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The hydrocracking properties of various CaY-supported metal (Fe, Co, Ni, Mo, Ru, Rh, Pd, W, Re, Ir, and Pt) sulfide catalysts (prepared by impregnation) are examined by studying the hydroconversion of \( n \)-decane. All catalysts show cracking conversions which are significantly higher than that of the CaY support. There are large differences in catalytic behavior dependent on the metal sulfide present on the zeolite support. The amounts of S present on the catalyst are analyzed to determine the degree of sulfidation of the metal sulfide, while high resolution electron microscopy is used to characterize the distribution of the metal sulfide phase over the zeolite support. The observed differences in activity can be explained by the differences in intrinsic activity of the metal sulfide phase and the differences in distribution of this phase over the zeolite particle (internal or external sulfide deposition).

Introduction

Hydrocracking is a typical example of bifunctional catalysis, in which both the hydrogenation/dehydrogenation and the cracking function play a crucial role. Weitkamp et al. (Schulz and Weitkamp, 1972; Weitkamp, 1982) and Jacobs et al. (Martens et al., 1986a,b; Jacobs and Martens, 1991) have extensively studied the hydrocracking reaction to unravel the mechanism, in particular for the hydrocracking of higher paraffins over noble metal on zeolite catalysts. The reaction starts with the dehydrogenation of the paraffins over the metallic (or metal sulfide) function producing olefins. These form carbenium ions at the acid sites and then undergo the usual acid-catalyzed reactions. At first they are isomerized, that is, if the reaction conditions are severe enough (at prolonged reaction times or higher temperatures), followed by cracking. The products can desorb from the acid sites and be hydrogenated to the corresponding paraffins. If the hydrogenation function is really strong, one usually finds that a substantial degree of isomerization can be achieved with only a little cracking, and that per cracked parent paraffin two product molecules are formed. This is referred to as "ideal hydrocracking" which means that the consecutive reactions (cracking after isomerization, secondary cracking after primary cracking) play a minor role (Jacobs et al., 1980).

Nowadays, hydrocracking catalysts are required to have a flexible product selectivity combined with a high activity. Additionally, they have to be resistant to poisoning by S- and N-containing compounds which are present in feedstocks treated in modern hydrocracking units. This can be achieved by combining a zeolite with a sulfidic hydrogenation function. Transition metal sulfides are effective hydrogenation catalysts and meet the requirements for a high resistance to poisoning by S- and N-containing compounds.

Industrial catalysts mostly use combinations of Mo or W with Ni or Co as the active metal sulfide component (Ward, 1993), and, consequently most of the papers dealing with zeolite-supported transition metal sulfides are focused on these metals (Brooks, 1980; Cid et al., 1985, 1990; Davidova et al., 1986; Kovacheva et al., 1991; Laniecki and Zmierczak, 1991). However, only a few of them include testing of the hydrocracking properties (Langois et al., 1966; Ward, 1983; Yan, 1985; Leglise et al., 1988, 1991b; Esener and Maxwell, 1989). Leglise et al. (1988, 1991b) measured the hydrogenation of benzene and the hydrocracking of \( n \)-heptane over a series of stabilized HY-supported Ni, Mo, and NiMo sulfide catalysts. They found for all these catalysts the hydrogenation function to be considerably weaker than the one found for example in Pt/HY hydroisomerization catalysts (Martens et al., 1986a,b), thus causing a hydrocracking behavior which is far from ideal. Other studies (Ward, 1983; Yan, 1985; Esener and Maxwell, 1989) are much more focused on the optimization of the industrial hydrocracking catalyst and the process conditions than on the fundamental aspects of preparation, structure, and catalytic properties of zeolite-supported transition metal sulfide catalysts.

Besides Co, Ni, Mo, and W there are however many other transition metal sulfides which are comparably or even more active for a range of catalytic reactions, such as thiophene or dibenzothiophene hydrodesulfurization (HDS) (Pecoraro and Chianelli, 1981; Vissers et al., 1984; Ledoux et al., 1986; Lacroix et al., 1989), hydrodenitrogenation (HDN) (Eijsbouts et al., 1988, 1991a,b), or hydrogenation of biphenyl (Lacroix et al., 1989). Combination of an acidic zeolite with these metal sulfides may result in highly active hydrocracking catalysts.

