle, when an increase of the biomass concentration is observed.

Figure 4.6 Concentration of glucose during digestion period at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and feeds load: 5gm. (◊), 10gm. (□) and 15gm. (Δ).
4.1.2 Optimization of the inoculum for biogas production by solid-state anaerobic digestion of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW).

For this study, three batch stirred reactors (125 ml glass bottle with a working volume of 100ml) were filled with MSW to obtain a 15 % fraction of total solids, using different volumes of inoculum (10, 15, and 20 mL respectively). Distilled water was added to produce a total liquid volume of 100 mL. Anaerobic conditions were ensured by flushing nitrogen for 20 min. Subsequently, the reactors were placed in an electrical furnace at 37°C and 150 rpm for 192 hrs. The conditions of the batch tests are summarized in table 4.2.

**Table (4.2):** Batch tests conditions for effect of different percentage of Inoculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MSW (gm of TS%)</th>
<th>Inoculum (mL)</th>
<th>Distilled water (mL)</th>
<th>Total volume (mL)</th>
<th>Temp (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.2.1 VFAs production and pH variation.

In the Figures 4.7-a-b-c the acetic, butyric and propionic acid and the ethanol profiles are shown as a function of time for three different concentrations of inoculum. The production of ethanol, acetic acid and butyric acid indicates that acetic and butyric fermentations are ongoing, causing a reduction of the biogas yield. The high values of the final concentration of butyric acid contributes to inhibit the bacteria that are responsible of the subsequent stages of the process (Mata-Alvarez J., 2003). The sample obtained using a higher amount of inoculum resulted in higher concentrations of VFA.

The pH variations during the digestion period are shown in the Figure 4.8. A decreasing behavior of the pH was observed in each test, due to the increase of VFA concentration. Consequently, at regular intervals (24 h), a suitable amount of 1 M Na₂HCO₃ solution was added into the reactor to restore the initial value of pH (7.0), to avoid the inhibition of methanogenesis occurring under acidic conditions.
**Figure 4.7a** VFA variation during digestion at $T= 37^\circ$C, 150 rpm and Inoculum: 10 mL. Products: Ethanol ($\bigodot$), Acetic Acid ($\square$), Propionic Acid ($\bigtriangleup$) and Butyric Acid ($\times$), the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

**Figure 4.7b** VFA variation during digestion at $T= 37^\circ$C, 150 rpm and inoculum: 15 mL. Products: Ethanol ($\bigodot$), Acetic Acid ($\square$), Propionic Acid ($\bigtriangleup$) and Butyric Acid ($\times$), the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
Figure 4.7c  VFA variation during digestion at T = 37 °C, 150 rpm and Inoculum: 20 mL. Products: Ethanol (◊), Acetic Acid (□), Propionic Acid (Δ) and Butyric Acid (х), the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.8  pH variation during AD tests at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and volumes of inoculum: 10 mL (◊), 15 mL (□) and 20 mL (Δ).
4.1.2.2 Biogas yield.

The cumulative volumes of biogas are presented in the Figure 4.9a whereas the cumulative biogas production per total VS added (specific biogas production) is presented in Figure 4.9b. The maximum cumulative volumes of biogas were obtained using the minimum amount of inoculum (10mL). The trends observed are in agreement with the results obtained in another study (Kalloum S. et al., 2014), they found the biogas production from an anaerobic digestion of slaughterhouse waste increased at values of the inoculum-substrate (I/S) ratio decreased. In order to explain this result, we measured the concentration-time profiles of biogas (CH₄, H₂ and CO₂) at different volumes of inoculum (10, 15, 20 mL). The results, shown in the Figures 4.10a-b-c, demonstrate that a higher fraction of methane is obtained as the inoculum volume is lower, the trends observed are in agreement with the results obtained in another study (Fernandez B. et al., 2001), they found greatest values of the specific methane produced from an anaerobic digestion for an organic fraction of municipal solid waste (OFMSW) at the lowest values of the inoculum-substrate (I/S) ratio.

A similar tendency was obtained by (Raposo F. et al., 2006) for the maize fermentation under anaerobic conditions, the tests carried out using a range of inoculum to substrate (I/S) the maximum methane production rate was obtained at lower values of the inoculum-substrate (I/S) ratio.

On the basis of the experimental results obtained, it can be said that higher volumes of inoculum do not represent the best choice, as they produce a higher production of VFA (see Figures 4.7a-b-c), and then higher inhibition effects.
Figure 4.9a Cumulative biogas yield during AD tests at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and volumes of inoculum: 10 mL (◊), 15 mL (□) and 20 mL (Δ).

Figure 4.9b Cumulative biogas/gm VS yield during AD tests at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and volumes of inoculum: 10 mL (◊), 15 mL (□) and 20 mL (Δ).
Figure 4.10a  Biogas composition during digestion at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and inoculum: 10 mL, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.10b  Biogas composition during digestion at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and inoculum: 15 mL, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.10c  Biogas composition during digestion at T= 37°C, 150 rpm and inoculum: 20 mL, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

4.1.2.3 Biomass growth and glucose concentration.

The data in Figure 4.11 describe the growth of biomass during digestion. Firstly the biomass has a rapid increase in the intermediate stage of the digestion (24-96 hours), however, the biomass decreases until it reaches a constant value in the final phase.

The concentration profile of glucose during the digestion is shown in the Figure 4.12. The glucose at time zero is partially derived from the synthetic medium used to prepare the inoculum, so the initial concentration of glucose increases when the quantity of inoculum is higher.
Figure 4.11 Biomass growth during digestion period at $T = 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm and volumes of inoculum: 10 mL (◊), 15 mL (□) and 20 mL (△).

Figure 4.12 Concentration of glucose during digestion period at $T = 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm and volumes of inoculum: 10 mL (◊), 15 mL (□) and 20 mL (△).
4.1.3 Optimization of anaerobic co-digestion of Municipal Solid Wastes (MSW) with lignocellulosic biomasses from Giant reed (GR) under mesophilic conditions.

For this study, five batch stirred reactors (125 mL serum bottles) were filled with 7.5 g TS of a mixture of MSW and GR and inoculated with 5 mL of inoculum, 37.5 mL of distilled water, and finally closed by butyl rubber stoppers with crimped metal seals. Anaerobic conditions were ensured by flushing nitrogen for 20 min. Subsequently, the reactors were placed in an electrical furnace at 37°C and 150 rpm for 384 hrs. (16 days of anaerobic digestion). Mixture compositions adopted for the batch tests are summarized in table (4.3). Final TS content of digestion mixture was 15 % by weight.

Table (4.3): Batch tests conditions for anaerobic co-digestion of Municipal Solid Wastes (MSW) with lignocellulosic biomasses from Giant reed (GR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feed load (TS %)</th>
<th>GR%</th>
<th>MSW%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.3.1 VFAs production and pH variation.

The concentration-time profiles of ethanol and the most abundantly produced VFAs (acetic acid, butyric acid, propionic acid) were analyzed (Figures 4.13a-b-c-d-e). The VFA concentrations showed a maximum that was reached in about 24 hrs. Subsequently, a progressive decrease was observed, that was quite fast when using a lower amount of lignocellulosic material (i.e. 25% GR). On the contrary, as the initial fraction of lignocellulosic material was increased, the concentrations of VFAs kept on a higher level for a prolonged time period. This period was as longer as higher amounts of lignocellulosic material were used.

In all instances, acetic acid and butyric acid were the most abundant VFAs. The maximum concentrations of acetic acid (3.6 g/L) and butyric acid (5.6 g/L) were obtained using 75% GR+25% MSW.

