

ELUCIDATION OF PHYSIO-CHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION OF ULTRASONIC CHEMICALLY DEMULSIFIED CRUDE OIL

WAFAA KAMIL MAHMOOD

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Chemical Engineering)

Faculty of Chemical and Natural Resources Engineering
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

May 2014

ABSTRACT

Formation of emulsions during oil production and processing is a costly problem, both in terms of chemicals used and production losses. It is necessary to separate the water completely from the crude oils before transporting to refinery. Traditional ways of breaking emulsions using heat and chemicals are disadvantageous from both economic and environmental perspectives. In this thesis, an alternative and multiple frequency energy potential of ultrasonic-assisted chemicals (environmental friendly) in demulsification of water-in-crude oil emulsions were utilized and investigated. Two types of crude oils were used namely; (Tapis and Miri crude oils). The study begun with some characterization studies to provide understanding of fundamental issues such as formation, formulation and breaking of emulsions by both chemicals and ultrasonic approaches. The aim was to obtain optimized operating conditions as well as fundamental understanding of water-in-oil stability, upon which further development of the demulsification process could be developed. The stability studies were carried out by analyzing operating conditions such as surfactant concentration, surfactant type, oil type, temperature and water-oil ratio (30-50%). For stability performance test, four emulsifiers were used namely; Triton X-100, Span 83, Cocamide DEA and SDDS. It was found that there exist a correlation between these factors and emulsion stability. Among these, emulsion stabilized by cocamide DEA was the best and followed by Span 83, SDDS and Triton X-100 respectively. For chemical emulsification performance test, five types of demulsifiers with different functional groups were utilized; these are Hexylamine, Dioctylamine, Cocamine, Polyethylene Glycol, PEG 1000 and PEG 600. Among these; Hexylamine was found to be the best in separating water and oil from emulsions (88%) and followed by cocamine (81%), Dioctylamine (79%), PEG 1000 (76%) and PEG 600 (70%). For ultrasonic forces (3, 5, 7 and 9) applied for emulsion breaking, results were significantly enhanced the separation time and amount of water separated. Results showed that, ultrasonic power, 9 and Hexylamine (1.0%) in demulsifying the crude oil A stabilized by Span 83 with maximum water separation of 96% after 150 min. Also, and within the same operating conditions mentioned above, a maximum water separation up to 99% was achieved with crude oil B. The other investigated demulsifiers with ultrasonic force showed also high water separation percentages such as cocamine (1.0%) emulsifier with 91% and 93% for crude oils A and B emulsions respectively. The results obtained in this thesis have exposed the capability of ultrasonic-assisted chemicals technology in demulsification of W/O emulsions. Further works are nevertheless required to provide deeper understanding of the mechanisms involved to facilitate the development of an optimum system applicable to the industry.

