Single Step and Non-Catalytic Process for Formaldehyde Production from Methane using Microchannel Reactor: Theoretical Analysis
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ABSTRACT
Conventionally, methane is reformed into syngas, and subsequently converted into \( \text{C}_1 \)-oxygenates (methanol and formaldehyde). A novel option is the catalyst-free single-step conversion of methane to \( \text{C}_1 \)-oxygenates. This study presents a comprehensive model of methane partial oxidation to formaldehyde as an intermediate chemical species in methane oxidation process using microreactor. The dependency of \( \text{C}_1 \)-oxygenates yield on operating parameters is crucial. Therefore a representative mathematical model is constructed and solved in order to investigate the effect of operating temperature, feed flow-rate, and composition on the formaldehyde yield. Fifty-four coupled of differential equations are solved by finite element method. Moreover, to simulate the process, GRI-Mech 3.0 is employed as the reaction kinetics. A good agreement was achieved when the model results were compared with experimental data from the literature in terms of formaldehyde concentration and methane conversion. Finally, results of the study are presented and discussed on the basis of a major reaction pathway proposed in this study for methane oxidation at low temperature, and the important design criteria are presented. With respect to the model results, 5.5% yield for formaldehyde per one pass of microreactor was achieved at the operating condition of \( T = 1000 \text{ K} \) and \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio = 17.

Keywords: Methane, Formaldehyde, Microreactor, Single Step, Non-catalytic, Kinetic Study.

INTRODUCTION
Conversion of natural gas into valuable chemicals and easily transportable liquid fuels is the focus of interest. This is due to the fact that methane as the main component of natural gas plays an important role in the petrochemical industry. \( \text{C}_1 \)-oxygenates are considered either an important source of petrochemicals or as intermediates. Moreover, the conventional processes for conversion of methane to \( \text{C}_1 \)-oxygenates suffer from high-maintenance catalyst demand. It requires massive scale plants in order to be economically profitable, while there are numerous natural gas sources with low capacity to become a candidate for syngas technologies [1]. Methane could be converted into \( \text{C}_1 \)-oxygenates via two routes: either by forming syngas from steam reforming followed by catalytic conversion at high pressure or by direct conversion methods
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using partial oxidation [1]. Almost all commercial processes for large scale natural gas conversion involve syngas step [2-5]. However, these massive processes are energy intensive due to the necessity of syngas production step [6], high-maintenance catalysts, and operating conditions of high pressures (200-600 psi) [1,7]. Consequently, these processes suffer from low energy efficiency and high capital and operating costs [8]. It is noted that more than 60% of the capital cost for the indirect process is associated with converting methane to syngas [9].

Therefore, direct partial oxidation of methane to C₁-oxygenates might be a promising alternative for effective use of abundant natural gas resources [2,10]. Moreover, direct routes have the potential of economic advantage over indirect method [1] They may be a breakthrough for the utilization of methane into useful chemicals. Both homogeneous gas phase reactions, e.g. [11-13] and heterogeneous catalytic reactions, e.g. [14-21] have been comprehensively investigated. It seems that the main challenge for direct routes is selectivity improvement without reducing conversion per single pass [22]. Direct partial oxidation of methane to C₁-oxygenates has also been studied by other methods such as biocatalysis [23,24], membrane technology [25, 26], photocatalysts technology [27], and etc. A technoeconomical assessment showed that direct process for C₁-oxygenates production could compete with conventional indirect one in terms of production costs if 80% selectivity of methanol could be achieved at single pass methane conversion of 10% [8].

Hence all these methods suffer from the low yield of C₁-oxygenates, and the reported yields are still not high enough to compete with the current multi-step process [6]. But this is not the end and in fact, microreactors due to low residence time, high heat, and mass transfer rates, low-pressure drop, uniform temperature distribution, and high surface to volume ratio provide a window of opportunity regarding direct synthesis route [28-32]. C₁-oxygenates are intermediates in chain reactions of methane partial oxidation, and objective should be to stop the progression of the reaction channel of CH₄ → CH₃ → CH₂O → HCO → CO → CO₂ when the formaldehyde reaches the maximum amounts. Achieving that goal requires strict control on residence time. Furthermore, rapid heat quenching should be realized which might be possible by the employment of microreactors [31].

