Cationic Polymerization in Rotating Packed Bed Reactor: Experimental and Modeling
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On the basis of analysis of key engineering factors predominating in cationic polymerization, butyl rubber (IIR) as an example was synthesized by cationic polymerization in the high-gravity environment generated by a rotating packed bed (RPB) reactor. The influence of the rotating speed, packing thickness, and polymerization temperature on the number average molecular weight (Mn) of IIR was studied. The optimum experimental conditions were determined as rotating speed of 1200 r min⁻¹, packing thickness of 40 mm and polymerization temperature of 173 K, where IIR with Mn of 289,000 and unimodal molecular weight distribution of 1.99 was obtained. According to the experimental results and elementary reactions, a model for the prediction of Mn was developed, and the validity of the model was confirmed by the fact that most of the predicted Mns agreed well with the experimental data with a deviation within 10%. © 2009 American Institute of Chemical Engineers AIChE J, 56: 1053–1062, 2010 Keywords: cationic polymerization, butyl rubber, rotating packed bed, modeling, number average molecular weight

Introduction

The past decade has seen a rapid development and wide application of cationic polymerization for the synthesis of a wide variety of novel materials with potential commercial interest, such as polyisobutylene, polybutenes, butyl rubber (IIR), etc.¹⁻¹²

The rate constants of propagation (kp) in the cationic polymerization vary considerably, e.g., kp’s from 10³ to 10⁷ L mol⁻¹ s⁻¹ have been reported for isobutylene polymerization.¹³,¹⁴ It is proposed that the discrepancy in kp reported for various cationic polymerizations is due to different mechanistic interpretations and assumptions.¹⁵ Two general methods, diffusion clock (DC) and ionic species concentration methods, are typically used to determine the propagation rate constants in cationic polymerization of vinyl monomers. Both of the methods give similar values of kp (kp = 10³–10⁵ L mol⁻¹ s⁻¹) for the polymerization of some substituted styrenes, while considerable higher values of kp (kp = 10⁷ L mol⁻¹ s⁻¹) are obtained by DC method in the case of styrene and isobutylene.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Despite large variation with some monomers, it is generally accepted that the rate constants of propagation in the cationic polymerization of alkenes are similar for most systems with kp ≈ 10⁵ L mol⁻¹ s⁻¹.¹⁶¹⁹ Therefore, the cationic polymerization features an extremely rapid intrinsic reaction rate with apparent reaction rate affected significantly by micromixing.²⁰⁻²⁴

Micromixing is the final stage of turbulent mixing and consists of the viscous-convective deformation of fluid elements, followed by molecular diffusion. It is believed that micromixing plays a very important role in chemical industry when the time scale of the chemical reaction involved is
at the same magnitude as or smaller than the time scale of the mixing process. Industrial processes, such as crystallization, precipitation and polymerization, are greatly influenced by micromixing. In these extremely rapid processes, the reactions may occur or complete before the reactants accomplish homogeneous mixing at the molecular scale. Consequently, the qualities of the product such as particle size distribution, molecular weight and its distribution are significantly influenced by micromixing.\textsuperscript{25,26}

Conventional cationic polymerization reactors include stirred tank reactor,\textsuperscript{27} continuous flow stirred reactor,\textsuperscript{28,29} etc. These reactors usually lead to poor mixing, broad residence time distribution and long residence time,\textsuperscript{23,24,30} resulting in the difficulty to control the number average molecular weight ($M_n$) and molecular weight distribution (MWD).\textsuperscript{12,23,31} Therefore, a novel reactor with good micromixing performance is a long sought-after goal in cationic polymerization and of significant importance to further improving the production efficiency and product quality.