ABSTRAK

Pembentukan emulsi semasa pengeluaran dan pemprosesan minyak adalah isu yang kritikal dari segi penggunaan bahan kimia dan masalah kerugian pengeluaran. Langkah pemisahan air yang menyeluruh daripada minyak mentah adalah penting sebelum dibawa ke kilang penapisan. Cara-cara tradisional untuk pengasingan emulsi menggunakan haba dan bahan kimia tidak efisien dari segi ekonomi dan alam sekitar. Tesis ini mengandungi alternatif dan pelbagai frekuensi tenaga potensi daripada bantuan bahan kimia ultrasonik (mesra alam sekitar) dalam proses pengasingan emulsi air daripada minyak mentah yang telah dikaji dan diaplikasikan. Dua jenis minyak mentah iaitu minyak mentah dari Tapis dan Miri telah digunakan. Kajian ini telah dimulakan dengan penyelidikan ciri-ciri supaya isu-isu asas seperti pembentukan, formulasi dan pengasingan emulsi dapat difahami menggunakan kaedah bahan kimia dan ultrasonik. Objektif kajian ini adalah untuk memperolehi kondisi optimum serta perfahaman yang mendalam tentang kestabilan air dalam minyak agar kajian proses pemisahan dapat diperkembangkan lanjut. Penyelidikan stabiliti dijalankan dengan menganalisa keadaan operasi seperti kepekatan surfaktan, jenis surfaktan, jenis minyak, suhu dan nisbah air-minyak (30-50%). Pengemulsi seperti Triton X-100, Span 83, Cocamide DEA dan SDDS telah digunakan bagi mengaji prestasi kestabilan. Kajian telah menunjukkan hubungan kait antara faktor-faktor ini dengan kestabilan emulsi. Cocamide DEA adalah yang terbaik di antara emulsi-emulsi yang lain diikuti dengan Span 83, SDDS dan Triton X-100. Terdapat 5 jenis pengasing emulsi yang digunakan untuk kajian pengemulsian bahan kimia. Antaranya adalah Hexylamine, Dioctylamine, Cocamine, Polyethylene Glycol, PEG 1000 dan PEG 600. Kajian ini juga megesahkan bahawa Hexylamine adalah bahan kimia terbaik untuk mengasingkan air daripada minyak (88%), diikuti dengan cocamine (81%), Dioctylamine (79%), PEG 1000 (76%) dan PEG 600 (70%). Keputusan signifikan telah dipertingkatkan dari segi jarak masa dan kuantiti air yang diasingkan dengan menggunakan tenaga ultrasonic (3, 5, 7 dan 9). Selepas 150 min, penceraian maksimum sebanyak 96% telah dicapai dengan aplikasi tenaga ultrasonik 9 dan Hexylamine (1.0%) di dalam proses pengasingan minyak mentah A yang distabilkan oleh Span 83, manakala bagi minyak mentah B adalah sebanyak 99%. Kajian juga menunjukkan peratusan tinggi pengasingan air seperti cocamine (1.0%) dengan 91% dan 93% menggunakan tenaga ultrasonik untuk emulsi minyak mentah A dan B. Keputusan yang diperolehi daripada kajian ini telah membantu untuk mendedahkan keupayaan teknologi bantuan kimia ultrasonik dalam pengasingan air/minyak emulsi, lantaran memberi kefahaman yang mendalam atas mekanisme yang terlibat untuk membantu dalam perkembangan optimum sistem dalam industri.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
SUPERVISOR’S DECLARATION		ii
STUDENT’S DECLARATION		iii
DEDICATION		iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		v
ABSTRACT		vi
ABSTRAK		vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS		viii
LIST OF TABLES		xii
LIST OF FIGURES		xii
LIST OF SYMBOLS		xxii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		xxiii
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Problem Statement	3
1.3	Objectives of Research	5
1.4	Scopes of Research	5
1.5	Study Contributions	6
1.6	Overview of the Thesis	7
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1	Introduction	8
2.2	Emulsions	8
2.3	Emulsions Formation Techniques	9
2.4	Factors Influencing the Emulsion Formation, Stability and Type	12
	2.4.1 Emulsifying agents (Surfactants)	12

	2.4.2	Crude Oil Properties	17
2.5		Emulsification and Emulsion Stability	20
2.6		Demulsification	28
	2.6.1	Chemical Demulsification	30
	2.6.2	Thermal Demulsification	35
	2.6.3	Microwave Demulsification	39
	2.6.4	Membrane Demulsification	43
	2.6.5	Ultrasonic Demulsification	46
CHAPTER 3		MATERIALS AND METHOD	
3.1		Introduction	54
3.2		Materials	
	3.2.1	Emulsifiers	54
	3.2.1.1	Cocamide DEA (Diethanolamide)	54
	3.2.1.2	Span 83 (Sorbitan Sesquiester)	55
	3.2.1.3	Triton X-100	55
	3.2.1.4	Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate (SDDS)	56
	3.2.2	Demulsifiers	
	3.2.2.1	Cocamine	58
	3.2.2.2	Hexylamine	59
	3.2.2.3	Dioctylamine	59
	3.2.2.4	Polyethylene Glycol (600 and 1000)	60
	3.2.3	Crude oils	60
3.3		Emulsion formation (Procedures and Equipment)	61
	3.3.1	Rheology Test	61
	3.3.2	Stability Test	62
3.4		Demulsification of crude oil emulsions	64

CHAPTER 4 CRUDE OIL EMULSIONS FORMATION AND STABILITY

4.1	Introduction	67
4.2	Rheological Behaviour of the Prepared Emulsions	67
4.2.1	Shear Stress versus Shear Rate (Effect of Additive Concentration)	68
4.2.2	Shear Stress versus Shear Rate (Effect of Temperature)	73
4.2.3	Emulsion Viscosity	80
4.2.3.1	Effect of Temperature	80
4.2.3.2	Effect of Rotation Speed (Shear rate)	86
4.2.3.3	Effect of Water Cut	90
4.2.3.4	Effect of Emulsifier Type	98
4.2.4	Effect of Oil Type on Emulsion Rheology	104
4.2.5	Emulsion droplets size effect	109
4.3	Emulsion Stability	114
4.3.1	Effect of emulsifier concentration on the emulsion stability	115
4.3.2	Effect of emulsifier type on emulsion stability	119
4.3.3	Effect of water content on the emulsion stability	128
4.3.4	Effect of oil type on the emulsion stability	132