During each AD test, a tendency to pH decrease due to VFA production was observed. In order to avoid pH values out optimum limits (6.5-7.5), potentially leading to the inhibition of methanogenesis (Agdag and Sponza, 2007), 1M Na$_2$HCO$_3$ of a basic solution was added daily to the reactors. The pH profiles observed in the reactors are described in the Figure 4.14. In all instances, the observed pH were in the range 5-8.
Figure 4.13a  VFA variation during digestion period at $T = 37 \, ^\circ\text{C}$, 150 rpm, 15%TS (25% GR+75% MSW) and 10 mL inoculum, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (∗) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.13b  VFA variation during digestion period at $T= 37 \, ^\circ\text{C}$, 150 rpm, 15%TS (50%GR+50% MSW) and 10 mL inoculum, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (∗) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
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Figure 4.13c  VFA variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 15%TS (75% GR+25% MSW) and 10mL inoculum, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (∇) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.13d  VFA variation during digestion period at T = 37 °C, 150 rpm, 15%TS (100% GR) and 10 mL inoculum, where (◊) Acetic Acid, (□) Propionic Acid and (Δ) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
Figure 4.13e  VFA variation during digestion period at $T = 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15%TS (15gm MSW) and 10 mL inoculum, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.14  pH variation n during digestion period at $T = 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoc. and 15%TS, where (○)100%MSW,(◊)25%GR+75%MSW,(□)50%GR+50%MSW , (Δ) 75%GR+25%MSW and (×) 100%GR.
4.1.3.2 Biogas yield.

The Figure 4.15 describes the effect of the initial composition of the feedstock on the specific biogas production. The highest cumulative specific volume of biogas (about 276.1 mL/gVS) was obtained when using a 75% fraction of the lignocellulosic material, due to a higher glucose concentration was producing during the hydrolysis step (see Figure 4.19). Lower values were obtained when the fraction of pre-treated GR was 50% (219 mL of biogas /g VS of biogas) and 25% (202 mL of biogas/gVS). A poor biogas production (42.1 and 78.4 mL/g VS) was obtained in the presence of 100% GR and 100% MSW. This result confirms that co-digestion of different wastes is effective for the optimization of the digestion efficiency. Because of the co-digestion technology, diluted of potentially toxic compounds, enhanced balance of nutrients, synergistic effects of microorganisms, increased load biodegradable organic matter and increased digestion rate, will lead to better biogas yield (Sosnowski P. et al., 2003, Nielfa A. et al., 2015).

![Figure 4.15](image_url)

**Figure 4.15** Specific cumulative biogas yield during digestion period at T =37°C, 150 rpm, 10mLInoc. and 15%TS, where (o) 100 % MSW, (D) 25%GR+75%MSW, (□) 50%GR+50%MSW, (A) 75%GR+25%MSW and (x) 100%GR.
The Figures (4.16a-b-c-d-e) show the variation in the composition of biogas (CH₄, H₂ and CO₂) as a function of the initial composition of the feedstock. The test with 100% of MSW, the biogas production was stopped after 192hrs, due to the reduced availability of easily biodegradable organics that is provided by lignocellulosic material in other digesters.

In all tests, an initial rise of the methane concentration was observed, followed by a progressive decrease. The highest fraction of methane was obtained when using a feedstock composition (75%GR - 25%MSW). Under these conditions, the highest amount of biogas was also obtained.

The fraction of biomethane produced is in agreement with the data presented in the literature (Bolzonella et al., 2006, Baoning et al., 2009, Ingrid et al., 2014). The maximum fraction of biomethane occurring during the intermediate phase of the process has been observed in previous works, as well (Liew L.N. et al., 2012).

In the first part of each test, significant volumes of biohydrogen were produced, due to the action of the hydrogen-producing bacteria (especially Clostridium) contained in the inoculum, as explained in the Figure 4.17 the growth to biohydrogen gas yield was limited during batch digestion test for municipal solid wastes (MSW), was done at same condition of digestion for other tests and same composition of MSW and inoculated with an inoculum prepared from adapted Clostridium bacteria to a synthetic medium at same procedure was followed for sewage sludge.

Compared to data from the literature (Vindis P. et al., 2009, Ingrid H. et al., 2014), the fractions of CO₂ were higher. This is due to the significant production of VFAs, which are converted to CO₂ by fermentation, as confirmed by the formation of bioethanol.
Figure 4.16a Composition of biogas for the sample 25%GR + 75% MSW at T = 37°C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoc. and 15%TS, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.16b Composition of biogas for the sample 50%GR + 50% MSW at T = 37 °C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoc. and 15%TS, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.16c Composition of biogas for the sample 75%GR + 25% MSW at T = 37 °C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoc. and 15%TS, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.16d Composition of biogas for the sample 100% GR at T = 37 °C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoc. and 15%TS, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
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Figure 4.16  Composition of biogas for the sample 100% MSW at $T = 37\, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoc. and 15%TS, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.17  Cumulative biogas, $H_2$ and $CO_2$ yield during digestion period for MSW at $T = 37\, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL of inoculum from synthetic medium prepared by adapted Clostridium bacteria and 15%TS, where Cumulative biogas (◊), Cumulative $H_2$ (□) and Cumulative $CO_2$ (△), the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.1.3.3 Biomass growth and glucose concentration.

The Figure 4.18 shows the growth of biomass during digestion period. When using mixtures of GR and MSW, similar behaviors were observed, whatever the initial composition adopted. In all cases, a maximum biomass concentration of about 4.9, 5.23 and 5.33 (mg/mL) for 25% ,50% and 75% GR, respectively was observed after about 144 hrs. Subsequently, a progressive reduction of the biomass concentration was observed.

On the contrary, when using 100% GR, no significant increases of the biomass concentration were observed. A possible explanation of this result is that there is no availability of nutrients for microorganisms.

When using 100% MSW, a significant increase of biomass concentration was observed (5.7 -5.9 mg/mL) from 24 to 72 hrs, though the biogas production stopped after 192 hours. Again, this result could be due to the poor immediate of easily biodegradable organics that is provided by lignocellulosic material in other digesters.
Figure 4.18 Biomass growth during digestion period at T= 37°C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoc.and 15% TS (100% MSW, 25% GR+75% MSW, 50% GR+50% MSW, 75% GR+25% MSW and 100% GR respectively), where (o) 100% MSW, (◊) 25% GR+75% MSW, (□) 50% GR+50% MSW, (Δ) 75% GR+25% MSW and (x) 100% GR.

The Figure 4.19 describes the profile of the glucose concentration during the anaerobic digestion. When using mixtures of GR and MSW, significant increases of glucose concentration were initially observed, due to the hydrolysis of the cellulose/hemicellulose feedstock.

The results indicate that the hydrolysis rate is affected by the initial concentration of cellulose/hemicellulose feedstock. The maximum concentrations of glucose were obtained when adopting higher concentrations of GR (29.75 g/L, 17.06 and 10.81 g/L in the presence of 75%, 50% and 25% GR, respectively).

In the test with 100% GR, only a slight increase of glucose concentration was observed. This confirms that, in the absence of MSW, there are not immediately available nutrients to digest.
In the test with 100%MSW the glucose concentration started from 5.96 g/L to decrease progressively. No increases due to the hydrolysis step were observed.

**Figure 4.19** Concentration of glucose during digestion period at $T = 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10 mL Inoc. and 15%TS (100%MSW, 25% GR+75%MSW, 50% GR+50%MSW, 75% GR+25%MSW and 100% GR respectively), where (*) 100% MSW, (x) 25% GR+75%MSW, (□) 50% GR+50%MSW, (△) 75% GR+25%MSW and (◊) 100% GR.
4.1.4 Effect mineral solution "M9 10x" and 400x salts addition on a performance of anaerobic digestion for Municipal Solid Waste (MSW).

For this study, a batch reactor (125 mL glass bottle with a working volume of 100mL) was filled with 15 % of total solid from MSW, inoculum (10 v/v%), 1.5 mL of M9 salts (Na$_2$HPO$_4$ 7.0 g/L, KH$_2$PO$_4$ 3.0 g/L, NaCl 0.5 g/L, NH$_4$Cl 1.0 g/L) and 40 µL of 400x salts (CuSO$_4$. 5H$_2$O 0.125g/L, ZnSO$_4$.7H$_2$O 0.72g/L, MnCl$_2$.H$_2$O 0.50g/L, CaCO$_3$ 1g/L, MgSO$_4$ 62.09g/L, FeSO$_4$.7H$_2$O 4.75g/L, CoSO$_4$.7H$_2$O 0.14g/L, H$_3$BO$_3$ 0.03g/L, HCL 25.6mL/L). Distilled water was added to obtain a total liquid volume of 100 mL. Anaerobic conditions were ensured by flushing the medium with nitrogen for 20 min, after that the vial is placed in electrical furnace at 37°C and 150 rpm for 192 hrs.

