# **Copyright Warning & Restrictions**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a, user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use" that user may be liable for copyright infringement,

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Please Note: The author retains the copyright while the New Jersey Institute of Technology reserves the right to distribute this thesis or dissertation

Printing note: If you do not wish to print this page, then select "Pages from: first page # to: last page #" on the print dialog screen



The Van Houten library has removed some of the personal information and all signatures from the approval page and biographical sketches of theses and dissertations in order to protect the identity of NJIT graduates and faculty.

# INVESTIGATION OF THE OCTENE-DECANE-UREA ADDUCT EQUILIBRIUM SYSTEM

ВΥ

### FREDERICK C. GUEST

## A THESIS

## PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

# THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

## MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

. 1

AT

### NEWARK COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

This thesis is to be used only with due regard to the rights of the author(s). Bibliographical references may be noted, but passages must not be copied without permission of the College and without credit being given in subsequent written or published work.

> Newark, New Jersey 1965

#### ABSTRACT

Experimental studies pertaining to urea adduct formed from octene-1 and from mixtures of octene-1 and n decane have been carried out using methanol as a solvent.

Concentrations of equilibrium mixtures formed by adding increments of octene to a solution of urea in methanol to form adduct are reported.

Calorimetric studies indicate that the addition of octene to a urea-methanol solution shows an endothermic heat effect prior to the formation of solid adduct. The heat effect becomes exothermic as solid adduct is formed.

Addition of decane to an equilibrium octene-urea adduct system increased octene concentration in the supernatent liquid, indicating an octene release from the original adduct as decane adduct was formed.

The order in which decane and octene were added to form the decane-octene-urea adduct system was shown to influence the final equilibrium concentration of the adduct and its supernatent liquid.

i

# APPROVAL OF THESIS

# FOR.

# DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

# NEWARK COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

ΒY





NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

JUNE, 1965

ii

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Professor Keeffe for his counsel and guidance throughout this project.

Jun '

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Approval Page	ii
Acknowledgement • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	iii
List of Tables and Figures	v
Introduction	1- 5
Experimental	6-25
Adduct Formation	6
Calorimetric Investigations	11
Decane-Octene Replacement Study	17
Order of Addition	22
Discussion and Conclusions	26-34
Appendix	35
Mixture Composition - Calculation Method	36
Adduct Composition Determination	38
Adduct Formation - Mechanism	
Determination	42
Order of Addition - Sampling Technique	
Evaluation	45
References	50

.

:

# LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

		Page
Table 1:	Adduct Formation-Reaction Data and	
	Observations	9-10
Table 2:	Calorimeter Data	.4-15
Figure 1:	Twin Calorimeter	16
Table 3:	Decane-Octene Replacement	
	Chromatographic Analyses	19
Table 4:	Decane-Octene Replacement	
	Intermediate Results	20
Table 5:	Decane-Octene Replacement	
	Final Equilibrium	21
Table 6:	Order of AdditionChromatographic	
	Analyses - Detail	24
Table 7:	Order of AdditionChromatographic	
	Analyses - Summary	25
Table 8:	Sampling Technique Evaluation	
	Chromatographic Analyses-Detail .	47
Table 9:	Sampling Technique Evaluation	
	Chromatographic Analyses-Summary .	48
Table 10:	Index of Refraction Measurements	49

V

#### INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1940's it has been known that urea, when mixed with long straight chain organic compounds, forms crystalline addition complexes, or "adducts". The phenomenon does not occur with branched or aromatic compounds. This shape selectivity has found commercial application in removing straight hydrocarbons from hydrocarbon mixtures (1).

Considerable information has appeared in the literature regarding urea adduct formation. X-ray studies of the adducts have revealed that the adducts contain "tunnels" formed by hexagonal prisms of urea, the hydrocarbons being resident in the tunnels  $\binom{2}{}$ . It has been postulated that van der Waal's forces hold the hydrocarbon. The hexagonal orientation differs from the tetragonal structure of normal urea crystals. The diameter of the urea "tunnel" has been determined at 5 to 5.25 Angstrom units. It has been found that the limiting cross-sectional diameter of a potential adduct-former must be less than 5.25 A<sup>0</sup> before urea-adduct

1.	Bailey,	W.	Α.	Jr.,	Bannerot,	R.	Α.,	, Fetterly,	, L. C.,	and
	Smith,	A.	G.,	Ind.	Eng. Chem	. 9 4	43,	2125-2129	(1951).	

<sup>2.</sup> Kobe, K. A., and Domask, W. J., <u>Petroleum Refiner</u>, <u>31</u>, 106-113, (1952)

formation can take place. This requirement is waived, however, when the branching or aromatic radical is formed at the end of a long straight-chain hydrocarbon, in which case the straight end of the molecule enters the urea tunnel. Adduct formation is greatly accelerated in the presence of an activator, eg., methanol, the apparent function of which is to provide a medium for contacting the reactants. Some articles have appeared stressing the physical nature of the adduct, others stressing the chemical. Kobe and Domask (3)point out that, unlike chemical compounds, the partners in urea adducts are not united in whole numbered ratios except in a few instances, by chance. They also point out that the type of molecule which can be entrapped is determined by volume considerations and not by chemical nature, indicating a physical phenomenon rather than a chemical inter-Redlich, et al (4) have found that the "reaction" action.

complex = reactant + m urea

<u>.</u>

fits the equilibrium constant concept, and have published considerable data giving equilibrium constants as a function of temperature for a variety of adduct reactions. Kobe and

3. <u>Ibid</u>.

4. Redlich, O., Gable, C.M., Beason, L.R., and Millar, R.W., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 72, 4153-62, (1950)

(5) Domask have used the Clausius-Clapeyron equation to calculate the heat of dissociation for adducts. The calculated heats agree well with experimentally determined values. Thus, the literature suggests that urea adducts constitute a physical entrapment of a hydrocarbon inside a distorted (hexagonal instead of the normal tetragonal) urea lattice, the entrapping forces being van der Waal. The adduct has been found to obey some of the classical laws of chemistry.

When the reaction is carried out in a solvent medium the rate of crystalline adduct formation is accelerated. The possibility of adduct formation in the liquid state prior to precipitation has received some attention in the literature. Zimmerschied, et al, has postulated the following equilibrium system:

Urea(solid) Urea(dissolved) nparaffin(liquid) nparaffin(dissolved) Urea(dissolved) nparaffin(dissolved) Adduct(dissolved) Adduct(dissolved) Adduct(solid)

This system clearly recognizes the existance of a dissolved adduct reaction product. Kobe and  $Domask^{(7)}$  have shown that water-insoluble adduct formers, such as cetane 5. Kobe, K.A., op. cit.