CHAPTER 5 CRUDE OIL EMULSION DEMULSIFICATION

5.1	Introduction	136
5.2	Chemically Assisted Demulsification	136
5.2.1	Effect of Demulsifier Concentration	136
5.2.2	Effect of Demulsifier Type	152
5.3	Ultrasonic-Chemically Assisted Demulsification	162

5.3.1	Effect of Irradiation Power	163
5.3.2	Effect of Demulsifier type (with Ultrasonic Irradiation)	175
5.3.3	Effect of Demulsifier Concentration (with Ultrasonic Irradiation)	178
5.4	Correlation Equation	182

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1	Conclusions	199
6.2	Recommendation of Future Work	201

REFERENCES		202
-------------------	--	-----

APPENDICES

A	Apperent physical properties and water separation of emulsions investigated	215
B	Chemically-Assisted Demulsification Data	251
C	Ultrasonic-Chemically-Assisted Demulsification Data	253
D	Statistica Software example	263
E	Accomplishments and publications	268

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page
2.1	Classification of emulsion types	22
3.1	Properties of Cocamide	55
3.2	Properties of Span 38	55
3.3	Properties of Triton x-100	56
3.4	Properties of SDDS	57
3.5	Properties of Cocamine	58
3.6	Properties of Hexylamine.	59
3.7	Properties of Dioctylamine	59
3.8	Properties of Polyethylene Glycol (600 and 1000)	60
4.1	Crude oil blends characteristics	105
5.1	Separation percentage and time performance for demulsifiers investigated	139
5.2	Water separation percentage and time enhancement for chemically-assisted and ultrasonic-chemically assisted demulsification	168
5.3	Correlation parameters for emulsification system at 28 oC	183
5.4	Correllation parameters for demulsification system at 28 oC	184

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page
2.1	Schematic diagram of membrane emulsification process.	11
2.2	Alkyl dimethyl benzyl ammonium chloride surfactant	15
2.3	Dodecyl methyl poly(ethylene oxide) ammonium chloride surfactant	15
2.4	Alkoxylated alkyl phenol formaldehyde condensates	16
2.5	Structure of hypothetical asphaltene molecule	19
2.6	Schematic drawing of the electric field cell	23
2.7	The relation HLB and even diameter to the emulsion of different Brine/Kelamay atmospheric residue	26
2.8	TEM images of prepared samples. The effect of HLB of the	27

	surfactant on the morphology of the samples was shown	
2.9	Schematic representation of the various breakdown processes in emulsions	29
2.10	The effect of dosage on demulsification of PAE82 at 45 °C	33
2.11	Demulsifying ability of the cells and demulsifying substances	35
2.12	Demulsification mechanism in freeze/thaw process of oily sludge (1, oil; 2, water; 3, surfactant)	36
2.13	Micrographs of freeze/thaw process of #1-1 emulsion. (a) Before freezing; (b) freezing; (c) after melted. The images represent a time/temperature sequence for a single field of view	37
2.14	Micrograph of an O/W emulsion (using Mexican HCO) diluted in water	39
2.15	Micrograph showing the effect of microwave dielectric heating at 50 W (left) and oil bath heating (right) 10 min after creation of the O/W emulsion	39
2.16	Separation of 50-50% water-oil emulsion using different methods	41
2.17	Schematic diagram of demulsification by porous glass membrane: (a) droplets in emulsion are adsorbed on the surface of the porous glass membrane, (b) droplets entering into smaller pore must deform (droplets are amplified), and (c) droplets in the pore are broken and adsorbed on the pore wall (droplets are amplified)	44
2.18	Schematic diagram of demulsification by hydrophilic nitrocellulose membrane	45
2.19	Schematic of rotating disk modulus	46
2.20	proposed mechanism for demulsification of crude oil emulsion with ultrasonic irradiation	50
2.21	Photo of water/oil emulsion after ultrasonic standing-wave irradiation	50
2.22	Effects of ultrasound on oil content after oily sludge deoiling (ultrasound frequency 28 kHz; sludge water ratio 1:16; acoustic pressure amplitude 0.10 MPa; ultrasonic irradiation time 20 min; air liquid volume ratio 0.27)	51
2.23	Effects of ultrasonic frequency on oil content after oily sludge deoiling (ultrasound frequency 28 kHz; sludge water ratio 1:16; temperature 40 °C; ultrasonic irradiation time 20 min; air liquid volume ratio 0.27)	52
3.1	Chemical structure of Cocamide DEA	55
3.2	Chemical structure of Span 83	56
3.3	Triton X-100 structure	57
3.4	Chemical structure of SDDS surfactant	57
3.5	Molecular structure of Cocamine.	58
3.6	Chemical structure of Hexylamine	59
3.7	Chemical structure of Dioctylamine	60
3.8	Chemical structure of PEG-600 and PEG-1000	60
3.9	Flow diagram of the emulsification Process	63
3.10	Brookfield Rotational Digital Viscometer Model LV/DV- II	64