Due to high surface per volume ratio, the microreactors may have a high heat transfer rate about 106 K/s [33]. In general, control of methane partial oxidation operation under free radical mechanism is a serious concern [1]. The dependency of C₁-oxygenates yield on various parameters is crucial. Moreover, a representative mathematical model is constructed and solved in order to get a deep understanding of catalyst-free single step methane conversion into C₁-oxygenates by microreactors. The kinetic mechanism of GRI-Mech 3.0 which is optimized for a wide range of thermodynamic conditions (1000K to 2500K, 10 Torr to 10 atm) and equivalence ratios (0.1 to 5) [34] have been chosen as reaction kinetic. The developed mathematical model has been solved numerically by the finite element method (FEM) using COMSOL Multiphysics 5.3a.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

Model Description

Model construction is based on general property balance equations which mathematically describe transport phenomena. Mass, momentum, and
energy are the three phenomena that their conservation equations finally lead to a set of non-linear partial differential equations. In Figure 1, the proposed schematic diagram for an annular flow microreactor system configuration is shown. It is assumed that perfectly, premixed ideal gases of argon, methane, and oxygen are fed into the microreactor system at a steady state condition.

**Figure 1: Schematic diagram of annular flow microreactor configuration.**

Although the microreactor system consists of a set of parallel channels, only one channel is modeled assuming flow is uniformly distributed in all channels [35,36]. Equation 1-a defines the mass balance equation for the annular flow microreactor [37]:

\[
\frac{\partial C_i}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (-D_i \nabla C_i) + \nabla \cdot (U_i C_i) = R_i \quad (1-a)
\]

The dimensionless form of Equation (1-a) is depicted in Equation 1-b [38].

\[
\frac{\partial C^*}{\partial \lambda} + \frac{\partial^2 C^*}{\partial z^2} + \nabla \cdot (\mu_j R_j) = \frac{1}{Pe_{MT}} \left( \frac{\partial^2 C^*}{\partial z^2} + \sum_{j=1}^{325} \nu_j A_{ij} R_j^* \right) \quad (1-b)
\]

\[C^* = \frac{C_i}{C_{i0}}, \quad \lambda = \frac{z}{L}, \quad \frac{K_j(T) L^2 (C_{i0})^{n_{ij}}}{D} = \lambda_{ij}^2, \quad Re, Sc = Pe_{MT} \cdot \]

The Reynolds number in the annular microreactor is found to be lower than 150 in reacting conditions [33]. High axial Peclet number (Pe_{MT}) (higher than 300) [6,33] suggests that in the mass balance equation, advection term play a dominant role over diffusion term. Also, radius dependency of concentration could be ignored since L/D ratio is too large. In addition, the volumetric flow rate in microreactor is assumed constant since the output flow rate is almost equal to the input flow rate due to highly diluted reactants (90% Argon).

Eventually, the mass balance equation for the annular flow microreactor is reduced to Equation 2:

\[
\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \lambda} = R_i \quad \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial \lambda} = R_i \quad \sum_{j=1}^{325} \nu_j \eta_j^i, \quad i = 1: 53, \text{chemical species} \quad j = 1: 325, \text{reversible reactions} \quad (2)
\]

which i stands for O, O\(_2\), H, OH, H\(_2\)O\(_2\), CH, CO, CH\(_2\), HCO, CH\(_3\), CH\(_3\)OH, CH\(_4\), CH\(_2\)OH, C\(_2\)H\(_5\), CH\(_3\)OH, C\(_2\)H\(_6\), C\(_2\)H\(_4\), C\(_2\)H\(_3\), C\(_2\)H\(_2\), C\(_2\)H, C\(_2\)H\(_2\), H\(_2\)O, N\(_2\), Ar, C, HCCOH, N, NO, N\(_2\)O, NO\(_2\), NH, HNO, NH\(_2\), NNN, CN, NCO, HCN, HCON, HCN, HCNO, NH\(_2\), CH\(_2\)CHO, CH\(_3\)CHO, C\(_3\)H\(_8\), and C\(_3\)H\(_7\).