In the present study the hydrocracking properties of several CaY-supported transition metal sulfides are examined by studying the hydroconversion of \( n \)-decane at moderate pressure (3 MPa). The differences in catalytic activity measured for the various metal sulfides are compared with the trends in activity observed for the above-mentioned test reactions (Pecoraro and Chianelli, 1981; Vissers et al., 1984; Ledoux et al., 1986; Eijsbouts et al., 1988, 1991a,b; Lacroix et al., 1989). In order to allow a meaningful comparison of the catalytic properties between the different metal sulfides, the composition of the metal sulfide phase present on the catalysts is examined by overall sulfur analysis, while...
Table 1. CaY-Supported Transition Metal Catalysts Prepared by Impregnation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Precursor Metal Salt</th>
<th>Metal Content (wt %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe/CaY</td>
<td>FeCl₂·6H₂O (Merck, &gt;99%)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce/CaY</td>
<td>CeCl₃·6H₂O (Merck, &gt;99%)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni/CaY</td>
<td>NiCl₂·6H₂O (Merck, &gt;99%)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo/CaY</td>
<td>NH₄₂MoO₅·4H₂O (Merck, &gt;99%)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru/CaY</td>
<td>NH₃₃RuCl₃ (Johnson)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rh/CaY</td>
<td>RhCl₃·H₂O (Johnson)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd/CaY</td>
<td>Pd(NO₃)₂·2H₂O (Fluka, &gt;99%)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/CaY</td>
<td>NH₃₃W₂O₁₉·8H₂O (Koch-Light Lab, &gt;99%)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re/CaY</td>
<td>NH₄₂ReO₄ (Merck, &gt;99%)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir/CaY</td>
<td>NH₃₃IrCl₃ (Johnson)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt/CaY</td>
<td>NH₃₃PtCl₃ (Johnson)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 100 x weight Me/weight (MeOₓ + CaY) with MeOₓ respectively FeOₓ, CoOₓ, NiO, MoOₓ, RuOₓ, RhOₓ, PdO, WOₓ, ReOₓ, IrOₓ, PtO.

the distribution of the sulfide phase over the zeolite particles on some of the catalysts is characterized by high resolution electron microscopy (HREM). In spite of the fact that stabilized Y zeolites are most commonly used for industrial hydrocracking (Ward, 1983), the original Y zeolite is used as support for our model catalysts in order to avoid changes in catalytic properties or degree of sulfidation of the metal sulfide phase caused by the extraframework alumina or by the presence of mesopores on the stabilized Y zeolite (Leglise et al., 1988).

Experimental Section

Catalyst Preparation. The CaY support (Ca₂₂Na₈₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅₋₅-
is determined. For all catalysts the metal loading is about 0.75 mmol/g CaY, meaning that in the case of ideal metal sulfide dispersion every supercage contains approximately one metal ion. The conversion plotted as a function of reaction temperature of the various catalysts is presented in Figures 1–3. In Figure 1 the conversions measured for Fe, Co, and Ni sulfides are given. All three metal sulfide catalysts show almost equal n-decane conversions, which are about 3 times higher than for the pure CaY support. None of the catalysts show any n-decane isomerization. The n-decane conversion observed for CaY is caused by catalytic cracking over its acid sites and remains low for the reaction temperatures applied in this study. High conversions due to catalytic cracking can only be obtained at temperatures above 673 K.

The activities of Mo, Ru, Rh, and Pd sulfides are given in Figure 2. These catalysts are clearly more active than those shown in Figure 1, and the same applies for W, Re, Ir, and Pt sulfides plotted in Figure 3. It appears that the Mo, W, Pt, and Rh catalysts show comparable conversions as a function of temperature. The Pd and Ru catalysts are slightly less active. At high temperatures (625–675 K) the conversion measured for the Re catalyst is comparable with that of Mo and W catalysts, but its decrease with decreasing temperature is much stronger. At temperatures below 600 K the activity becomes unstable (it varies between 30 and 0%). Clearly, Ir/CaY is the most active catalyst.

Only a few of the above CaY-supported metal sulfide catalysts show feed isomerization. Maximum n-decane isomerization selectivities as high as 38 and 32% are measured for Ir/CaY and RWCaY, respectively. Of all the other catalysts, WCaY and Pd/CaY have the highest n-decane isomerization with maxima of 2.0 and 1.6%, respectively. The isomerization of n-decane on the Ir and Rh catalysts resembles the ideal hydrocracking behavior as observed for instance in the case of metallic Pt/CaY catalysts (Weitkamp, 1973), but the positions of the isomerization maxima are shifted toward higher temperatures (about 80–100 K) and their maximum product selectivities for isomerization are lower than for metallic Pt/CaY. In Figure 4 the formation of monobranched and multibranched decane isomers as well as cracked products is given as a function of conversion as measured for Ir/CaY. From this figure it becomes clear that the monobranched decanes are the primary products, while only at increasing conversion multibranched decane molecules are formed. Cracking becomes important at even higher total conversions. Rh/CaY shows the same features. The yield pattern shown in Figure 4 is similar to that observed for ideal hydrocracking (Steyns et al., 1981) which indicates that the reaction proceeds via isomerization, first to monobranched decane and in a second step to dibranched or higher branched products, while together with the formation of multibranched decane molecules also cracking occurs.
The presence of the branched decane products indicates that the olefins which desorb from the acid site are hydrogenated quickly to the corresponding paraffins. Apparently, the CaY-supported Rh and Ir sulfide catalysts have a strong (de)hydrogenation function.