3.11	Powersonic® - tabletop ultrasonic generator (Type D)	65
3.12	Powersonic® - tabletop ultrasonic generator (Type D) setting screen (from equipment manual).	65
3.13	Flow diagram of the Demulsification Process.	66
4.1	Shear stress versus shear rate in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with Span83 Emulsifier	70
4.2	Shear stress versus shear rate in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with DEA Emulsifier	70
4.3	Shear stress versus shear rate in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with SDDS Emulsifier	71
4.4	Shear stress versus shear rate in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with Triton-X100 Emulsifier	71
4.5	Shear stress versus shear rate in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with SDDS Emulsifier	72
4.6	Shear stress versus shear rate in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with Triton-X100 Emulsifier	72
4.7	Shear stress versus shear rate in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with DEA Emulsifier	73
4.8	Shear stress versus shear rate in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % DEA Emulsifier	74
4.9	Shear stress versus shear rate in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.0 vol. % DEA Emulsifier	75
4.10	Shear stress versus shear rate in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % DEA Emulsifier	75
4.11	Shear stress versus shear rate in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % DEA Emulsifier	76
4.12	Shear stress versus shear rate in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.0 vol. % SDDS Emulsifier	76
4.13	Shear stress versus shear rate in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % Span 83 Emulsifier	77
4.14	Shear stress versus shear rate in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % SDDS Emulsifier	77
4.15	Shear stress versus shear rate in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % SDDS Emulsifier	78
4.16	Shear stress versus shear rate in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % DEA Emulsifier	78
4.17	Shear stress versus shear rate in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % Span 83 Emulsifier	79
4.18	Shear stress versus shear rate in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (70%-30% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % Triton-X100 Emulsifier	79
4.19	Shear rate versus viscosity in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % SDDS Emulsifier	81
4.20	Shear rate versus viscosity in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % SDDS Emulsifier	82
4.21	Shear rate versus viscosity in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % Triton-X100 Emulsifier	82
4.22	Shear rate versus viscosity in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % DEA Emulsifier	83