**Analysis of polymerization and selection of reactor type**

Cationic polymerization process is characterized by initiation, propagation, termination and chain transfer. The propagation reaction is first order with respect to monomer concentration, so the reactive characteristic time $t_{1/2}$ is:

$$t_{1/2} = \frac{\ln 2}{k_p} \quad (1)$$

The value of propagation rate constant for isobutylene cationic polymerization about $10^5 \approx 1 \, \text{L mol}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ could be chosen for estimation based on the reported data.\textsuperscript{16,19} Because of the copolymerization of isobutylene with lower reactive monomer isoprene (1.5–2.0%), the propagation rate constant with lower values of $10^2–10^3 \, \text{L mol}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ could be adopted. Therefore $t_{1/2}$ is estimated at about 0.01–0.1 ms.

Micromixing, which determines the local spatial distribution of the monomers, is very critical in the scale-up of the cationic polymerization process. Micromixing has no influence on the apparent propagation reaction rate in the region of $t_m \leq t_{1/2}$ and has significant influence on the apparent propagation reaction rate when $t_m > t_{1/2}$, where, $t_m$ is the micromixing characteristic time for species reaching a maximum mixed state at the molecule level. Because of the very strong nonlinearity of propagation, micromixing should be intensified to reach the region of $t_m \leq t_{1/2}$, so that the propagation rates at different locations will be nearly the same, and $M_n$ and MWD can be controlled at a desired value and a uniform level.

The characteristic time of micromixing was estimated by Li et al. as,\textsuperscript{32}

$$t_m = k_m (v/\delta)^{1/2} \quad (2)$$

where $k_m$ is a constant, $k_m = 16$, as presented by Chen et al.\textsuperscript{33} In a typical stirred tank, $t_m$ is estimated to be in the region of 5–50 ms.\textsuperscript{33} Therefore, $t_m > t_{1/2}$, which implies that $M_n$ and MWD in a stirred tank cannot be easily controlled for the extremely rapid cationic polymerization and the scale-up effect will play a more important role owing to the poor micromixing.

Rotating Packed Bed (RPB) is an apparatus consisting mainly of a packed rotator and a fixed casing. The basic principle of RPB is to create a high-gravity environment via the action of centrifugal force as so called “Higee”.\textsuperscript{34,35} The fluids going through the packing of RPB are spread or split into very fine droplets, threads, and thin films by the strong shear, resulting in a significant intensification of micromixing and mass transfer between the fluid elements. The rate of mass transfer between gas and liquid in RPB is 1–3 orders of magnitude larger than that in a conventional packed bed, allowing a dramatic reduction of reaction time.\textsuperscript{33,36–40} In terms of these unique features, RPB has been successfully applied to the preparation of nanoparticles and is regarded as a promising industrial platform for the production of inorganic nanoparticles.\textsuperscript{38,40}

The value of $t_m$ in RPB is estimated to be 0.01–0.1 ms,\textsuperscript{25} which could meet the requirement of $t_m \leq t_{1/2}$ and therefore $M_n$ and MWD could be well controlled when RPB is employed for polymer synthesis reactions limited by micromixing. It can be thus deduced that RPB is a promising reactor for cationic polymerization.

**Experimental Section**

**Reagents**

Isobutylene (polymer grade, purity $> 99\%$, Beijing Yanshan Petrochemical Group), isoprene (polymer grade, purity $> 99\%$, Beijing Yanshan Petrochemical Group) and aluminum trichloride (AlCl$_3$, purity $> 99\%$, Belgium Acros Organic Chemical) were used as received. Dichloromethane (CH$_2$Cl$_2$, purity $> 99.5\%$, Beijing Yili Fine Chemical) was dried prior to use by distillation from calcium hydride.
instrumentation

Gel Permeation Chromatography (GPC, 515–2410, Waters) was employed to determine the $M_n$ of IIR products. Tetrahydrofuran (THF) served as the solvent of IIR with 20 mg of IIR dissolved in 10 ml of THF and the mobile phase flowed at 1.0 ml/min.

Experimental procedures

The experimental set-up for IIR synthesis is shown schematically in Figure 1. The RPB for IIR synthesis consists mainly of a packed rotator, a fixed casing, and different liquid inlets to introduce the monomers, catalyst, and coolant, respectively (Figure 2). The inner and outer diameters of the rotator are 150 mm and 258 mm, respectively, and the axial length of the rotator is 50 mm. The rotator is installed inside the fixed casing and rotates at the speed of several hundreds and thousands rpm.