All other catalysts show hardly any n-decane isomerization, in spite of the fact that some of them (Mo, W, Re, Pt) show high conversions for n-decane cracking, comparable with that of the Rh/CaY catalyst. The hydrogenation function of the sulfide phase present in these catalysts is too weak to hydrogenate the olefins which desorb from the acid sites before they are adsorbed again and cracked. Evidently, the (de)hydrogenation function of all these catalysts is considerably less strong than that of the Rh and Ir sulfide catalysts.

On the basis of the performed hydrocracking tests, it is difficult to give an accurate comparison of the product selectivities for the various hydrocracking catalysts included in this study. In case cracking is ideal, the product selectivity is only dependent on the conversion (Steijns et al., 1981) and a comparison of the catalyst product selectivities can be made at one conversion level, independent of the reaction temperature. When secondary cracking occurs, the product selectivity becomes a function of both the conversion level and the reaction temperature (or the space velocity). In this case an extensive comparison of the various catalyst product selectivities cannot be made since they are depending not only on the type of metal sulfide but also on the reaction conditions. Nevertheless, a careful examination of the observed product selectivities can still give valuable information. In Table 2 the product selectivities of the CaY-supported metal sulfide catalysts are given as a function of the number of carbon atoms in the product molecules for two different conversion levels. Since the amounts of alkenes usually remained below the detection limit, only alkane-type products are given in Table 2.

The Ir and Rh sulfide catalysts show a symmetric pattern in their product distribution as can be seen in Figure 5 for Ir/CaY, indicating that only primary cracking occurred. Also the number of product molecules per cracked n-decane molecule at low conversions (last column in Table 2) shows that hardly any secondary cracking occurs on these catalysts. At high conversions the degree of secondary cracking is of course somewhat higher. The other catalysts do not show a symmetric product distribution at low conversions, which implies the presence of secondary cracking (see Table 2 and Figure 5). Also from the number of product molecules per cracked n-C10 molecule it can be concluded that the degree of secondary cracking is higher on the other catalysts, varying from slightly higher for the Pt, Pd, and W sulfide catalysts to very high for the Co and Ni sulfide catalysts. However, as these product selectivities are compared at equal conversion and not at the same reaction temperature, the high degree of secondary cracking, especially for the Ni and Co catalysts, can partly be due to the high reaction temperatures needed to obtain the conversion at which the comparison is made. On the other hand, when the secondary cracking activity of Ni and Co catalysts at 654 K is compared with that of Ir and Rh catalysts at 673 K (at a conversion of almost 100%), we can see that they still show a far higher degree of secondary cracking. Obviously the differences in secondary cracking between the different metal sulfide catalysts are to a large extent caused by the variations in hydrogenation strength between the various catalysts. For catalysts with a weak hydrogenation function the product olefins are cracked again before they can be hydrogenated, resulting in a high degree of secondary cracking. From the conversions and the product distributions we can roughly rank the CaY-supported metal sulfide catalysts in the following order: Rh/CaY, MoICaY, WICaY, Fe/CaY, WCaY, IrICaY, Ni/CaY, ReICaY.
that their hydrogenation function is less strong. All catalysts are stabilized during 48 h. During this period large amounts of coke are formed. The deactivation observed for some catalysts can be explained by this coking. Possibly coke is covering acid sites. Nevertheless rhodium sulfide catalysts give a different metal sulfide phase. Prior to the conversion measurements the catalysts are stabilized during 48 h. During this period large differences in deactivation behavior are observed (Figure 6). Whereas some catalysts like Ni/CaY, Co/CaY, Fe/CaY (not shown), and CaY deactivate considerably, others deactivate less (Ru/CaY, Pd/CaY, and Pt/CaY (not shown)) or not at all (Mo/CaY, Rh/CaY, Ir/CaY (not shown), and Re/CaY (not shown)). After 48 h some of the catalysts still show a very slow deactivation. However, the influence of this slow deactivation on the conversion levels appears to be negligible.

In Table 3 the results of coke analysis are presented. Prior to the conversion measurements the catalysts are stabilized during 48 h. During this period large differences in deactivation behavior are observed (Figure 6). Whereas some catalysts like Ni/CaY, Co/CaY, Fe/CaY (not shown), and CaY deactivate considerably, others deactivate less (Ru/CaY, Pd/CaY, and Pt/CaY (not shown)) or not at all (Mo/CaY, Rh/CaY, Ir/CaY (not shown), and Re/CaY (not shown)). After 48 h some of the catalysts still show a very slow deactivation. However, the influence of this slow deactivation on the conversion levels appears to be negligible.