4.1.4.1 VFAs production and pH variation.

The Figure 4.20 shows VFA (acetic acid, butyric acid, Propionic Acid) and ethanol variation during the digestion period. The VFA concentration increased and decreases gradually with time. The organic fraction of municipal solid waste (OFMSW) is degradable organic matters, which is easily converted into VFA. As VFA concentration cases increased, a corresponding decrease of pH was observed, as shown in Figure 4.21. The pH was corrected to optimal average values between 6.5 and 7.5 by addition of 1M of Na$_2$HCO$_3$ solution to avoid the inhibition of methanogenesis at low pH. By comparing this result with that obtained under the same conditions (par. 4.1.2.1, Figure 4.7a) in the absence of mineral and salts, we can observe a little increase in the VFAs production.
Figure 4.20 VFA variation during digestion period at T= 37°C, 150 rpm, 15%TS and 10 mL Inoculum for effect of mineral and salts solution addition, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (▲) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.21 pH variation during digestion period at T= 37°C, 150 rpm, 15%TS and 10 mL Inoculum for effect of mineral and salts solution addition.
4.1.4.2 Biogas yield.

The effect of mineral and salts solution addition on anaerobic digestion of MSW was studied adopting a TS content of 15%. The Figure 4.22 shows that the maximum cumulative volume biogas yield was about 386ml. By comparing this result with that obtained under the same conditions in the absence of mineral and salts (par. 4.1.2.2, Figure 4.9a), we can observe that a higher amount of biogas was produced (386 mL versus 359 mL) regardless a little increase in the produce VFAs that explained above. In addition, a higher fraction of methane was obtained, as shown in the Figure 4.23, by comparing with that obtained in (par. 4.1.2.2, Figure 4.10a). Consequently, it can be said that the addition of the salts solution improvises the efficiency of the methanogenesis step.

![Cumulative biogas yield during digestion period with mineral and salts solution addition at T= 37 °C, 150rpm, 10v/v Inoc. and 15%TS.](image)

**Figure 4.22** Cumulative biogas yield during digestion period with mineral and salts solution addition at T= 37 °C, 150rpm, 10v/v Inoc. and 15%TS.
Figure 4.23  Composition of biogas for the test with mineral and salts solution addition at $T=37^\circ\text{C}$, 150rpm, 10v/v Inoc. and 15%TS, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.1.4.3 Biomass growth and glucose concentration.

The Figure 4.24 shows the growth of biomass and glucose concentration during the digestion period. Firstly the biomass concentration increased rapidly, reaching a maximum concentration after 72 hours. Subsequently, a progressive reduction of the biomass concentration was observed, tending to zero. The concentrations of glucose at zero time was 5.7 g/L, then decreases to zero due to increasing growth of microorganisms.

![Graph showing biomass growth and glucose concentration](image-url)

**Figure 4.24** Biomass growth and glucose concentration during digestion period at T=37°C, 150 rpm, 15%TS and mineral and salts solution addition.
4.1.5 Optimization of trace metals addition for biogas production from solid-state anaerobic digestion process of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW).

In this study, fourteen batch stirred reactors (125 mL glass bottle with a working volume of 100 mL) were filled with MSW (15 % wt.) and inoculum (10 mL), then distilled water was added to obtain a liquid volume of 100 mL. Each bioreactor was dosed with the desired concentration of single or mixed trace elements, and sealed by rubber stoppers. Anaerobic conditions were ensured by flushing nitrogen for 20 min. Subsequently, the reactor was placed in an electrical furnace at 37°C and 150 rpm for 288 hrs. The conditions adopted for the batch tests are summarized in table (4.4).

Table (4.4): Batch tests conditions for the effect of trace metals addition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feed load (g)</th>
<th>Ni Conc. (mg/L)</th>
<th>Zn Conc. (mg/L)</th>
<th>Co Conc. (mg/L)</th>
<th>Inoculum (mL)</th>
<th>Distilled water (mL)</th>
<th>Total volume (mL)</th>
<th>Test temp. (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.5.1 VFA and pH variation during (AD).

4.1.5.1.1 VFA and pH variation during (AD) for individual trace element.

The Figures 4.25a-b-c-d-e-f-g-h-i-j show the produced VFAs (acetic acid, butyric acid, propionic acid) and ethanol concentration profiles as a function of time. Three different concentrations (5, 50 and 100 mg/L) were adopted for each trace element (Ni, Zn and Co). A control test with MSW in the absence of trace elements was also carried out.

The final concentrations of VFAs and ethanol obtained in each experimental test are reported in the table (4.5).

Table (4.5): Final concentrations of VFAs and ethanol obtained in each experimental test for the effect of trace metals addition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feed load (g)</th>
<th>Ni Conc. (mg/l)</th>
<th>Zn Conc. (mg/l)</th>
<th>Co Conc. (mg/l)</th>
<th>Eth. Conc. (mg/ml)</th>
<th>Ac.Ac. Conc. (mg/ml)</th>
<th>Pr.Ac. Conc. (mg/ml)</th>
<th>Bu. Ac. Conc. (mg/ml)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.16263286</td>
<td>0.37594093</td>
<td>1.04217477</td>
<td>11.8396156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.03519155</td>
<td>1.14151031</td>
<td>1.1742664</td>
<td>5.67745807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.85927063</td>
<td>0.59363293</td>
<td>4.97693198</td>
<td>12.3576966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.96888684</td>
<td>1.28763319</td>
<td>6.25846247</td>
<td>21.4425244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.15877701</td>
<td>0.9315939</td>
<td>1.41904648</td>
<td>13.3381798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.75016495</td>
<td>0.55030256</td>
<td>2.3505797</td>
<td>18.5342096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.407508</td>
<td>0.29891511</td>
<td>1.7839313</td>
<td>26.4890812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.36210613</td>
<td>0.99698225</td>
<td>1.01316519</td>
<td>6.43470437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.06917247</td>
<td>0.69574184</td>
<td>2.4780791</td>
<td>15.8992825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.5661026</td>
<td>0.76556233</td>
<td>2.64183418</td>
<td>31.4835773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.16838152</td>
<td>0.10259954</td>
<td>0.11939709</td>
<td>0.42111724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.62411385</td>
<td>0.63897586</td>
<td>0.47054711</td>
<td>5.26690066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.09376594</td>
<td>0.23121232</td>
<td>0.01321978</td>
<td>1.99751781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.44373134</td>
<td>0.35336288</td>
<td>1.97604511</td>
<td>6.92426447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In all cases, higher values of the final concentration chiefly (Butyric acid) and alcohol (Ethanol), was obtained when higher amounts of trace element were used. On the contrary, as the initial concentration of trace elements was decreased, the concentrations of VFA and alcohol kept at a low level. The higher concentration of butyric acid contributes to inhibit the bacteria that are responsible of the subsequent stages of the fermentation process.

The pH variations during the digestion period are shown in the Figures 4.26a-b and c. The pH was tended to decrease during the anaerobic digestion process due to VFA production. In order to avoid pH values out optimum limits (6.5-7.5), potentially leading to the inhibition of methanogenesis under acidic conditions (Agdag and Sponza, 2007), 1M Na$_2$HCO$_3$ solution was added daily to the reactors.