All the pipelines and equipment were swept by nitrogen before use in order to remove the moisture and air. Isobutylene, isoprene, and dichloromethane were added into tank (3) to form a monomers solution of 9 L with $[\text{isobutylene}] = 2.7$ mol L$^{-1}$ and $[\text{isoprene}] = 0.05$ mol L$^{-1}$, and 900 mL of the catalyst solution of aluminum trichloride and dichloromethane ($[\text{AlCl}_3] = 1.1 \times 10^{-2}$ mol L$^{-1}$) was added into tank (4). The pipelines and RPB reactor were prechilled to the set temperature by the coolant. When the temperature of reactants in tanks (3) and (4) reached the polymerization temperature, the reactants were pumped into RPB at a volumetric flow rate ratio of monomers/catalyst $= 10$ to conduct the polymerization reaction. The synthesized IIR product was collected by tank (7). When the system reached a steady state, the IIR slurry sample was taken and treated for $M_n$ and MWD analyses. The $M_n$ of IIR at different radial positions of the packing was obtained by changing the packing thickness.

Model Development

Modeling of IIR synthesis in RPB reactor

The packing of RPB was assumed to be composed of a number of concentric cages as shown in Figure 3. Under the action of centrifugal force, liquid sprayed on the inner edge of the packing moves outwards throughout the void space of the packing, and finally flows out of the outer edge of the packing. It was also assumed that the liquid had the same residence time in the packing and the liquid flow pattern at radial direction was plug flow (Figure 4), and the liquid phase existed as dispersed droplets in the packing based on previous visual observations of liquid flow in RPB. The exchange of reactants among droplets on every cage was described by a coalescence-redispersion model, which
treated the liquid as numerous miscible droplets and mixing was realized by collision, coalescence, and redispersion of two droplets, as illustrated in Figure 5. In the coalescence-redispersion model, all droplets have the same size and the coalescence of any two droplets is followed instantaneously by redispersion into two identical droplets with uniform concentration, and the participated droplets on each cage are chosen by Monte Carlo stochastic function method.

When the coalescence-redispersion model was used to predict the effects of micromixing during liquid-liquid reactive precipitation in RPB, the concentration of each component was assumed to be homogeneous in every active droplet. The model was used to establish polymerization kinetics equations of active droplets.

**Estimation of Parameters**

**Droplet diameter and number.** The mean diameter of droplets in RPB was reported to be 0.1–0.3 mm. On the basis of the mean diameter of the droplets and the liquid flow rate, the total number of droplets was calculated as 550, which was thus used as the initial droplet number in the following calculation.

**Residence time.** The mean residence time of liquid throughout the packing in RPB under different experimental conditions was reported by Guo. The residence time of droplets between two adjacent packing cages was determined as,

\[ t_i = \frac{\tau}{N_L} \]  

**Modeling of the polymerization kinetics**

This study employed a “chain analysis” method to develop the model. In chain analysis method macromolecules with various chain lengths and compositions can be regarded as composed of different structural units. For one given polymer, the variety of structural units is limited to a certain number, so complex macromolecules can be analyzed through these definite structural units.

The kinetic scheme adopted for the synthesis of IIR by cationic polymerization involves initiation, propagation, chain transfer to the monomer, and termination as shown in Scheme 1.

Several denotations are defined as follows.