In Table 3 the results of coke analysis are presented. Prior to the conversion measurements the catalysts are stabilized during 48 h. During this period large differences in deactivation behavior are observed (Figure 6). Whereas some catalysts like Ni/CaY, Co/CaY, Fe/CaY (not shown), and CaY deactivate considerably, others deactivate less (Ru/CaY, Pd/CaY, and Pt/CaY (not shown)) or not at all (Mo/CaY, Rh/CaY, Ir/CaY (not shown), and Re/CaY (not shown)). After 48 h some of the catalysts still show a very slow deactivation. However, the influence of this slow deactivation on the conversion levels appears to be negligible.

In Table 3 the results of coke analysis are presented. Prior to the conversion measurements the catalysts are stabilized during 48 h. During this period large differences in deactivation behavior are observed (Figure 6). Whereas some catalysts like Ni/CaY, Co/CaY, Fe/CaY (not shown), and CaY deactivate considerably, others deactivate less (Ru/CaY, Pd/CaY, and Pt/CaY (not shown)) or not at all (Mo/CaY, Rh/CaY, Ir/CaY (not shown), and Re/CaY (not shown)). After 48 h some of the catalysts still show a very slow deactivation. However, the influence of this slow deactivation on the conversion levels appears to be negligible.

Overall Sulfur Analysis. One reason for the surprisingly high hydrogenation properties of the Ir and Rh catalysts might be that these catalysts are not fully sulfided under reaction conditions. The low ratio might cause a partial reduction of the Rh or Ir sulfide phase during reaction conditions. Mangnus (1991) showed that the metal sulfide phase present in the catalysts can be strongly dependent on the ratio. Also the support can have an influence on the metal sulfide phase (Burch and Collins, 1986).

To verify their degree of sulfidation, the catalysts are sulfided under conditions comparable to reaction conditions (first sulfidation in 10% H2S/H2 at 673 K, followed by 24 h of equilibration at a H2S/H2 ratio of 1:1250 at 3.0 MPa), and the sulfur content is subsequently analyzed. From the Me:S ratios given in Table 4 it can be concluded that after the sulfidation procedure the Ni, Co, Fe, Pd, W, and Re catalysts contain the metal sulfide phase which is to be expected on the basis of thermodynamics (Mangnus, 1991). In the case of Mo/CaY, not all Mo has been converted into MoS2, which is the thermodynamically stable phase under reaction conditions (H2S/H2 ratio of 1:1250). The incomplete sulfidation is most likely due to the formation of Mo species which are difficult to sulfide, such as large MoO3 crystals on the exterior of the zeolite particles (Welters et al., 1994a). For Ru/CaY, Rh/CaY, Ir/CaY, and Pt/CaY the Me:S ratio differs from the one predicted by thermodynamics (Mangnus, 1991). Under reaction conditions RhS2 and platinum metal are predicted to be the most stable phases for Rh/CaY and Pt/CaY, respectively. Nevertheless RhS2 and PtS2 are found to be present in these catalysts. Possibly, these sulfides are formed during sulfidation (H2S/H2 = 1:10) prior to equilibration (H2S/H2 = 1:1250).

For Ru/CaY and Ir/CaY the Me:S ratio does not correspond to a known metal sulfide phase (Vissers et al., 1984; Lacroix et al., 1989; Mangnus, 1991). From the available thermodynamical data it is not possible to decide which sulfide will be present under reaction conditions.

The Re/CaY catalyst appears to give a different metal sulfide phase when it is kept under reaction conditions (3.0 MPa, H2S/H2 = 1:1250) at a temperature of 553 K instead of 673 K. Overall sulfur analysis revealed that the rhenum sulfide phase of a Re/CaY catalyst kept at 553 K for 24 h has a Re:S ratio of 1:2.9. This can be explained by assuming that ReS2 formed during the in situ sulfidation pretreatment (10% H2S/H2, 673 K) is slowly converted into Re2S7. Due to the low temperature the conversion will be very slow and still not completed after 24 h, resulting in a sulfur content in between that of ReS2 and Re2S7. Also Ledoux et al. (Ledoux et al., 1986) found a phase transition for the rhenum sulfide catalyst at almost the same temperature.
Generally, the metal sulfide phases (except for Mo/ CaY) correspond well with those found by X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy in carbon-supported metal sulfide catalysts as reported by Vissers et al. (1984). Also for the unsupported metal sulfide catalysts the same sulfides are found at similar conditions (first presulfidation at 673 K in a 15% H$_2$S/H$_2$ flow, followed by reaction under 3.1 MPa H$_2$ pressure) (Pecoraro and Chianelli, 1981), except for Ir/CaY.

Possibly on some catalysts elemental sulfur is present, which would complicate an exact determination of the metal sulfide phase and the degree of sulfidation. However, in the presence of a transition metal sulfide elemental sulfur can be reduced (H$_2$S formation) at the conditions used for catalyst sulfidation (Arnoldy et al., 1985; Mangnus, 1991). Nevertheless, overall sulfur analysis is not the most preferable method to identify the metal sulfide phase present in this type of (hydrocracking) catalysts since it determines not only sulfide sulfur but also elemental sulfur which can be formed during sulfidation. Therefore, other techniques, such as temperature programmed sulfidation and reduction, have to be used to obtain more precise information on the metal sulfide phase and the presence of elemental sulfur on these hydrocracking catalysts.

