Homologation of Olefins with Methane on Transition Metals
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Abstract: Alkylation of olefins using methane has been realized on transition metal catalysts. The main problem is to get methane dissociatively adsorbed together with an olefin. This is due to the difficult activation of the strong tetrahedral C–H bonds of methane. To react methane with an olefin, a reaction sequence is used consisting of three steps. First methane is dissociatively adsorbed between 600 and 800 K on a reduced transition metal catalyst. After cooling, an olefin is coadsorbed on the metal center (M) of the complex is able to interact selectively with organo-metal complexes. In such a reaction the metal center (M) of the complex is able to interact with an alkane (R–H) and can finally insert into the C–H bond according to R–H + M → R–H–M → R–M–H.

Recently it has been found that hydrocarbons can be formed when methane is activated on a Ni single crystal. A Ni single crystal can be activated thermally or by the activation of linear metallocenes, these force constants can be obtained for the metals in Table VIII by simply using those of ferrocene as a generic set, provided the correct equilibrium bond lengths and angles are used. This will probably apply even for somewhat strained linear metallocenes.
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mixtures to propane with a selectively of 40-60%, using TaF₅-HF at 40 °C and 1 MPa. Olah used superacids immobilized on alumina. At 70 °C he reached a conversion of 38% with respect to ethene with a feed of CH₄/C₂H₆ of 9:1 mol/mol. Olah et al. showed in a reaction with ¹³C₁₂CH₄ and ¹²C₂H₆ under mild conditions, that ¹³C₁₂C₁₂C propane is formed selectively, when the methane/ethylene ratio is about 100. Scurrell indicated that methane into co-adsorbed olefins. One of the main problems in the conversion of methane together with olefins on transition metals is the low sticking coefficient for dissociative methane adsorption compared to that of alkene adsorption. This prevents the simultaneous adsorption of methane and an olefin. To realize their co-adsorption, methane should not be adsorbed together with other reactants, but should be activated in a separate step. To achieve this, we developed a catalytic cycle in which the reactants are adsorbed separately at different temperatures (see Figure 1).

In the first step methane is thermally activated by dissociative adsorption on a reduced transition metal catalyst at a temperature between 200 and 550 °C. In the second step an olefin is co-adsorbed with surface carbon from methane at a temperature between 20 and 100 °C. In the third step both hydrocarbon fragments are hydrogenated, forming a higher homologue.

This reaction sequence provides an overall reaction path for the Fischer-Tropsch reaction, it is known that adsorbed olefins can undergo chain growth, resulting in longer hydrocarbons. A similar principle is applied here to incorporate surface carbon from methane into co-adsorbed olefins.

Experimental Section

Catalysts. A 5 wt % ruthenium catalyst and a 10 wt % cobalt catalyst were prepared by incipient wetness impregnation of Grace 323 type silica (300 m²/g, pore volume = 1.65 mL/g, mesh size 75-125) with an aqueous solution of RuCl₃ (Drijfhouw, Amsterdam) and Co(NO₃)₂·6H₂O (Merck), respectively. The catalysts were dried at 110 °C and reduced before each experiment in situ between 400 and 550 °C. The ruthenium catalyst was treated in a synthesis gas flow (H₂/CO = 2 at 100 kPa) for 30 min at 250 °C to increase its CO chemisorption capacity. The metal particle size as determined with transmission electron microscopy was 5.5 nm for the ruthenium and 8.5 nm for the cobalt catalyst.

Experimental Conditions. For each experiment 300 mg of the catalyst was placed in the reactor which consisted of a quartz tube (i.e. 10 mm). Methane adsorption was performed at 450 °C from a methane pulse to 90 s of 0.5% CH₄ in helium in a flow of 22.4 mL/min. After methane adsorption the catalyst was cooled to a temperature between 25 and 150 °C in helium as quickly as possible to avoid “aging” of the surface carbon: typically the temperature was lowered within 100 s to 150 °C. Ethene, acetylene, or propene was adsorbed from pulses of 1.4 µmol between 25 and 150 °C. Subsequently, the adsorbed carbonaceous
surface species were hydrogenated in a flow of 22.4 mL/min of hydrogen at ambient pressure at the same temperature as the olefin adsorption. After this hydrogenation the temperature was raised at a rate of 20 °C/min to 550 °C to remove carbonaceous residues. After cooling to 450 °C the cycle was repeated.

Analysis. During the first 2 min of hydrogenation, 15 × 0.2 mL of the reaction gases were stored in a 16 loop multiposition valve (Chrompack type ST34). The stored reaction gases were injected in a GC (CP 9000, Chrompack) and the reaction products were separated on a widebore plot Q column (25 m × 0.53 mm i.d.)