4.23	Shear rate versus viscosity in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % Span 83 Emulsifier	83
4.24	Shear rate versus viscosity in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % Span 83 Emulsifier at different temperatures	84
4.25	Shear rate versus viscosity in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % Span 83 Emulsifier at different temperatures	84
4.26	Shear rate versus viscosity in 40%-60% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % DEA Emulsifier at different temperatures	85
4.27	Shear rate versus viscosity in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % SDDS Emulsifier at different temperatures	85
4.28	Temperature versus viscosity in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 0.5 vol. % Triton-X100 Emulsifier	86
4.29	Temperature versus viscosity in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.0 vol. % SDDS Emulsifier	87
4.30	Temperature versus viscosity in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % SDDS Emulsifier	87
4.31	Temperature versus viscosity in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.0 vol. % DEA Emulsifier	88
4.32	Temperature versus viscosity in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (50%-50% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % Span 83Emulsifier	88
4.33	Temperature versus viscosity in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (30%-70% oil blend with 1.5 vol. % Span 83Emulsifier	89
4.34	Temperature versus viscosity in 30%-70% W/O emulsion in (30%-70% oil blend with 1.0 vol. % Triton-X100 Emulsifier	89
4.35	Temperature versus viscosity in 50%-50% W/O emulsion in (30%-70% oil blend with 1.0 vol. % Triton-X100 Emulsifier	90
4.36	Effect of water content on emulsion viscosity in (30%-70% oil blend) at T = 50 oC and RPM = 100	92
4.37	Effect of water content on emulsion viscosity in (50%-50% oil blend) at T = 90 oC and RPM = 100	92
4.38	Effect of water content on emulsion viscosity in (50%-50% oil blend) at T = 70 oC and RPM = 100	93
4.39	Effect of water content on emulsion viscosity in (30%-70% oil blend) at T = 70 oC and RPM = 100	93
4.40	Effect of water content on emulsion viscosity in (30%-70% oil blend) at T = 28 oC and RPM = 100	94
4.41	Effect of water content on emulsion viscosity in (30%-70% oil blend) at T = 90 oC and RPM = 100	94
4.42	Shear rate versus shear stress for different water cuts at T=28 oC and Span83 surfactant in (50%-50%) oil blend	95
4.43	Shear rate versus shear stress for different water cuts at T=28 oC and SDDS surfactant in (50%-50%) oil blend	96
4.44	Shear rate versus shear stress for different water cuts at T=28 oC and Span 83 surfactant in (30%-70%) oil blend	96
4.45	Shear rate versus shear stress for different water cuts at T=28 oC	97

	and SDDS surfactant in (30%-70%) oil blend	
4.46	Shear rate versus shear stress for different water cuts at T=28 oC and Triton X-100 surfactant in (30%-70%) oil blend.	97
4.47	Effect of emulsifier type on emulsion (50%-50% W/O) viscosity in (50%-50% oil blend) at T = 28 oC	101
4.48	Effect of emulsifier type on emulsion (40%-60% W/O) viscosity in (50%-50% oil blend) at T = 50 oC	102
4.49	Effect of emulsifier type on emulsion (30%-70% W/O) viscosity in (50%-50% oil blend) at T = 70 oC	102
4.50	Effect of emulsifier type on emulsion (30%-70% W/O) viscosity in (30%-70% oil blend) at T = 28 oC	103
4.51	Effect of emulsifier type on emulsion (40%-60% W/O) viscosity in (30%-70% oil blend) at T = 90 oC	103
4.52	Effect of emulsifier type on emulsion (50%-50% W/O) viscosity in (30%-70% oil blend) at T = 70 oC	104
4.53	Shear rate versus Shear stress of Crude oil A and B with 1.5 vol.% Span 83 emulsifier in 30 vol.% water cut emulsion at T =28 oC	107
4.54	Shear rate versus Shear stress of Crude oil A and B with 0.5 vol.% Triton X-100 emulsifier in 50 vol.% water cut emulsion at T =28 oC	107
4.55	Shear rate versus Shear stress of Crude oil A and B with 1.0 vol.% SDDS emulsifier in 40 vol.% water cut emulsion at T =28 oC	108
4.56	Shear rate versus Shear stress of Crude oil A and B with 0.5 vol.% DEA emulsifier in 50 vol.% water cut emulsion at T =28 oC	108
4.57	Effect of additive concentration on droplet size and distribution for emulsion formulated with crude oil A and 30 vol.% water cut	111
4.58	Effect of additive concentration on droplet size and distribution for emulsion formulated with crude oil B and 40 vol.% water cut	111
4.59	Effect of additive concentration on droplet size and distribution for emulsion formulated with crude oil A and 50 vol.% water cut	111
4.60	Effect of temperature on the droplet size and emulsion viscosity for Emulsions prepared with 1.5 vol.% SDDS in crude oil A and 50 vol.% water	112
4.61	Effect of temperature on the droplet size and emulsion viscosity for Emulsions prepared with 1.5 vol. % DEA in crude oil A and 50 vol. % water	112
4.62	Effect of temperature on the droplet size and emulsion viscosity for Emulsions prepared with 1.5 vol. % Triton X-100 in crude oil B and 50 vol. % water	113
4.63	Effect of temperature on the droplet size and emulsion viscosity for Emulsions prepared with 1.5 vol. % Span 83 in crude oil B and 50 vol. % water	113
4.64	Effect of DEA concentration on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (50 vol. %- 50 Vol. %) (water / crude oil B) emulsion	116