- \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) represent isobutylene and isoprene monomers respectively:

\[
\begin{align*}
M_1 & : CH_2=CH_2 \\
M_2 & : CH_2=CH=CH_2
\end{align*}
\]

- \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) represent two structural units of IIR respectively:

\[
\begin{align*}
C_1 & : CH_2-CH_2-CH_3 \\
C_2 & : CH_2-CH=CH-CH_2
\end{align*}
\]

- \( A \) represents the growing chain unit:

\[
A : CH_2=CH_2
\]

- \( E_1 \) represents the end group of IIR:

\[
E_1 : CH_3-CH=CH_2
\]

- \( E_2 \) represents the end group of IIR:

\[
E_2 : CH_2-CH=CH_2
\]

- \( I \) represents the initiator, \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) represents \( A \), \( P_{1(n+1)} \) represents \( AC_1 \), \( P_{2(n+2)} \) represents \( AC_2 \), \( P_{n1} \) represents \( PE_1 \), \( P_{n2} \) represents \( PE_2 \), \( P \) represents dead polymer.
In the process of polymerization, IIR with different components and chain lengths is composed of structural units with varied amounts of C1, C2, E1, E2, and A. Therefore, the determination of \( M_n \) can be converted into the calculation of the five units of C1, C2, E1, E2, and A.

As shown in Scheme 1, cationic polymerization involves several distinct kinetic steps. The polymerization starts with the formation of a growing chain unit (A), and the chain propagation proceeds linearly, incorporating \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) groups along the polymer backbone.

The following assumptions were employed in dealing with the reaction kinetics:

1. **Equal activity assumption**: The activity of macromolecules with different chain length was assumed to be the same.31,53

2. **Linear chain propagation assumption**: Linear chain propagation assumption is also named long chain approximation. This assumption can simplify the modeling derivation without sacrificing the validity of the polymerization kinetics.31,54

3. **As \( k_p(IB) > k_p(IP) \)**, it was assumed that \( k_p(IB) = 10 \times k_p(IP) \) in our calculation. Moreover, it is shown in Figure 6 that the \( k_p(IB)/k_p(IP) \) ratio does not influence the simulated \( M_n \).

The generation/consumption rates of every reaction can be written in the following forms:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d[M_1]}{dt} &= -r_1 - r_{p,M_1} - r_{tr,M_1} = -k_1[I][M_1] - k_2[M_1][M_1] \\
\frac{d[M_2]}{dt} &= -r_{p,M_2} = -k_p[M_2][A][M_1] \quad (9) \\
\frac{d[A]}{dt} &= r_1 - r_{tr,M_1} = k_1[I][M_1] - k_1[A] \quad (10) \\
\frac{d[I]}{dt} &= -r_1 = -k_1[I][M_1] \quad (11)
\end{align*}
\]

The reaction rate constants in the above equations were experimentally determined and applied to the derivation of the polymerization kinetic model of IIR.

**Calculation of \( M_n \)**

The concentration of structural units in the reactor at different time can be calculated from the reaction kinetics. \( M_n \) can be calculated from the number-average molecule weight definition and the linear chain assumption of chain analysis.31,53,54 According to the proposed mechanism, the theoretical \( M_n \) was predicted by the following equation,

\[
M_n = \frac{W}{n} = \frac{\sum_i n_i M_i}{\sum_i n_i} = 2 \times \frac{\sum_i ([C_i] \times M_{w,c}) + \sum_i ([E_i] \times M_{w,e}) + [A] \times M_{w,a}}{[A] + \sum_i [E_i]} 
\]

(17)

Via Eqs. 9–17, the concentration of every structural unit on each active droplet was obtained, and the average concentration of every structural unit for all droplets in No. \( i \) cage (\( [C_{i,k}] \)) was calculated as,

\[
[C_{i,k}] = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^{N_i} [C_{i,k,g}]}{N_D} 
\]

(18)

Then the \( M_n \) at No. \( i \) cage was calculated by the mean concentration of every structural unit.

**Numerical solution**

The proposed differential Eqs. 9–18 need to be solved by taking into account the boundary conditions to simulate the \( M_n \) of IIR synthesized in RPB. The concentrations of the monomers and catalyst entering the RPB at its inner edge were known. In the process of computation, Monte Carlo random functions were adopted to characterize the coalescence–redispersion of liquid through the packing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Parameter Values Used in the Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N_D )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Concentration of every structural unit on each cage was solved through the Runge–Kutta numerical method. A MATLAB program was used to solve the model equations. Figure 7 illustrates the simulation flow chart for the model. All differential equations involved were integrated by Runge–Kutta method. The specific set of relevant parameters used in the model is given in Table 1.