For the experiments with labeled methane (99% {13}CH4 from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories), the stored reaction gases were separated on the same column, which was connected (splitless) with a coupling unit (Graphpack-3D-Saulenverbinder from Gerstel) to a fused silica capillary of 2 m (i.d. 100 μm). This capillary was directly introduced in the ion chamber of a high resolution mass spectrometer.5 During the analyses the masses between 10 and 60 Da were scanned every 1.5 s. For each component about 10–20 mass spectra were taken to calculate the average peak ratios. From these peak ratios the fraction of each labeled product was calculated (see Appendix). From the mass spectra the position of the {13}C atom incorporated could be deduced.

Results

During the methane pulse at 450 °C all the methane is adsorbed on the ruthenium catalyst, resulting in a carbon surface coverage of about 20%. On the cobalt catalyst 60% of the methane is adsorbed. During the adsorption of ethene, acetylene, and propene between 25 and 150 °C, not all the reactants are adsorbed. A part of the olefin was autohydrogenated to the paraffin, while no olefin desorbed from the catalyst when adsorbed in small amounts. Especially when no methane was preadsorbed, olefin desorption was detected. Figure 2 compares the fractions of carbon adsorbed from a pulse of 1.4 μmol of ethene on a reduced ruthenium catalyst, with a pulse after pre-adsorption of 6.6 μmol of methane at 450 °C.

The fraction of adsorbed ethene is increased when surface carbon from methane is present on the catalyst surface. On the ruthenium catalyst more methane formation is observed during ethene adsorption than on cobalt. Above 100 °C methane is the only product desorbing from the ruthenium catalyst, while mainly ethene desorbs from the cobalt catalyst.

After the adsorption steps on the ruthenium catalyst 6.6 μmol of carbon from methane and 2.8 μmol of carbon atoms from ethene (1 pulse) are present on the catalyst surface. For the cobalt catalyst these figures are 4.0 and 1.7 μmol, respectively, due to the incomplete adsorption from the pulses. The amount of adsorbed carbonaceous surface species, which can be hydrogenated at a particular hydrogenation temperature, is shown in Figure 3 for the cobalt catalyst.

At a hydrogenation temperature above 100 °C most of the desorbing hydrocarbons originate from methane. Upon hydro-
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Figure 3. Total amount of carbonaceous material (in μmol of C) that can be hydrogenated after separate methane and ethene adsorption and their co-adsorption on the cobalt catalyst as a function of the hydrogenation temperature (6.6 μmol of methane pulsed at 450 °C; 1.4 μmol of ethene pulsed at the hydrogenation temperature).

Figure 4. Products formed during the hydrogenation at 40 °C of adsorbed methane (6.6 μmol at 450 °C) and ethene (1.4 μmol at 40 °C) on the ruthenium catalyst at 40 °C as a function of the hydrogenation time.

Figure 5. Product selectivity during the hydrogenation of adsorbed methane (at 450 °C) and ethene (1 pulse at stated temperature) as a function of the temperature: (a) cobalt, (b) ruthenium.

Figure 6. Product formation upon hydrogenation at 40 °C of adsorbed methane (Tads = 450 °C), adsorbed ethene (1 pulse at 40 °C), and their co-adsorption, on cobalt.

hydrogenation around 50 °C the hydrocarbons are formed from about the same amounts of adsorbed ethene and methane.

Figure 4 depicts hydrocarbon formation from surface carbon as a function of the exposure time to hydrogen at 40 °C, during the first 2 min. By integrating these curves, the selectivity can be calculated. This is shown in Figure 5 and is expressed on the basis of carbon efficiency. For butane and pentane the isoo and normal products are taken together. Mainly linear hydrocarbons are formed.
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Table I. Product Selectivity during Hydrogenation at 50 °C of Adsorbed Olefins with and without Preadsorbed Methane at 450 °C

| adsorbates | methane | ethane | propane | butane | pentane | ratio
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH, + C,H,</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH,</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH, + C,H,</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C,H,</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH, + C,H,</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C,H,</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSum of iso and n product.

On cobalt, at a low ethene adsorption and hydrogenation temperature, the selectivity to butane is remarkably high due to ethene dimerization. When the hydrogenation temperature is raised, the methane selectivity increases owing to enhanced hydrogenolysis. The selectivity for the interesting reaction product propane is not a strong function of the temperature and has its maximum of 19% at 40 °C on the cobalt catalyst.