Reaction term in mass balance equation is based on the GRI-Mech 3.0 which consists of 53 species and 325 elementary reactions [34]. It is necessary to solve mass and heat transfer equations simultaneously. The energy balance equation for annular flow microreactor system is written as Equation 3 [37]:

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial \lambda} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \left( \mu_i \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right) = \frac{1}{Pe_{MT}} \left( \frac{\partial^2 C^*}{\partial z^2} + \sum_{j=1}^{325} \nu_j A_{ij} R_j^* \right) \quad (3)
\]

Similar to mass balance equation circumstance, after some straightforward manipulations, Equation 3 is decreased to Equation 4.

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{325} F_j \times C_{p,j} \times \frac{dT}{d\lambda} = Q_{heat, source} + Q_{heat, source} - \sum_{j=1}^{325} H_j \eta_j \quad (4)
\]

The derived Equations 2 and 4 with their related boundary conditions in Table 1 were solved by the FEM using COMSOL Multiphysics 5.3a. The specific mesh size of the microreactor (about 3500 elements) with an extremely fine grid near the inlet
and outlet and the 10000 fixed number of elements in the domain of the annular microreactor was developed. In addition, simulations were carried out in order to make the element size independent from the solution.

Table 1: Boundary types and conditions of the microchannel in the microreactor system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary type</th>
<th>Boundary condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inlet</td>
<td>( C = c^{CH_4} + \frac{O}{CH_4} \cdot 0.4 \cdot 20 ) and ( x_{O_2} \cdot x_{CH_4} = 0.1 ), ( T = T^\circ (T^\circ - 1000,1050,1100,1150,1250) ), ( P = 2 \text{bar} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlet</td>
<td>( \frac{dc_t}{dz} = 0, \quad \frac{dT}{dz} = 0, \quad P = 2 \text{bar} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>( n \cdot N_t = 0, \quad n \cdot q = 0, \quad \text{No surface reactions} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reaction Pathways Analysis**

The major reaction pathways for low-temperature oxidation (LTO) of methane are illustrated in Figure 2. The elementary reactions considered in pathways are based on those introduced by Glarborg et al [39] and reaction kinetic of GRI-Mech 3.0. An important point regarding Figure 2 is the width of the arrows which refer to the relative importance of each particular reaction path. For simplicity, pathways with reaction rate of less than \( 1.00 \times 10^{-7} \text{ gmol/cm/s} \) are not shown. Reaction kinetics of pathways which have a higher order of importance with their related Arrhenius parameters are presented in Table 2 [34].