- 6. Zimmerschied, W.J., Higlez, W.S., and Lien, A.P., <u>The Pet.</u> Engr., <u>Ref.Ann.</u>, C-44 (1950).
- 7. Kobe, K.A., <u>op. cit.</u>

and stearic acid, are made soluble by the presence of urea. Moreover, they found that:

l Urea + 34 n-butyric acid ------

1 Urea in solution + 95 cal (Equ. 1)

The solution of urea is normally an endothermic process, as in Equ. 2. Since heat is evolved in Equ. 1, there is evidence of some interaction in the liquid phase.

In light of the above background information, this thesis was undertaken to further explore the behavior of urea adducts. Investigations were along four lines:

- (1) Increments of octene were added to a methanolurea-octene system to determine whether the adduct formation reaction follows an equilibrium relationship. The equilibrium adduct and supernatent liquid concentrations were subsequently determined.
- (2) The heat effect of the adduct reaction both prior and subsequent to the formation of crystals was investigated calorimetrically, to gain some insight into the possibility of a dissolved adduct reaction product.

- (3) Decane was added to an equilibrium system consisting of dissolved urea, methanol, octene, and solid octene-urea adduct, to determine whether a release of octene from the adduct would take place.
- (4) A system consisting of octene, decane, methanol, dissolved urea, and solid adduct was formed by adding decane to the equilibrium octene-methanolurea system. Identical amounts of the same reactants were used to form a second system, in which the octene was added to the equilibrium decane-methanol-urea system. Analyses of the two final equilibrium systems thus revealed the effect which the order of reactant addition had on final equilibrium composition.

#### EXPERIMENTAL

#### Adduct Formation

A solution of urea in methanol was charged to a flask fitted with a variable speed stirrer and immersed in a constant temperature bath held at  $25^{\circ}$  C.

Octene was added to the mixture in increments. After several increments were added, solid adduct began to form. The liquid phase of the mixture was sampled after each incremental addition, sufficient time (several days) being allowed for attainment of equilibrium before samples were taken. The samples, containing octene, methanol, dissolved urea, and possibly dissolved adduct, were distilled to separate the octene and methanol from the dissolved urea. The resultant distillates contained all of the methanol and octene in the original samples, including octene contained in whatever dissolved adduct there may have been. The solid urea remaining in the distillation flask was dissolved in water. The solution was inspected for presence of an "oil slick" indicating incomplete removal of octene in the distillation. No slick was observed.

The percentages of octene and of methanol in the distillates were determined from a refractive index correlation developed experimentally for that purpose (see Table 10). This data was then used to calculate the solid and liquid compositions of the equilibrium mixtures. The calculation method is detailed in the appendix.

Results of the adduct formation experiments are shown in Table 1. It was observed that:

Precipitate that formed at lower octene concentrations dissolved upon stirring. Lasting precipitate did not form until octene and urea concentrations reached about 6 and 14 percent respectively.

Solutions in equilibrium with solid adduct showed lesser amounts of octene than present in the total mixture.

Part of each octene addition remained in solution, while part reacted with urea to form adduct.

The reaction did not progress to "completion". That is, neither the octene nor urea were totally consumed.

The solubility limit of octene was exceeded at a lower concentration than the solubility limit of a binary octene-methanol solution. The available urea was not exhausted at this point.

The significance of the above observations is discussed under "Discussion and Conclusions". For the sake of continuity it will suffice to mention here that the observations

suggest "some" intermediate step/steps taking place in the liquid phase prior to solid adduct formation. To investigate this calorimetric investigations were undertaken.

J.

ADDUCT	FORMATION -	- REACTION	DATA AN	D OBSERVATIONS	- TABLE 1

.

.

	EQUIL. WT.%	LIQUID MOL.%	EQUIL.LIQ GRAMS	UID MOLES	TOT.SOLIDA GRAMS	&LIQUID MOLES	SAMPLE GRAMS	COMME NT S	
OCTENE UREA METHANOL	0.83 15.68 83.49	0.23 8.03 91.74	2.2568 42.64 227.18 OCTENE	0.0201 0.708 7.08 ADDED 4.1	2.2568 42.64 227.18 L659 gm.	0.0201 0.708 7.08	0.0703 1.3280 7.0760	No ppt.	
OCTENE UREA METHANOL	2.39 15.43 82.22	0.74 9.06 90.20	6.3524 41.31 220.10 OCTENE	0.0566 0.689 6.86 ADDED 6.8	6.3524 41.31 220.10 3704 gm.	0.0566 0.689 6.86	0.2024 1.1554 7.0797	PPt.formed lo- cally; dissolved upon stirring	
OCTENE UREA METHANOL	4.89 15.08 80.03	1.56 9.00 89.44	13.0204 40.15 213.02 OCTENE	0.1160 0.6690 6.64 ADDED 4.2	13.0204 40.15 213.02 2601 gm.	0.1160 0.6690 6.64	0.4091 1.2616 6.6934	Ppt.formed lo- cally; dissolved upon stirring	
OCTENE UREA METHANOL	6.30 14.29 79.41	2.02 8.58 89.40	16.3510 37.12 206.33 OCTENE	0.1455 0.618 6.43 ADDED 1.4	16.8714 38.89 206.33 4388 gm.	0.1500 0.648 6.43	0.5179 1.1758 6.5361	Ppt.deposited at top of flask due to violent stir- ring. When ppt.	
	NOTE: Malfunction of the thermostat on the constant temperature bath resulted in excessive heating of the reaction mixture. A new mixture was made up at this point.							solution it did not dissolve.	
OCTENE UREA METHANOL	7.30 14.10 78.60	2.37 8.53 89.10	21.202 40.96 228.14 OCTENE	0.189 0.682 7.13 ADDED 5.7	21.7758 42.91 22 <b>8.</b> 14 7631 gm.	0.1941 0.715 7.11	0.5119 0.9889 5.5087	Permanent ppt.	
OCTENE UREA METHANOL	8.80 12.22 78.98	2.85 7.42 89.73	24.8411 34.49 222.63 OCTENE	0.221 0.575 6.95 ADDED 5.7	27.0270 41.92 222.63 7925 gm.	0.241 0.698 6.94	0.5959 0.8274 5.3408	Permanent ppt.	