4.65	Effect of SDDS concentration on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (50 vol. %- 50 Vol. %) (water / crude oil B) emulsion	116
4.66	Effect of Triton X-100 concentration on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (50 vol. %- 50 Vol. %) (Water / crude oil B) emulsion	117
4.67	Effect of Span 83 concentration on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (50 vol. %- 50 Vol. %) (water / crude oil A) emulsion	117
4.68	Effect of DEA concentration on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (40 vol. %- 60 Vol. %) (water / crude oil A) emulsion	118
4.69	Effect of SDDS concentration on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (30 vol. %- 70 Vol. %) (Water / Crude oil A) emulsion.	118
4.70	Emulsion separation performance with SDDS surfactant in crude oil B	124
4.71	Effect of additives type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (50 vol. %- 50 Vol. %) (water / crude oil B) emulsion	125
4.72	Effect of additives type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (30 vol. %- 70 Vol. %) (water / crude oil B) emulsion	125
4.73	Effect of additives type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (40 vol. %- 60 Vol. %) (water / crude oil B) emulsion	126
4.74	Effect of additives type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (50 vol. %- 50 Vol. %) (water / crude oil A) emulsion	126
4.75	Effect of additives type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (50 vol. %- 50 Vol. %) (water / crude oil A) emulsion	127
4.76	Effect of additives type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (30 vol. %- 70 Vol. %) (water / crude oil A) emulsion	127
4.77	Effect of water content on the emulsion stability (water separation) for DEA emulsifier in emulsion formulated from crude oil B	129
4.78	Effect of water content on the emulsion stability (water separation) for SDDS emulsifier in emulsion formulated from crude oil B	130
4.79	Effect of water content on the emulsion stability (water separation) for DEA emulsifier in emulsion formulated from crude oil B	130
4.80	Effect of water content on the emulsion stability (water separation) for DEA emulsifier in emulsion formulated from crude oil A	131
4.81	Effect of water content on the emulsion stability (water separation) for Triton X-100 emulsifier in emulsion formulated	131

	from crude oil A	
4.82	Effect of water content on the emulsion stability (water separation) for SDDS emulsifier in emulsion formulated from crude oil A.	132
4.83	Effect of oil type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (50 vol. %- 50 Vol. %) (water / crude oil) emulsion with 0.5% DEA	134
4.84	Effect of oil type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (30 vol. %- 70 Vol. %) (water / crude oil) emulsion with 0.5% SDDS	134
4.85	Effect of oil type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (40 vol. %- 60 Vol. %) (water / crude oil) emulsion with 1.0% DEA	135
4.86	Effect of oil type on the emulsion stability (water separation) for (30 vol. %- 70 Vol. %) (water / crude oil) emulsion with 0.5% Triton X-100	135
5.1	Effect of Heylamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA.	142
5.2	Effect of Cocamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA.	142
5.3	Effect of Dioctylamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA.	143
5.4	Effect of PEG 1000 concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA	143
5.5	Effect of PEG 600 concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA.	144
5.6	Effect of Cocamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	144
5.7	Effect of PEG-1000 concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	145
5.8	Effect of Hexylamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	145
5.9	Effect of Dioctylamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	146
5.10	Effect of PEG-600 concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil A emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	146
5.11	Effect of Heylamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.%	147

	Cocamide DEA.	
5.12	Effect of Cocamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA.	147
5.13	Effect of Dioctylamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA.	148
5.14	Effect of PEG 1000 concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA.	148
5.15	Effect of PEG 600 concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Cocamide DEA.	149
5.16	Effect of Cocamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	149
5.17	Effect of PEG-1000 concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	150
5.18	Effect of Hexylamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	150
5.19	Effect of Dioctylamine concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	151
5.20	Effect of PEG-600 concentration on the water separation percentage for crude oil B emulsions stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83.	151
5.21	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (0.5 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil A and DEA.	156
5.22	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (0.2 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil A and DEA.	157
5.23	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (1.0 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil A and DEA.	157
5.24	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (0.2 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil A and Span 83.	158
5.25	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (0.5 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil A and Span 83.	158
5.26	comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (1.0 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil A and Span 83	159
5.27	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (0.2 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil B and DEA.	159
5.28	comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (0.5 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil B and DEA	160
5.29	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (1.0 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil B and DEA.	160
5.30	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (0.2 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil B and Span 83.	161