**Figure 4.25a**  VFA variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW ,10 mL  Inoculum and Zero  trace elements Conc., where (Θ) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid  (△) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
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**Figure 4.25b** VFA variation during digestion period at $T = 37 \, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 5mg/L Ni Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid., (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

**Figure 4.25c** VFA variation during digestion period at $T = 37 \, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 50mg/L Ni Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid., (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
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**Figure 4.25d** VFA variation during digestion period at $T= 37 \, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15\%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 100 mg/L Ni Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (△) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

**Figure 4.25e** VFA variation during digestion period at $T= 37 \, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15\%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 5 mg/L Zn Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (△) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
Figure 4.25f  VFA variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 50mg/L Zn Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.25g  VFA variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 100 mg/L Ni Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
**Figure 4.25** VFA variation during digestion period at $T=37\,^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 5 mg/L Co Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

**Figure 4.25i** VFA variation during digestion period at $T=37\,^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 50 mg/L Co Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
Figure 4.25j VFA variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and 100 mg/L Co Conc., where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.26a pH variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15% TS MSW and different Ni Concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (×) 100mg/L.
Figure 4.26b pH variation during digestion period at $T = 37 \, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15% TS MSW and different Zn Concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (x) 100mg/L.

Figure 4.26c pH variation during digestion period at $T= 37 \, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15% TS MSW and different Co Concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (x) 100mg/L.
4.1.5.1.2 VFA and pH variation during (AD) for mixed trace element.

In this part we were studying the effect of different mixed essential trace elements (Ni, Zn and Co) with optimum concentration 5mg/L were obtained in the first part of this study.

**Figures 4.27 a-b-c and d.** Show the concentration-time profiles of ethanol and the most abundantly produced VFAs (acetic acid, butyric acid, propionic acid) were analyzed. The VFA and ethanol accumulations show a maximum when a mixed from two essential trace elements (Ni/Co, Ni/Zn and Zn/Co) were used. While, the lowest accumulations were observed when mixed from three trace elements (Ni/Co/Zn) was used. The final concentrations of VFAs and ethanol obtained in each experimental test are reported above in the Table (4.5).

The pH variations during the digestion period are presented in the **Figure 4.28.** The pH was tended to decrease during the anaerobic digestion process due to VFA production. A few drops from Sodium bicarbonate solution at concentration (1M), was added daily to the bioreactors to avoid pH values out optimum limits (6.5-7.5), that cause inhibition of methanogenesis step. The pH profiles detected in each test was corresponding to the profiles of the VFA concentration.
Figure 4.27a  VFA and ethanol variation during digestion period at $T=37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and mix of three trace elements (Ni, Zn and Co) with concentration 5mg/L For each one, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.27b  VFA and ethanol variation during digestion period at $T=37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and mix of two trace elements (Ni and Co) with concentration 5mg/L For each one, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid., (Δ) Propionic Acid and (×) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
Figure 4.27c  VFA and ethanol variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and mix of two trace elements (Ni and Zn) with concentration 5mg/L For each one, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (∆) Propionic Acid and (∗) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).

Figure 4.27d  VFA and ethanol variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 15%TS MSW, 10 mL Inoculum and mix of trace elements (Zn and Co) with concentration 5mg/L For each one, where (◊) Ethanol, (□) Acetic Acid, (∆) Propionic Acid and (∗) Butyric Acid, the composition of liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
Figure 4.28  pH variation during digestion period at T= 37 °C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15% TS MSW and different mix of trace elements, where (◊)Ni/Co/Zn, (□) Ni/Co, (Δ) Ni/Zn and (х) Zn/Co.
4.1.5.2 Biogas yield.

4.1.5.2.1 Effect of individual trace element addition on biogas yield.

The cumulative volumes of biogas production for with and without individual trace element addition are presented in Figures 4.29a-b and c. The highest values were obtained about (768, 733 and 800 mL) at 5mg/L addition for each Ni, Zn and Co respectively. Whereas, Lower values were about (246.5, 211.5 and 184.5 mL) for Ni, Zn and Co respectively, when the concentration of individual trace elements was 100mg/L. On the other hand, a little increasing was observed when a 50mg/L was used, they produced (507, 541.5 and 557 mL) for Ni, Zn and Co respectively. Whilst, the reactor without element addition it was produced (425mL).

This result suggests that the optimum biogas production at a concentration (5mg/L) from each individual trace element addition.

Figures (4.30a-b-c-d-e-f-g-h-i and j). Show the variation in the composition of biogas (CH$_4$, H$_2$ and CO$_2$) as a function of the individual trace element addition (Ni, Zn and Co). These results show an initial rise of the methane concentration, followed by a progressive decrease.

The highest fraction of methane was obtained when using 5mg/L, as the highest amount of biogas was produced under these additions. The results are agreement with the data presented in the literature (Lo H.M. et al., 2012, Altas L., 2009). The maximum production occurring approximately during the intermediate phase of the process has been observed in previous work, as well (Brulé M. et al., 2013).
In the first part of each test, significant volumes of biohydrogen were produced, probably due to the action of the hydrogen-producing bacteria (especially Clostridium) contained in the inoculum.

![Cumulative Biogas Production](image)

**Figure 4.29a** Cumulative biogas yield during digestion period at T= 37°C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Ni concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (х) 100mg/L.

![Cumulative Biogas Production](image)

**Figure 4.29b** Cumulative biogas yield during digestion period at T= 37°C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Zn concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (х) 100mg/L.
Figure 4.29c Cumulative biogas yield during digestion period at $T=37^\circ$C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Co concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (△) 50mg/L and (x) 100mg/L.

Figure 4.30a Composition of biogas for the sample without trace element addition at $T=37\,^\circ C, 15\%TS, 150\,\text{rpm}$ and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.30b  Composition of biogas for the sample with Ni concentration 5mg/L at T= 37 °C, 15 %TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.30c  Composition of biogas for the sample with Ni concentration 50mg/L at T= 37°C, 15 %TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.30d  Composition of biogas for the sample with Ni concentration 100 mg/L at T= 37 °C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.30c Composition of biogas for the sample with Zn concentration 5mg/L at T= 37 °C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.30f  Composition of biogas for the sample with Zn concentration 50 mg/L at T= 37 °C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.30g  Composition of biogas for the sample with Zn concentration 100 mg/L at T= 37°C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.30h Composition of biogas for the sample with Co concentration 5mg/L at T=37°C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.30i Composition of biogas for the sample with Co concentration 50 mg/L at T=37°C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.30j Composition of biogas for the sample with Co concentration 100 mg/L at T = 37°C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.1.5.2.2 Effect mixed trace element addition on Biogas yield.

The effect of different mixed essential trace element addition (Ni, Zn and Co) concentration 5mg/L for each one, on cumulative volumes of biogas production are presented in Figure 4.31. The highest cumulative volume of biogas was about 1332.65 mL. This value was obtained by adding a mix from three trace elements to the reactor. Lower values were obtained when the mix of two trace elements were used, it was about (1113.08 mL) for Ni/Co and (974.36 mL) for Ni/Zn. While, the mix of two elements (Zn/Co) adding not have any significant effect above single trace element addition, we were studying in first part, it was produced (703.67 mL). This result suggests that the optimum biogas production at mix from three elements (Ni//Co/Zn) was added to the reactor.

Figures 4.32a-b-c and d. Show the variation in the composition of biogas (CH\textsubscript{4}, H\textsubscript{2} and CO\textsubscript{2}) as a function of the different mixture from trace element addition (Ni/Co/Zn, Ni/Co, Ni/Zn and Zn/Co) at the concentration 5mg/L for every element. In these results we were observing an initial rise of the biomethane fraction, followed by a progressive decrease. The maximum fraction of producing biomethane occurring in the period between (96 and 192 hrs.). This result are agreeing with the data presented in the literature (Qiang H. et al., 2012).

In the first test time for each sample, we can noting, significant volumes of biohydrogen were produced, probably due to the action of the hydrogen-producing bacteria (especially Clostridium) contained in the inoculum.
This result suggests, according to cumulative production of biogas the higher accumulative volume of biomethane produced when the mixture of trace elements were used, especially with three trace elements.