-	ADDUCT H	FORMATION	- REACTION	I DATA A	ND OBSERVAT	IONS - T	ABLE 1	(CONT * D.)	
	EQUII WT.%	L.LIQUID MOL.%	EQUIL.LI GRAMS	QUID MOLES	TOT.SOLIDA GRAMS	&LIQUID MOLES	SAMPLE GRAMS	COMMENTS	
OCTENE UREA METHANO	10.58 11.43 L 77.99	8 3.47 3 7.00 9 89.53	29.5145 31.88 217.29 OCTENE	0.263 0.532 6.79 ADDED 5	32.2236 41.09 217.29 .5998 gm.	0.287 0.683 6.79	0.8311 0.8977 6.1192	Permanent	ppt.
OCTENE UREA METHANO	12.39 10.60 L 77.09	5 4.07 0 6.50 5 89.43	33.6689 28.89 211.17 OCTENE	0.301 0.481 6.61 ADDED 1	36.9923 40.19 211.17 6.1036 gm.	0.330 0.669 6.61	0.8566 0.7350 5.3728	Permanent	ppt.

NOTE: Addition of the 16.1036 gm. octene resulted in the formation of two liquid layers. The overall solid-liquid analysis was:

Octene	18.1	wt.%
Urea	13.4	wt.%
Methanol	68.5	wt.%

Binary mixture of methanol and octene soluble at 50% octene.

#### <u>Calorimetric Investigations</u>

A twin calorimeter consisting of two Dewar flasks suspended inside of a copper submarine box was built. Access to the Dewar flasks was provided by two open stacks fastened to flanges above the Dewars (see Figure 1). Initially, openings for admitting agitators, a heater, and thermocouple to the Dewars were drilled in the flanges. However, leakage problems necessitated sealing these openings. The calorimeter was consequently used as a qualitative rather than quantitative instrument. Thermocouples were introduced via the open stacks. The calorimeter was built in a similar fashion to the one built by Konrad (1).

The assembled calorimeter was submerged in a water bath at room temperature. The basic concept of using one of the Dewars as a reactor and one as a blank was followed; that is, all additions of reactants to the "reactor" Dewar were paralleled by additions of water to the "blank" Dewar. By comparing temperature changes in the reactor to temperature changes in the blank, the effect of extraneous temperature changes, such as minor fluctuations in bath temperature could be backed out.

<sup>1.</sup> Konrad, F.M., <u>Thesis-Department of Chemical Engineering</u>, <u>Newark College of Engineering</u>, 1955

Three heat effects were investigated:

The heat of mixing for methanol-octene solutions.
 The heat of reaction for a methanol-urea-octene system where reactant concentrations were kept below those required for solid adduct formation.

(3) The heat of reaction for a methanol-urea-octene system where solid adduct was formed.

For each of the three systems, a charge of reactant and a corresponding charge of water were initially added to the Dewars. At least 12 hours were allowed for thermal equilibrium to be attained, during which time the water bath was agitated intermittently. Further reactants and the parallel amounts of water were subsequently added via hypodermic syringes which had been charged and positioned inside of the "stacks". The charged syringes were kept inside of the stacks for at least 12 hours prior to injection to eliminate temperature differences between the contents of the Dewars and the contents of the syringes. Temperature of the reactor and blank Dewars were recorded simultaneously at time intervals before and after the syringes were injected.

Results of the calorimeter work are presented on Table 2. It was observed that:

The heat of mixing for octene and methanol in the concentration range of 6.7 to 13.3 wt.% octene is endothermic.

The addition of octene to a methanol-urea system in overall concentrations of 4% octene, 15% urea, 81% methanol results in an endothermic heat effect about 4 times as great as observed from the octenemethanol heat of mixing data. No precipitate was formed at these concentrations.

The addition of octene to a methanol-urea-octene system in sufficient quantity to produce a very small quantity of precipitate results in an almost negligible endothermic heat effect. Addition of a further increment of octene results in a significant exothermic heat effect. CALORIMETER DATA TABLE 2

I.	HEAT	OF MIXING	- METHAI	NOL AND OCTENE		1	1
	T IME	EMF- REACTOR	MV   BLANK	CONTENTS ( REACTOR (BEFORE)	)F: SYRINGE		
RUN R-1	11:30 11:40 11:45 11:55 12:10 12:20 12:35 <u>12:50</u>	0.855 SYRINGES 0.852 0.850 0.848 0.848 0.848 0.847 <u>0.847</u> 0.847	0.885 EMPTIED 0.882 0.881 0.881 0.881 0.881 0.881 0.881 0.881 0.881	272.62 gm.	19.17	METHANOL OCTENE	
RUN R-2	7:10 7:15 7:25 7:27 7:32 7:40 7:47 7:57 8:07	0.876 0.876 0.876 SYRINGES 0.871 0.868 0.867 0.867 0.867 0.867 0.867	0.875 0.873 0.873 EMPTIED 0.872 0.871 0.872 0.872 0.872 0.872 0.872 0.872	272.62 19.17	22.58	METHANOL OCTENE	
II.	METH	ANOL, URE	A AND OCT	CENE BELOW ADDUC	T – FORI	MING CONC	ENTRATIONS
	TIME	EMF- REACTOR	MV BLANK	CONTENTS C REACTOR (BEFORE)	F: SYRINGE		COMMENTS
RUN R-4	6:30 6:40 6:50 6:52 6:56 7:03 <u>7:12</u>	0.910 0.910 0.910 SYRINGES 0.902 0.899 <u>0.875</u> -0.035	0.876 0.876 0.876 EMPTIED 0.877 0.877 <u>0.877</u> 0.001	199.61 gm. 36.93	10.06	METHANOL UREA	No ppt in Reactor
RUN R-6	6:35 6:40 6:46 6:50 7:00 7:10 7:20 7:25 <u>7:30</u>	0.875 0.875 SYRINGES 0.873 0.870 0.840 0.835 0.834 0.835 0.834	0.866 0.866 EMPTIED 0.867 0.868 0.866 0.866 0.866 0.866 0.866 0.866	200.02 37.22	10.99	METHANOL UREA OCTENE	No ppt in Reactor
	• •	í	l				

CALORIMETER DATA TABLE 2 (CONT D.)

