



Effect of secondary additives on the properties of vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide tableted catalysts used in the oxidation of propane

Víctor G. Baldovino-Medrano^{a,b,c,*}, Benjamin Farin^c, Eric M. Gaigneaux^{c,*}

^a Centro de Investigaciones en Catálisis -CICAT-UIS (CICAT), Parque Tecnológico de Guatiguará, Universidad Industrial de Santander, km 2 vía El Refugio, Piedecuesta 681011, Colombia

^b Laboratorio de Ciencia de Superficies (Ccss-UIS), Parque Tecnológico de Guatiguará, Universidad Industrial de Santander, km 2 vía El Refugio, Piedecuesta 681011, Colombia

^c Institute of Condensed Matter and Nanosciences - IMCN, Division Molecular Chemistry, Materials and Catalysts -MOST, UCLouvain, Place Louis Pasteur 1, box L4.01.09, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 7 October 2020

Received in revised form 3 February 2021

Accepted 29 March 2021

Available online xxxx

Keywords:

Technical catalysts

Tableting

Vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide

Additives

Propane oxidation

ABSTRACT

The effect of adding secondary additives for tableting vanadium-aluminum mixed-oxides, VAIO, on key physico-chemical properties and on the catalytic performance in propane oxidation was investigated. Graphite was used as the primary shaping agent. The secondary additives were MgO, silica, BN, sepiolite, and ZnO. The hardness, fracture strength, and particle shape of the secondary additives were associated to the changes of the mechanical strength and porosity of the tablets. There was a compromise between mechanical strength and loss of mesoporosity and surface area. Meanwhile, the additives did not establish a chemical interaction with the VAIO material. Therefore, the secondary additives may act as co-catalysts during propane oxidation. BN and sepiolite were best for promoting both the reactivity of the catalytic formulations and the production of propene. This promotion may be due to the combination of a redox mechanism over the VAIO phase and to a surface radical mechanism occurring over the active moieties of BN and sepiolite.

© 2021 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Shaping is a must for technical catalysts and its importance cannot be overstated [1–18]. As Armor pointed out in his 2005 essay: Do you really have a better catalyst? [10], “It is important to remember that there is an overall rate (of reaction) determined by catalyst composition, catalyst shape/structure, porosity, and additives; sometimes an extremely active powder may be difficult to formulate into a commercial product which fits the reactor conditions.” Therefore, technical catalysts are shaped bodies that possess the catalytic functionalities needed for high cost-effective processes and that have adequate qualities for fitting specific reactor types, configurations, and conditions [1–16]. To fulfill these requirements, they must possess convenient composition, size, geometry, and porosity that provide mechanical resistance, thermal, and chemical resilience. When a promising catalyst powder is identified in the laboratory, the scaling-up of its production includes designing a series of unit operations for shaping it. The shaped catalyst is what is called technical catalyst.

The catalytic powder is often combined with other substances that may serve as binders, lubricants, plasticizers, compaction agents, porogeneous agents, and other additives promoting chemical reactivity or stability during the forming operation that leads to shaping [2,3,6,7,15,19]. The formulation of a technical catalyst hence consists of making an adequate selection of these substances and devising their relative composition in the formulation while keeping in mind the method selected for the forming operation [2,5,8,12,13,20,21].

Conventional forming operations are spray-drying, granulation, extrusion, and tableting (or pelleting). Extrusion and tableting are most often employed for forming catalysts aimed to processes operated with fixed-bed or trickle-bed reactors at the ton scale; e.g. hydrotreating, reforming, and selective oxidations [6,11,22]. When a technical catalyst is installed within these reactors, its lifespan depends on how it withstands the chemical, thermal, and mechanical stresses imposed by their own weight, the weight of the reactants, and the constantly changing operation conditions of the process [23–33]. The effects of these stresses are intricately interconnected with each other; e.g. thermal stresses may lead to sintering or crystallization that may make the technical catalyst brittle henceforth promoting particle breakage into irregular bodies and fines that cause channeling, hot-spots, and increased pressure gradients to a point where the reactor plugs and the operation must be stopped. In these instances, catalysts extrudates and tablets must offer the highest mechanical resistance possible without strongly compromising the chemical reactivity and the access of the

* Corresponding authors at: Institute of Condensed Matter and Nanosciences - IMCN, Division Molecular Chemistry, Materials and Catalysts -MOST, UCLouvain, Place Louis Pasteur 1, box L4.01.09, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

E-mail addresses: vicbaldo@uis.edu.co (V.G. Baldovino-Medrano), eric.gaigneaux@uclouvain.be (E.M. Gaigneaux).

reactants to the catalytically active centers. Where, the accessibility to the active centers of the catalysts is controlled by the porosity of the shaped catalyst.

Previous contributions from recent years were devoted to understanding the basics behind the extrusion and tableting of catalytic powders used in selective oxidation reactions [34–38]. Particularly, investigations aiming to understand how tableting modifies the physicochemical and catalytic properties of vanadium–aluminum mixed (hydr)oxide (VAIO) powders used for the oxidative dehydrogenation of propane were done [35,37,39]. Within this context, VAIO was identified as a promising material for propane ammoxidation and dehydrogenation [40,41]. It was found that VAIO powders can only be tableted if they are mixed with low loadings of graphite (G), ca. 1.0 wt%, because this substance is needed as both lubricant and binding agent during the forming operation. The tablets produced with graphite displayed better selectivity to the production of propene as compared to those made solely with the base VAIO powder. Furthermore, an analysis of the spent catalysts showed that graphite does not decompose or burn during the catalytic tests. The latter was a matter of concern for the studied reaction; propane oxidation. Indeed, Stiles [7] strongly warned upon the risks of graphite burning or oxidation at high temperatures on the stability and performance of industrial catalysts. Unfortunately, and as it is common for literature concerning the shaping of catalysts, the author neither provided evidence to support his warning nor did he mention literature references documenting the fact.

Given the advances described above, it was decided to broaden the scope of this research by investigating the effect of putting secondary additives of different acid–base characteristics into the formulation of tablets of VAIO-G over some of the relevant physicochemical and catalytic properties of these materials. For this purpose, 5.0 wt% of the following substances were arbitrarily added during tableting: basic MgO, neutral or slightly basic sepiolite [42], neutral boron nitride, neutral or slightly acidic SiO₂, and amphoteric ZnO. The produced tablets were analyzed in terms of their mechanical resistance, porosity, surface chemical composition, and their catalytic behavior on the oxidation of propane. For the latter, it was investigated how the produced formulations behaved in front of changes of the temperature and of the O₂/C₃H₈ molar ratio of the reaction feed.

2. Experimental methods

2.1. Synthesis of vanadium–aluminum mixed hydroxides

The synthesis of vanadium–aluminum mixed hydroxides at the 1 kg scale was described in detail in previous works [35–37,40,43]. Briefly, adequate quantities of ammonium metavanadate (NH₄VO₃, Isochim, technical degree) and aluminum nitrate nonahydrate (Al(NO₃)₃·9H₂O, Merck, 95%) were dissolved in distilled water at 333 K in an 80 L stainless steel precipitation tank stirred with a boat propeller type stirrer. A nominal bulk molar V/Al ratio of 0.25 was fixed for the synthesis. The coprecipitation of the mixed hydroxide proceeded at a pH of 5.5. This pH was reached and maintained by adding NH₄OH (Merck, 25%). The obtained hydroxide slurry was filtered in a belt-filter and then washed overnight under stirring with hot water in the co-precipitation reactor vessel. After a second filtration, the recovered solid was dried in a static air stove at 333 K. The dried vanadium–aluminum mixed hydroxide powder was grounded and sieved to particle sizes below 100 µm.

2.2. Tableting

The sifted vanadium–aluminum mixed hydroxide powder was mixed with 1.0 wt% graphite (Merck, technical grade) and 5.0 wt% of the selected secondary shaping additives inside a glass bottle. The mixture of the powders was made by rolling the bottle on a table and shaking it by hand during a few minutes [35,37]. The homogeneity of the

mixture was visually verified by checking that no separated particles could be distinguished. The secondary additives were powders of magnesium oxide -MgO: basic- (Aldrich), sepiolite -Mg₄Si₆O₁₅(OH)₂·6H₂O: neutral or slightly basic- [42] (Sigma-Aldrich), boron nitride -BN: neutral- (Sigma-Aldrich), silica -SiO₂: neutral or slightly acidic- (Merck), and zinc oxide -ZnO: amphoteric- (Merck), that were all technical grade products with particle sizes comparable to the one of the sifted vanadium–aluminum mixed hydroxide powder. Cylindrical tablets with dimensions: L = 2.3 mm × Ø = 5.1 mm, were manufactured with a hand-operated machine (Ateliers Ed. Courtoy, series 796) [35,37]. Tablets were roasted inside a stove under static air at 773 K for 4 h. The formed materials were named following the nomenclature: VAIO-G-Additive. Where, G stands for 1.0 wt% graphite and Additive was replaced by the corresponding nomenclature adopted for each additive. Namely, Mg = magnesium oxide, BN = boron nitride, Si = silica, Sep = sepiolite, and Zn = zinc oxide.

2.3. Assessment of the physicochemical properties of the materials

2.3.1. Mechanical resistance

The axial compressive strength (σ_c) of the tablets was measured with an automatic Instron 5566 testing machine using the methods reported elsewhere [34,35,37]. Tablets were placed in the instrument where they were submitted to an axial load at a constant speed of 5 mm/min. The accuracy of the measured force was ± 1 N. The measurements were replicated at least five times for each tested sample.

2.3.2. Surface area and porosity

N₂ adsorption-desorption isotherms at 77 K were measured by the volumetric method in a Micromeritics Tristar 3000 apparatus. The analysis was performed on particles of sizes ranging between 100 and 350 µm. These particles were recovered after crushing the corresponding VAIO-G-Additive tablets. In general, 0.15–0.25 g of sample were outgassed overnight at 423 K under a vacuum pressure of 15 Pa before running the analyses. During each test, both the warm and cold free spaces of the sample cells were automatically measured by the apparatus. The relative pressure (P/P₀) range of the measurements was comprised between 0.01 and 0.99 with ~59 points being collected to complete the isotherms.

2.3.3. X-Ray photoelectron spectrometry (XPS)

XPS measurements were performed with an SSI-X-probe (SSX-100/206) photoelectron spectrometer (Surface Science Instruments) equipped with a monochromatic microfocused Al K α X-ray source (1486.6 eV) using the same procedures reported elsewhere [34–37]. Sample preparation consisted of crushing and grounding randomly selected tablets into fine powders by hand with an agate mortar and pestle. These powders were then pressed into small stainless-steel troughs and mounted on a multi-specimen ceramic carousel used as the sample holder. Samples were then introduced in the preparation chamber of the instrument where they were outgassed overnight over vacuum. Afterward, they were passed to the analysis chamber of the instrument where the pressure was around 1.3×10^{-6} Pa. An area of approximately 1.4 mm² (1000 µm × 1700 µm) was analyzed for each sample. To avoid issues with sample charging, a Ni grid was placed 3 mm above the carousel holding the samples and the samples were flooded with low energy electrons using a flood gun operated at 8 eV. The reader can see a sketch of this set-up at [44]. During the analyses, general survey spectra were recorded using a pass energy of 150 eV. Under such a condition, the full width at half maximum (FWHM) of the Au 4f_{7/2} peak of a clean gold standard sample was about 1.6 eV. Besides the general spectra, narrow scans were recorded for selected regions of the spectra by setting the pass energy at 50 eV. The stability of the surface charge of the samples during the measurements was monitored by recording the C 1s peak of the samples at the beginning and at the end of the measurements. The recorded data were analyzed with CasaXPS® (Casa

Software Ltd., UK) using a Gaussian/Lorentzian (85/15) product function as line shape after subtraction of a Shirley baseline. Further details on the analysis conditions are given elsewhere [34,35,37,45,].