![Cumulative Biogas Production](image)

**Figure 4.31** Cumulative biogas yield during digestion period at T= 37°C, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum,15%TS MSW and different mix of trace elements, where (◊)Ni/Co/Zn, (□) Ni/Co, (△) Ni/Zn and (×) Zn/Co.
Figure 4.32a  Composition of biogas for the sample with mix from three trace elements Ni/Co/Zn at T=37°C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.32b  Composition of biogas for the sample with mix from two trace elements Ni/Co at T= 37°C,15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
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**Figure 4.32c** Composition of biogas for the sample with mix from two trace elements Ni/Zn at T=37°C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

**Figure 4.32d** Composition of biogas for the sample with mix from two trace elements Zn/Co at T=37°C, 15%TS, 150 rpm and 10mL Inoculum, the composition of biogas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.1.5.3 Biomass growth and glucose concentration.

4.1.5.3.1 Effect of individual trace element addition on biomass growth.

Figures 4.33a-b and c. Show the influence of individual trace element addition with three different concentrations (5, 50 and 100 mg/L) on the growth of biomass during the digestion period. In all cases, approximately similar behaviors of growth were observed, and the maximum concentration of biomass was (6.951, 6.72 and 7.01 mg/mL) at (144hrs.) for single element Ni, Zn and Co respectively at concentration 5mg/L was used. On the contrary, when using concentration 100mg/L of single elements, to little significant increases of the biomass concentration were observed. Due to processes inhabitation at this concentration.

Figures 4.34 a-b and c. describe the reduction of glucose Concentration during the digestion period. The concentration of glucose at zero time for the test without element addition, it was a bout (7g/L) and (7.24, 7.22 and 7.32), (7.19, 7.25 and 7.12), (7.27, 7.12 and 6.51) for Ni, Zn and Co at three individual different concentrations 5, 50 and 100 mg/L respectively. A simple sugars formed at intermediate hydrolysis step are immediately biodegraded and indeed successive values tend to zero.
Figure 4.33a  Biomass growth during digestion period at $T= 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Ni concentration where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (х) 100mg/L.

Figure 4.33b  Biomass growth during digestion period at $T= 37 ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Zn concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (х) 100mg/L.
Figure 4.33c Biomass growth during digestion period at $T = 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Co concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (х) 100mg/L.

Figure 4.34a Concentration of glucose during digestion period at $T= 37 \, ^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Ni concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (х) 100mg/L.
Figure 4.34b Concentration of glucose during digestion period at $T = 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Zn concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (✓) 100mg/L.

Figure 4.34c Concentration of glucose during digestion period at $T= 37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different Co concentration, where (◊) Zero, (□) 5mg/L, (Δ) 50mg/L and (✓) 100mg/L.
4.1.5.3.2 Effect of mixed trace element addition biomass growth and glucose concentration.

Figure 4.35 shows the growth of biomass during the digestion period. When using different mixtures of trace elements with concentration 5mg/L for everyone, similar behaviors were observed. In all cases, a maximum biomass concentration about 8.27, 8.01, 7.34 and 6.89 (mg/mL) for Ni/CO/Zn, Ni/Co, Ni/Zn and Zn/Co Mixture addition, respectively, was observed after about 144 hrs. Subsequently, a progressive reduction of the biomass concentration to zero value at the end of a testes were observed.

The reduction of glucose Concentration during the digestion period were analyzed as shows in Figure 4.36. The concentration of glucose in the beginning, it was about (7.29, 7.2, 7.14 and 7.02 g/L) for Ni/Zn/Co, Ni/Co, Ni/Zn and Zn/Co mixture addition, respectively. A simple sugars formed at intermediate hydrolysis step are immediately biodegraded and indeed successive values tend to zero.
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**Figure 4.35** Biomass growth during digestion period at $T=37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different mix of trace elements addition, where (◊) Ni/Co/Zn, (□) Ni/Co, (Δ) Ni/Zn and (х) Zn/Co.

**Figure 4.36** Concentration of glucose during digestion period at $T=37^\circ C$, 150 rpm, 10mL Inoculum, 15%TS MSW and different mix of trace elements addition, where (◊) Ni/Co/Zn, (□) Ni/Co, (Δ) Ni/Zn and (х) Zn/Co.
4.2 Catalyst Characterization.

4.2.1 Temperature-programmed reduction (TPR).

The reduction behavior of 15% Co/Al₂O₃ was studied by temperature-programmed reduction (TPR) as shown in Figure 4.37.

Four hydrogen consumption peaks were observed. The first peak at 167 °C was assigned to the reduction of incompletely decomposed of nitrate species Co(NO₃)₂ in hydrogen after calcination (Chu W. et al., 2007). The second and third peak, at 300°C and 373°C respectively, were assigned to the reduction of Co₃O₄ to CoO and CoO to Co⁰ according to equations (4.1 and 4.2) (Pendyala V.R.R. et al., 2016). Whilst, the fourth peak at (655 °C) represents the reduction of the cobalt aluminum mixed (e.g. Co₂AlO₄), formed during the TPR analysis as a result of the interaction of the highly dispersed CoO with the -Al₂O₃ support (Jalama K., 2011, Fratalocchi L., 2015). Hence, it was proven that 2% H₂/Ar flow of 6 NL/h at 400 °C for 10 hours was appropriate for reducing the cobalt oxides to metallic cobalt prior to the FTS reaction (Appendix C, C.1).

\[ \text{Co}_3\text{O}_4 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{CoO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \]  

(4.1)

\[ 3\text{CoO} + 3\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{Co}^0 + 3\text{H}_2\text{O} \]  

(4.2)
Figure 4.37 TPR profiles of the catalysts.
4.2.2 Nitrogen adsorption measurement.

BET surface area and pore volume for the catalyst, shown in the table (4.6), were measured by nitrogen adsorption at -196 °C.

A percentage loading of 15 % Co is equivalent to 20.4% by weight of Co$_3$O$_4$. The BET surface area of the Co/Al$_2$O$_3$ catalyst should be approximately $0.796 \times 220 = 175.12 \text{ m}^2\text{g}^{-1}$ in theory (see Appendix C, C.2). The measured value (120 m$^2$g$^{-1}$), though, is observably lower than the calculated value, which indicates some pore blockage by cobalt oxide clusters.

Table (4.6): BET surface area and pore volume for the support and catalyst.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst/Support</th>
<th>BET surface area (m$^2$g$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Pore volume (cm$^3$g$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%Co/Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Fischer –Tropsch Synthesis Parameter Study.

The FT Synthesis experiments were previously explained in chapter three. In general, the catalyst was activated under the following conditions: drying under helium flow at atmospheric pressure, followed by a reduction in (2\%H_{2}/Ar) flow at 400 °C with a heating rate of 10°C/min.

After reduction, the temperature of the reactor was decreased gradually for the first test of FT reaction temperature (220 °C), then the first experiment was started.

Once the catalyst is activated, in all the subsequent tests the catalysts were heated to experiment temperature under helium flow at a flow rate of 2.5 NL/h, starting from room temperature.

The effect of two parameters (Temperature and Gas hourly space velocity) on the catalytic activity and product selectivity were studied and the results were recorded once the system reached steady-state conditions. All the experiments were done with diluted feeding conditions (4\% H_{2}, 2\% CO, He as balance) at ratio H_{2}/CO = 2, with 5 g of 15Co/AL_{2}O_{3} catalyst and 1 atm of overpressure.

The experimental conditions and the results at steady-state conditions are summarized in table (4.7).

The discussion below will be including:

a. Trends of reactants conversion and products as a function of the time on stream for a test achieved as an example from results as an optimum condition (T=220 °C and GHSV=370 h\(^{-1}\)) for the high selectivity liquid product.

b. Effect of parameters (T and GHSV) on the conversion of reactants and products selectivity at steady-state conditions.
Table (4.7): F-T Synthesis experiments conditions and results at steady-state conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Conversion %</th>
<th>Selectivity %</th>
<th>Collected Product Selectivity %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T (°C)</td>
<td>GHSV (h⁻¹)</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>H₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>26.65</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>22.96</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1 Description of transitory condition (Time on Stream) for single test as an example.

Results on FT tests at $T = 220 \, ^\circ\text{C}$ and GHSV $= 370 \, \text{h}^{-1}$ are discussed as following. Figures 4.38-4.40 show the trends of H$_2$ and CO conversion and the concentration of the most relevant products during the initial transitory phase.