Figure 6 compares the amount of products formed during hydrogenation, after separate methane and ethene adsorption and their co-adsorption. As previously demonstrated, surface carbon from methane alone can be hydrogenation to C, hydrocarbons. However, most of the dissociatively adsorbed methane reacts back toward methane. When ethene is co-adsorbed, the amount of methane formed as reduced and propane formation becomes significant. This indicates a reaction between adsorbed C, species from methane and co-adsorbed ethene forming propane. The ability to form propane from adsorbed methane and ethene was tested to different metal catalysts. The order of the selectivity for propane formation is Co, Ru, Pt, Ni, Rh, Ir > Re, Fe. Here only the results of the cobalt and ruthenium catalyst will be discussed.

As indicated in Table I, propane formation is also possible from adsorbed ethene via hydrogenolysis and homologation, resulting in methane and propane. Such disproportionation reactions have been extensively studied by Bassett and co-workers. To distinguish this reaction from methane incorporation into adsorbed ethene, experiments with 13C-labeled methane were performed. Therefore, 6.6 μmol of 13CH, was pulsed at 450 °C over the catalyst and 5.2 μmol of unlabeled ethene, acetylene, or propane was co-adsorbed at 50 °C. The product selectivities of the experiments performed under those conditions are shown in Table I.

The reactions were repeated using 13CH, and the products were analyzed for the presence of 13C atoms. Of interest is the fraction of 13CH, incorporated in the alkylated reaction products. This was measured for the different labeled isotopes and is shown in Table I.

The labeled 13C atom from methane is added to adsorbed acetylene, ethene, and propane resulting in a product with one 13C atom from methane and 12C atoms from the olefin. This is shown by the underlined figures in Table I. As deduced from the fragment mass spectra, the labeled 13C atom in the singly labeled products is the primary atom in propane and butane. The reaction products propane and butane are also formed exclusively from 12C atoms from the adsorbed olefin due to auto-homolo-
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Figure 7. The fraction of each product consisting of one 13C atom as a function of the hydrogenation time, for the stepwise reaction of [13C]-methane with unlabeled ethene: (a) cobalt, (b) ruthenium.
hydrogen atoms at temperatures above room temperature and is adsorbed like an ethyldiene (CCH2), vinylidene (CCH3), or acetylide (CCH) surface species.59 Because of the low temperature, the resulting surface hydrogen does not desorb but is used to hydrogenate other ethene molecules to ethane in an auto-hydrogenation reaction. The desorbing products consist of only methane and ethene; no trace of ethene was detected at the low ethene surface concentrations applied. When surface carbon from methane is present, the free forming hydrogen atoms from ethene are used to form CHx surface species, instead of forming ethene from ethene. This increases the formation of ethane and enhances the fraction of ethene that remains adsorbed.

**Hydrogenation.** The optimum temperature for hydrogenation of surface carbon depends on the amount of surface species that can be hydrogenated and on the product selectivity (Figures 3, 4, and 5). In general, the selectivity to propane and butane is high at low hydrogenation temperature, while at a hydrogenation temperature about 80 °C, more surface carbon can be hydrogenated. The optimum hydrogenation temperature is about 50 °C. This is the temperature at which the experiments with labeled methane were done. At this temperature about equimolar amounts of adsorbed methane and ethene are hydrogenated on both catalyst systems. These amounts correspond to a carbon surface coverage of about 11% for both methane and alkene (normalized on the CO chemisorption capacity). At higher surface carbon coverages, surface carbon becomes less reactive because of the enhanced formation of C2p.

Table I shows that, upon hydrogenation of adsorbed olefins, the selectivity for methane formation is higher in the reaction products propane and butane. This demonstrates alkylaion of olefins with methane according to the reaction cycle

\[ \text{alkylene} + \text{methane} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 \text{CCL} + \text{CCH}_2 \text{CCL} \]

in Figure 2. However, 30-50% of the homologated olefins contain only 13C, and thus originate entirely from the initial olefins. This means that C-C bond formation from C2 intermediates, generated from methane deposition or from alkene hydrogenolysis, occurs with about the same probability. Because the surface concentrations of the reacting methane and olefin fragments are the same, this indicates that the C3 intermediates involved are very similar. They probably both form carbon-carbon bonds according to a Fischer–Tropsch-like reaction mechanism.