2.4. Catalytic tests

The oxidation of propane was used as a test reaction. Tests were carried out in a U-shaped fixed-bed reactor made of quartz; external diameter of the tube = 0.6 cm; external diameter of the fixed-bed = 1.4 cm, L = 19.1 cm, and provided with a frit to hold the catalyst. Before the tests, the tablets of the catalysts were crushed and the recovered particles were sifted to sizes between 200 and 315 μm . Circa 0.1 g of these particles were diluted in quartz spheres (0.4 g, $D_p \leq 200 \mu\text{m}$) and put inside the reactor for testing under plug-flow conditions. The volume of the catalytic bed (catalyst plus quartz spheres) was ca. 1.0 cm^3 . The empty space between the entrance and exit of the fixed bed was not filled up. The reactor was provided with a thermowell located at the same height as the catalytic bed. This allowed direct sensing and control of the reactor temperature at the level of the catalytic bed through the ca. 1.0 mm thickness of the reactor wall. The temperature was sensed by a K-type thermocouple connected to a conventional PID controller. The tests were made as follows. First, the catalysts were dried for 1 h under nitrogen flow after which the reactants were fed to the reactor. Then, the temperature was consecutively ramped up to 723, 748, and 773 K. The feed consisted of 40 cm^3/min of a mixture of O_2 and C_3H_8 and N_2 as diluent. Tests were made at different $\text{O}_2/\text{C}_3\text{H}_8$ molar ratios; namely, 2.0, 1.5, 1.0, and 0.67. Technical grade propane, 99.999% purity oxygen, and 99.999% purity nitrogen were used. All gases were provided by Praxair and used as received. Under the above conditions, the absence of mass and heat transfer profiles was ruled out as described in a previous paper [1]. Reaction products identification was made with an on-line Varian GC provided with three GC columns and two detectors. A Hayesep column coupled with a Molecular Sieve column and a TCD detector were used to separate and quantify O_2 , N_2 , CO , CO_2 , C_3H_8 , and C_3H_6 . The presence and quantification of oxygenates were managed through a system composed of one EC-Wax column coupled with an FID detector. Samples of the reaction products were taken approximately every 30 min. Further details of the reaction set-up are presented elsewhere [34,35]. Carbon balances around 100% were achieved for each catalytic test. A standard deviation of 10–15% was accepted due to the uncontrolled limitations of the experimental set-up. The catalytic performance was assessed in terms of fractional conversions and products yields according to the equations:

$$X_i = \frac{(n_i^0 - n_i^f)}{n_i^0}; \quad i = \text{C}_3\text{H}_8 \text{ or } \text{O}_2 \quad (1)$$

$$y_j = \left(\frac{\nu_j}{\nu_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_8}} \right) \times \frac{n_j^f}{n_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_8}^0 - n_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_8}^f}; \quad j = \text{C}_3\text{H}_6, \text{CO}_2, \text{CO}, \text{ or other oxygenated hydrocarbons} \quad (2)$$

The catalytic tests were done until reaching steady state conversions under each tested reaction condition. Typically, steady state was reached after ca. one hour of time on stream. For the tests made at different temperatures, the temperature was increased at each corresponding level after at least four hours of time on stream.

2.5. Statistical assessment of the data

Boxplots were used to represent and compare groups of data from the results of characterization and catalytic tests for each one of the formulated catalytic tablets. Boxplots were chosen as statistical graphical descriptors of the data since they do not only portrait central tendency descriptors such as the median and the average, but also portrait how the data is distributed through the width of the boxes which mark the

quartiles of the data. In addition, the whiskers of the boxplot serve to detect outliers by marking data points which fall outside them. In this work, boxplots were made with Microsoft® Excel® for Office 365 MSO by including the median in the calculations. The interested reader can look into a video illustrating how one of the boxplots included in this paper was done by clicking [here](#). The boxplots comparing catalytic data were done with the steady state averages of the metrics used for following these tests. When the data from the catalytic tests were plotted as a function of the physicochemical characteristics of the catalysts, the corresponding values of the latter were used as categories for the boxplots.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Physicochemical properties

First, the effect of the use of the selected secondary additives on the mechanical resistance of the materials will be discussed. Then, it will be shown that the original mesopore structure, shape and average dimensions, of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxides was kept by the tableted materials even though the number of mesopores was reduced by the forces exerted during the forming operation. The latter translated into losses of specific surface area and pore volume which were found to vary with the type of secondary additive.

3.2. Mechanical resistance

Fig. 1 shows boxplots comparing the axial compression strength for samples of the manufactured tablets. Raw data can be found in Table S1. The sole addition of graphite to the VAIO powder during tableting increased mechanical resistance. This effect was reported and analyzed elsewhere [34,37,]. On the other hand, the further addition of silica, **VAIO-G-Si**, strengthened the axial compression resistance of the tablets beyond the levels reached with the sole addition of graphite, **VAIO-G**. However, the mechanical resistance of **VAIO-G-Si** was highly variable with some tablets having a similar mechanical resistance than those produced with the other secondary additives. To this respect, compared to **VAIO-G**, boron nitride, magnesium oxide, sepiolite, and zinc oxide lowered the mechanical resistance to a very similar extent. These changes could be related to the hardness of the secondary additives. Indeed, the Mohs hardness of the secondary additives are ~2.0 for boron nitride and sepiolite, ~4.5 for zinc oxide, ~5.5 for magnesium oxide, and ~7.0 for silica [46]. Accordingly, silica is the hardest solid followed by MgO, while the other additives are soft. Such a trend seems to correlate with the tendency in mechanical resistance, Fig. 1. On the other hand, according to the literature [8,20,47], ductility is necessary for wielding the particles from the different substances that make part of the technical catalyst during tableting. However, as suggested by one of the reviewers of this contribution, enhancement of the mechanical strength of tablets also requires the breakage of the particles of the formulation during the compression stage. Accordingly, finer particles would make denser and stronger tablets. Scheme 1 is a cartoon that depicts this explanation. Particularly, the fact that silica particles may break the easiest due to their highest hardness and spherical shape would also promote the breakage of the vanadium aluminum mixed oxide particles as well. Thus, a mixture of the finest particles within VAIO-G-Si would be formed. This hypothesis finds further support on the fact that this solid has the lowest fracture toughness, 0.62–0.67 $\text{Ma} \times \text{m}^{-1/2}$ [55], among the used secondary additives. Other factor to be considered to explain the observed trends is the shape of the particles of the secondary additives. In this sense, shapes that may align along the same plane and intercalate with the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide would not promote further particle breakage during the compression stage of tableting. Particularly, MgO particles are platy [48], graphite and boron nitride particles are flaky [34,49], sepiolite particles are needle shaped [42,50–53], and ZnO particles are prism-like shaped





Fig. 1. Boxplots for the mechanical resistance of vanadium-aluminum mixed tablets manufactured with different shaping additives. Nomenclature: VAIO-G-Additive, where, G = 1 wt% graphite, Si = SiO₂, BN = Boron nitride, Mg = Magnesium oxide, Sep = Sepiolite, Zn = Zinc oxide. All tablets contained 5.0 wt% of the corresponding additives.



Scheme 1. Cartoon sketching the tableting production process. G = 1.0 wt% graphite; Si = 5.0 wt% silica; * = 5.0 wt% of secondary additives: MgO, boron nitride, sepiolite, and ZnO.

[54]. As a consequence, the mechanical resistance of the tablets formulated with these additives may be expected to remain at the same level as the ones found for VAIO and VAIO-G.

3.3. Porosity

Fig. 2 shows two nitrogen physisorption isotherms, selected among those measured for the manufactured catalysts tablets, that illustrate that the mesoporous structure of the catalytic vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide was kept by the tablets made with the secondary additives. The isotherms, measured with particles recovered after crushing tablets of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide and of the formulation with 1.0 wt% graphite and 5.0 wt% silica, are presented in terms of a χ -plot [56,57]. This method was used because it is more adequate for estimating surface area, SA_{χ} , than the conventional BET method for the present materials [58]. As discussed in a previous contribution [35], vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide powders consist of platy particles making slit-like mesopores that produce type II isotherms with an H3 hysteresis loop. As the results presented in Fig. 2 show, the tests did not detect changes of the pore structure after tableting using the additives studied herein. This is further corroborated by the results of the

BJH calculations [59] done for assessing the corresponding mesopore size distributions, Insets Fig. 2 and Fig. S2. Indeed, the original two families of mesopores found for the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide powder after tableting; one around 6.0 nm and the other around 15 nm, were also found for the powders recovered from the other tablets, Fig. S2. In conclusion, neither of the formulations employed for tableting the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide catalyst modified the original mesoporous structure of the latter.

Although the manufactured tablets kept the mesoporous structure of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide, tableting led to a loss in the number of mesopores hence decreasing the surface area of the materials. This effect is made patent by the results featured in Fig. 3 (numerical values are reported in Table S1). It may be noticed that, as secondary additives, magnesium oxide and silica roughly had a lower surface area and cumulative pore volume than the tablets produced solely with graphite. It may also be noticed that the tablets produced with sepiolite were those with the lowest loss in surface area and cumulative pore volume while keeping the same level of mechanical strength of the tablets manufactured with zinc oxide and boron nitride. The effect of sepiolite may be explained considering that this material is a clay binder whose needle-like and soft particles may easily intercalate with those of the




Fig. 2. Representative nitrogen physisorption isotherms, χ -plots [35,56] for particles recovered from two representative formulations of vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide tablets: **VAIO** = vanadium-aluminum mixed tableted without additives. **VAIO-G-Si** = vanadium-aluminum mixed tableted with 1.0 wt% graphite and 5.0 wt% silica. Physisorption isotherms for the other manufactured tablets can be found in Fig. S1. Insets correspond to BJH [59] pore size distributions and cumulative pore volumes considering slit-shape pores. Other pore size distributions and cumulative pore volume plots are presented in Fig. S2.




Fig. 3. Surface area, SA_x , and cumulative pore volume, V_p , plotted as a function of the median of the axial compressive strengths exhibited by the manufactured tablets. Nomenclature: VAIO-G-Additive, where, G = 1 wt% graphite, Si = SiO_2 , BN = Boron nitride, Mg = Magnesium oxide, Sep = Sepiolite, Zn = Zinc oxide. All tablets contained 5.0 wt% of the corresponding additives.

vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide. In this sense and as explained earlier, its addition to the formulation would not contribute to enhancing the mechanical resistance of the tablets because it would not promote further particle breaking during the forming operation. Similar considerations can be made for explaining the effects of boron nitride and zinc oxide who are also soft layered materials.