Results and Discussion
A series of experiments were carried out through changing operation conditions such as rotating speed (N), packing thickness (D), and polymerization temperature (T_p). In the experiments, the initial conditions were [M_1]_0 = 2.7 mol L^-1, [M_2]_0 = 0.05 mol L^-1, [I]_0 = 0.011 mol L^-1, and the flow rate ratio of the monomers to the catalyst was 10:1.

Polymerization kinetics parameters were calculated based on the data of the polymerization temperature experiment while the coalescence probability was determined by the data of the rotating speed experiment. The validity of the model was demonstrated by a comparison with the data of the packing thickness experiment.

Estimation of polymerization kinetics parameters
Effect of T_p. Figure 8 gives the calculated and experimental M_n as a function of T_p. It can be seen that the M_n of IIR decreased as T_p increased. The effects of the temperature on the rate constants can be explained from the activation energy of the reactions. The total activation energy of IIR synthesis reaction is negative, so the reaction rate increases with decreasing T_p. At the same time, decreasing T_p is favorable for the formation of active centers. The energy of chain termination is much higher than that of chain propagation, so the decrease of T_p is beneficial to chain propagation. Therefore, to obtain IIR with high molecular weight, it is essential to carry out the polymerization at low temperature, where the rate of chain-transfer reaction is reduced, leading to the increase in M_n.

The M_n of IIR synthesized at 173 K reached 289,000 and polydispersity of the IIR was 1.99, exhibiting a unimodal molecular weight distribution. It can also be seen from Figure 8 that the calculated M_n fit well with the experimental M_n.

Figure 9 illustrates calculation process of the polymerization kinetics parameter k_p,M_1 based on the temperature experiment data.

Estimation of k_p,M_1
Figure 10a shows the effect of k_p,M_1 on M_n. Simulation by the model indicated that M_n increased as k_p,M_1 increased from 1 × 10^4 to 1 × 10^10 L mol^-1 s^-1, and M_n increased sharply when k_p,M_1 was larger than 1 × 10^8 L mol^-1 s^-1, with M_n reaching 14.4 × 10^5 when k_p,M_1 was 1 × 10^9 L mol^-1 s^-1. It is also deduced from Figures 8 and 10a that the decrease of temperature resulted in the increase of k_p,M_1, leading to the increase of M_n.

Table 2 gives the data of M_n, T_p and k_p,M_1. M_n and T_p were obtained from the experiments and k_p,M_1 was calculated by the model. It can be seen from Table 2 that with the experimental M_n at about 1 × 10^7–3 × 10^5, k_p,M_1 was in the range of 10^4–10^5 L mol^-1 s^-1 in this study. Propagation rate constant for cationic polymerization of alkenes is generally accepted at about 10^5 ± 1 L mol^-1 s^-1. It was also reported that propagation rate constant for cationic polymerization of isobutylene (k_p,IB) is k_p,IB = 9.1 × 10^3 L mol^-1 s^-1 (Ionizing radiation, CH_2Cl_2, 195 K).21,22 and k_p,IB = 7.9 × 10^5 L mol^-1 s^-1 (Light/VCl_4, in bulk, 253 K).22 Therefore, it can be seen that our proposed k_p,M_1 is in the same magnitude order range as reported in the literature.

The apparent activation energy (E_a) was calculated as –23.8 kJ mol^-1 from the slope of Arrhenius plot of ln k_p,M_1 vs. 1/T_p, which is somewhat higher than that reported by Faust et al. (–34 kJ mol^-1),14 Storey et al. (–30.1 kJ mol^-1),56 and Puskas et al. (–26.4 kJ mol^-1).57

Estimation of k_i
It can be assumed k_i ≈ k_p,15 so k_i was chosen as 1 × 10^4 L mol^-1 s^-1 in this study.