![Reaction Pathways Diagram](image-url)
Table 2: Elementary reactions with Arrhenius parameters corresponding to reaction pathways (Figure 2) [40].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Forward rate coefficient (^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) (n) (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3 = \text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>100 1.6 13054.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{CH}_3 = \text{CH}_2 + \text{H})</td>
<td>660.0 1.62 45354.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(\text{O} + \text{CH}_3 = \text{OH} + \text{CH}_2)</td>
<td>1020.0 1.5 35982.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_4 + \text{CH}_3(\text{+M}) = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5(\text{+M}))</td>
<td>(6.77 \times 10^{10}) -1.18 2736.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_2(\text{+M}) = \text{CH}_2\text{OH}(\text{+M}))</td>
<td>(2.79 \times 10^{12}) -1.43 5564.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{OH} = \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2)</td>
<td>17.00 2.1 20376.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_2\text{OH} = \text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>1.44 2.0 -3514.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{OH} = \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2)</td>
<td>4.20 2.1 20376.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_2\text{OH} = \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>6.30 2.0 6276.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{O}(\text{+M}) = \text{CH}_2\text{O}(\text{+M}))</td>
<td>(5.40 \times 10^{5}) 0.454 10878.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{O}(\text{+M}) = \text{CH}_2\text{OH}(\text{+M}))</td>
<td>(5.4 \times 10^{5}) 0.454 15062.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{O}_2 = \text{HO}_2 + \text{CH}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(1.80 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 3765.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{OH} = \text{OH} + \text{CH}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(1.60 \times 10^{5}) 0.65 -1188.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(\text{O} + \text{CH}_2\text{O} = \text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(1.44 \times 10^{12}) 0.0 -1870.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_2\text{O} = \text{HCO} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(3.90 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 14811.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{O} = \text{HCO} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(2.1 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 -3158.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(\text{O} + \text{CH}_2\text{O} = \text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(6.77 \times 10^{8}) 0.0 2242.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{O} = \text{HO} + \text{HCO})</td>
<td>(5.0 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 6276.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_2\text{(s)} + \text{N}_2 = \text{CH}_2 + \text{N}_2)</td>
<td>(1.50 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 2510.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_2\text{(s)} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(3.00 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_2\text{(s)} = \text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>56.0 1.6 22677.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>(\text{CH} + \text{H}_2 = \text{H} + \text{CH}_2)</td>
<td>(1.08 \times 10^{8}) 0.0 13012.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_2\text{(s)} = \text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(1.13 \times 10^{7}) 2.0 3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>(\text{CH} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(5.71 \times 10^{6}) 0.0 -3158.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_2 = \text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(11.30 \times 10^{6}) 2.0 12552.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 = \text{OH} + \text{HCO})</td>
<td>(5.0 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 6276.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>(\text{HCO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{H} + \text{CO} + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(1.5 \times 10^{12}) -1.0 71128.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>(\text{HCO} + \text{M} = \text{H} + \text{CO} + \text{M})</td>
<td>(1.87 \times 10^{12}) -1.0 71128.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>(\text{HCO} + \text{O}_2 = \text{HO}_2 + \text{CO})</td>
<td>(1.345 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 1673.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{HCO} = \text{H}_2 + \text{CO})</td>
<td>(7.34 \times 10^{7}) 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{CO} = \text{H} + \text{CO}_2)</td>
<td>(47.60 \times 10^{7}) 1.228 292.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>(\text{CH}_2\text{(s)} + \text{CO}_2 = \text{CO} + \text{CH}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>(1.40 \times 10^{13}) 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 = \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>3.54 2.12 3640.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4(\text{+M}) = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3(\text{+M}))</td>
<td>(5.40 \times 10^{5}) 0.454 7614.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>(\text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>3.60 2.0 1460.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4(\text{+M}) = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3(\text{+M}))</td>
<td>56.00 \times 10^{5} 2.0 10041.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>(\text{O} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 = \text{CO} + \text{CH}_2\text{O})</td>
<td>6.94 2.0 7949.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4(\text{+M}) = \text{C}_2\text{H}_3(\text{+M}))</td>
<td>1.39 \times 10^{10} -0.534 2242.624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)The forward rate coefficient \(k = A^* (T/T_{\text{ref}})^n \exp (-E/R/T)\). \(R\) is universal gas constant (J/mol/K), \(T\) is the temperature in K, and \(T_{\text{ref}}\) equals 1 K. the units of \(A\) involve mol/cm\(^3\) and s, \(E\) is J/mol.
The linear progression of CH\textsubscript{4} to CO\textsubscript{2}, together with several side loops originating from methyl radical is shown in reaction pathways. Moreover, the starting point of CH\textsubscript{4} linear progression (Black) is from reactions where OH, H, and O radicals attack CH\textsubscript{4} to produce CH\textsubscript{3}. Methyl radical then combines with an oxygen atom to form formaldehyde (target product of this study). Subsequently, formaldehyde reacts with OH, H, and O radicals to form formyl radical (HCO). Follow-up formyl radical is transformed to CO through four elementary reactions, and finally, CO is converted to CO\textsubscript{2}.