In summary, it was found that the use of the secondary additives for tableting vanadium-aluminum mixed oxides has a strong impact on the mechanical resistance of the manufactured tablets. Specifically, if the additive is a hard solid with low fracture toughness and spherical shape such as silica, the produced tablets increase their mechanical strength. Meanwhile, if the additive is made of soft platy-like particles; e.g., boron nitride, sepiolite, zinc oxide, the mechanical strength of the tablets decreases as compared to the tablets made solely with graphite, VAIO-G. In general, tableting, as practiced under the conditions of the present study, does not alter the mesoporous structure of the catalytic powder. What tableting does make nonetheless is to reduce the number of mesopores of the catalyst. This translates into losses in surface area and pore volume. In this sense, softer and platy-like additives mitigate such losses but at the above-mentioned expense in mechanical strength. This teaches that the mechanical resistance of a catalytic tablet cannot be optimized without reaching a compromise between this property and surface area.

Second, the effect of the secondary additives of the catalyst tablets over their surface chemistry as measured by XPS is discussed.

3.4. Surface chemistry

Table 1 shows the surface composition of particles recovered after crushing the manufactured tablets. The presented composition is representative of the internal surface of the tablets which may differ from what is present at their external surface [24,35]. The internal surface of the tablets is where most of the active sites of the catalyst are located though. Therefore, its characterization is relevant for understanding catalysis; particularly, at the laboratory scale where transport limitations are ruled out, which is the present case [35]. The first thing to comment about these results is that the composition of the tablets made from the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide without and with graphite, VAIO and VAIO-G, respectively, are similar to what was reported in a previous contribution [35]. Namely, the molar percentage of vanadium, ~4.0

Table 1


Elemental surface composition of particles recovered after crushing the manufactured tablets measured by X-Ray photoelectron spectroscopy. Nomenclature: VAIO-G-Additive, where, G = 1 wt% graphite, Si = SiO_2 , BN = Boron nitride, Mg = Magnesium oxide, Sep = Sepiolite, Zn = Zinc oxide. All tablets contained 5.0 wt% of the corresponding additives.


Catalyst code	Element mole%				
	C	O	V	Al	Others
		Organic/Inorganic	V^{5+}/V^{4+}		
VAIO	14.0	4.7/50.6	4.6	25.8	$N = 0.3$
VAIO-G	19.7	4.2/47.0	3.5	25.3	$N = 0.4$
VAIO-G-Si	20.6	3.9/51.7	2.3	11.0	Si = 10.5
VAIO-G-BN	21.4	4.7/32.0	2.8	13.9	B = 12.5 $N = 12.8$
VAIO-G-Mg	27.4	5.6/42.8	3.1	16.1	Mg = 5.0
VAIO-G-Sep	24.5	5.1/46.2	4.7	17.6	Si = 1.8
VAIO-G-Zn	26.6	4.4/44.5	3.6	16.4	Mg = 1.3 Zn = 4.7

mol%, and the V/Al molar ratio, ~0.16, of these catalysts are within the range of values found earlier [35]. Besides, the V^{5+}/V^{4+} molar ratio of this set of materials was also within the margins of what has been found earlier for vanadium-aluminum mixed oxides [60].

It is interesting to see how the concentration of surface carbon increased with the addition of the secondary additives during tableting. Surface carbon has two sources in the featured materials; carbon from graphite, that roughly contributes 5.0 mol%, and adventitious carbon [61–65] adsorbed from the environment which roughly contributes 14.0 mol% in the case of VAIO materials, Table 1 and previous works [35]. What seems interesting from the current results is how the concentration of carbon increased for the tablets made with magnesium oxide, 27.4 mol%, sepiolite, 24.5 mol%, and zinc oxide, 26.6 mol%, while it rather remained at the same level for the tablets made with silica, 20.6 mol%, and boron nitride, 21.4 mol%. These increments are due to an increase in adventitious carbon since the loading of graphite was the same in all cases. Considering this fact, a correlation between the concentration of surface carbon and the acidobasicity of the additives is suggested. It may be noticed that both silica and boron nitride, which are rather neutral, did not enhance carbon concentration while basic MgO, slightly basic sepiolite, and amphoteric ZnO did. Therefore, the concentration of adventitious carbon can be employed as an indirect marker for the acidobasicity of the materials. It can be recalled that the surface of metallic oxides tends to minimize its surface energy by adsorbing organic molecules with lower surface tension [64]. This observation will become handy when analyzing the general catalytic trends found herein, Section 3.2.

The focus is now put on the concentration of oxygen. The total concentration of this element can be discriminated into organic and inorganic simply by subtracting the oxygen associated to the C 1 s peak from the concentration of oxygen calculated with the O 1 s peak (see Table S3 and Fig. 4 for details). Such a distinction is important because only inorganic oxygen will play a role in catalysis since organic carbon is weakly bonded to the surface hence being eliminated during the drying stage of the catalytic tests. Assuming the stoichiometries of the additives, it can be further aimed distinguishing the oxygen that should belong to the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide from the oxygen that belongs to the additives. For this, it was assumed that the added oxides obey their nominal stoichiometries which is, of course, a rough approximation. Therefore, silica will be SiO_2 , magnesium oxide will be MgO, zinc oxide will be ZnO, and sepiolite will follow the empirical formula accepted in mineralogy: $Mg_4Si_6O_{15} \cdot 6(H_2O)$. [65] For sepiolite, it can be noticed that the Si/Mg measured by XPS, 1.8/1.3–1.4 is approximately





the same as the one of the mineral, $6/4 = 1.5$. According to simple arithmetic, the mole percentages of oxygen associated to the vanadium-aluminum oxide decreased in the order: VAIO, 50.6 mol% > VAIO-G, 47.0 mol% > VAIO-G-Sep, 39.9 mol% ~ VAIO-G-Zn, 39.8 mol% ~ VAIO-G-Mg, 37.8 mol% > VAIO-G-BN, 32.0 mol% ~ VAIO-G-Si, 30.7 mol%. Two facts can be highlighted from such a comparison: (i) both graphite and the secondary additives reduced the concentration of surface oxygen linked to the catalytic phase. Where, the secondary additives further decreased the concentration of such oxygen. (ii) The additives with neutral acidobasicity; namely, boron nitride and silica, showed the lowest concentration of oxygen linked to the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide whereas those with acidobasic qualities, sepiolite, magnesium oxide, and zinc oxide, led to similar concentrations of this kind of oxygen.

The trends described above do not correspond to the formation of new bonds between the catalytic phase and the additives. Indeed, results evidenced that the chemical state of vanadium in the formulations, i.e. valence state and peak position, remained the same as the one for the base VAIO powder, see Fig. 4 and Fig. S3 and Table S3 of the Supplementary Information. This result is a corroboration of the fact that conventional tableting does not modify the chemical nature of mixed oxides [34,35].

3.5. Catalytic behavior

The effect of temperature, at a fixed O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio = 2/3, over the catalytic behavior will be discussed first. Then, the effect of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio, at a fixed temperature = 723 K, over the catalytic performance will be addressed. The presentation of the results will be separated for discussing first the tendencies found for the conversions of propane and oxygen and then the distribution of products. The analysis will not include rigorous kinetic considerations since the experiments were done under conditions where thermodynamic effects cannot be completely ruled out [66]. Such a limitation is justified at this stage of the research since the goal was to identify the main effects that the selected secondary additives have on the overall catalytic behavior. The used reaction conditions do not favor homogeneous reactions [67,68]. Therefore, the observed catalytic trends were solely ascribed to surface reactions.

3.6. Effect of temperature on conversion

Table 2 shows the steady state average conversions of propane and oxygen as a function of temperature for the formulated catalysts. Excepting the catalysts formulated with magnesium oxide and silica, VAIO-G-Mg and VAIO-G-Si, all catalysts started approaching full oxygen conversion at 748 K. Oxygen was the limiting reactant and this set the limit for the conversion of propane. The comparison of the catalytic performances will be limited to the results found at 723 K since an analysis under a full conversion regime would be mostly controlled by thermodynamics. The following comparisons will also be limited to the conversion of propane since, under the current conditions, the conversion of oxygen was roughly twice the conversion of the hydrocarbon in all instances. This suggests that, regardless of the nature of additive, the reactions of oxidation of propane were prevalent during the tests. Keeping these considerations in mind, the reactivity of the formulated catalysts decreased in the following order: VAIO-G-Sep ($X_{C_3H_8} \sim 0.40$) $\geq$ VAIO-G-BN ($X_{C_3H_8} \sim 0.37$) > VAIO ($X_{C_3H_8} \sim 0.32$) > VAIO-G-Zn ($X_{C_3H_8} \sim 0.27$) $\geq$ VAIO-G-Si ($X_{C_3H_8} \sim 0.26$) $\geq$ VAIO-G-Mg ($X_{C_3H_8} \sim 0.23$) > VAIO-G ($X_{C_3H_8} \sim 0.19$). Two facts can be highlighted from this trend: (i) all

Table 2

Molar fraction conversion of propane and oxygen as a function of temperature, 723, 748, and 773 K, over particles recovered from tablets of the catalytic formulations. Reaction conditions: U-shaped quartz fixed bed reactor, p = atmospheric pressure (Louvain-la-Neuve ~ 1.03 bar), catalyst weight ~ 0.1 g, average diameters of the catalyst particles 315–200 μm , catalytic bed volume ~ 1.0 cm^3 (catalyst plus ca. 0.4 g of quartz spheres of diameter ≤ 200 μm), gas flows, F_i [cm^3/min]: $F_{C_3H_8} = 4$; $F_{O_2} = 6$; $F_{N_2} = 30$. Nomenclature: VAIO = vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide; G = 1.0 wt% graphite; Mg = magnesium oxide; Si = silica; BN = boron nitride; Zn = zinc oxide; Sep = sepiolite. *Reactivity Index (RI) [$=$] $\text{kg}_{\text{reactant}}/(\text{m}_{\text{cat}}^3 \times \text{h})$. -cat = catalyst. For calculating the V_{cat} in RI, it was assumed that the density of the materials corresponds to the density of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide [36], $\rho = 2800$ kg/m^3 .

Catalyst code	T [K]	$X_{C_3H_8}$	X_{O_2}	$X_{O_2}/X_{C_3H_8}$	$RI_{C_3H_8}^*$	$RI_{O_2}^*$
VAIO	723	0.32	0.66	2.04	3983.6	8688.8
	748	0.48	1.00	2.06	5963.1	13,178.9
	773	0.50	1.00	2.01	6148.6	13,231.9
VAIO-G	723	0.19	0.32	1.67	2350.6	4211.9
	748	0.34	0.65	1.93	4156.8	8582.8
	773	0.50	1.00	2.00	6148.6	13,192.1
VAIO-G-Mg	723	0.23	0.39	1.72	2808.3	5165.6
	748	0.40	0.78	1.95	4948.6	10,317.9
	773	0.51	1.00	1.94	6359.0	13,231.9
VAIO-G-Si	723	0.26	0.57	2.18	3229.0	7523.2
	748	0.41	0.87	2.14	5022.8	11,523.3
	773	0.50	1.00	2.02	6136.3	13,245.1
VAIO-G-BN	723	0.37	0.74	2.01	4565.1	9814.6
	748	0.49	1.00	2.04	6049.7	13,192.1
	773	0.50	1.00	2.02	6123.9	13,231.9
VAIO-G-Zn	723	0.27	0.50	1.85	3352.7	6622.6
	748	0.46	0.94	2.06	5641.4	12,450.4
	773	0.50	1.00	2.00	6198.1	13,245.1
VAIO-G-Sep	723	0.40	0.84	2.09	4948.6	11,059.7
	748	0.50	1.00	1.99	6210.5	13,245.1
	773	0.51	1.00	1.97	6272.4	13,245.1

secondary additives increased the reactivity of the catalytic formulations as compared to the reference made with graphite, VAIO-G. (ii) The acido-basicity of the secondary additives did not seem to play a crucial role on defining the reactivity of the catalysts as a function of temperature. Indeed, the formulations made with sepiolite, weakly basic, and boron nitride, neutral, were more reactive than the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide material itself, while the formulations made with more basic MgO, neutral or slightly acidic SiO_2 , and Lewis acidic ZnO showed a rather similar reactivity. Beyond such a consideration, as additives, sepiolite and boron nitride promoted the reactivity of the VAIO catalyst.