**HREM and EDX.** The distribution of the metal sulfide phase over the zeolite particles can have a strong influence on the hydrocracking properties. In order to see whether there are large differences in the metal sulfide distribution, HREM is performed on some of the sulfided catalysts (sulfidation conditions the same as for sulfur analysis).

For Ni/CaY sulfided at 3.0 MPa (sulfidation conditions the same as for the sulfur analysis) the HREM measurements show that a large fraction of the nickel sulfide is located on the outside of the zeolite particles (pictures not shown). Combination of HREM with EDX experiments can provide additional information on the distribution of the nickel sulfide over the zeolite particles. The average Ni/Si ratio in the EDX spectrum of a great number of zeolite particles is compared with the ratio of a spot on a zeolite particle not containing nickel sulfide at its outer surface. From this comparison an estimation of the relative amounts of nickel sulfide located in the zeolite pore system can be made. The combined HREM–EDX experiments show that approximately 15% of the total amount of Ni is located inside the zeolite pores.

HREM pictures of a sulfided Co/CaY catalyst (Figure 7A) show the presence of large cobalt sulfide particles (black spots) on the outside of the zeolite particles. The cobalt sulfide particles can be as large as 50 nm, but also very small cobalt sulfide particles (approximately 3 nm) are present. The two dark spots in Figure 7B are most likely cobalt sulfide particles, while the grid is caused by the zeolite framework. These small cobalt sulfide particles might be located inside the zeolite pores, although they are too large to fit into one supercage. The amount of Co located in the zeolite pores can be estimated at about 10% of the total amount of Co present. This implies that most of the cobalt sulfide is located on the outside of the zeolite particles.

Figure 8 shows a HREM picture of a sulfided Mo/CaY catalyst. The large MoS$_2$ slabs on the outside of the zeolite particles are clearly visible. The zeolite particles are to a large extent covered by the MoS$_2$ slabs which are sometimes stacked up to 10 or more layers. Clearly, a large fraction of the molybdenum sulfide is located on the outer zeolite surface. From HREM–EDX measurements it is inferred that a relatively small fraction of the molybdenum is located inside the zeolite pores (Welters et al., 1994a). The latter fraction is estimated to correspond to about 1% of the total molybdenum content. Besides the large MoS$_2$ slabs also some large particles (up to 100 nm) consisting of MoS$_2$ and some amorphous material can be observed on the outside of the zeolite. The EDX results show that these particles contain Ca atoms. Also on the oxidic samples (before sulfidation) some particles are observed which contain, besides O, mainly Ca and Mo, and hardly any Al or Si. This suggests that a calcium molybdenum oxide (probably CaMoO$_4$) has been formed after impregnation and calcination. Possibly, some of the Ca$^{2+}$ ions of the CaY support are leached out during impregnation (they might have been replaced by the NH$_4^+$ ions of the (NH$_4$)$_6$Mo$_7$O$_{26}$), leading to the formation of CaMoO$_4$ on the surface of the zeolite framework. Upon sulfidation the particles containing CaMoO$_4$ are partly converted.
into MoS$_2$. But, as CaMoO$_4$ is probably difficult to sulfide, some CaMoO$_4$ will remain after sulfidation resulting in the presence of large particles consisting of MoS$_2$ and some amorphous material.

The distribution of the RuS$_x$ over the zeolite particles is again very inhomogeneous (HREM pictures not shown). Some zeolite particles contain almost exclusively very large rhodium sulfide particles at their outer surface, whereas others contain both large and small ones. The small RuS$_x$ particles are probably located in the zeolite pores. EDX experiments revealed that even for those zeolite particles on which a large number of small sulfide particles are visible only relatively little rhodium is actually present in the zeolite pores (approximately 15%). Apparently, the larger part of the ruthenium is located on the exterior of the zeolite particles as large sulfide crystals.

Similar to the Ru/CaY, the Rh/CaY catalyst contains large sulfide particles (Rh$_2$S$_3$) at the outer zeolite surface (pictures not shown), albeit they are less abundant and there are more small particles present which are probably located inside the zeolite pores. This is corroborated by EDX results on zeolite particles which contain no large rhodium agglomerates on the exterior showing that approximately 40% of the total Rh content is present in the zeolite pores. Probably, the Rh$_2$S$_3$ phase is distributed more homogeneously throughout the zeolite particles than for instance the metal sulfide phase on the Mo/CaY, Ni/CaY, or Ru/CaY catalysts.