III. METHANOL, UREA AND OCTENE - ABOVE ADDUCT-FORMING CONCENTRATIONS

	TIME	EMF- REACTOR	MV BLANK	CONTENTS ( REACTOR (BEFORE	F: SYRINGE		COMMENTS
RUN R-3	6:30 6:40 6:45 6:47 6:50 7:00 7:00 7:10 7:20 7:25	0.872 0.869 SYRINGES 0.863 0.869 0.870 0.870 0.870 0.870 0.870	0.872 0.870 0.871 EMPTIED 0.871 0.871 0.871 0.871 0.871 0.871 0.871 0.871	199.45 gm. 37.17	15.53	METHANOL UREA OCTENE	Permanent ppt in reactor
RUN R-5	7:15 7:25 7:45 <u>7:53</u>	0.900 0.900 0.918 <u>0.919</u> 0.019	0.894 0.894 0.893 <u>0.892</u> -0.002	199.61 36.93 10.06	9•99	METHANOL UREA OCTENE	Permanent ppt in reactor

Thermocouples were iron-constantan

Potentiometer - Leeds & Northrup,

Model #8662

TWIN CALORIMETER FIGURE 1



#### Decane-Octene Replacement Study

The experimental work described in this section examines the effect of adding decane to an equilibrium system consisting of octene, methanol, dissolved urea, solid adduct, and intermediates, if any.

A charge of methanol and urea was added to a stirred flask immersed in a constant temperature bath at  $25^{\circ}$  C. After the urea dissolved, octene was added in sufficient quantity to produce solid adduct. The equilibrium liquid was sampled, distilled for removal of dissolved urea, and analysed using a chromatograph (sample E-1). Decane was added to the equilibrium mixture, and the resultant equilibrium liquid was sampled, distilled and analysed (sample E-2). The results are shown in Table 3. The calculation method used to determine adduct and equilibrium liquid compositions from the chromatographic analyses is detailed in the appendix.

From the data it was observed that: The octene/methanol ratio is higher for sample E-2 (decane added) than for sample E-1 indicating that addition of decane resulted in an increase in the amount of octene in solution.

There was free urea available for reaction with decane.

The increase in the amount of octene in solution is greater than if all of the <u>reacted</u> decane replaced octene in octene-urea adduct, based on adduct compositions given in the literature (see Table 5).

# DECANE-OCTENE REPLACEMENT TABLE 3

# CHROMATOGRAPHIC ANALYSES

	SAMPLE	E-1			SAMPLE	E-2		
RUN #	METHANOL	OCTENE	OCT/METH	RUN #	METHANOL	OCTENE	DECANE	OCT/METH
1	93.45	6.55	0.0700/1	1	89.10	6.73	4.17	0.0755/1
2	93.45	6.55	0.0700/1	2	90.94	7.32	1.74	0.0805/1
3	93.38	6.62	0.0713/1	3	91.38	6.59	2.03	0.0718/1
4	93.60	6.40	0.0685/1		• ·			
AVG.	93.47	6.53	0.0700/1	AVG.	90.50	6.85	2.65	0.0760/1

#### DECANE-OCTENE REPLACEMENT TABLE 4

# INTERMEDIATE RESULTS

COMPONENT	INITIAL CHARGE -GM-	EQUIL.LIQUID UREA-FREE ANALYSIS (Sample E-1) WT.%	TOTAL SAMPLE CONTENT-GMS.	EQUIL.MIXTURE SOLID & LIQUID	AFTER	SAMPLE LIQUID	AMT.OCTENE REACTED -GM-
METHANOL UREA OCTENE	225.70 43.48 22.25	93.47 6.53	6.6941 0.6341 0.4671	219.01 42.8459 21.7829	2] 2 ]	9.01 20.7459 15.2829	6.50

7.0070 gm DECANE ADDED

COMPONENT	EQUIL.LIQUID UREA-FREE ANALYSIS (Sample E-2) WT.%	EQUIL.MIXTURE BEFORE SAMPLE SOLID & LIQUID-GMS	OCTENE IN EQUIL. LIQ.BEFORE SAMPLE	DECANE IN EQUIL. LIQ.BEFORE SAMPIE
METHANOL UREA OCTENE	90.50	219.01 42.8459 21.7829	219.01 x <u>6.85</u> 90.50 = 16.576	219.01 x $\frac{2.65}{90.50}$
DECANE	2.05	7.0070		■ 0•413

16.576 -<u>15.283</u> 1.293 gm octene additional in liquid

7.0070 -<u>6.4130</u> 0.5940 gm decane reacted

20.

## FINAL EQUILIBRIUM

# Final equilibrium liquid composition for octene-decane-urea-methanol system

Octene	16.576 gm
Decane	6.413
Urea	23.466
Methanol	219.01

Moles of octene and urea based on 100 gms. of above solution

Octene	0.0557	moles
Urea	0.1475	

Adduct Compositions(2)

Octene-urea	3.4	gm	urea	per	gm	octene
Decane-urea	3.4	gm.	urea	a per	r gn	decane

2. Redlich, O., Gable, C.M., Beason, L.R., and Miller, R.W., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 72, 4154 (1950)

#### Order of Addition

Work described in this section examines the effect of varying the sequence of addition of octene and decane to methanol-urea solutions in forming two otherwise identical systems.

A methanol-urea solution was added to a stirred flask immersed in a constant temperature bath at 25° C. Octene was added to this solution in sufficient quantity to cause precipitation of solid adduct. After agitating the mixture for more than 24 hours to insure equilibrium, decane was added to the flask. The mixture was then agitated another 24 hours, after which time a liquid sample was withdrawn, distilled for removal of dissolved urea, and analysed using a chromatograph. The entire procedure was then repeated using identical quantities of reactants. octene being added to the decane-urea-methanol system. That is, the first system was formed by adding octene before decane, the second by adding decane before octene. This series of experiments was repeated, giving two sets of data which are summarized in Tables 6 and 7. The accuracy of the sampling, distilling and chromatographic techniques is shown in the Appendix.

From the data it was observed that: The order of addition affects the final equilibrium distribution of reactants between the equilibrium liquid and the solid adduct.

In both sets of data, when octene was added first more octene was reacted than when octene was added last.

In the set of data represented by samples F-2 and F-3, when decane was added first more decane was reacted than when decane was added last.

In the set of data represented by samples G-O and G-1, when decane was added first <u>less</u> decane was reacted than when decane was added last.

The confidence level of the data corresponding to samples G-O and G-l should be better than for F-2 and F-3 because of the greater number of analyses and shorter sample storage time prior to analysis.

# ORDER OF ADDITION TABLE 6

# CHROMATOGRAPHIC ANALYSES - DETAIL

# Decane added last SAMPLE G-O

## Octene added last SAMPLE G-1

			and the second se
RUN #	METHANOL	OCTENE	DECANE
1	92.59	6.07	1.34
2	91.54	6.72	1.74
3	92.67	5.87	1.46
4	91.72	6.58	1.70
5	92.56	6.07	1.37
6	92.10	6.36	1.54
7	91.37	7.15	1.48
8	92.60	6.12	1.28
9	92.35	6.27	1.38
_10	92.40	6.14	1.46
	1		

RUN #	METHANOL	OCTENE	DECANE
1	91.52	6.70	1.78
2	90.90	7.07	2.03
3	91.01	7.15	1.84
4	91.25	6.96	1.79
5	91.39	6.93	1.68
6	91.37	7.00	1.63
7	92.82	5.97	1.21
8	91.26	6.95	1.79
9	91.96	6.43	1.61

# SAMPLE F-2

. .