In addition to the direct pathway of methyl radical to formaldehyde, there also exist side loops (Blue) where they all end up in formaldehyde formation except one (Orange). Meanwhile, C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons originated from CH\textsubscript{3} end up forming CO (and CH\textsubscript{2}) (Red). Consequently, in order to have formaldehyde as the target product, side loop (Orange), C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbons (Red), and linear progression of formaldehyde to CO and CO\textsubscript{2} (CH\textsubscript{2}O → CO → CO\textsubscript{2}, which is highlighted at reactions pathways by gray) must be prevented.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Methanol and formaldehyde are among intermediates in the oxidation of methane. C–H bond in methane is stronger than that of C\textsubscript{1}-oxygenates, and therefore extraction of C\textsubscript{1}-oxygenates from the reaction zone is challenging as they are more reactive than methane itself [41]. Hence the main concern is how to achieve a high order of C\textsubscript{1}-oxygenates selectivity at acceptable methane conversions [2,8]. According to the published literature, in the LTO of methane (T < 1500 K and 1 < P < 10 bar), production of methanol is much lower than formaldehyde [42]. Moreover, in this study formaldehyde is representative of C\textsubscript{1}-oxygenates. As mentioned earlier, microreactor might be an appropriate apparatus for LTO of methane to produce formaldehyde. Being an intermediate in the process of methane oxidation, the objective would be to withdraw formaldehyde as the product from the output of microreactor before it is converted to other species. In the followings, initially, the mathematical model for the methane oxidation proposed in this study is validated, and then the effect of feed temperature, O\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} ratio and residence time which are determining parameters in conversion of methane to formaldehyde are discussed.

Validation

To validate the constructed mathematical model, it is noted that the well-validated reaction kinetic of GRI-Mech 3.0 was used in the mass balance equation. However, the obtained results of the mathematical model were compared with the few experimental results reported by Zhang et al [13]. As reported in Table 3, there is a good agreement between model and experimental results in terms of formaldehyde mole fraction and methane conversion.

Methane Conversion

Methane conversion (Equation 5) at LTO to formaldehyde versus residence time at different temperatures and O\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} ratios are illustrated in Figures 3 and 4.

\[
\text{Methane conversion} = \frac{\text{moles of methane converted}}{\text{mole of methane introduced}} \times 100
\]
Table 3: Comparison of mathematical model results with experimental results in terms of formaldehyde mole fraction and methane conversion [43].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Operating condition</th>
<th>Formaldehyde mole fraction</th>
<th>Methane conversion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 2</td>
<td>4.34 E-5</td>
<td>4.18 E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 2</td>
<td>7.63 E-5</td>
<td>7.27 E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 2</td>
<td>2.05 E-4</td>
<td>1.92 E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 2</td>
<td>7.01 E-5</td>
<td>6.78 E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 2</td>
<td>1.31 E-4</td>
<td>1.28 E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 2</td>
<td>2.48 E-4</td>
<td>2.36 E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 4</td>
<td>0.90 E-4</td>
<td>8.38E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 8</td>
<td>7.89 E-5</td>
<td>7.60 E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 5</td>
<td>8.64 E-5</td>
<td>8.22 E-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>O$_2$/CH$_4$ = 2</td>
<td>1.81e-4</td>
<td>1.70e-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variations of methane conversion along the microreactor length with temperature and \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio suggest that methane conversion at LTO reactions could be divided into two zones as (a)-where methane conversion is very low and only negligible amount of formaldehyde is being formed and (b)-where methane conversion increases rapidly to complete the reaction. This is the crucial zone where formaldehyde production rate (R5, R13, R14, R18, and R21 of reaction pathways) is higher than its consumption rate (R15, R16, and R17 of reaction pathways). Of course, all loops are active as well to produce oxidation products (\( \text{CO}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \)). Consequently, in order to achieve a reasonable amount of formaldehyde as a target product in the microreactor the zone (a) and only starting portions of the zone (b) are concentrated.