According to the results showed in Figure 4.38, the reaction starts with a higher conversion of CO ($X_{\text{CO}}$) and lower conversion of H$_2$ ($X_{\text{H}_2}$), then $X_{\text{CO}}$ decreases and $X_{\text{H}_2}$ increases gradually up to values of 27 and 21% respectively at the steady-state conditions, that begins approximately after 600-800 min. These trends can be explained taking into account that the catalytic mechanism involves the initial absorption of CO whilst the increase of H$_2$ conversion is due to the chain propagation for the polymerization reaction, as described in literature data (Post M. F. M. et al., 1989, Cheng J. et al., 2008). Indeed, the pathway of this FT reaction can be explained according to alkyne mechanism. In this model, the chain initiation of reaction occurs by dissociation of adsorbed CO toward C and O atoms on the Co sites, then C is hydrogenated by adsorbed H$_2$ to yield in a successive reaction methyne (-CH$_3$) and methylene (-CH$_2$) groups. Because -CH$_3$ is chain initiator and -CH$_2$ is the monomer of polymerization reaction, then the chain growth is thought to take place by consecutive combination of methylene surface species (CH$_2$) to generate hydrocarbons (n-paraffins or $\alpha$-olefins) by hydrogen addition or $\beta$-hydride elimination respectively (Overett M. J. et al., 2000, Ail and Dasappa, 2016). Moreover, the products of this polymerization reaction are saturated linear hydrocarbons with a broad range of carbon (Dry E. M., 2002).
Chapter Four  

Results and Discussion

Figure 4.38  Conversion of CO and H₂ on time stream at P= 1 atm., H₂/CO = 2, T=220 °C , GHSV = 370 h⁻¹ and 5gm of catalyst, where (□) CO and (◊)H₂, the inlet and outlet amount of syngas was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.39 shows the trends of the most relevant gaseous product: CH₄, CO₂ and hydrocarbons in C₂-C₄ range, considering that hydrocarbons with more than four C atoms (C₅⁺) are liquid. Figure 4.40 shows trends of yields in liquid (C₅⁺) and gaseous products (CH₄ + C₂-C₄) and CO₂ during the transitory phase.

According to literature data (Tristantini D. et al., 2007, Pendyala V. R. et al., 2016), the initial formation of light hydrocarbons products and CO₂ is preferred due to the water-gas shift reaction. Then they decrease gradually in favour of the formation of liquid products, which corresponds to an increase of the chain growth. Stable yield values are reached after 600 min, observing yields in liquid hydrocarbons of about 26 %.
The decrease in the production of light hydrocarbons (CH\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2}-C\textsubscript{4}) and CO\textsubscript{2} obtained should lead to an increase of the selectivity towards gasoline and diesel hydrocarbons, in the range of C\textsubscript{5}-C\textsubscript{11} and C\textsubscript{12}-C\textsubscript{20} respectively (Rytter E. et al., 2016, Galadima and Muraza, 2015, Zennaro R. et al., 2000).

The Table (4.7) above shows the selectivity to different products and the CO and H\textsubscript{2} conversions obtained at the steady-state condition (after 600 min). It can be observed that the selectivity of products of interest, gasoline and diesel hydrocarbons, is 40.30\% and 47.18\% respectively. An amount of heavy hydrocarbons, with a number of C atoms higher than 20 (C\textsubscript{21+}) of about 10.82\% has been found. It is important to note that such an increase of the liquid product selectivity is not caused by the lower degree of CO conversion, but is as a result of the decrease of the light hydrocarbons formation and of a side reaction (water-gas shift reaction), as explained in literature (Cheng K. et al., 2016).

The steady state condition has been kept for 10 days. The test has been repeated several times with no appreciable changes. As a consequence it can be hypothesized that no deactivation of the catalyst had occurred during these tests.
Figure 4.39 Mole percentage of products on time stream at $P = 1$ atm., $H_2/CO = 2$, $T = 220 \, ^\circ C$, GHSV = 370 h$^{-1}$ and 5gm of catalyst, where (x) Liquid products, ($\Delta$)C$_2$-C$_4$, (◊) CH$_4$ and (□) CO$_2$, the composition of produced liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3) and the composition of produced gas phase was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.40 Yield percentage of products on time stream at $P = 1$ atm., $H_2/CO = 2$, $T = 220 \, ^\circ C$, GHSV = 370 h$^{-1}$ and 5gm of catalyst, where ($\Delta$) Liquid products, (◊)CO$_2$ and (□) CH$_4$+(C$_2$-C$_4$),the composition of produced liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3) and the composition of produced gas phase was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.3.2 Description the results at steady-state conditions.

In this section the discussion focuses on the synthesis gas conversion (CO and H₂) and product selectivity as a function of reaction temperature and GHSV. When the values reach a steady-state as shown above in table (4.7), the reaction accrues under atmospheric pressure, H₂/CO feed ratio equal 2, different gas hourly space velocity (370, 520, 670 and 820 h⁻¹) and the reaction temperatures (220, 235 and 250 °C).
4.3.2.1 Effect of reaction temperature and GHSV on the conversion of synthesis gas.

In this part, the discussion focuses on the effect of reaction temperature and gas hourly space velocity on synthesis gas conversion (CO and H₂).

4.3.2.1.1 Effect of reaction temperature on synthesis gas conversion (CO and H₂).

Figure 4.41 shows the CO conversion as a function of the reaction temperature. The CO conversion seems approximately constant with increasing the reaction temperature for all space velocities. This is probably due to the diluted concentration of CO (2%) and the operating pressure limitation (1atm) for the reaction system used in this study. On the other hand, the conversions at steady state for all tests at lower temperature (220 °C) are higher in comparison to the values reported by Marie A. J. et al., 2009 (15 wt.% Co/Al₂O₃, T=212 °C, P=20 bar and X_Co=22), Chu W. et al., 2007 (15 wt.% Co/Al₂O₃, T=453-483 K, P=1 bar and X_Co=2.2-7.2) and Nabaho D. et al., 2016 (20wt.% Co/Al₂O₃, T=220 °C, P=20 bar and X_Co=9.1).

The conversion of H₂ as a function of the reaction temperature as shown in Figure 4.42. The experimental results show that the H₂ conversion has a little increase with the increasing reaction temperature for all space velocities. Again, this is probably due to the diluted concentration of H₂ (4%) and the operating pressure limitation (1atm) for the reaction system used in this study. At steady state for all tests, the trends observed are in agreement with the results obtained in another study carried out using cobalt-based catalysts (Osa A.R. et al., 2011 c).
Figure 4.41  Effect of reaction temperature on CO conversion at P= 1 atm., H₂/CO = 2, where GHSV= (◊)370, (□) 520, (Δ) 670 and (x) 820 h⁻¹, and 5gm of catalyst, the outlet amount of CO was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).

Figure 4.42  Effect of reaction temperature on H₂ conversion at P =1 atm., H₂/CO = 2, where GHSV= (◊)370, (□) 520, (Δ) 670 and (x) 820 h⁻¹, and 5gm of catalyst, the outlet amount of H₂ was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.3.2.1.2 Effect of gas hourly space velocity (GHSV) on synthesis gas conversion (CO and H₂).

**Figures 4.43 and 4.44** show the conversion of synthesis gas (CO and H₂) as a function of gas hourly space velocity. In all cases the conversion of CO, seems approximately constant, while H₂ conversion shows a little decrease with increasing the gas hourly space velocity. As explained above, the observed trends are probably due to the diluted concentration of the reactants CO (2%) and H₂ (4%) and to the operating pressure limitation (1 atm) for the reaction system used in this study. At steady-state, for all tests, the trends observed for H₂ are in agreement with results obtained with other studies using cobalt-based catalysts (Tristantini D. et al., 2007, Osa A.R. et al., 2011 c).

![Figure 4.43](image)

**Figure 4.43** Effect of GHSV on CO conversion at P=1 atm., H₂/CO = 2, where T = (◊)220, (□)235 and (△) 250 °C, and 5 gm of catalyst, the outlet amount of CO was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
Figure 4.44 Effect of GHSV on H₂ conversion at P = 1 atm., H₂/CO = 2, where T = (◊) 220°C, (□) 235°C, and (Δ) 250°C, and 5gm of catalyst, the outlet amount of H₂ was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.3.2.2 Effect of reaction temperature and GHSV on gases product selectivity.