SAMPLE F-3

RUN #	METHANOL	OCTENE	DECANE	RUN #	METHANOL	OCTENE
1	92.59	5.86	1.55	1	91.79	7.18
2	93.12	5.56	1.32	2	92.99	6.15

Analyses are of liquid phase in equilibrium with solid adduct. Analyses on urea-free basis.

1

DECANE 1.03 0.86

# ORDER OF ADDITION TABLE 7

## CHROMATOGRAPHIC ANALYSES - SUMMARY

SAMPLE	COM <b>P</b> ONE NT	AVG. COMP. (WT.%)	MIN	MAX	SPREAD	% OF MAX.	METH.RANGE CONF.LEVEL 95%	NO. OF RUNS IN AVG.	COMMENTS
G-0	Decane Octene Methanol	1.47 6.34 92.19	1.28 5.87 91.37	1.74 7.15 92.67	0.19 1.28 1.30	10.9 17.9 1.4	91.85 to 92.53	TEN	Decane added last
G-1	<u>Decane</u> Octene Methanol	1.71 6.80 91.49	<u>1.21</u> 5.97 90.90	2.03 7.15 92.82	0.82 1.18 1.92	40.4 16.5 2.1	91.06 to 91.94	NINE	Octene added last
F-2	Decane Octene Methanol	1.44 5.71 92.85	1.32 5.56 92.59	1.55 5.86 93.12	0.23 0.30 0.53	14.8 5.1 0.57		TWO	Decane added last
F-3	Decane Octene Methanol	0.95 6.68 92.37	0.86 6.15 91.79	1.03 7.18 92.99	0.17 1.03 1.20	$\frac{16.5}{14.4}$		TWO	Octene added last
Blank-X	Decane Octene Methanol	1.13 6.35 92.52	1.11 6.16 92.32	1.14 6.54 92.73	0.03 0.38 0.31	2.63 5.82 0.34	1.03 (Known Comp. 5.89 (""" 93.08("""	TWO	

Confidence level of 95% established assuming "Bell Curve" distribution.

Analyses are of liquid phase in equilibrium with solid adduct. Analyses are on urea-free basis.

Analyses of F-2 and F-3 were made after the samples had been stored in ground glass containers all summer.

#### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The data indicates that the adduct reaction requires certain concentrations of reactants before a lasting precipitate will be formed. Once precipitate forms, the reaction does not progress to completion as might be the case if the formation of a seed crystal were required to initiate the precipitation. As was seen, precipitate forming at areas of high local concentrations dissolved upon stirring. Clearly, then, formation of solid adduct requires attainment of significant concentrations of reactants in solution; the reaction does not progress to completion once initiated by the formation of the first crystal of precipitate.

The fact that succeeding increments of octene are divided between solid adduct and the supernatent solution indicates that an equilibrium exists. Attempts were made (see Appendix) to correlate the equilibrium concentrations of urea and octene to mathematical equilibrium constant expressions assuming various reaction mechanisms. The spread in the results, due partly to accuracy limitations in experimental and analytical technique, to the few data points available and to the simplifying assumptions made in the equilibrium constant expression (eg., using concentrations instead of activities) is too great for mechanism determination. The best results were attained when the mechanism was considered to be

octene + 2 urea adduct(SOLID). Equilibrium relationships given in the literature( 1) were developed for a mechanism

complex = reactant + m urea

It is significant that experimental data best fits a mechanism which does not consider dissolved adduct. In applying the laboratory data shown in Table 1 to the equilibrium expression

 $K = (octene)(urea)^2$ 

it was assumed that the observed quantities of octene and urea in the equilibrium solution were present in their free form, and not combined in a dissolved adduct, and that the activity of the solid adduct was equal to one. The validity of this assumption is supported by the fact that results obtained by using this mechanism had greater consistancy than results obtained by including dissolved adduct in the equilibrium calculations. Apparently dissolved adduct, if it exists, exists in very low concentrations.

As was seen, no visible reaction took place until the necessary reactant concentrations were reached; moreover, crystal growth or the need for a seed crystal was not required for initiation of a visible reaction. Since it seems unlikely that <u>nothing</u> was happening before the criti-

Redlich, O., Gable, C.M., Beason, L.R., and Miller, R.W., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 72, 4153-4160 (1950).

cal reactant concentrations were reached, it was felt that observation of a measurable change taking place within the system at these concentrations would be meaningful. Hence, calorimeter work to study heat effects above and below the critical reactant concentrations was undertaken.

Calorimetric data indicates that the heat of mixing for a binary methanol-octene system is endothermic in the concentration range investigated. The addition of octene to a methanol-urea solution in approximately the same methanol-octene concentration range as the heat of mixing work has an endothermic effect about four times greater than that observed in the heat of mixing experiments. No precipitate was formed at these concentrations. The addition of octene to a methanol-urea solution in sufficient amounts to form considerable precipitate has an exothermic effect of the same order of magnitude as the endothermic effect noted in the lower concentration ranges. The exothermic heat effect appears to increase with the amounts of precipitate formed.

The endothermic effect noted in the lower octene concentration ranges can have one or both of the following explanations:

 An intermediate process is taking place, involving a product in the dissolved state.

(2) The heat of mixing effect has been made several-

#### fold more endothermic due to dissolved urea.

It may be firmly concluded that the exothermic "heat of reaction" reported in the literature for the formation of solid adduct has within it an endothermic portion attributed to either a heat of mixing or an intermediate liquid phase reaction, or both.

Endothermic heat effects have been reported in the literature. Zimmerschied, et al<sup>(2)</sup> postulated that an endothermic heat effect is associated with distortion of the urea molecule, a greater exothermic heat effect accompanying the introduction of the hydrocarbon into the distorted molecule. This postulation was used to explain the fact that the "heat of reaction" was not as great as the authors had anticipated. The endothermic heat effect is not reported by the authors as having been observed.