As can be seen from Figure 9, a sulfided Ir/CaY again contains quite a number of large sulfide particles (IrS$_x$) inhomogeneously distributed over the outside of the zeolite particles, but it can clearly be seen that in addition to this there are many small dark spots which are homogeneously distributed over the zeolite particle. These dark spots represent small IrS$_x$ particles probably located inside the zeolite pores. The concentration of spots (metal sulfide particles) increases with increasing zeolite crystal thickness (Figure 9A; the thicker the zeolite crystal, the darker its image in the micrograph, and the darker zeolite particles contain a higher density of small iridium particles). This suggests that these particles are located inside the zeolite pores, since otherwise their concentration should be independent of the thickness of the zeolite crystal. The metal sulfide fraction located inside the zeolite pores is comparable to the Rh/CaY catalysts. In Figure 9B a large number (compared to for instance Co/CaY or Ru/CaY) of small metal sulfide particles present inside the zeolite pores can be seen. The size of the iron particles varies between 1 and 4 nm. As for the Co/CaY and Ru/CaY catalysts, the small IrS$_x$ particles which are probably located inside the zeolite pores are larger than the supercage dimensions, a phenomenon which has also been observed for metallic Pt/CaY zeolites (Lunsford and Treybig, 1981). The explanation can be that the IrS$_x$ cluster occupies several neighboring supercages, or that it is located in voids and defects in the zeolite crystal. These voids may have been formed during the formation of the metal sulfide particles.

A general conclusion which can be drawn from the above results is that on those catalysts which are examined by HREM a large fraction of the metal sulfide phase is located at the outside of the zeolite particles. Still there are some differences between the various metal sulfide catalysts. Compared with the Ni, Co, Mo, or Ru catalysts, on Rh/CaY and Ir/CaY a relatively large part of the sulfide phase is inside the zeolite pores as very small particles. For Co/CaY, Ni/CaY, Mo/CaY, or Ru/CaY the amount of metal sulfide inside the zeolite pores is very small.

Discussion

Most of the CaY-supported metal sulfide catalysts show high conversions for cracking of n-decane compared with the pure CaY support, but their catalytic properties are nevertheless far from ideal hydrocracking behavior, as observed for instance on metallic Pt/CaY catalysts (Schulz and Weitkamp, 1972; Jacobs et al., 1980; Weitkamp, 1982). There are large differences in hydrocracking properties between the various metal sulfide catalysts, which correlate roughly with the activity trends observed for other sulfide catalyzed reactions like thiophene HDS (Vissers et al., 1984; Ledoux et al., 1986), HDS of dibenzothiophene at low pressure, HDN of quinoline (Eijsbouts et al., 1989) or high (Pecoraro and Chianelli, 1981) pressure, HDN of quinoline (Eijsbouts et al., 1988, 1991a,b), and the hydrogenation (HYD) of biphenyl (Lacroix et al., 1989).

Compared with the activity trends for typical HDS, HDN, and HYD reactions, the trend measured for hydrocracking of n-decane shows some striking differences. Re and especially Mo and W sulfide catalysts show a surprisingly high hydrocracking activity in comparison with the other metal sulfides like Pd, Pt, Rh, and Ir. The Ru catalyst shows a relatively low n-decane conversion, while for all other test reactions the Ru sulfide is one of the most active catalysts. Similar to the trends measured for the other test reactions, the Fe, Co, and Ni sulfide are the least active hydrocracking catalysts, although the difference in activity between these catalysts and the other metal sulfides seems to be large compared to the picture that emerges from relative activities for HDS, HDN, and HYD reactions. A more detailed comparison of the activity trends for distinct test reactions is not possible.
due to the differences between the test reactions, the reaction conditions, and the various preparation methods used for the metal sulfide catalysts. Especially for the zeolite-supported metal sulfide catalysts both the position of the metal sulfide (in the zeolite pores or on the external) and the dispersion may have a strong influence on the catalytic activity, as will be discussed below.

From the product distributions shown in Table 2 some conclusions can be drawn concerning the cracking mechanisms taking place on the various catalysts. Several catalysts show a considerable production of C1–C2 molecules especially at high reaction temperatures. Since products containing only one or two carbon atoms could not be separately analyzed by the GC system used, they will be treated as a lumped fraction referred to as C1–C2. Their formation cannot be the result of β-scission as, according to the stability rules of the carbenium ion, the formation of C1 and C2 products during this cracking reaction is not favored (Martens et al., 1986a,b; Jacobs and Martens, 1991). The C1–C2 production may be caused by hydrogenolysis (Sinfelt, 1973) or by cracking via a nonclassical pentacoordinated carbocation (PCI) as intermediate (Haag and Dessau, 1984; Mirodatos and Barthomeuf, 1988). If hydrogenolysis occurs on these catalysts, it should take place on the metal sulfide phase. The fact that NaY-supported Mo and Ni sulfide catalysts (which show hardly any activity in the hydrocracking reaction due to the absence of acid sites) do not produce C1–C2 is a strong indication that also the corresponding CaY-supported metal sulfide catalysts do not produce C1 and C2 via hydrogenolysis. In addition, the fact that the pure CaY zeolite yields a considerable amount of C1–C2 strongly indicates that C1–C2 formation is not due to hydrogenolysis, but to cracking via the PCI intermediate. For all catalysts, C1–C2 formation increases strongly with increasing reaction temperature. Apparently cracking via the PCI intermediate is mainly dependent on the reaction temperature. The conversion and the hydrogenation properties of the metal sulfide have a small influence on the degree of cracking via the PCI intermediate.