Some additional experiments were done to study the influence of the olefin hydrogenation temperature and the ratio of adsorbed methane/olefin. When less ethene was pulsed and the ethene adsorption and hydrogenation temperature were decreased to 25 °C, the fraction of singly labeled 13C propane increased to 76% on the ruthenium catalyst. Because of the lower temperature, the rate of hydrogenolysis decreases. This reduces the amount of 12C surface fragments, resulting in an enhanced fraction of propane from [13C]methane and [13C]ethene. The rate of hydrogenolysis is much lower on the cobalt catalyst. At 25 °C no methane formation is observed when adsorbed ethene is hydrogenated. However, in the reaction of 13CH4 with ethene, only 66% of the propane formed is singly labeled, while still 30% consists of only 13C from ethene. This suggests that either ethene reacts toward propane and methene, or that singly labeled propane can exchange its 13C carbon atom with a 12C from ethene, resulting in 12C-13C ethene. The latter compound does not appear in the gas phase, but can be dimerized to singly or doubly labeled butane, which butanes are formed in low fractions.

The absence of singly 13C-labeled propane, when propene is co-adsorbed with labeled methane, and the absence of singly labeled ethene, when ethene is co-adsorbed, indicate that the metathesis reaction (see Figure 8) or other routes for carbon scrambling are slow compared to hydrogenolysis, carbon–carbon bond formation, and hydrogenation, on ruthenium. The metathesis reaction between 13C surface carbon and an olefin as proposed in Figure 8 does not occur and is therefore very slow compared to hydrogenolysis and carbon–carbon bond formation at 50 °C and 100 kPa of H2. Hence, nonlabeled butane is not formed from two propene molecules via metathesis, resulting in ethene and butene, but via hydrogenolysis and homologation.

This result is in agreement with measurements of Tanaka et al.73-76

![Figure 8. Metathesis mechanism according to which [13C]propene may exchange a carbon atom with a 13C from methane. The hydrogen atoms are not drawn (M is an active center consisting of one or more metal atoms).](image-url)
on MoO₃ catalysts. They demonstrated that surface carbon species involved in metathesis are different from the intermediates active in the Fischer–Tropsch reaction. The hydrocarbon isomerization reactions as reported on platinum²⁷–³⁹ are relatively slow on these catalysts.

It is possible to calculate the selectivity for hydrogenolysis and homologation of the adsorbed olefins in the presence of ¹³C from methane from Tables I and II, by not taking into account the molecules containing ¹³C atoms. The selectivity pattern appeared to be about the same as that of the solely adsorbed olefins. This indicates that the selectivities for hydrogenolysis, homologation, and dimerization are not influenced by surface carbon species from methane. In particular, for hydrogenolysis this was unexpected, because surface carbon should decrease the amount of free metal ensembles necessary for hydrogenolysis. Apparently the carbon surface coverages applied (~20%) are too low to change the mentioned rates significantly.

**Isobutane/n-Butane Ratio.** During the hydrogenation of carbonaceous intermediates from methane and olefins at 50 °C, the selectivity for butane formation varies from 5 to 60%. Most of the butane is n-butane but also some isobutane is formed. In relation to isobutane formation, differences in the mechanistic routes of formation are of interest. A comparison of the fraction of ¹³C in n-butane and isobutane in the hydrogenation reaction of adsorbed ¹³C with ethene or propene is given in Table III.

Owing to the low selectivity, the fraction of ¹³C in isobutane could not be determined with great accuracy. The incorporation of ¹³C in isobutane formed from ethene is more dominant than in n-butane, because the latter is mainly formed by dimerization of ethene. Iso- and n-butanes are not in a dynamic equilibrium, and their routes of formation are probably different. For the incorporation of ¹³C in propene to form iso- and n-butane, no significant differences were found. This indicates that surface carbon generated from propene dissociation reacts similarly as surface carbon from methane.

When the carbon surface coverage is higher, adsorbed propene species react to a larger extent to isobutane: the ratio of iso- to n-butane increases from 0.08 to 0.16 on cobalt (see Table I). This indicates that in the formation of isobutane a surface carbon atom is involved. The ratio of iso- to n-butane from only surface carbon from methane is higher (0.30) than that with adsorbed propene.


**Table III. Percentage of Singly ¹³C-labeled iso and n-Butane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>precursors</th>
<th>¹³Cᵢ-C₄</th>
<th>n-C₄</th>
<th>¹³Cᵢ-C₆</th>
<th>n-C₆</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¹³CH₄ + C₂H₄</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₄ + C₂H₄</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Reference mass spectrum with intensities $I_p$ at mass $m_p$. The intensities of the peaks $p_i$ to $p_j$ from the labeled mixture at mass $m_i$ to $m_j$ are shown by the dashed lines.

with these observations: more surface carbon from methane undergoes carbon–carbon bond formation when ethene is co-adSORbed.