Kobe and Domask<sup>(3)</sup> postulate that three separate heat effects accompany adduct formation, these being:

- The overcoming of molecular adhesion of the reactant molecules in the liquid state to form isolated single molecules.
- Zimmerschied, W.J., Dinerstein, R.A., Weitkamp, A.W., and Marschner, R.F., <u>Ind. Eng. Chem.</u>, <u>42</u>, 1306 (July 1950).
- Kobe,K.A., and Domask,W.G., Petroleum Refiner, 31, 151-157, (May 1952).

- (2) The combination of the reactant molecules and the urea molecule.
- (3) The transformation of urea from a tetragonal lattice to a hexagonal lattice.

Schlenk<sup>(4)</sup> reasons that since urea is transformed from hexagonal form to tetragonal form when the adduct is decomposed, the tetragonal form is favored energetically. That is, the transformation from tetragonal to hexagonal form is accompanied by the consumption of heat. Although Kobe and Domask derive the endothermic heat effect mathematically, they do not report having observed it.

The endothermic heat effect documented in Table 2 was directly observed. By mixing adduct-forming reactants in concentrations below those required for solid adduct formation it appears that the endothermic heat effect reported in the literature has been isolated. It is possible that the observed endothermic heat effect is accompanying a conversion of liquid urea aggregate from the tetragonal to the hexagonal configuration.

Attention was given once more to the behavior of the overall reaction. Data taken in the octene-decane replacement study showed that the concentration of octene in a solu-

4. Schlenk, W., <u>Ann.</u>, <u>565</u>, 204-40 (1949).

tion in equilibrium with solid octene-urea adduct could be increased by the addition of a reactant which would compete with the octene for the urea. Qualitatively, this is what would be predicted for a reversible reaction. That is, if the classical equilibrium concept is followed,

 $(Activity_{octene})^{x}$   $(Activity_{urea})^{y} = K (Activity_{adduct})^{z}$ for the reaction

x octene + y urea z adduct then decreasing the urea concentration by reacting it with decane should require an increase in the octene concentration.

As was seen, however, the increase in the amount of octene in solution was greater than if all the reacted decane replaced octene in the octene-urea adduct, based on literature for urea-octene and urea-decane adduct compositions. This could be explained by some or all of the following reasons:

- (1) Addition of decane could have an appreciable effect on the activities of the reactants and/or products requiring a greater change in the equilibrium concentration of the octene than would normally be expected.
- (2) The adduct resulting from reaction of urea with octene and decane may have a different composition than either the octene-urea or decane-urea adducts.

(3) The chromatographic peak for decane is the least reliable of the three because the attenuation is considerably lower for decane at the concentration encountered than for the methanol or octene.

That the activities of the reactants have been affected is somewhat supported by the fact that the product of

 $(octene) (urea)^2$ 

using the data from Table 1 gives a value of  $1.21 \times 10^{-3}$ , which differs from, but is of the same order of magnitude for the value shown in Appendix (avg.  $3.36 \times 10^{-3}$ ) representing an octene-urea-methanol system. The literature<sup>(5)</sup> states that adducts formed from mixture of adduct-forming reactants consist of a single solid phase containing the various reactants. That is, the resultant adduct is not a mixture of various "binary" adducts, but is rather a unique product containing combinations of the various reactants.

Order of addition experiments were next undertaken. Since, for a truly reversible chemical system the order of addition of the reactants has no effect on the final equilibrium concentrations, it should not matter whether decane or octene is added first to a methanol-urea, octene

5. Kobe, K.A., <u>op. cit</u>.

decane system. As shown in the order of addition data collected, the sequence did have an effect on the equilbrium concentrations, more total hydrocarbon reacting when decane was added last than when octene was added last. This observation is well within the cumulative limits of accuracy of the sampling, distilling, and analytical procedures as shown by the "Sampling Technique Evaluation" section of the Appendix as well as the 95% confidence range indicated in Table 7.

This observation indicates that some phenomenon other than pure chemical equilibrium is being encountered. 0ne possible reason for this behavior lies with the adduct itself. When one component "replaces" another in a solid adduct it is not known whether the adduct decomposes and reforms with the new hydrocarbon, or whether the structure of the adduct remains intact while the place formerly occupied by one hydrocarbon is taken over by another hydrocarbon, or whether a combination of these takes place. An adduct formed in an octene-decane-urea-methanol system may consist of octene-urea and decane-urea adduct crystals or may be a different adduct in which decane and octene are both present in a single adduct crystal perhaps in different concentrations than the binary decane-urea. octene-urea adducts. Determination of the nature of the adduct is outside of the scope of this thesis. We have. however, established conclusively the fact that the

methanol-urea, decane, octene, adduct system is one which deviates from the behavior associated with pure chemical equilibrium, and have provided an incentive for continued investigation into the nature of the adduct itself. APPENDIX

## <u>Mixture Composition - Calculation Method</u>

A mixture of the following composition is initially charged:

Methanol		228.14	gms.
Urea	:	42.91	gms.
Octene		21.7758	gms.

A solid precipitate is formed and settles to the bottom of the reaction flask. A sample of the liquid is weighed and then distilled. Refractive index of the distillate is 1.3337. Using the equation shown in Table 10:

1.3337 = (7.8097 x 10<sup>-4</sup>) (wt.% octene) + 1.32706 or wt. % octene = 8.502 wt. % methanol = 91.498 (by difference)

Amount of octene in solution (liquid) before sample is taken:

 $228.14 \left( \frac{8.502}{91.498} \right) = 21.202 \text{ gm. octene}$ 

Amount of octene in adduct:

21.7758 gm. octene charged -21.2020 gm. octene in solution 0.5738 gm. octene reacted

Adduct contains 3.4 gm. urea per gm. octene 1.5738 (3.4) = 1.9509 gm. urea reacted

Amount of urea in solution before sample is taken:

Solution before sample: 228.14 gm. methanol 21.202 gm. octene 40.96 gm. urea

Weight of sample = 7.0097 gms. Let x = grams methanol in sample  $\frac{21.202}{228.14} x = \text{grams octene in sample}$   $\frac{40.96}{228.14} x = \text{grams urea in sample}$   $x + \frac{21.202}{228.14} x + \frac{40.96}{228.14} x = 7.0097$ 

> x = 5.5087 gm. methanol  $\frac{21.202}{228.14}$  x = 0.5119 gm. octene  $\frac{40.96}{228.14}$  x = 0.9889 gm. urea 7.0095 gm.

Summary:

	Charge	Solution	Sample		
Octene	21.7758 gm.	21.202 gm.	0.5119 gm.	7.30 wt%	
Urea	42.91	40.96	0.9889	14.10	
Methanol	228.14	228.14	5.5087	78.60	

The 4.1 figure exceeds the literature figure of 3.4 gm urea per gm octene. This is most likely due to incomplete separation of dissolved urea from the adduct sample by the benzene wash. In addition, some octene was lost due to adherence to the sides of the separatory funnel. This entire technique was simple, but crude.