Also secondary cracking does not proceed exclusively via β-scission. If we assume β-scission to be the only secondary cracking reaction, each 2-fold split decane molecule is converted into two C3 and one C4 molecules. From Table 2 we can calculate the amounts of secondary cracking products by subtracting the primary cracking products (this means subtracting equal amounts of C3 and C4 as there are C7 and C6 products). These amounts are given in Table 5. For almost all catalysts the C4/C3 ratio is far higher than expected if only secondary cracking is taking place. So, the β-scission mechanism alone cannot explain this product distribution. Also abstraction of C1 or C2 molecules via the PCI cracking mechanism, followed by further cracking via β-scission cannot explain the high C4 production (the C1–C2 production is too low to explain the excess formation of C4 products). Langlois et al. (1966) observed the same features on silica–alumina supported nickel sulfide catalysts. A possible explanation can be the occurrence of bimolecular reactions between for instance alkenes and carbenium ions resulting in the formation of heavier carbenium ions:

$$C_nH_{2n} + C_mH_{2m+1} \rightarrow C_{n+m}H_{2(n+m)+1} \rightarrow \text{cracking}$$

Leglise et al. (1991a) proposed this formation of large carbenium ions in the cracking of n-nonane over poorly dispersed Pd/HY catalysts. These carbenium ions will probably almost immediately be cracked into small molecules. As a consequence of this side reaction, the product distribution will be changed. The high reactivity of these large carbenium ions (Weitkamp, 1978; Sie, 1993) is probably the reason why large product molecules are never detected (only occasionally traces of C8 products are found). They are also very likely coke precursors. Also Vasquez et al. (1987) observed (C6 + C5 + C4)/(C1 + C2 + C3) ratios higher than 1 in cracking of n-heptane over oxidic Ni–Mo/HY zeolites and concluded that consecutive alkylation–cracking reactions occurred.

The almost ideal hydrocracking behavior of the Rh and Ir sulfide catalysts contrasts sharply with the total absence of ideal hydrocracking features on all the other catalysts. The reason for the relatively good hydrocracking properties of these two catalysts is probably not the presence of a metal instead of a sulfide phase (as overall sulfur analysis showed that there are large amounts of sulfur present on these catalysts), but a combination of a relatively good distribution of the metal sulfide phase throughout the pores of the zeolite particle combined with a high intrinsic hydrogenation activity of these metal sulfides, as has already been reported by others (Pecoraro and Chianelli, 1981; Lacroix et al., 1989). This is probably also the reason for the low degree of coke formation found for these catalysts. Also for the Pd/CaY and Pt/CaY the metal sulfide distribution will probably be relatively homogeneous, but as the hydrogenation properties of these metal sulfides are less strong compared to Ir and Rh sulfide, the Pd/CaY and Pt/CaY catalysts show lower conversions and no ideal hydrocracking behavior.

Compared to the other catalysts the Ru catalyst shows a relatively low activity and a high degree of coke formation. This is probably the consequence of a very poor metal sulfide dispersion, as measured by HREM. The reason for the relatively low hydrocracking conversions of the Ni, Co, and Fe catalysts is most likely also the very inhomogeneous distribution of the metal sulfide phase over the zeolite particles. For the Co and Ni catalysts it was shown by HREM that a large part of the sulfide phase is located on the outside of the zeolite crystals as large metal sulfide particles. The relatively small amounts of metal sulfide present in the pores of the zeolite for Ni/CaY and Co/CaY (as observed with the combined HREM–EDX measurements) agree well with

---

**Table 5. Product Distribution from Secondary Cracking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>catalyst</th>
<th>total conv</th>
<th>temp (K)</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe/CaY</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co/CaY</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni/CaY</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo/CaY</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru/CaY</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rh/CaY</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd/CaY</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/CaY</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re/CaY</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir/CaY</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt/CaY</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo/CaY</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rh/CaY</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/CaY</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re/CaY</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir/CaY</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt/CaY</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the large coke contents found after reaction. Because there are only small amounts of hydrogenating sulfide species present in the pores, coke formation cannot be prevented and is therefore high.