Concerning the effect of sepiolite on the catalytic behavior, around the mid-90s, Corma et al. [50,69–71] found that magnesium from sepiolite interact strongly with vanadium if they roasted sepiolite at 923 K before impregnating the vanadium oxide precursor and then roasted again at 823 K. This strong interaction leads to the formation of different vanadium-magnesium mixed oxide phases; MgV_2O_6 , $\text{Mg}_3\text{V}_2\text{O}_8$, α - and β - $\text{Mg}_2\text{V}_2\text{O}_7$, that are reactive in propane oxidation. Herein, no evidence of the existence of these interactions was found. But, it must be said that the synthesis conditions of the catalysts made by Corma et al. [50,69–71] are very different to the preparation of the catalysts studied herein. Therefore, although it is certain that adding sepiolite during the tableting of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide catalyst promotes its reactivity, the reasons behind such a promotion effect remain to be established.

Regarding the promotional effect of boron nitride, three years after publishing results concerning this effect in 2013 [39], the group of Hermans at the University of Wisconsin [72,73] developed research proving that by itself boron nitride is catalytically reactive in alkane

Fig. 4. Peak decomposition of high resolution XPS spectra for samples of powders recovered after crushing the tablets manufactured with the different formulation. Nomenclature: VAIO-G-Additive, where, G = 1 wt% graphite, Si = SiO_2 , BN = Boron nitride, Mg = Magnesium oxide, Sep = Sepiolite, Zn = Zinc oxide. All tablets contained 5.0 wt% of the corresponding additives.

oxidations while yielding interesting amounts of olefins. In the specific case of hexagonal boron nitride, this group reported that this material favors parallel alkane cracking reactions instead of their combustion. They further postulated that boron nitride oxidizes to form $B(OH)_xO_{3-x}$ moieties that constitute its catalytically active sites [74].

One clue towards understanding the effects of sepiolite and boron nitride within the frame of the current research is to analyze the chemistry measured by XPS, Tables 1 and S3. From these results, it can be asked: did the relative concentration of surface vanadium increased for the formulations made with sepiolite and boron nitride as compared to the base vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide? No, it did not. Therefore, the increase in reactivity by an increase in surface vanadium cannot be accepted as an explanation because there was not a clear correlation between the concentration of surface vanadium and the catalytic performance for any of the materials under any of the studied reaction conditions, Fig. S4. Second, is the promotion of the reactivity of the catalysts by sepiolite and boron nitride due to a modification on the V^{5+}/V^{4+} ratio of surface vanadium? It might be, but... The V^{5+}/V^{4+} ratio decreased from 2.8 for the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide to 2.3 and 2.1 in the formulations where sepiolite and boron nitride were added, respectively. However, the VAIO-G formulation showed the same V^{5+}/V^{4+} ratio as VAIO-G-BN and was less reactive. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the promotion of the reactivity of the catalysts is due to a change in the V^{5+}/V^{4+} ratio for these two formulations. Finally, is the promotion related to the quantity of surface inorganic oxygen linked to vanadium? As in the case of the second question, this does not seem to be the case since the relative amount of surface oxygen was mostly at the same level for all catalysts, Table 1, but for VAIO-G-BN. Indeed, the catalyst formulated with boron nitride showed the lowest quantity of surface oxygen among the materials, 32.0 mol%. This suggests that the reactivity of the formulated catalysts is more a matter of the quality and dynamic behavior of the surface oxygen than on its quantity. The lack of correlation the catalytic performance and the surface concentration of oxygen linked to vanadium was further corroborated in Fig. S5.

In general, the negative answers for the three questions asked above show that if the chemistry behind the catalytic behavior of multicomponent technical catalysts is to be understood, both the individual contribution of each component to the catalytic reaction and their corresponding interaction among themselves and with the reactive surface species require analysis. Explaining the behavior of multicomponent catalysts is still an unresolved issue in catalysis science since most investigations are made for understanding model systems. In the past, however, the extensive works of the late Prof. Delmon et al. [75,76] aimed explaining such effects by postulating the so-called remote control theory in which one catalytic phase would be responsible for activating oxygen molecules (or hydrogen) and then spilling it over another catalytic phase. Where, the rate of spillover would determine the reactivity of the system and the dynamics of the reaction. This theory was useful for modelling the kinetic behavior of multicomponent catalysts and reactors [77–80]. More recently, Vuong et al. [81] used an alternative approach for modelling the synergistic effects of mechanical mixtures of catalysts for car exhaust depollution. The approach consisted on making combinatorial kinetics from a library of kinetic models for the individual catalysts that would be physically mixed inside a catalytic reactor. Their work emphasized the role that concentration gradients have on the synergy displayed by mechanical mixtures of catalytic powders. The scope of the present contribution does not comprise an assessment of the above aspects to explain the current observations. However, they should be considered in future investigations since the conventional analysis of the surface chemistry of the formulations VAIO-G-BN and VAIO-G-Sep failed to provide explanations.

Finally, a reactivity index of interest for technical catalysts used in fixed-bed reactors is to be discussed, Table 2. This index was calculated as the mass of reactant converted per volume of catalyst per hour $[kg_R/(m^3_{cat} \times h)]$. The index is, of course, analogous to the definition


of the so-called Space-Time Yield ($kg_R/(kg_{cat} \times h)$) used by other authors [67]. Considering that the current catalytic tests were made at the laboratory scale and over particles recovered after crushing and sifting catalytic tablets, the values of the reactivity index can be considered as maxima for measuring the catalytic performance. Results show that formulating the catalyst with graphite decreases the reactivity. Therefore, an industrial unit using the VAIO-G formulation will require either a larger volume of catalyst or a higher operation temperature to reach the same level of converted hydrocarbon per volume of catalyst as compared to the tablets made with only the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide. Conversely, the formulations made with sepiolite and boron nitride would be less catalyst consuming for a process based on them. As already mentioned, besides reactivity, technical catalysts are also assessed in terms of their mechanical strength [2–4,30–33]. Recalling the results in Figs. 1 and 3 and Table S1, the eventual use of tablets formulated with sepiolite and boron nitride in a fixed-bed unit would be a good trade-off between reactivity and mechanical resistance because the latter was higher as compared to the mechanical resistance of the tablets made with the powder of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide. Furthermore, as reported earlier [37] the continuous production of pure VAIO tablets was impracticable. Thus, the use of graphite or of another type of lubricant is mandatory. [7,82] Another aspect that makes attractive the use of sepiolite and boron nitride as secondary additives for the production of technical catalysts based on VAIO is that they reduce the loss in porosity of the base catalyst, Fig. 3 and Table S1. Based on these qualities, both sepiolite and boron nitride are a priori interesting forming additives for technical catalysts used in oxidation processes. In this regard, the impact of the secondary additives the distribution of products from the oxidation reaction needs analysis. It is important to keep in mind that, in the case of selective oxidations, a higher reactivity is accompanied by the thermodynamic prevalence of undesirable combustion reactions.

3.7. Effect of temperature on the distribution of products

Scheme 2 presents a reaction pathway for propane oxidation over the catalytic formulations studied in this work. The scheme was made from the products detected by on-line gas chromatography during the catalytic tests. Accordingly, besides the main reaction products; namely, propene, carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide, five oxygenated hydrocarbons were also produced: 2-methyloxirane, 2-propanone, propanal, 2-propenal, and 1,3,3-triethoxy-1-propene. The presence of these products suggests that diverse reaction mechanisms may be operating simultaneously under the tested conditions.

It has been established that, at temperatures below 773 K, propane oxidation may proceed over mixed oxides via a redox mechanism or via a surface radical mechanism [67,83]. The redox mechanism comprises the activation of propane into an allylic intermediate over reduced metallic moieties, e.g. V^{6+} centers. Further coordination of such kind of reactions with the addition of lattice oxygen to the surface activated complex takes place. Meanwhile, gaseous oxygen is activated and thereupon incorporated to the lattice of the oxide, hence renewing the active site. The unfolding of this type of mechanism in propane oxidation leads to the production of propene if the allylic surface intermediate is rapidly stabilized and desorbed into the gas phase or to the production of CO and CO_2 if otherwise. It is interesting to recall that the production of CO has been related to lattice oxygen while the production of CO_2 is related to a high consumption of oxygen by the catalyst, Table 3 and previous literature reports [83,84]. On the other hand, the surface radical mechanism has been associated to the production of propyl radicals either by Lewis acid centers or by a homolytic scission of a C–H bond of the molecule that leads to propyl and hydrogen radicals. The propyl radical is further oxidized to produce selective oxidation products such as the ones featured in Scheme 2.

Table 3 shows the molar yields and the productivity of propene for the catalytic formulations as a function of temperature. Specific values



Scheme 2. Reaction scheme representing the products found during the catalytic tests. Reaction conditions: U-shaped quartz fixed bed reactor, $T = 723\text{--}773\text{ K}$, $p =$ atmospheric pressure (Louvain-la-Neuve ~ 1.03 bar), catalyst weight ~ 0.1 g, average diameters of the catalyst particles $315\text{--}200\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, catalytic bed volume $\sim 1.0\text{ cm}^3$ (catalyst plus ca. 0.4 g of quartz spheres of diameter $\leq 200\text{ }\mu\text{m}$), gas flows, F_i [cm^3/min]: $F_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_8} = 4$; $F_{\text{O}_2} = 6$; $F_{\text{N}_2} = 30$.

of the molar yields of the oxygenated hydrocarbons are given in Table S4, Supplementary Information. The following can be noticed: (i) although the productivity of propene over the catalytic formulation made with magnesium oxide was the highest, the yields to propene

were very similar among all catalysts and tended to decrease with increasing the temperature. (ii) The production of oxygenates was more important for the formulations made with graphite, magnesium oxide,

Table 3

Molar yields (y_i) from propane oxidation as a function of temperature, 723, 748, and 773 K, over particles recovered from tablets of the catalytic formulations. Reaction conditions: U-shaped quartz fixed bed reactor, $p =$ atmospheric pressure (Louvain-la-Neuve ~ 1.03 bar), catalyst weight ~ 0.1 g, average diameters of the catalyst particles $315\text{--}200\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, catalytic bed volume $\sim 1.0\text{ cm}^3$ (catalyst plus ca. 0.4 g of quartz spheres of diameter $\leq 200\text{ }\mu\text{m}$), gas flows, F_i [cm^3/min]: $F_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_8} = 4$; $F_{\text{O}_2} = 6$; $F_{\text{N}_2} = 30$. Nomenclature: VAIO = vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide; G = $1.0\text{ wt}\%$ graphite; Mg = magnesium oxide; Si = silica; BN = boron nitride; Zn = zinc oxide; Sep = sepiolite. y_{oxy} : yield to oxygenated hydrocarbons = sum of the yields of 2-methyloxirane, propanal, 2-propanone, 2-propanal, 1,3,3-triethoxy-1-propene. $\text{Propene and Oxygenates Productivity Index (PI)} [=] \text{kg}_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_8} \text{ or } \text{kg}_{\text{oxy}}/(\text{m}^2_{\text{cat}} \times \text{h})$. -cat = catalyst. For calculating the V_{cat} in PI, it was assumed that the density of the materials corresponds to the density of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide [36], $\rho = 2800\text{ kg/m}^3$.