Figure 9 Flow chart of kinetics parameters calculation.
Estimation of $k_{tr,M1}$

Figure 10b shows the effect of $k_{tr,M1}$ on $M_n$. It can be seen that $M_n$ decreased as $k_{tr,M1}$ increased from $1 \times 10^{-1}$ to $1 \times 10^3$ L mol$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$. When $K_{tr,M1} \geq 10$ L mol$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$, $M_n$ almost reached a fixed value, and the effect of $k_{tr,M1}$ on $M_n$ can be neglected, so $K_{tr,M1}$ was chosen as $10$ L mol$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$.

It was calculated that $k_{tr,M1}/k_p \approx 10^{-4}$ in this study, which is in the same magnitude order range as reported in the literature.$^{58}$

Estimation of $k_t$

Figure 10c shows the effect of $k_t$ on $M_n$. It can be seen that $M_n$ decreased as $k_t$ increased from $1 \times 10^{-1}$ to $1 \times 10^3$ s$^{-1}$. When $k_t \leq 10$ s$^{-1}$, $M_n$ almost reached a fixed value, and the effect of $k_t$ on $M_n$ can be neglected, so $k_t$ was chosen as $10$ s$^{-1}$.

Estimation of coalescence probability ($P$)

Effect of $N$. Figure 11 presents the calculated and experimental data of the influence of $N$ on the $M_n$ of IIR. The experimental results demonstrate that $M_n$ increased sharply with an increase in the $N$ of RPB ranging from 600 to 1200 r min$^{-1}$ and then leveled off when $N$ was more than 1200 r min$^{-1}$. The optimum rotating speed was thus determined as 1200 r min$^{-1}$ where IIR with $M_n = 289,000$ and MWD = 1.99 was obtained. It can also be seen from Figure 11 that the calculated $M_n$s fit well with the experimental $M_n$s.

The reasons that $M_n$ increases with an increasing $N$ under certain conditions may be explained as follows. Vigorous impingement between liquid and the packing is achieved with an increase in $N$, and the increase in collision probability among the liquid elements results in better mixing effects. In addition, there is also an increase in both the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$M_n \times 10^{-5}$</th>
<th>$T_p$ (K)</th>
<th>$k_{p,M1} \times 10^{-4}$</th>
<th>$(1/T_p) \times 10^3$</th>
<th>ln $k_{p,M1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>10.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>11.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Experimental and calculated $M_n$ vs. $N$ ($T_p = 173$ K, $D = 40$ mm).
micromixing rate and the coalescence–redispersion frequency of the liquid elements with the increase of $N$.25,59

Calculation of $P$. The micromixing intensity of liquid−liquid on every cage in RPB can be characterized by the coalescence probability, which is defined as the percentage of droplet number participating in coalescence–redispersion process. The mixing intensity of liquid–liquid throughout the whole packing is denoted by the coalescence–redispersion frequency that is directly proportional to the coalescence probability at every cage. Therefore, a larger coalescence probability means a faster mixing rate, which is favorable for producing IIR with a higher $M_n$. Figure 12 illustrates the calculation process of $P$.

Figure 13 exhibits that $\ln P$ was linearly related to $\ln N$. It was deduced,

$$P = 1.37 \times 10^{-6} \cdot N^{1.63}, \text{when } N < 1200 \text{ r min}^{-1} \quad (19)$$

and $P = 0.15$, when $N \geq 1200 \text{ r min}^{-1}$ since $M_n$ did not increase when $N$ was more than $1200 \text{ r min}^{-1}$.

Model prediction: Effect of $D$

The above parameters were used to predict $M_n$ vs. $r^*$. Figure 14 shows the results of the simulated and experimental $M_n$ with a changing $D$ at different temperatures. It can be seen that $M_n$ increased with the increase of $D$ and then leveled off when $D$ was more than 40 mm ($r^* = 0.75$). It was thus determined that the optimum packing thickness was 40 mm. It can also be seen from Figure 14 that the simulated $M_n$s fit well with the experimental $M_n$s, exhibiting the validity of the parameters in the model.