**Formaldehyde Selectivity**

In methane LTO process, achieving a high order of selectivity (Equation 6) for the desired product is a crucial challenge. \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio, operating temperature and residence time are the key effective parameters.

\[
\text{Formaldehyde selectivity} = \frac{\text{moles of formaldehyde formed}}{\text{mole of methane converted}} \times 100
\]  

However, \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio and temperature have a high order of interaction, and therefore their effects are analyzed together. In Figures 5 to 7, formaldehyde selectivity versus residence time at different temperatures and \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratios.

Figure 3: Methane conversion versus residence time at different temperatures. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio = 0.4 and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.

Figure 4: Methane conversion versus residence time at different \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratios. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, T = 1000 \text{ K} \) and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.

Figure 5: Formaldehyde selectivity versus residence time at different temperatures. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio = 2 and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.

Figure 6: Formaldehyde selectivity versus residence time at different temperatures. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio = 8 and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.
As shown in Figure 2 and reaction path analysis, the temperature rise has a stronger effect on formaldehyde consumption rate (R15, R16, R17 of reaction pathways) than its production rate (R5, R13, R14, R18, R21 of reaction pathways). This is due to the higher reaction rate constants because of lower activation energies related to formaldehyde consumption reactions. Consequently, the temperature rise will result in a sharper drop of formaldehyde selectivity to zero along reactor length as seen in Figures 5 to 7. In other words, the fall in selectivity happens earlier at the entrance of microreactor as temperature increases. With regard to \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio effect, it is seen that increasing \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio causes a slight increase in the selectivity percent, but again drop of formaldehyde selectivity becomes sharper, and at shorter intervals of reactor inlet, the selectivity of formaldehyde becomes zero.

**Formaldehyde Yield**

Although single pass formaldehyde selectivity is important, it should be noted that choosing selectivity as a criterion is not practical by itself because methane conversion at maximum selectivity of the formaldehyde is very low (< 1%). Hence, formaldehyde yield (Equation 7) takes into account, and both selectivity and conversion are a more meaningful basis for reactor design.

\[
\text{Formaldehyde yield} = \frac{\text{moles of formaldehyde formed}}{\text{mole of methane introduced}} 
\times 100 = \text{selectivity} \times \text{conversion}
\]

As previously seen, formaldehyde selectivity versus residence time has an ascending trend followed by descending trend, while conversion is ascend in all domains. This causes formaldehyde yield to have a similar trend as its selectivity, which is shown in Figure 8.

---

**Formaldehyde selectivity and methane conversion (%)**

**Formaldehyde selectivity versus residence time at different temperatures. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio = 15 and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.**

---

**Formaldehyde yield versus residence time under different operating temperatures and \( \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratios are presented in Figures 9 to 11.**

---

**Formaldehyde yield versus residence time at different temperatures. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, \text{O}_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio = 2, and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.**
Figure 10: Formaldehyde yield versus residence time at different temperatures. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, \ O_2/\text{CH}_4 \text{ ratio} = 8, \) and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.

Moreover, results show that by increasing \( O_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio, formaldehyde yield increases while temperature variation does not play any noticeable roles. Therefore, it seems that the best-operating conditions are high \( O_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio and any temperature in the acceptable range of LTO. However, one can argue that at low temperatures, see Figures 9 to 11, formaldehyde formation zone in the microreactor spreads out which is helpful for controlling the process in term of withdrawing formaldehyde. Therefore operating conditions would favor low temperature and high \( O_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio. Also, it should be noted at maximum formaldehyde yield, its selectivity is less than 100% which means the existence of by-products. Also, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, hydrogen, water, and \( C_2 \) hydrocarbons are the main by-products with traces of other chemicals.