Catalyst code	T [K]	y_{CO_2}	y_{CO}	$y_{\text{CO}}/y_{\text{CO}_2}$	$y_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_6}$	y_{oxy}^*	$PI_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_6}$	PI_{Oxy}
VAIO	723	0.11	0.13	1.18	0.08	2.34E-04	978.0	3.8
	748	0.14	0.26	1.86	0.08	4.85E-04	952.9	7.9
	773	0.14	0.29	2.08	0.07	5.70E-04	854.0	9.2
VAIO-G	723	0.06	0.05	0.85	0.07	2.11E-03	856.2	38.1
	748	0.11	0.14	1.19	0.08	3.29E-03	953.2	63.0
	773	0.17	0.26	1.52	0.07	3.05E-03	783.1	63.2
VAIO-G-Mg	723	0.09	0.05	0.55	0.09	8.27E-04	1082.1	17.9
	748	0.17	0.13	0.74	0.10	1.98E-03	1212.0	37.6
	773	0.18	0.24	1.34	0.09	1.83E-03	1010.9	41.4
VAIO-G-Si	723	0.13	0.07	0.51	0.06	2.90E-04	665.9	10.6
	748	0.17	0.17	1.03	0.07	1.29E-03	777.5	30.0
	773	0.16	0.28	1.78	0.06	1.23E-03	706.9	33.3
VAIO-G-BN	723	0.11	0.19	1.66	0.07	3.58E-04	806.5	5.8
	748	0.14	0.29	2.10	0.06	5.28E-04	713.9	8.6
	773	0.13	0.31	2.37	0.06	2.69E-04	678.6	4.4
VAIO-G-Zn	723	0.09	0.10	1.08	0.08	3.54E-04	943.4	5.7
	748	0.15	0.23	1.50	0.07	3.82E-04	860.2	6.2
	773	0.17	0.27	1.64	0.06	1.39E-04	711.4	2.3
VAIO-G-Sep	723	0.15	0.16	1.07	0.08	1.06E-03	944.9	30.4
	748	0.15	0.28	1.82	0.07	1.03E-03	831.4	35.8
	773	0.14	0.30	2.12	0.07	3.71E-04	819.7	8.4

Table 4

Molar fraction conversion of propane and oxygen as a function of the $\text{O}_2/\text{C}_3\text{H}_8$ molar ratio over particles recovered from tablets of the catalytic formulations. Reaction conditions: U-shaped quartz fixed bed reactor, $T = 723\text{ K}$, $p =$ atmospheric pressure (Louvain-la-Neuve ~ 1.03 bar), catalyst weight ~ 0.1 g, average diameters of the catalyst particles $315\text{--}200\text{ }\mu\text{m}$, catalytic bed volume $\sim 1.0\text{ cm}^3$ (catalyst plus ca. 0.4 g of quartz spheres of diameter $\leq 200\text{ }\mu\text{m}$), Total gas flow, F_{tot} [cm^3/min] = 40. Nomenclature: VAIO = vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide; G = $1.0\text{ wt}\%$ graphite; Mg = magnesium oxide; Si = silica; BN = boron nitride; Zn = zinc oxide; Sep = sepiolite.

Catalyst code	$\text{O}_2/\text{C}_3\text{H}_8$	$X_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_8}$	X_{O_2}	$X_{\text{O}_2}/X_{\text{C}_3\text{H}_8}$
VAIO	0.7	0.30	1.00	3.4
	1.0	0.34	0.95	2.8
	1.5	0.34	0.72	2.1
	2.0	0.38	0.87	2.3
VAIO-G	0.7	0.22	0.94	4.2
	1.0	0.22	0.88	4.0
	1.5	0.22	0.41	1.9
	2.0	0.22	0.32	1.4
VAIO-G-Mg	0.7	0.20	0.74	3.7
	1.0	0.21	0.64	3.1
	1.5	0.24	0.65	2.8
	2.0	0.23	0.51	2.2
VAIO-G-Si	0.7	0.27	0.98	3.7
	1.0	0.28	0.93	3.3
	1.5	0.30	0.75	2.5
	2.0	0.35	0.76	2.2
VAIO-G-BN	0.7	0.28	1.00	3.5
	1.0	0.36	1.00	2.8
	1.5	0.39	0.85	2.2
	2.0	0.46	0.81	1.7
VAIO-G-Zn	0.7	0.29	1.00	3.4
	1.0	0.30	0.89	3.0
	1.5	0.32	0.90	2.8
	2.0	0.42	0.94	2.2
VAIO-G-Sep	0.7	0.30	1.00	3.4
	1.0	0.37	0.99	2.7
	1.5	0.51	1.00	2.0
	2.0	0.58	1.00	1.7

Table 5

Molar yields (y_i) from propane oxidation as a function of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio over particles recovered from tablets of the catalytic formulations. Reaction conditions: U-shaped quartz fixed bed reactor, $T = 723$ K, $p =$ atmospheric pressure (Louvain-la-Neuve ~ 1.03 bar), catalyst weight ~ 0.1 g, average diameters of the catalyst particles 315–200 μm , catalytic bed volume ~ 1.0 cm³ (catalyst plus ca. 0.4 g of quartz spheres of diameter ≤ 200 μm), Total gas flow, F_{tot} [cm³/min] = 40. Nomenclature: VAIO = vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide; G = 1.0 wt% graphite; Mg = magnesium oxide; Si = silica; BN = boron nitride; Zn = zinc oxide; Sep = sepiolite. $^{*}y_{oxy}$: yield to oxygenated hydrocarbons = sum of the yields of 2-methyloxirane, propanal, 2-propanone, 2-propenal, 1,3,3-triethoxy-1-propene.

Catalyst code	O_2/C_3H_8	y_{CO_2}	y_{CO}	y_{CO}/y_{CO_2}	$y_{C_3H_6}$	y_{Oxy}^*
VAIO	0.7	0.08	0.09	1.12	0.10	3.22E-03
	1.0	0.07	0.07	0.95	0.07	3.88E-03
	1.5	0.11	0.07	0.59	0.06	2.34E-04
VAIO-G	2.0	0.28	0.03	0.10	0.03	0.00
	0.7	0.12	0.03	0.28	0.05	5.79E-04
	1.0	0.13	0.02	0.13	0.01	4.50E-04
VAIO-G-Mg	1.5	0.08	0.02	0.19	0.05	6.60E-03
	2.0	0.09	0.02	0.20	0.05	5.60E-03
	0.7	0.09	0.02	0.23	0.07	7.11E-04
VAIO-G-Si	1.0	0.10	0.01	0.10	0.03	7.87E-04
	1.5	0.17	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.00
	2.0	0.17	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.00
VAIO-G-BN	0.7	0.08	0.08	0.98	0.07	2.70E-03
	1.0	0.12	0.03	0.30	0.04	6.51E-04
	1.5	0.12	0.05	0.37	0.04	3.54E-03
VAIO-G-Zn	2.0	0.17	0.03	0.17	0.04	4.86E-03
	0.7	0.08	0.11	1.35	0.08	3.23E-03
	1.0	0.08	0.11	1.49	0.05	2.86E-03
VAIO-G-Sep	1.5	0.13	0.11	0.88	0.05	2.77E-03
	2.0	0.17	0.13	0.76	0.04	0.00
	0.7	0.09	0.08	0.93	0.09	0.00
VAIO-G-Sep	1.0	0.09	0.06	0.67	0.06	0.00
	1.5	0.23	0.02	0.09	0.03	0.00
	2.0	0.31	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.00
VAIO-G-Sep	0.7	0.08	0.12	1.48	0.09	2.99E-03
	1.0	0.08	0.11	1.41	0.06	4.24E-03
	1.5	0.10	0.24	2.28	0.05	2.54E-03
	2.0	0.12	0.32	2.58	0.04	0.00

silica, and sepiolite. For the two first formulations, the increase of temperature did not reduce such a production in contrast to what happened to the latter. (iii) All catalytic formulations tended to produce more CO than CO_2 . This tendency was favored by the increase of temperature. As already commented, all the catalytic formulations started reaching full conversion of oxygen at 748 K hence limiting the conversion of propane stoichiometrically. Therefore, a kinetic discussion of the tendencies enumerated above is aimless because the reaction is strongly

influenced by thermodynamics. However, the behavior of the catalysts in the reactions is not solely determined by thermodynamics but also in part by kinetic effects linked to the chemistry of the catalytic phases that are present in each formulation.

3.8. Effect of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio on conversion

Given the catalytic trends discussed in the previous section, these experiments were done at 723 K. Table 4 shows the behavior of the catalytic formulations in the oxidation of propane as a function of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio on the conversion of both propane and oxygen. For the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide, increasing the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio increased the conversion of propane from 0.30, $O_2/C_3H_8 = 0.7$, to 0.38, $O_2/C_3H_8 = 2.0$, while the conversion of oxygen decreased at a point where it was no longer the limiting reactant. This trend is reflected on the fact that the ratio of the conversions of the reactants, XO_2/XC_3H_8 , decreased from 3.4 to ~ 2.0 ; where the latter has been often reported for catalysts based on vanadium oxides [35,67,68,84,85]. In contrast, the catalytic formulation done with graphite showed a constant conversion of propane, ca. 0.22, regardless of the O_2/C_3H_8 fed to the reactor. Consequently, in this case, oxygen was not a limiting reactant either. This trend confirms that graphite modifies the reactivity of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide [35,37]. These facts about the VAIO and VAIO-G catalysts establish a comparison base for assessing the effects of the secondary shaping additives.

The conversion of propane over VAIO-G-Mg was roughly constant and like the one observed for VAIO-G; 0.22 ± 0.02 , regardless of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio fed to the reactor. Therefore, the addition of basic magnesium oxide to the formulation did not change the catalytic reactivity towards the alkane. On the other hand, oxygen was not fully converted under any O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio and this trend was what made the catalytic behavior of VAIO-G-Mg differ from the behavior of both the VAIO catalytic phase and the VAIO-G formulation. Coming back to the results found for the formulation made with magnesium oxide as a function of temperature, the reader may recall that this was the formulation with the lowest consumption of oxygen overall.