Adduct composition via liquid analyses. A known amount of methanol, urea and octene were charged to a stirred flask to form solid adduct. A sample of the equilibrium <u>liquid</u> was weighed and distilled. The residue and distillate were both weighed. The composition of the distillate was determined both from the index of refraction correlation and from chromatographic, analysis. Using the weights of initial charge, sample, distillate and residue, and the composition of the distillate, the composition of the equilibrium adduct was calculated. Calculated adduct composition ranged from 4.22 to 0.966 gm urea/gm octene, the range being due to discrepancies in the analysis of the distillate.

The accuracy of the refractive index analysis was damaged by the distillation step. In effecting complete distillation of the liquid sample, a small amount of urea was apparently carried over with the "last few cc's" of distillate. This is apparent from the wide spread in refractive indices taken of the distillate when the distillation was 99.5% complete and when it was fully complete.

#### Adduct Composition Determination

Calculations used to determine the amounts of octene and urea reacted required use of the adduct composition given in the literature:

3.4 grams of urea per gram of octene.

It was decided to check the adduct composition experimentally. This was done by two separate methods:

- (1) Analysis of the solid liquid
- (2) Analysis of the liquid in equilibrium with an adduct.

Adduct composition via adduct analysis. A sample of solid adduct was taken from a methanol, urea, octene system at equilibrium. The sample was washed with benzene, air dryed, and dissolved in a weighed amount of water. The octene layer from the resultant two-phase system was separated and weighed. The water layer was weighed, and the weight of urea was determined by the difference between the weight of the water layer and the weight of the water charged.

Weight of water used to dissolve adduct 67.8 gm Weight of octene layer 0.8078 gm Weight of water and dissolved urea 71.15 gm Weight of dissolved urea 3.3 gm Ratio of urea/octene =  $\frac{3.3}{0.8078}$  = 4.1 gm urea per gm octene In addition, the refractive index correlation relies heavily on the fourth decimal of the refractive index, which is gotten by interpolation.

The urea carry-over problem mentioned above did not affect the chromatographic analysis of sample F-1, consequently the chromatographic results are more reliable than results from the refractive index correlation. This ratio of 3.62 gm urea per gm octene gotten from this data is within reasonable experimental error of the literature value.

INITIAL CHARGE

108.31 gm methanol 21.00 gm urea 16.8224 gm octene

SAMPLE OF EQUILIBRIUM LIQUOR63.73 gm sampleDISTILLATION99.5% Complete100% Complete

 WT. OF DISTILLATE
 51.91 gm
 53.23 gm

 I/R OF DISTILLATE @25° C
 1.3373
 1.3361

 RESIDUE
 8.34

Calculation of Adduct Composition:

63.73 Sample Wt. -<u>8.34</u> Wt. of residue (urea) 55.39 gm octene and methanol in sample

Urea-free composition of distillate using I/R of 1.3373

13.11 Wt. % octene 86.89 Wt. % methanol

13.11 x  $\frac{108.31}{86.89}$  = 16.3 gm octene in solution

16.8224 gm octene charged -16.3000 gm octene 0.5224 gm octene reacted
55.39 x 0.8689 = 48.12 gm methanol in sample
8.34 x <u>108.31</u> = 18.8 gm urea in liquid 48.12
21.00 gm urea charged -18.80 gm urea in liquid 2.20 gm urea reacted
$\frac{2.20}{0.5224} = \frac{4.22 \text{ gm urea/gm octene adduct}}{composition}$
Urea-free composition of distillate using I/R of 1.3361
ll.58 Wt. % octene 88.42 Wt. % methanol
Using same calculation methods as above:
Amount of octene reacted = $2.64 \text{ gm}$ Amount of urea reacted = $2.55 \text{ gm}$
$\frac{2.55}{2.64} = \frac{0.966 \text{ gm urea/gm octene}}{\frac{\text{adduct composition}}{2.64}}$
Urea-free composition of distillate using chromatograph
13.0% octene 87.0% methanol
Using same calculation methods as above:
Amount of octene reacted = $0.6224$ Amount of urea reacted = $2.25$

 $\frac{2.25}{0.6224} = \frac{3.62 \text{ gm urea/gm octene}}{10.6224}$ 

#### Adduct Formation - Mechanism Determination

Equilibrium data for the octene-urea-methanol system given in Table 1 was reduced to a constant weight basis and used in equilibrium equations derived from four assumed reaction mechanisms.

Equilibrium data.	Moles octene per 100 gm solution	Moles urea per 100 gm solution
n an	0.0559 0.0650 0.0785 0.0942 0.1095	0.238 0.235 0.203 0.1905 0.1760

<u>Mechanism 1.</u> Assume mechanism is octene + urea adduct<sub>solid</sub>

then

(Activity<sub>octene</sub>)(Activity<sub>urea</sub>) - K

Using the concentrations shown above instead of activities, the calculated values of K are:

0.0133	
0.0153	
0.0159	
0.0180	
0.0193	

<u>Mechanism 2.</u> Assume mechanism is

octene + 2 urea adductsolid

then

 $(Activity_{octene})(Activity_{urea})^2 = K$ 

Using the above concentrations the calculated values of K are:

3.17	х	10-3
3.59	х	10-3
3.24	х	10-3
3.42	х	10-3
3.40	х	10-5

<u>Mechanism 3.</u> Assume mechanism is octene + urea adductliquid

then

Activity<sub>adduct</sub> = K (Activity<sub>octene</sub>)(Activity<sub>urea</sub>)

Assuming the concentration of liquid adduct is constant due to its limited solubility:

(Activity<sub>octene</sub>)(Activity<sub>urea</sub>) = K\*

Let

 $\Phi = \text{conc. of octene, both in solution and}$ as liquid adduct U = conc. of urea, both in solution and asliquid adduct

x = moles of octene present in liquid adduct

6.8x = moles of urea present in liquid adduct (1)

 $(\phi -x)(U - 6.8x) = K'$ 

Using this equation with various pairs of equilibrium data, the following values of x were calculated.