**Yields.** The overall yield for the reaction of methane and ethene to propane according to the proposed reaction cycle depends on the fraction of methane adsorbed, fraction of ethene adsorbed, amount of surface carbon hydrogenated at the hydrogenation temperature, selectivity to propane, and the fraction of propane consisting of only one ¹³C atom from methane. Taking all these factors into account, the yield for the reaction of ¹³CH₄ with adsorbed ethene is 2.8% on the basis of pulsed methane and 4.5% on the basis of pulsed ethene on the ruthenium catalyst. The ethene yield can be increased by increasing the methane/ethene ratio. The yield on methane basis is about three times higher than that in superacid catalyzed alkylation,⁴³ while it is lower by a factor of ~6 on an ethene basis.

**Conclusions.** The incorporation of methane into alkenes in the presence of hydrogen on transition metal catalysts can be performed using a reaction cycle in which methane is separately adsorbed. In this way methane can be used as an alkylating agent. This is demonstrated for the incorporation of methane into ethene, acetylene, and propene. The reaction products propene and butane can be formed also via auto-homologation. The comparable reaction rates of self-homologation and methane incorporation indicate that the C₄ intermediates involved are similar; they are both related to the CH₄ fragments active in the Fischer–Tropsch reaction.

The exchange of carbon atoms according to a metathesis reaction does not occur on the ruthenium catalyst, while it cannot be excluded on cobalt. The cobalt catalyst has a remarkably high selectivity for dimerization of adsorbed ethene.

**Appendix**

**Calculation of Isotopic Distributions from Mass Spectra.** An alkene with n carbon atoms either ¹²C or labeled ¹³C, can have $n + 1$ differently labeled isotopes: unlabeled, singly ¹³C labeled, up to n times labeled alkane (not taking into account the different positions of the ¹³C atom). It is possible to calculate the fraction of each differently labeled isotope from a mass spectrum. This is not trivial because the mass spectrum of the unlabeled alkane disturbs an easy calculation.⁸⁶ Here we present an algorithm to deduce these fractions from the mass spectrum. Propene is taken as an example, while problems are identical for C₄ with $n > 3$.
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Abstract: The aerobic oxidative dehydrogenation of a-terpinene to p-cymene catalyzed by the mixed-addenda heteropolyanion PV$_2$Mo$_{10}$O$_{40}^-$ has been used to investigate the oxidation mechanism catalyzed by this class of compounds. The kinetics of the reaction show it to be zero order in a-terpinene, first order in dioxygen, and second order in the heteropolyanion catalyst. The kinetic results along with the use of UV-vis, ESR, $^{31}$P NMR, and IR spectroscopy have enabled the formulation of a reaction scheme involving the formation of a stable substrate–catalyst complex in the catalyst reduction (substrate oxidation) stage and a peroxo catalyst intermediate in the catalyst reoxidation stage where dioxygen is reduced to water in a four-electron redox reaction.

Introduction

Since the discovery in 1826 by Berzelius of the first heteropoly compound, the vast field of heteropolyanion chemistry has been centered mostly around the preparation, structure, properties, and analytical chemistry applications of these compounds. Heteropoly compounds are soluble polyoxoanions of anions having the general formula [X$_m$M$_n$O$_{12}$]$^{v-}$ (x ≤ m), where X is a heteroatom and M is an addenda atom. A common and important class of these salts and those used in the majority of catalytic applications is the Keggin compounds (Figure 1), with the general formula X$^m$M$_n$O$_{12}$ (1) (X = P, Si, As, Ge, B, etc.; M = Mo, W).

Further catalytically important subclasses of the Keggin compounds are the mixed-addenda anions X$^m$M$_n$O$_{12}$ (2), where for example X = P, M$^*$ = V, and n = 1, 2, and the transition metal substituted Keggin compounds X$^m$(L)M$_n$O$_{12}$ (3), where M$^*$ is a transition metal such as Mn, Co, Cu, Ru, etc. and L is a ligand such as H$_2$O, OH, or pyridine, among others.

Interest in heteropoly compounds as homogeneous liquid-phase oxidation catalysts is only a recent development that has been fueled by the inherent stability of these compounds to strongly oxidizing conditions as opposed to other effective and widely studied catalysts such as metalloporphyrins, which always decompose in the presence of oxidants. Importantly, it has also

In principle, from any n peaks from the mass spectrum of C$_n$H$_{2n+2}$ this calculation can be performed; however, experimental errors are relatively low when differences between intensities in the reference spectrum are large. Therefore, we used the masses m/z 44-47 for propane, m/z 30-32 for ethane, and m/z 31-29 for the C$_2$ fragment of propane. By comparing the analyses of the C$_2$ and the C$_3$ fragments of propane, it could be concluded that in the singly labeled product mainly the primary atom is labeled.
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