In the case of the other formulations, the conversion of propane increased with increasing the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio. Besides, these other formulations tended to consume all the oxygen supplied to the reaction hence remarking the central role played by surface activated oxygen species on their reactivity towards the alkane. However, as more oxygen was supplied to the reactor, the formulations made with all the secondary additives were not able to fully convert propane, except for sepiolite.




Fig. 5. Molar yield to propene ($y_{C_3H_6}$) -a)- and y_{CO}/y_{CO_2} ratio -b)- from propane oxidation as a function of the conversion of propane ($y_{C_3H_8}$) over particles recovered from tablets of the catalytic formulations: VAIO, VAIO-G-BN, and VAIO-G-Sep. Reaction conditions: U-shaped quartz fixed bed reactor, $T = 723$ K, $p =$ atmospheric pressure (Louvain-la-Neuve ~ 1.03 bar), catalyst weight ~ 0.1 g, average diameters of the catalyst particles 315–200 μm , catalytic bed volume ~ 1.0 cm³ (catalyst plus ca. 0.4 g of quartz spheres of diameter ≤ 200 μm), Total gas flow, F_{tot} [cm³/min] = 40. Nomenclature: VAIO = vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide; G = 1.0 wt% graphite; BN = boron nitride; Sep = sepiolite.

It is interesting to take a closer look at the behavior of the formulation made with sepiolite since, as observed in Table 4, this formulation always consumed all the supplied oxygen while steadily increasing the conversion of propane from 0.30, at O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio = 0.7, to 0.60, at O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio = 2.0. This is peculiar because for the other formulations the conversion of oxygen decreased by increasing the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio. Sepiolite is a clay with a chainlike structure that make mesoporous needle-like particles [42,50–53]. The hydration or dehydration of sepiolite makes its crystals to fold or unfold by the rotation of its Si-O-Si bonds [53]. Such processes indicate that this clay has an important capacity to restructure under reactive atmospheres that contain water vapor. Water vapor is known to modify the catalytic reactivity of vanadium oxide in propane oxidation [66,86]. However, defining the possible effect of water vapor on the catalytic performance falls out of the scope of the present investigation.

3.9. Effect of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio on the distribution of products

Table 5 shows the yield to the reaction products as a function of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio for the different catalytic formulations. In general, the increase of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio favored the total combustion of propane for all formulations except for the one made solely with graphite, VAIO-G. Indeed, only VAIO-G showed a slight increase in the production of propene with the increase of the O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratio. From these results and the ones presented in Table 4, it may be concluded that the increase in the supply of the oxygen to the reactor led to the production of surface oxygen species that mostly combusted the activated surface hydrocarbons.

Considering the ensemble of the catalytic results presented above, a succinct comparison of the performance of the formulations made with boron nitride and sepiolite with the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide catalytic phase will be made. The comparison will be made in terms of the evolution of the yields to propene, and the CO/CO₂ yield ratio as a function of the conversion of propane, Fig. 5. For this purpose, only the results obtained at 723 K were considered. The plots in Fig. 5a evidence how both VAIO-G-BN and VAIO-G-Sep kept a slightly higher production of propene at higher conversions of propane as compared to VAIO. Fig. 5b also shows that the CO/CO₂ yield ratio increased steeply over the formulation made with sepiolite. This behavior was not observed for the VAIO and VAIO-G-BN formulations. These trends further help demonstrating that both boron nitride and sepiolite contribute individually to the catalytic reactivity of the formulated tablets. The evidence suggests that they may act by modulating the reactivity of the activated surface species and by contributing with their own active sites.

3.10. General considerations

In general, the observed catalytic trends were not correlated to changes in surface area as it can be seen in Fig. S6.

Fig. 6 shows boxplots correlating the fractional conversion of propane and the molar yield to CO with the concentration of surface carbon as measured by XPS. In the case of the conversion of propane, Fig. 6a, the obtained correlation is an apparent volcano plot. The top of the volcano is occupied by the formulation VAIO-G-Sep; i.e. the most reactive catalytic formulation. As mentioned before, surface carbon measured by XPS may be used as a marker for the acid/basicity of catalytic oxides because metallic oxides minimize their surface energy by adsorbing adventitious carbon [64]. Therefore, the higher the surface free energy of the oxide, the higher its tendency to adsorb hydrocarbons. Although, the surface free energy of the catalyst is modified by reaction conditions owing to surface restructuring phenomena [64], a link between the catalytic reactivity of an oxide in a hydrocarbon oxidation reaction and its affinity towards the adsorption of environmental carbon is suggested in Fig. 6.

On the other hand, the correlation between the production of CO and the concentration of adventitious carbon also showed a volcano shape type trend, Fig. 6b. However, the relative positions of the different




Fig. 6. Boxplots correlating the fractional conversion of propane -a)- and the molar yield to CO -b)- with the concentration of surface carbon as measured by XPS. Reaction conditions: U-shaped quartz fixed bed reactor, $T = 723, 748,$ and 773 K, O_2/C_3H_8 molar ratios = 0.7, 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0, $p =$ atmospheric pressure (Louvain-la-Neuve ~ 1.03 bar), catalyst weight ~ 0.1 g, average diameters of the catalyst particles $315\text{--}200$ μm , catalytic bed volume ~ 1.0 cm^3 (catalyst plus ca. 0.4 g of quartz spheres of diameter ≤ 200 μm), Total gas flow, F_{Tot} [cm^3/min] = 40. Nomenclature: VAIO = vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide; G = 1.0 wt% graphite; Mg = magnesium oxide; Si = silica; BN = boron nitride; Zn = zinc oxide; Sep = sepiolite.

formulations in the plot shifted. Namely, the formulations VAIO, VAIO-G, VAIO-G-Si, VAIO-G-Zn, and VAIO-G-Mg were roughly at the same level in the plot, while VAIO-G-Sep remained at the top closely followed by VAIO-G-BN. The adsorption of adventitious hydrocarbons over a surface makes it hydrophobic [87,88]. As discussed earlier, under reaction conditions, water vapor may play a role on the catalytic behavior of the formulated materials. Considering these arguments and the correlations found in Fig. 6b, it may be suggested that the hydrophobicity developed by surface of the formulations VAIO-G-Sep and VAIO-G-BN after reacting with propane may increase the rate of desorption of surface water or modify the reactivity of in-situ formed surface hydroxyls hence slowing the oxidation of CO to CO₂. It is important to say that the above commented correlations were not found for the yields to propene and CO₂, Fig. S7.

Finally, the catalytic performance was plotted as a function of the V^{5+}/V^{4+} molar ratio measured by XPS, Fig. 7. Once again, the formulations made with sepiolite and boron nitride made a difference as compared to the other formulations. Particularly, they exhibited the highest propane conversion and CO yield while having the lowest V^{5+}/V^{4+} molar ratios. According to the literature [67,68,89],




Fig. 7. Boxplots correlating the fractional conversion of propane -a-) and the molar yield to CO -b-) with the concentration of surface carbon as measured by XPS. Reaction conditions: U-shaped quartz fixed bed reactor, $T = 723, 748, \text{ and } 773 \text{ K}$, $\text{O}_2/\text{C}_3\text{H}_8$ molar ratios = 0.7, 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0, $p = \text{atmospheric pressure}$ (Louvain-la-Neuve $\sim 1.03 \text{ bar}$), catalyst weight $\sim 0.1 \text{ g}$, average diameters of the catalyst particles $315\text{--}200 \mu\text{m}$, catalytic bed volume $\sim 1.0 \text{ cm}^3$ (catalyst plus ca. 0.4 g of quartz spheres of diameter $\leq 200 \mu\text{m}$), Total gas flow, $F_{\text{tot}} [\text{cm}^3/\text{min}] = 40$. Nomenclature: VAIO = vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide; G = 1.0 wt% graphite; Mg = magnesium oxide; Si = silica; BN = boron nitride; Zn = zinc oxide; Sep = sepiolite.

the $\text{V}^{5+}/\text{V}^{4+}$ molar ratio of vanadium oxide based catalysts determines their reactivity and selectivity in hydrocarbon oxidation reactions; where, V^{4+} moieties are thought to favor the production of propene. This relationship was not verified for the case of the catalytic formulations studied herein since the yield to propene, as well as the yield to CO_2 , showed a constant correlation with the $\text{V}^{5+}/\text{V}^{4+}$ molar ratio of the materials, Fig. S8. These results further support the hypothesis that the present multicomponent catalytic materials react by two simultaneous mechanisms in the oxidation of propane.

4. Conclusions

Building on previous investigations concerning the effects of shaping on the properties of catalysts for oxidation reactions, the effect of secondary additives for tableting vanadium-aluminum mixed-oxides over the mechanical resistance, surface chemistry, and catalytic performance in propane oxidation was investigated. For this purpose, tablets made with 1.0 wt% graphite as a shaping agent and 5.0 wt% of magnesium oxide, silica, boron nitride, sepiolite, and zinc oxide were formulated. Results showed the following: (i) all the tablets formulated with the cited additives had a higher mechanical resistance to axial compression as compared to the tablets made with the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide powder. However, only those formulated with silica had a stronger mechanical resistance than the ones formulated solely with graphite. In this sense, the changes in mechanical strength were correlated to the shape, hardness and fracture toughness of the secondary additive. Overall, it was assumed that additives with a higher hardness, lower fracture toughness, and constituted by spherical or similarly shaped particles promote the breaking of the catalyst particles into finer ones hence making tablets with higher mechanical strength. (ii) All the formulated tablets retained the mesoporous structure of the vanadium-aluminum catalytic phase. However, the formulated tablets had lower surface areas and total pore volumes as compared to the former. These losses depended on the nature of the additives in a similar manner as the mechanical strength did. Therefore, a strong correlation between the hardness, fracture toughness, and particle shape of the secondary additives and the modifications in the mechanical strength and the porosity of the catalysts shaped by tableting was evidenced. (iii) The used secondary additives did not modify the surface chemistry of the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide but simply mixed mechanically

with it during the tableting operation. For this reason, there was no correlation between the measured surface chemistry of vanadium for the different catalytic formulations and their performance in propane oxidation. (iv) Though the additives did not modify the surface chemistry of the catalytic vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide phase, the evidence suggested that they may act as co-catalysts during propane oxidation. Particularly, boron nitride and sepiolite showed the stronger modifications of the catalytic behavior since the formulations made with them were more reactive than the vanadium-aluminum mixed oxide while exhibiting a better productivity of propene. An analysis of the distribution of products obtained with the different catalytic formulations led to suggest that such alterations of the catalytic behavior can be explained by the combination of a redox mechanism over the vanadium-aluminum mixed phase and a surface radical mechanism occurring over the active moieties of the secondary additives.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This work was done within the Frame of the IAP P6/17 “Inanomat” project entitled “Advanced complex inorganic materials by a novel bottom-up nanochemistry approach: processing and shaping”. V.G.B.-M. thanks the office of the “Politique scientifique fédérale belge”, Belgium for a postdoctorate fellowship and current funding from by Agencia Nacional de Hidrocarburos -ANH- and Minciencias, Colombia, within the frame of the Project 1102-721-50962: “Desarrollo de alternativas catalíticas para la reducción y valorización de emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero típicas de pozos y refinerías petroleras por combustión catalítica de VOCs y transformación de CO_2 y CH_4 en gas de síntesis.” The authors thank Michel Genet, Marc Sinnave, and Pascal Valvassori for their help in making the experiments featured in this work.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2021.03.067>.