Also for Mo/CaY and W/CaY much coke is found to be present after reaction. But in spite of the large coke contents and the most probably low dispersion of the metal sulfide, these catalysts show surprisingly high hydrocracking conversions. The product selectivities of these catalysts however show that there is a strong imbalance between the hydrogenation function and the acidic function, resulting in a high degree of secondary cracking.

For the Mo/CaY catalyst it is shown that probably some of the Ca$^{2+}$ ions are leached out of the zeolite support during impregnation (HREM-EDX results). Also for the W/CaY catalysts some removal of Ca$^{2+}$ from the zeolite support may have occurred. This may lead to a stronger acidity of the zeolite support after sulfidation, and consequently to a higher hydrocracking activity. The amount of Ca-containing Mo particles as observed by HREM is low, indicating that the Ca removal will cause only a rather small increase of the acidity of the zeolite support. It is not clear whether this effect is strong enough to explain the relatively high hydrocracking activities of the Mo and W catalysts. It may explain however the very high degree of coking observed on these catalysts.

In agreement with the results reported by Leglise et al. (1988) the Mo/CaY is not fully sulfided. The incomplete sulfidation may have been caused by the presence of large molybdenum oxide particles on the exterior of the zeolite particles (Welters et al., 1994a). Furthermore, the CaMoO$\_4$ formed after impregnation may be difficult to convert into MoS$\_2$. The HREM results however suggest that the CaMoO$\_4$ particles are partially converted into MoS$\_2$. The presence of incompletely sulfided molybdenum oxide or CaMoO$\_4$ particles may have some influence on the hydrocracking properties of the Mo/CaY catalyst. But, as most of these particles will be partially or completely covered by MoS$\_2$ layers (the surface of the molybdenum oxide particles is usually more easily sulfided than the core (Arnoldy et al., 1985)), their influence on the catalytic properties will not be very strong.

In view of the incomplete sulfidation of the Mo/CaY catalyst, the full sulfidation of the W/CaY catalyst (measured by overall sulfur analysis) is somewhat surprising. Scheffer et al. (Scheffer et al., 1990) showed that both WO$\_3$ and W/Al$_2$O$_3$ catalysts are difficult to sulfide. Additionally W/CaY may also contain large bulklike WO$_3$ particles and/or CaWO$_4$ which, comparable with the Mo/CaY catalyst, should hamper the sulfidation.

Re/CaY also shows a high hydrocracking conversion at high reaction temperatures, but the degree of secondary cracking and the coke formation on this catalyst are lower than on Mo/CaY and W/CaY, indicating a better balance between the hydrogenation and the acidic function on this catalyst. The unstable conversions measured at temperatures below 600 K are most likely caused by the phase transition of the ReS$_2$ to ReS$_7$ (Ledoux et al., 1986). Because of the low temperatures and the low H$_2$S/H$_2$ ratio, the phase transition will be very slow (overall sulfur analysis showed that after 24 h at 550 K this transition is still not completed) which explains why the conversion remains unstable for a long period of time.

Summarizing, it can be concluded that the activity trend for hydrocracking measured for CaY-supported metal sulfides is determined by both the hydrogenation properties of the metal sulfide and its distribution over the zeolite particle. On all catalysts except Rh/CaY and Ir/CaY the hydrogenation function is too weak to obtain ideal hydrocracking behavior. The distribution of the metal sulfide over the zeolite particle is very inhomogeneous for all catalysts (even for Rh/CaY and Ir/CaY only 40% of the metal sulfide is located in the zeolite pores). A large part of the sulfide is located on the outside of the zeolite particles. As a result, the catalysts show a high degree of coke formation and a strong imbalance between the hydrogenation and the acidic function. Possibly, higher conversions and/or catalytic properties closer to ideal hydrocracking could be obtained via preparation methods resulting in a high metal sulfide dispersion and a homogeneous distribution of the metal sulfide throughout the zeolite particles.

Conclusions

All the CaY-supported metal sulfide catalysts show cracking conversions which are significantly higher than that of the CaY support. Their hydrocracking activity is determined by both the hydrogenation properties of the metal sulfide present and its distribution over the zeolite particle. The relatively good distribution of the Rh and Ir sulfide phase throughout the zeolite particle, combined with their intrinsically strong hydrogenation properties (Pecoraro and Chianelli, 1981; Vissers et al., 1984; Ledoux et al., 1986; Eisebouts et al., 1988, 1991a,b; Lacroix et al., 1989), results in almost ideal hydrocracking behavior for sulfided Rh/CaY and Ir/CaY. Those catalysts having a metal sulfide phase mainly located on the outside of the zeolite crystals show a high degree of coking, lower conversions, and nonideal hydrocracking properties. Mo/CaY and W/CaY show relatively high hydrocracking conversions in spite of the high amount of metal sulfide located on the outside of the zeolite crystals and the high degree of coke formation. This can be due to a relatively high acidity of the zeolite caused by the exchange of Ca$^{2+}$ by NH$_4^+$ during impregnation.
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