**Design Criteria**

Residence time depends on reactor volume and feed flow rate. However, at any operating conditions of temperature and \( O_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio, the residence time must be determined in a way to guarantee the production of formaldehyde at the output of microreactor. This is possible with reference to Figures 9 to 11. For example in Figure 11, the residence time operating microreactor at \( T = 1000 \) K and \( O_2/\text{CH}_4 = 15 \) should be 522 ms in order to produce maximum yield (amount) of formaldehyde. Residence time corresponding to the maximum yield of formaldehyde at microreactor output depends on \( O_2/\text{CH}_4 \) and temperature. It can be seen that maximum yield does not change with temperature which implies that residence time corresponding to maximum yield of formaldehyde at the output is a function of \( O_2/\text{CH}_4 \) ratio only. It should be noted that the temperature change along the reactor length is negligible, as shown in Figure 12, and could be assumed that the temperature is almost constant during the time of reaction.

Figure 11: Formaldehyde selectivity versus residence time at different temperatures. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, \ O_2/\text{CH}_4 \text{ ratio} = 15, \) and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.

Figure 12: Temperature variation versus reactor length at different temperatures. Reaction conditions: \( P_t = 2 \text{ bar}, \ \tau = 30 \) ms, \( O_2/\text{CH}_4 \text{ ratio} = 15, \) and mole fraction of Argon = 90%.
It can be noticed that an annular microreactor allows very rapid heating and cooling of components, and leads to a relatively constant temperature [33]. Figures 13 shows residence time and yield as functions of $O_2/CH_4$ ratio at temperature of 1000 K. The maximum yield of formaldehyde can be reached up to 5.5% per single pass of microreactor system in the residence time of 493 ms which corresponds with the optimum operating condition ($T = 1000 \text{ K}$ and $O_2/CH_4$ ratio = 17).

![Figure 13: Residence time and formaldehyde yield as a function of $O_2/CH_4$ ratio. Reaction conditions: $P_t = 2 \text{ bar, } T = 1000 \text{ K, and mole fraction of Argon = 90%}$.](image)

**CONCLUSIONS**

Pathways for production of formaldehyde from LTO of methane were analyzed, modeled, and confirmed by available experimental data. It is found out that increasing temperature beyond 1000 K does not affect formaldehyde yield, and it is $O_2/CH_4$ ratio which is an influential parameter to increase yield and to determine the residence time in microreactor to guarantee formaldehyde production at the output of microreactor system. Moreover, it is concluded that the maximum yield of formaldehyde by LTO of methane can be reached up to 5.5% per single pass in a microreactor system. Finally, the production of by-products is inevitable under all conditions, and efforts are needed to reduce them.

**NOMENCLATURES**

- $F_i$: Molar flow rate of species $i$, mol/s
- $C_i$: Concentration of species $i$, mol/m$^3$
- $C_{i0}$: Initial concentration of species $i$, mol/m$^3$
- $C_{in}$: Inlet concentration of species $i$, mol/m$^3$
- $T$: Reactor temperature, K
- $T^*$: Reactor temperature, K
- $P_t$: Reactor pressure, bar
- $V$: Reactor volume, m$^3$
- $L$: Reactor Length, m
- $D$: Reactor diameter, m
- $R_i$: Reaction rate of species $i$, mol/m$^3$/s
- $r_j$: Reaction rate of reaction $j$, mol/m$^3$/s
- $H_j$: Enthalpy of the reaction $j$, J/mol
- $Q_{heat\ source}$: Heat of reactions, J/m$^3$/s
- $q_{cond}$: External heat added or removed the reactor, J/m$^3$/s
- $N_i$: Axial coordinate, m
- $t$: Times, s
- $A_L$: Cross sectional area, m$^2$
- $E$: Activation energy, J/mol
- $D_{i,mix}$: The diffusivity coefficient in mixture, m$^2$/s
- $\Lambda_{ij}$: Stoichiometric coefficient of species $i$ in reaction $j$
- $\alpha_i^D$: Damkohler number for component $i$ in the $j$-th chemical reaction
- $\nu_{ij}$: Damkohler number for component $i$ in the $j$-th reaction
- $K_j(T)$: The kinetic rate constant for reaction $j$ with units of (volume/mole)$^{n_j}$/time
- $n_j$: The simplified order of the $j$-th reaction
- $R_j^*$: Dimensionless rate law for the $j$-th reaction
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