References

- [1] W.D. Stillwell, Preformed Catalysts and techniques of tableting, *Ind. Eng. Chem.* 49 (1957) 245–249, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie50566a038>.
- [2] G. Berrebi, P. Bernusset, Making industrial catalysts, in: G. Poncelet, B. Delmon, P. Grange, P.A. Jacobs (Eds.), *Prep. Catal. I Sci. Bases Prep. Heterog. Catal. Proc. First Int. Symp. Held Solvay Res. Cent, Elsevier* 1976, pp. 13–38, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(08\)63941-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(08)63941-5).
- [3] J.F. Le Page, J. Miquel, Determining mechanical properties of industrial catalysts : correlations with their morphological and physical-chemical properties, in: B. Delmon, P. Jacobs, C. Poncelet (Eds.), *Prep. Catal. I, Elsevier* 1976, pp. 39–50, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(08\)63942-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(08)63942-7).
- [4] K.I. Areshidze, G.O. Chivadze, Effects of different factors on the specific surface area, activity, stability and mechanical strength of industrial catalysts, in: B. Delmon, P. Jacobs, C. Poncelet (Eds.), *Prep. Catal. I, Elsevier* 1976, pp. 559–567, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(08\)63978-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(08)63978-6).
- [5] J.-F. Le Page, J. Cosyns, P. Courty, E. Freund, J.-P. Franck, Y. Jacquin, B. Juguin, C. Marcilly, G. Martino, J. Miquel, R. Montarnal, A. Sugier, H. Van Landeghem, *Applied Heterogeneous Catalysis: Design, Manufacture, Use of Solid Catalysts*, 1st ed. Institut Français du Pétrole, Paris, 1987.
- [6] C.N. Satterfield, *Heterogeneous Catalysis in Industrial Practice*, 2nd ed. Krieger Publishing company, Malabar, 1991.
- [7] A.B. Stiles, T.A. Koch, *Catalyst Manufacture*, 2nd ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1995.
- [8] C. Perego, P. Villa, Catalyst preparation methods, *Catal. Today* 34 (1997) 281–305, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-5861\(96\)00055-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-5861(96)00055-7).
- [9] J.J.H.M. Font Freide, T.D. Gamlin, C. Graham, J.R. Hensman, B. Nay, C. Sharp, An adventure in catalysis: the story of the BP Fischer–Tropsch catalyst from laboratory to full-scale demonstration in Alaska, *Top. Catal.* 26 (2003) 3–12, <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:TOCA.0000012982.48191.ab>.
- [10] J.N. Armor, Do you really have a better catalyst? *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* 282 (2005) 1–4, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2005.01.014>.
- [11] C.H. Bartholomew, R.J. Farrauto, *Fundamentals of Industrial Catalytic Processes*, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, 2006 <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780471730071>.
- [12] F. Schüth, M. Hesse, Catalyst forming, in: G. Ertl, H. Knözinger, F. Schüth, J. Weitkamp (Eds.), *Handb. Heterog. Catal.* 2nd ed. Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim 2008, p. 3865, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9783527610044>.
- [13] B. Kraushaar–Czarnetzki, P.S. Muller, Shaping of solid Catalysts, in: K.P. de Jong (Ed.), *Synth. Solid Catal.* 1st ed. Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim 2009, p. 26, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9783527626854>.
- [14] J.J. Birtill, Some experiences in industrial catalysis, *J. Mol. Catal. A Chem.* 305 (2009) 183–189, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcata.2008.11.015>.
- [15] S. Mitchell, N.-L. Michels, J. Pérez-Ramírez, From powder to technical body: the undervalued science of catalyst scale up, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 42 (2013) 6094–6112, <https://doi.org/10.1039/C3CS60076A>.
- [16] R. Bingre, B. Louis, P. Nguyen, An overview on zeolite shaping technology and solutions to overcome diffusion limitations, *Catalysts* 8 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.3390/catal8040163>.
- [17] K.C. Metaxas, N.G. Papayannakos, Studying the internal mass transfer phenomena inside a Ni/Al₂O₃ catalyst for benzene hydrogenation, *Chem. Eng. J.* 140 (2008) 352–357, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2007.10.010>.
- [18] V.L. Hartmann, A.V. Obysov, A.V. Dulnev, S.V. Afanas'ev, New basic shape of catalysts for natural gas reforming reactors, *Chem. Eng. J.* 176–177 (2011) 102–105, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2011.08.031>.
- [19] P. Topka, J. Karban, K. Soukup, K. Jiráková, O. Šolcová, Preparation of Al–SBA-15 pellets with low amount of additives: effect of binder content on texture and mechanical properties. Application to Friedel–Crafts alkylation, *Chem. Eng. J.* 168 (2011) 433–440, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2010.12.079>.
- [20] M. Campanati, G. Fornasari, A. Vaccari, Fundamentals in the preparation of heterogeneous catalysts, *Catal. Today* 77 (2003) 299–314, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-5861\(02\)00375-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-5861(02)00375-9).
- [21] K. Johansen, Aspects of scale-up of catalyst production, in: E. Gaigneaux, D.E. De Vos, P. Grange, P.A. Jacobs, J.A. Martens, P. Ruiz, C. Poncelet (Eds.), *Sci. Bases Prep. Heterog. Catal.* Elsevier 2000, pp. 1–15, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(00\)80637-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(00)80637-0).
- [22] G. Froment, K.B. Bischoff, J. De Wilde, *Chemical Reactor - Analysis and Design*, 3rd ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2011.
- [23] A.-C. Larsson, Study of Catalyst Deactivation in Three Different Industrial Processes, Växjö University, 2007.
- [24] L. Duarte, L. Garzón, V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, An analysis of the physicochemical properties of spent catalysts from an industrial hydrotreating unit, *Catal. Today* (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2019.05.025>.
- [25] S. Spatenka, M. Matzopoulos, Z. Urban, A. Cano, From laboratory to industrial operation: model-based digital design and optimization of fixed-bed catalytic reactors, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 58 (2019) 12571–12585, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.9b01314>.
- [26] J. Butt, E.E. Petersen, *Activation, Deactivation, and Poisoning of Catalysts*, 1st ed. Elsevier Inc., Amsterdam, 1988 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-147695-3.X5001-1>.
- [27] P. Torres-Mancera, P. Rayo, J. Ancheyta, G. Marroquín, G. Centeno, F. Alonso, Catalyst deactivation pattern along a residue hydrotreating bench-scale reactor, *Catal. Today* 220–222 (2014) 153–158, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2013.10.024>.
- [28] E. Rodríguez, G. Félix, J. Ancheyta, F. Trejo, Modeling of hydrotreating catalyst deactivation for heavy oil hydrocarbons, *Fuel* 225 (2018) 118–133, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2018.02.085>.
- [29] S.M. Rao, M.-O. Coppens, Mitigating deactivation effects through rational design of hierarchically structured catalysts: application to hydrodemetalation, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 49 (2010) 11087–11097, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie1009487>.
- [30] M. Zakeri, A. Samimi, M.S. Afarani, A. Salehirad, Interaction between Weibull parameters and mechanical strength reliability of industrial-scale water gas shift catalysts, *Particuology* 32 (2017) 160–166, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.partic.2016.08.006>.
- [31] M. Zakeri, A. Samimi, M. Khorram, H. Atashi, A. Mirzaei, Effect of forming on selectivity and attrition of co-precipitated co-Mn Fischer–Tropsch catalysts, *Powder Technol.* 200 (2010) 164–170, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2010.02.021>.
- [32] A. Thon, J. Werther, Attrition resistance of a VPO catalyst, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* 376 (2010) 56–65, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2009.11.036>.
- [33] C. Couroyer, M. Ghadiri, P. Laval, N. Brunard, F. Kolenda, Methodology for investigating the mechanical strength of reforming catalyst beads, *Oil Gas Sci. Technol. - Rev. IFP* 55 (2000) 67–85.
- [34] V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, M.T. Le, I. Van Driessche, E. Bruneel, E.M. Gaigneaux, Influence of graphite as a shaping agent of bi molybdate powders on their mechanical, physicochemical, and catalytic properties, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 50 (2011) 5467–5477, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie102473h>.
- [35] V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, B. Farin, E.M. Gaigneaux, Establishing the role of graphite as a shaping agent of vanadium–aluminum mixed (Hydr)oxides and their physicochemical properties and catalytic functionalities, *ACS Catal.* 2 (2012) 322–336, <https://doi.org/10.1021/cs200465h>.
- [36] V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, C. Alcázar, M.T. Colomer, R. Moreno, E.M. Gaigneaux, Understanding the molecular basics behind catalyst shaping: Preparation of suspensions of vanadium–aluminum mixed (hydr)oxides, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* 468 (2013) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2013.08.041>.
- [37] V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, M.T. Le, I. Van Driessche, E. Bruneel, C. Alcázar, M.T. Colomer, R. Moreno, A. Florencie, B. Farin, E.M. Gaigneaux, Role of shaping in the preparation of heterogeneous catalysts: Tableting and slip-casting of oxidation catalysts, *Catal. Today* 246 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2014.08.030>.
- [38] V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, B. Kartheuser, E.M. Gaigneaux, Production and testing of technical catalysts based on MnO₂ for the abatement of aromatic volatile compounds at the laboratory and pilot plant scales, *Catal. Today* 338 (2019) 81–92, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2019.03.029>.
- [39] V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, B. Farin, E.M. Gaigneaux, Understanding the role of shaping on the performance of oxidation catalysts: analysis of the effect of tableting additives for vanadium–aluminum mixed oxides, *Proc. 7th World Conf. Oxid. Catal.*, Saint Louis, 2013.
- [40] R.P. Silvy, N. Blangenois, M. Hamrouni, P. Grange, E.M. Gaigneaux, Parameters controlling the scaling-up of a V–Al oxynitride catalyst for the ammoxidation of propane, in: E.M. Gaigneaux, M. Devillers, D.E. De Vos, S. Hermans, P.A. Jacobs, J.A. Martens, C. Ruiz (Eds.), *Sci. Bases Prep. Heterog. Catal.* Elsevier 2006, pp. 187–194, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(06\)80906-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(06)80906-7).
- [41] R.P. Silvy, M. Florea, N. Blangenois, P. Grange, Propane ammoxidation catalyst based on vanadium–aluminum oxynitride, *AIChE J.* 49 (2003) 2228–2231, <https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.690490830>.
- [42] A. Corma, J. Perez-Pariente, V. Fornes, A. Mifsud, Surface acidity and catalytic activity of a modified sepiolite, *Clay Miner.* 19 (1984) 673–676, <https://doi.org/10.1180/claymin.1984.019.4.14>.
- [43] N. Blangenois, M. Florea, P. Grange, R.P. Silvy, S.P. Chenakin, J.M. Bastin, N. Kruse, B.P. Barbero, L. Cadús, Influence of the co-precipitation pH on the physico-chemical and catalytic properties of vanadium aluminum oxide catalyst, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* 263 (2004) 163–170, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2003.12.008>.
- [44] V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, R. Ospina, E.M. Gaigneaux, Differential charging effects from impurities in pyrolytic graphite, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 476 (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsusc.2018.12.269>.
- [45] V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, G. Pollefeyt, V. Bliznuk, I. Van Driessche, E.M. Gaigneaux, P. Ruiz, R. Wojcieszak, Synergetic behavior of TiO₂-supported Pd(z)Pt(1–2) catalysts in the green synthesis of methyl formate, *ChemCatChem* 8 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1002/cctc.201501211>.
- [46] D.R. Lide, *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, CRC Press/Taylor and Francis, Boca Raton, 2010.
- [47] S.P.S. Andrew, Theory and practice of the formulation of heterogeneous catalysts, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 36 (1981) 1431–1445, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509\(81\)85106-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509(81)85106-8).
- [48] B. Zaidi, S. Belghit, M.S. Ullah, B. Hadjoudja, A. Guerraoui, S. Gagai, N. Houaidji, B. Chouail, C. Shekhar, Investigation of MgO powders synthesized by liquid-phase method, *Metallofiz. i Noveishie Tekhnologii* 41 (2019) 1121–1126, <https://doi.org/10.15407/mfint.41.08.1121>.
- [49] M. Öner, G. Kizil, G. Keskin, C. Pochat-Bohatier, M. Bechelany, The effect of boron nitride on the thermal and mechanical properties of poly(3-hydroxybutyrate-co-3-hydroxyvalerate), *Nanomaterials* 8 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.3390/nano8110940>.
- [50] A. Corma, J.M.L. Nieto, N. Paredes, M. Pérez, Oxidative dehydrogenation of propane on vanadium supported on magnesium silicates, *Appl. Catal. A Gen.* 97 (1993) 159–175, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-860X\(93\)80082-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-860X(93)80082-2).
- [51] Q. Tang, F. Wang, M. Tang, J. Liang, C. Ren, Study on pore distribution and formation rule of sepiolite mineral nanomaterials, *J. Nanomater.* 2012 (2012) 382603, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/382603>.
- [52] G. Busca, Bases and basic materials in industrial and environmental chemistry: a review of commercial processes, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 48 (2009) 6486–6511, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie801878d>.
- [53] C. Serna, J.L. Ahlrichs, J.M. Serratos, Folding in Sepiolite crystals, *Clay Clay Miner.* 23 (1975) 452–457, <https://doi.org/10.1346/CCMN.1975.0230607>.
- [54] I.B. Kobiakov, Elastic, piezoelectric and dielectric properties of ZnO and CdS single crystals in a wide range of temperatures, *Solid State Commun.* 35 (1980) 305–310, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-1098\(80\)90502-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-1098(80)90502-5).