> 0.0220 0.0213 0.0217 0.1815 0.0208 average

 Redlich, O., Gable, C.M., Dunlop, A.K, and Miller, R.W., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 72, 4154 (1950). Using the average x, the following values of K' were calculated:

$$3.39 \times 10^{-3}$$
  
 $4.13 \times 10^{-3}$   
 $3.55 \times 10^{-3}$   
 $3.60 \times 10^{-3}$   
 $3.06 \times 10^{-3}$ 

 $\frac{\text{Mechanism } 4.}{\text{octene } + 2 \text{ urea}} \text{ adduct}_{\text{liquid}}$ Then  $\frac{\text{Activity}_{adduct}}{(\text{Activity}_{octene})(\text{Activity}_{urea})^2} K$ 

Making the same assumptions and using the same symbols as above:

 $(\phi - x)(U - 6.8x)^2 - K'$ 

The following values of x were calculated using various pairs of equilibrium data:

0.0331			0.0298
0.0317			0.0284
	0.0308	average	

Using the average x the following values of K' were calculated:

2.11	х	10]3
2.31	х	10_5
0.17	х	$10^{-7}$
21.7	х	$10^{-2}$
85.8	х	10-2

#### Order of Addition - Sampling Technique Evaluation

Analyses of samples G-O and G-l shown in Table 7 indicate that order of addition influences the equilibrium composition of a decane, octene, methanol-urea mixture. To determine the degree to which the sampling and sample processing technique contributed to the difference in equilibrium concentrations, the following work was undertaken.

The reactants itemized below were charged to a reactor flask.

Methanol	55.00	gm.
Urea	12.81	gm.
Octene	4.24	gm.
Decane	1.39	gm.

After equilibrium was attained, two samples, G-2 and G-3 were taken of the equilibrium liquid. The two samples were distilled separately, and chromatographically analysed.

The results, shown in Tables 8 and 9, indicate that the sampling and distilling technique account for only 23% (approx.) of the difference between the equilibrium concentrations of samples G-O and G-1.

Inaccuracies in the chromatographic analyses resulted in approximately the same spread in analyses of samples G-2 and G-3 as for G-0 and G-1. For samples G-0 and G-1 there is very little "overlap" in the range of equilibrium methanol concentration. Consequently, the conclusion that order of addition influences the equilibrium concentration of a decane, octene, methanol-urea mixture, may be made within the confidence limit of the data.

# CHROMATOGRAPHIC ANALYSES - DETAIL

SAMPLE G-2

SAMPLE G	-3
----------	----

RUN #	METHANOL	OCTENE	DECANE
1	91.63	6.78	1.59
2	91.01	7.15	1.84
3	91.58	6.78	1.64
4	91.47	6.82	1.71
5	92.04	6.55	1.41

-

RUN #	METHANOL	OCTENE	DECANE
1	90.85	7.32	1.83
2	91.29	7.13	1.58
3	91.61	6.75	1.64
4	91.62	6.82	1.56
5	91.50	6.97	1.53

# SAMPLING TECHNIQUE EVALUATION TABLE 9

CHROMATOGRAPHIC ANALYSES - SUMMARY

I

SAMPLE	COMPONENT	AVG.COMP. (WT.%)	MIN	MAX	SPREAD	% OF MAX.	METH.RANGE CONF.LEVEL 95%	NO. OF RUNS IN AVG.
G-2	<u>Decane</u> Octene Methanol	1.64 6.82 91.54	1.41 6.55 91.01	<u>1.84</u> <u>7.15</u> 92.04	0.43 0.60 1.03	23.3 8.4 1.1	91.11 to 91.95	FIVE
G-3	Decane Octene Methanol	1.63 7.00 91.37	1.53 6.75 90.85	1.83 7.32 91.62	0.30 0.57 0.77	1.6 7.8 0.8	90.97 to 91.77	FIVE

Confidence level of 95% established assuming "Bell Curve" distribution.

## INDEX OF REFRACTION MEASUREMENTS TABLE 10

## METHANOL-OCTENE SOLUTION

WT. % OCTENE	INDEX OF REFRACTION (25°C)
0.00	1.3270
1.45	1.3284
2.44	1.3290
3.23	1.3294
3.80	1.3303
4.59	1.3308
5.62	1.3316
6.12	1.3321
6.29	1.3318
6.85	1.3323
7.06	1.3323
7.58	1.3328
7.62	1.3332
7.74	1.3327
11.78	1.3363
14.68	1.3387

"Best straight line" using method of least squares: (2)

 $(Index of Refraction) = (0.78097 \times 10^{-3})(Wt.\% Octene) + 1.32706$ 

Fourth decimal place in refractive index by interpolation.

2. Thomas,G.B., <u>Calculus and Analytic Geometry</u>, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., 1954 pp. 512-515.

#### REFERENCES

- Bailey, W. A. Jr., Bannerot, R. A., Fetterly, L. C. and Smith, A. G., "Urea Extractive Crystallization of Straight-Chain Hydrocarbons", <u>Industrial and En-</u> <u>gineering Chemistry</u>, Vol. 43, No. 9, September 1951, pp. 2125-9.
- Dahm, Leroy A., "Urea Adduction of Oleic Acid", <u>Thesis</u>-<u>Department of Chemical Engineering</u>, Newark College <u>of Engineering</u>, 1962
- Kobe, K. A. and Domask, W. J., "Extractive Crystallization--A New Separation Process", <u>Petroleum Refiner</u>, Vol. 31, No. 5, May 1952, pp. 151-7, Vol.31, No. 7, July 1952, pp. 125-9.
- Konrad, F. M., "The Heat of Mixing of Diacetone Alcohol and Water at 25° C.", <u>Thesis-Department of Chemical</u> Engineering, Newark College of Engineering, 1955.
- Redlich, O., Gable, C. M., Dunlop, A. K. and Miller, R. W., "Addition Compounds of Urea and Organic Compounds", Journal of the American Chemical Society, Vol. 72, September 1950, pp. 4153-60.
- Schlenk, W., "Urea Adduction of Aliphatic Compounds", Ann., Vol. 565, 1949, pp. 204-240.
- Swern, D., "Urea and Thiourea Complexes in Separating Organic Compounds", <u>Industrial and Engineering Chemistry</u>, Vol. 47, No. 2, February 1955, pp. 216-221.
- Thomas, G. B., <u>Calculus and Analytic Geometry</u>, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., 1954, pp. 512-515.
- Zimmerschied, W. J., Dinerstein, R. A., Weitkamp, A. W. and Marrchner, R. F., "Crystalline Adducts of Urea with Linear Aliphatic Compounds", <u>Industrial and Engineering</u> <u>Chemistry</u>, Vol. 42, No. 7, July 1950, pp. 1300-6.
- Zimmerschied, W. J., Higlez, W. S., and Lien, A. P., "Hydrocarbon Analysis", <u>Petroleum Refiner</u>, Reference Annual, 1950, pp. C43-47.