In this part, the discussion focuses on the effect of reaction temperature and GHSV on Gases product selectivity.

4.3.2.2.1 Effect of reaction temperature on light hydrocarbon selectivity.

The selectivity of collected light hydrocarbon (C$_1$- C$_4$) reported in the table (4.7) above, is described as a function of reaction temperature in the Figure 4.45. An increase of the reaction temperature was caused by a gradual increase in selectivity of light hydrocarbons. Since the FT polymerization reaction is exothermic, an increase in reaction temperature leads to an increase of hydrogenation rate of ‘CH$_2$’ units, and consequently the products are shifted towards low molecular weight hydrocarbon (Dry M. E., 1996, Mansouri M. et al., 2014). At steady state for all tests, the trends are in agreement with results obtained in other studies using cobalt-based catalysts (Osa A.R. et al. 2011a, b and c, Najafabadi A.T.etal.,2016).
Figure 4.45 Effect of reaction temperature on light hydrocarbon (C₁- C₄) selectivity at P = 1 atm., H₂/CO = 2, where GHSV = (◊)370, (□) 520, (△) 670 and (×) 820 h⁻¹, and 5gm of catalyst, the composition of produced gas phase was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.3.2.2.2 Effect of reaction temperature on Carbon dioxide selectivity.

The selectivity for Carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) as a function of reaction temperature is presented in Figure 4.46. An increase of the reaction temperature caused by a gradual increase in selectivity of CO$_2$. The CO$_2$ production depends on the amount of water produced through water–gas shift (WGS) in FT reaction. Consequently, the little amount of CO$_2$ produced is in agreement with the little WGS activity normally shown by the cobalt catalyst (Osa A.R. et al., 2011 c; Pendyala V. R. R. et al., 2016). At steady state for all tests, the trends are in agreement with results obtained in other studies using cobalt-based catalysts (Xu D. et al., 2006, Jung I.Y. et al., 2010, Osa A.R. et al.2011a and b).

![Figure 4.46](image)

**Figure 4.46** Effect of reaction temperature on CO$_2$ selectivity at P = 1 atm., H$_2$/CO = 2, where GHSV = (◊)370, (□) 520, (Δ) 670 and (x) 820 h$^{-1}$, and 5gm of catalyst, the amount of produced CO$_2$ was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.3.2.2.3 Effect of gas hourly space velocity (GHSV) on light hydrocarbon selectivity.

The selectivity of collecting Light hydrocarbon (C_1-C_4) reported in the table (4.7) as a function of gas hourly space velocity as shown in Figure 4.47. When increasing the gas hourly space velocity, the formation of CH\textsubscript{4} and light hydrocarbon (C_2-C_4) is increased. At steady state for all tests the trends found are in agreement with results obtained in other studies using cobalt-based catalysts (Tristantini D. et al., 2007, Osa A.R. et al., 2011c).

![Figure 4.47](image-url)  
**Figure 4.47** Effect of GHSV on light hydrocarbons (C_1-C_4) selectivity at P = 1 atm., \(\text{H}_2/\text{CO}= 2\), where \(T = (\bigcirc)220\), \((\square)235\) and \((\bigtriangleup)250\) °C, and 5gm of catalyst, the composition of produced gas phase was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.3.2.2.4 Effect of gas hourly space velocity (GHSV) on Carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) selectivity.

The CO$_2$ selectivity is reported in Figure 4.48 as a function of gas hourly space velocity. Increases in GHSV caused a moderate increase in the selectivity of CO$_2$. As a matter of facts, CO$_2$ production depends on the amount of water produced by water–gas shift (WGS) in FT reaction, and the WGS reaction is a side-reaction that cannot take place before the water has been produced in FT (Tristantini D. et al., 2007). The negligible amount of CO$_2$ produced is in agreement with the reduced WGS activity obtained in other studies using cobalt-based catalysts (Osa A.R. et al., 2011a, b and c).

![Figure 4.48](image-url)  
*Figure 4.48* Effect of GHSV on CO$_2$ selectivity at $P = 1$ atm., $H_2/CO = 2$, where $T = (◊)220$, (□)235 and (△) 250 °C, and 5gm of catalyst the amount of produced CO$_2$ was analysis by GC-HP 5890 equipped with a TCD detector (see section 3.1.6).
4.3.2.3 Effect of reaction temperature and GHSV on liquid products selectivity.

In this part, the discussion focuses on the effect of reaction temperature and GHSV on Liquid products (C$_{5+}$) selectivity.

4.3.2.3.1 Effect of reaction temperature on liquid hydrocarbon selectivity.

The selectivity of in liquid hydrocarbons (C$_5$-C$_{11}$, C$_{12}$-C$_{20}$ and > 20) reported in the table (4.7) in terms of (C$_{5+}$) as a function of reaction temperature is described in Figure 4.49. The liquid hydrocarbon selectivity decreases when increasing the reaction temperature. As a matter of facts, increases in reaction temperature lead to an increase in the hydrogenation activity, thus producing a shift in the reaction towards light hydrocarbons, as explained in the section 4.3.2.2.1. In other words, the selectivity of desired products (e.g. gasoline and diesel hydrocarbons), in the range of C$_5$-C$_{11}$ and C$_{12}$-C$_{20}$ respectively, can be achieved at a low reaction temperature. At steady state, for all tests the observed trends are in agreement with the results obtained in other carried out using cobalt-based catalysts (Chu W. et al., 2007, Osa A.R. et al., 2011 a, b and c, Rytter E.etal.,2016).
Figure 4.49  Effect of reaction temperature on liquid hydrocarbon (C$_{5+}$) selectivity at P = 1 atm., H$_2$/CO =2, where GHSV= (◊)370, (□) 520, (△) 670 and (×) 820 hr$^{-1}$, and 5gm of catalyst, the composition of produced liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
4.5.2.3.2 Effect of gas hourly space velocity (GHSV) on liquid product selectivity.

The light hydrocarbon selectivity is increased when increasing the gas hourly space velocity, as shown in section 4.3.2.2.3. On the contrary, the selectivity in liquid hydrocarbons (C₅-C₁₁, C₁₂-C₂₀ and>20) decreases with the gas hourly space velocity, as shown in the table (4.7) in terms of (C₅₊) and in Figure 4.50. For this reason, the desired products (e.g. gasoline and diesel hydrocarbons), in the range of C₅-C₁₁ and C₁₂-C₂₀ respectively, can be achieved at a lower GHSV. At steady state, for all tests the trends observed are in agreement with results obtained in other studies carried out using cobalt-based catalysts (Tristantini D. et al., 2007, Osa A.R. et al., 2011 c).

Figure 4.50 Effect of GHSV on Liquid hydrocarbon (C₅₊) selectivity at P = 1 atm., H₂/CO = 2, where T = (◊)220, (□)235 and (△) 250 °C, and 5gm of catalyst, the composition of produced liquid phase was analysis by GC-17A equipped with a FID detector (see section 3.1.5.3).
Chapter Five: Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the results obtained:

5.1 Conclusions - optimization of an anaerobic digestion process.

- The effect of three different total solid fractions (TS %) from municipal solid waste on the biogas production was studied by performing a series of experiments using sewage sludge, adapted in a synthetic medium, as inoculum. The results show that the gas production is significantly affected by the TS content in feedstock. The best performance for biogas generation and methane fraction was obtained when adopting the highest amount of TS (15 %).
- The effect of three different volume fractions of inoculum on the biogas production was studied by performing a series of experiments using a synthetic medium. The best results in terms of biogas generation and methane fraction were obtained adopting lower volume fractions of volume inoculum (10 v/v %). Higher volumes of inoculum produced a higher amount of VFA, leading to higher inhibition effects.
- The effect of co-digestion with different fractions of MSW and GR on performances of digesters for biogas production were studied. The results show that:
  - The best performances of co-digestion were obtained in the presence of 75% GR and 25% MSW. This is because a large amount of GR provides an appropriate intake of carbon to balance the nitrogen content in the MSW.
• When using 100% GR, the biogas production was very low. This was due to the poor availability of nutrients, leading to a slow carbon hydrolysis. Similarly, when using 100% MSW, a poor biogas production was observed.