- [55] P.M. Dove, Geochemical controls on the kinetics of quartz fracture at subcritical tensile stresses, *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth* 100 (1995) 22349–22359, <https://doi.org/10.1029/95JB02155>.
- [56] J.B. Condon, *Surface Area and Porosity Determinations by Physisorption Measurements and Theory*, 1st ed. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 2006.
- [57] J.B. Condon, Chi representation of standard nitrogen, argon, and oxygen adsorption curves, *Langmuir* 17 (2001) 3423–3430, <https://doi.org/10.1021/la010095y>.
- [58] S. Brunauer, P.H. Emmett, E. Teller, Adsorption of gases in multimolecular layers, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 60 (1938) 309–319, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja01269a023>.
- [59] E.P. Barrett, L.G. Joyner, P.P. Halenda, The determination of pore volume and area distributions in porous substances. I. computations from nitrogen isotherms, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 73 (1951) 373–380, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja01145a126>.
- [60] S.P. Chenakin, R.P. Silvy, N. Kruse, X-ray induced surface modification of aluminovanadate oxide, *Catal. Letters* 102 (2005) 39–43, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10562-005-5200-z>.
- [61] C.D. Wagner, Studies of the charging of insulators in ESCA, *J. Electron Spectros. Relat. Phenomena* 18 (1980) 345–349, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0368-2048\(80\)80022-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0368-2048(80)80022-3).
- [62] T.L. Barr, S. Seal, Nature of the use of adventitious carbon as a binding energy standard, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A* 13 (1995) 1239–1246, <https://doi.org/10.1116/1.579868>.
- [63] G. Johansson, J. Hedman, A. Berndtsson, M. Klasson, R. Nilsson, Calibration of electron spectra, *J. Electron Spectros. Relat. Phenomena* 2 (1973) 295–317, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0368-2048\(73\)80022-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0368-2048(73)80022-2).
- [64] G.A. Somorjai, Y. Li, *Introduction to Surface Chemistry and Catalysis*, 2nd Edition, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, 2010.
- [65] D. Barthelmy, Sepiolite Mineral Data, Mineral. Database. <http://www.webmineral.com/data/Sepiolite.shtml>, n.d., (accessed May 24, 2020)
- [66] K. Chen, A.T. Bell, E. Iglesia, Kinetics and mechanism of oxidative dehydrogenation of propane on vanadium, molybdenum, and tungsten oxides, *J. Phys. Chem. B* 104 (2000) 1292–1299, <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp9933875>.
- [67] S. Albonetti, F. Cavani, F. Trifirò, Key aspects of catalyst Design for the Selective Oxidation of Paraffins, *Catal. Rev.* 38 (1996) 413–438, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01614949608006463>.
- [68] F. Cavani, N. Ballarini, A. Cericola, Oxidative dehydrogenation of ethane and propane: how far from commercial implementation? *Catal. Today* 127 (2007) 113–131, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2007.05.009>.
- [69] Oxidative dehydrogenation of propane and n-butane on V-Mg based catalysts, in: A. Corma, J.M.L. Nieto, N. Parades, A. Dejoz, I. Vazquez, V.C. Corberán, C. Bellón (Eds.), *New Dev. Sel. Oxid. II*, Elsevier 1994, pp. 113–123, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(08\)63403-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(08)63403-5).
- [70] A. Corma, J.M.L. Nieto, N. Paredes, Influence of the preparation methods of V-mg-O Catalysts on their catalytic properties for the oxidative dehydrogenation of propane, *J. Catal.* 144 (1993) 425–438, <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcat.1993.1343>.
- [71] Oxidative dehydrogenation of propane over supported-vanadium oxide catalysts, in: A. Corma, J.M. López-Nieto, N. Paredes, M. Pérez, Y. Shen, H. Cao, C. Delmon (Eds.), *New Dev. Sel. Oxid. by Heterog. Catal*, Elsevier 1992, pp. 213–220, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(08\)61673-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(08)61673-0).
- [72] J.T. Grant, C.A. Carrero, F. Goettl, J. Venegas, P. Mueller, S.P. Burt, S.E. Specht, W.P. McDermott, A. Chierigato, I. Hermans, Selective oxidative dehydrogenation of propane to propene using boron nitride catalysts, *Science* (80-.) 354 (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf7885> 1570 LP – 1573.
- [73] J.M. Venegas, W.P. McDermott, I. Hermans, Serendipity in catalysis research: boron-based materials for alkane oxidative dehydrogenation, *Acc. Chem. Res.* 51 (2018) 2556–2564, <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.accounts.8b00330>.
- [74] A.M. Love, B. Thomas, S.E. Specht, M.P. Hanrahan, J.M. Venegas, S.P. Burt, J.T. Grant, M.C. Cendejas, W.P. McDermott, A.J. Rossini, I. Hermans, Probing the transformation of boron nitride Catalysts under oxidative dehydrogenation conditions, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 141 (2019) 182–190, <https://doi.org/10.1021/jacs.8b08165>.
- [75] B. Delmon, G.F. Froment, Remote control of catalytic sites by spillover species: a chemical reaction engineering approach, *Catal. Rev.* 38 (1996) 69–100, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01614949608006454>.
- [76] B. Delmon, Are solid catalysts successfully emulating enzymes? *Chi. Catal.* 31 (2010) 859–871, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1872-2067\(09\)60088-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1872-2067(09)60088-7).
- [77] Oxygen spillover for the design of industrial oxidation catalysts, in: Y. Moro-Oka, T. Lnui, K. Fujimoto, T. Uchijima, C. Masai (Eds.), *New Asp. Spillover Eff. Catal*, Elsevier 1993, pp. 95–103, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(08\)63159-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(08)63159-6).
- [78] B. Delmon, Solid-state reactions in catalysts during ageing: beneficial role of spillover, in: B. Delmon, C. Froment (Eds.), *Catal. Deactiv*, Elsevier 1994, pp. 113–128, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(08\)62733-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(08)62733-0).
- [79] Spillover-modified catalysis: Experimental rules and mathematical modeling, in: C. Vayenas, S. Brosda, A. Guerrero-Ruiz, C. Rodríguez-Ramos (Eds.), *Spillover Mobil. Species Solid Surfaces*, Elsevier 2001, pp. 197–204, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991\(01\)80030-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2991(01)80030-6).
- [80] L.C. Porras, A. Centeno, S.A. Giraldo, Simulación del comportamiento de sistemas catalíticos Pt-Mo en reacciones simultáneas de hidrogenación e hidrodesulfuración, basada en la teoría del control a distancia, *Rev. ION.* 23 (2010) 59–70.
- [81] H. Vuong, A.J. Binder, J.E. Sutton, T. Toops, A. Savara, Experimental data based combinatorial kinetic simulations for predictions of synergistic catalyst mixtures, *Catal. Today* 338 (2019) 117–127, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cattod.2019.04.026>.
- [82] D.E. Dria, N.J. Bremer, *Process for Tableting Fine Powders*, 1984 4426342.
- [83] O.V. Buyevskaya, M. Baerns, Catalytic selective oxidation of propane, *Catal. Today* 42 (1998) 315–323, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-5861\(98\)00108-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-5861(98)00108-4).
- [84] C.B. Hernández-Maya, Mery S. Espinosa-Lobo, E. Cabanzo Hernández, Rafael Mejía-Ospino, V.G. Baldovino-Medrano, Propane oxidation over silica supported sodium vanadate catalysts, *ACS Catal.* 46 (2020) Under revi.
- [85] F. Cavani, F. Trifirò, The oxidative dehydrogenation of ethane and propane as an alternative way for the production of light olefins, *Catal. Today* 24 (1995) 307–313, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0920-5861\(95\)00051-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0920-5861(95)00051-G).
- [86] K. Chen, A. Khodakov, J. Yang, A.T. Bell, E. Iglesia, Isotopic tracer and kinetic studies of oxidative dehydrogenation pathways on vanadium oxide catalysts, *J. Catal.* 186 (1999) 325–333, <https://doi.org/10.1006/jcat.1999.2510>.
- [87] J. Landoulsi, M.J. Genet, S. Fleith, Y. Touré, I. Liascukiene, C. Méthivier, P.G. Rouxhet, Organic adlayer on inorganic materials: XPS analysis selectivity to cope with adventitious contamination, *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 383 (2016) 71–83, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsusc.2016.04.147>.
- [88] J. Landoulsi, M.J. Genet, C. Richard, K. El Kirat, S. Pulvin, P.G. Rouxhet, Evolution of the passive film and organic constituents at the surface of stainless steel immersed in fresh water, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* 318 (2008) 278–289, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2007.09.087>.
- [89] E.A. Mamedov, V. Cortés Corberán, Oxidative dehydrogenation of lower alkanes on vanadium oxide-based catalysts. The present state of the art and outlooks, *Appl. Catal. A Gen* 127 (1995) 1–40, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-860X\(95\)00056-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-860X(95)00056-9).