The results indicated that the inlet region of RPB plays a very important role in the mixing and reaction processes. The inlet region, also called end effect zone, refers to the part of the packing close to the inner edge of the rotator. It was revealed that strong micromixing occurs in the inlet region due to a large relative circumferential velocity and strong impingement between the liquid and the packing, resulting in a sharp increase of $M_n$ in the inlet region. A slight increase of $M_n$ in the bulk packing region (the part of the packing apart from the inlet region) was observed as a result of lower micromixing efficiency in this region compared to the inlet region.25,49,59

Model Validation

Figure 15 is the diagonal plot of all the simulation data and experimental values of $M_n$ at different $T_p$, $N$, and $D$. It
can be found that this model offers relatively precise predictions on the $M_n$ of IIR prepared in RPB, with a deviation within 10% compared with the experimental values.

Conclusions

On recognition of conventional reactors’ deficiency in micromixing for rapid cationic polymerization, rotating packed bed was employed for the synthesis of IIR via caticonic copolymerization of isobutylene and a small amount of isoprene. IIR with high production efficiency and high quality was obtained, which was attributed to the intensified micromixing performance of RPB. The optimum experimental conditions were determined at rotating speed of 1200 r min$^{-1}$, packing thickness of 40 mm and polymerization temperature of 173 K, where IIR with high molecular weight ($M_n = 289,000$) and unimodal molecular weight distribution ($MWD = 1.99$) was obtained. The mean residence time of the reaction process is less than 1 s in RPB while that is 30–60 min in conventional stirred tank reactors. It is thus estimated that the production capacity per unit equipment volume is increased by 2–3 orders of magnitude, which reveals that RPB may be employed as a novel and efficient reactor for polymer synthesis by cationic polymerization in wide industrial applications.

A mathematical model to predict the $M_n$ of IIR was developed. The model predicted $M_n$ as a function of the polymerization temperature, rotating speed, and packing thickness. The results showed a good agreement between the simulated values and the experimental data. It is believed that this model could be used for cationic polymerization process development using RPB as a reactor.
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Notation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$[A]$</td>
<td>growing chain unit concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[C_i]$</td>
<td>structural unit concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>packing thickness, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[E_i]$</td>
<td>end group concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[E_i]$*</td>
<td>end group concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[I]$</td>
<td>initiator concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[I]_0$</td>
<td>initial initiator concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_i$</td>
<td>rate constant for initiation, L mol$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{in}$</td>
<td>constant, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{p,M}$</td>
<td>rate constant for propagation of $M_1$, L mol$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{p,M}$*</td>
<td>rate constant for propagation of $M_2$, L mol$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{t}$</td>
<td>rate constant of termination, s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{s,M}$</td>
<td>rate constant for chain transfer to $M_1$, L mol$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[M_i]$</td>
<td>isobutylene monomer concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[M_i]_0$</td>
<td>initial isobutylene monomer concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[M_3]$</td>
<td>initial isoprene monomer concentration, mol L$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>rotating speed, r min$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_t$</td>
<td>total cage number of packing, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_D$</td>
<td>droplets number in every cage, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>coalescence probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^*$</td>
<td>dimensionless form of $r$, $(r - r_1)/(r_a - r_i)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_i$</td>
<td>inner radius of rotating packed bed, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_a$</td>
<td>outer radius of rotating packed bed, mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>time, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{1/2}$</td>
<td>reactive characteristic time, ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_m$</td>
<td>characteristic time of micromixing, ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_p$</td>
<td>polymerization temperature, K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek letters

$\delta$ = distance between adjacent cages, mm
$\varepsilon$ = energy dissipation rate per mass, w kg$^{-1}$
$\tau$ = mean residence time, s
$\nu$ = kinematic viscosities, m$^2$ s$^{-1}$
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