• These results indicate that a synergetic use of both MSW and GR may significantly improve the efficiency of the anaerobic digestion process.

• The addition of mineral solution "M9 10x" and 400x salts had a positive effect on anaerobic digestion of MSW, increasing the biogas production as well as the fraction of methane. This is probably due to the improved efficiency of the methanogenesis step.

❖ The effects of addition Ni, Zn and Co, separately or in mixtures, on biogas production, composition of biogas and intermediate products of AD (acetic acid, butyric acid, propionic acid and ethanol), have been studied. The results show that:

• The biogas production and the methane fraction were increased by the separate addition of a single element in a concentration range from 5 to 50 mg/L. Whatever the element added, the best results were obtained at a concentration of 5 mg/L. Inhibition phenomena were observed at 100mg /L.

• Whatever the element added, a minimum amount of VFAs was obtained at a concentration of 5mg/L.

• The addition of trace elements (Ni, Zn and Co) is very important to improve the anaerobic digestion process, though the best growth of biomass was obtained at low concentrations of these elements.
• The best values of cumulative volume of biogas produced, biomass growth, and the minimum VFA production was obtained when adding any mixture of trace element containing Ni, with the concentration 5 mg/L for each one. And the best results were obtained when using all the three elements (Ni, Zn, and Co).

5.2 Conclusions - catalyst characterization.

A 15% wt. Co/Al₂O₃ catalyst was prepared by impregnation technique under vacuum and characterized by Temperature-Programmed Reduction (TPR) and N₂ adsorption isotherm techniques. The results show that:

• The TPR is a most important technique used for characterizing the catalyst, that provides information about the degree of temperature and amount of H₂ consumed for the complete reduction of Co₃O₄ to CoO and then to Co on the support surface.

• The measured BET surface area of the Co/Al₂O₃ catalyst is lower than the calculated value (see Appendix C, C.2), due to the pore blockage produced by cobalt oxide clusters.

5.3 Conclusions - FT reaction.

The effect of a range of two parameters, namely: reaction temperature and gas hourly space velocity (GHSV), on the FT reaction in the presence of Cobalt-Alumina based catalyst was measured. The results show that:

• In all tests, at the beginning a higher conversion of CO and a lower conversion of H₂ were observed. Subsequently Xₜₚ decreases and Xₜstrconv increases gradually until reaching the steady-state conditions approximately after 600-800 min.
The formation of light hydrocarbons (C₁-C₄) products and CO₂ decreases gradually and the formation of liquid products corresponds to an increase of the chain length.

A decrease in the production of light hydrocarbons leads to an increase in the selectivity towards gasoline and diesel hydrocarbons.

The reaction temperature and the gas hourly space velocity do not have significant effects on the conversion of diluted CO while having few effects on the conversion of diluted H₂.

An increase in the reaction temperature and GHSV leads to a shift of the product towards low molecular weight hydrocarbons.

The selectivity towards the desired products (e.g. gasoline and diesel hydrocarbons) is 40.3% and 47.2% respectively, and can be achieved at a reaction temperature of 220 °C and a GHSV value of 370 h⁻¹.

The value of the CO conversion obtained at steady state adopting the minimum values of temperatures and GHSV is about 27%, which is higher than the values reported in the literature with the same H₂/CO ratio for a not diluted condition.

The reduced amounts of CO₂ demonstrate that the presence of cobalt catalyst reduces substantially the WGS activity.

The steady state condition has been kept for 10 days and tests repeated several times with no appreciable changes, demonstrating the high stability of the catalyst.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Composition of alkaline copper tartrate solution

**Copper Reagent A.** Dissolve 2.5 g of Na$_2$CO$_3$ (anhydrous), 2.5 g of Sodium potassium tartrate (Rochelle salt), 2 g of Sodium bicarbonates NaHCO$_3$, and 20 g Sodium sulfate (Na$_2$SO$_4$) (anhydrous) in 80 mL of distilled water in a beaker and then diluted to 100 mL.

**Copper Reagent B.** Dissolve 15 g of Copper sulfate (CuSO$_4$.5H$_2$O) in 80 mL of distilled water in beaker. Then, two drops of concentrated sulfuric acid (H$_2$SO$_4$) and diluted to 100 mL.

Finally, the alkaline copper tartrate solution was prepared by mixed 25 mL of Copper Reagent A with 1 mL of Copper Reagent B.

Composition of arsénomolybdate reagent

1- Dissolve 2.5 gm of ammonium molybdate in 45 mL of distilled water in a beaker, then 2.1 mL of concentrated sulfuric acid H$_2$SO$_4$ was added and mix.

2- Dissolve 0.3 g of Arsenate (Na$_2$HASO$_4$.7H$_2$O in 25 mL distilled water in a beaker.

3- Then mix two beakers and placed in an incubator at 37°C for 24 to 48 hours.
Figure A.1 Calibration line Assay by Nelson-Somogyi for measuring reducing sugars.

Figure A.2 Calibration curve for biomass growth.
Appendix B

Figure B.1 Calibration curve for ethanol.

Figure B.2 Calibration curve for butyric acid.

Figure B.3 Calibration curve for acetic acid.
Figure B.4 Calibration curve for propionic acid.

Figure B.5 Calibration curve for methane.

Figure B.6 Calibration curve for hydrogen.
Figure B.7 Calibration curve for carbon dioxide.

Figure B.8 Calibration curve for hydrogen feed to FT reaction.

Figure B.9 Calibration curve for carbon monoxide feed to FT reaction.
Appendix C

C.1 Reducibility Calculation

The area of peaks during temperature-programmed reduction (TPR) calculate based on weight of the calcined cobalt catalysts. By assuming the major species of calcined Co catalysts is Co₃O₄. Based on 15wt% of Co in the Co/Al₂O₃. The amount of H₂ that can be consumed by Co₃O₄ is calculated as follow:

\[
\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{CoO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \\
3\text{CoO} + 3\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{Co}^0 + 3\text{H}_2\text{O} \\
\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4 + 4\text{H}_2 \rightarrow 3\text{Co} + 4\text{H}_2\text{O}
\]

Molecular Weight of Co = 58.93 g/mole and Co₃O₄ = 240.79 g/mole

Catalyst loaded in reactor = 5 g with 15% Co (i.e 0.75 g Co)

Mole of Co= 0.75/58.93 = 0.01273 mole

\[
\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4/\text{Co} = 1/3 \quad \text{mole of Co}_3\text{O}_4 = 1/3 \times \text{mole Co} = 1/3 \times 0.01273 = 0.00424 \text{ mole.}
\]

\[
\text{Co}_3\text{O}_4/\text{H}_2 = 1/4, \text{mole of H}_2 = 4 \times \text{mole of Co}_3\text{O}_4 = 4 \times 0.00424 \text{ mole} = 0.01697 \text{ mole of H}_2 \text{ consumed for 100% reducibility.}
\]

For in suit reduction 2 % H₂/Ar mixture at flow rate =6NL/h. (i.e 0.12 NL/h H₂)

Mole of H₂ = 0.12 (NL/h) × 1 (atm.)/0.08206 (L. atm. /mole. K) ×673.15 K) =0.002172 mole/h.

For 10 hours = 0.02172 mole.
C.2 Calculation surface area for Co/Al₂O₃

Weight Co/Al₂O₃ catalyst = 5 g.

BET surface area of Al₂O₃=220 m²g⁻¹

Moles of Co₃O₄ after calcination =0.00424 mole (Appendix C, C.1)

Weight of Co₃O₄ =0.00424 mole ×240.79 g/mole =1.021 g.

Weight percentage of Co₃O₄= 1.021/5 = 0.204.

Theoretical surface area = (1-0.204) ×220 m²g⁻¹= 175.12 m²g⁻¹