5.31	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (0.5 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil B and Span 83.	161
5.32	Comparing the effects of the Demulsifiers investigated (1.0 vol.%) with emulsion formed from crude oil B and Span 83.	162
5.33	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil A emulsion with DEA emulsifier and Hexylamine as demulsifier.	170
5.34	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil A emulsion with DEA emulsifier and Cocamine as demulsifier.	170
5.35	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil A emulsion with DEA emulsifier and PEG-600 as demulsifier	171
5.36	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil A emulsion with Span 83 emulsifier and Hexylamine as demulsifier	171
5.37	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil A emulsion with Span 83 emulsifier and Cocamine as demulsifier.	172
5.38	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil A emulsion with Span 83 emulsifier and Dioctylamine as demulsifier.	172
5.39	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil B emulsion with DEA emulsifier and Hexylamine as demulsifier.	173
5.40	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil B emulsion with DEA emulsifier and Cocamine as demulsifier.	173
5.41	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil B emulsion with DEA emulsifier and Dioctylamine as demulsifier	174
5.42	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil B emulsion with Span 83 emulsifier and PEG1000 as demulsifier.	174
5.43	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil B emulsion with Span 83 emulsifier and PEG-600 as demulsifier.	175
5.44	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil A emulsion with DEA emulsifier and different types of demulsifiers at 0.5 vol.%.	176
5.45	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil A emulsion with Span 83 emulsifier and different types of demulsifiers at 0.5 vol.%.	176
5.46	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil B emulsion with DEA emulsifier and different types of demulsifiers at 0.5 vol.%.	177
5.47	Effect of ultrasonic forces on the water separation performance for Crude oil B emulsion with Span 83 emulsifier and different types of demulsifiers at 0.2 vol.%.	177

5.48	Effect of Cocamine demulsifier concentration on the water separation of crude oil B-Span 83 emulsion with ultrasonic power 3	178
5.49	Effect of PEG-1000 demulsifier concentration on the water separation of crude oil B-Span 83 emulsion with ultrasonic power 9	179
5.50	Effect of Hexylamine demulsifier concentration on the water separation of crude oil A-DEA emulsion with ultrasonic power 3	179
5.51	Effect of PEG-1000 demulsifier concentration on the water separation of crude oil A-DEA emulsion with ultrasonic power 7	180
5.52	Effect of Dioctylamine demulsifier concentration on the water separation of crude oil A-Span 83 emulsion with ultrasonic power 7	180
5.53	Effect of Cocamine demulsifier concentration on the water separation of crude oil A-Span 83 emulsion with ultrasonic power 9	181
5.54	Effect of PEG-600 demulsifier concentration on the water separation of crude oil B-DEA emulsion with ultrasonic power 5	181
5.55	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion stabilized with Triton X-100 at 28 °C.	185
5.56	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion stabilized with SDDS at 28 °C.	185
5.57	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion stabilized with Span 83 at 28 °C.	186
5.58	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion stabilized with Cocamide DEA at 28 °C.	186
5.59	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil B emulsion stabilized with Triton X-100 at 28 °C.	187
5.60	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil B emulsion stabilized with SDDS at 28 °C.	187
5.61	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil B emulsion stabilized with Cocamide DEA at 28 °C.	188
5.62	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83) demulsified using Hexylamine and ultrasonic power.	189
5.63	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83) demulsified using Cocamine and ultrasonic power.	190
5.64	Predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83) demulsified using Dioctylamine and ultrasonic power.	191
5.65	predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83) demulsified using PEG-1000 and ultrasonic power	192
5.66	predicted versus observed values for Crude oil A emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% Span 83) demulsified using PEG-600 and ultrasonic power	193
5.67	predicted versus observed values for Crude oil B emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% DEA) demulsified using Hexylamine	194

	and ultrasonic power	
5.68	predicted versus observed values for Crude oil B emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% DEA) demulsified using Cocamine and ultrasonic power	195
5.69	predicted versus observed values for Crude oil B emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% DEA) demulsified using Dioctylamine and ultrasonic power	196
5.70	predicted versus observed values for Crude oil B emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% DEA) demulsified using PEG-1000 and ultrasonic power	197
5.71	predicted versus observed values for Crude oil B emulsion (stabilized with 1.5 vol.% DEA) demulsified using PEG-600 and ultrasonic power	198

LIST OF SYMBOLS

M	Meter
μ_r	Emulsion relative viscosity
μ_e	Emulsion viscosity
μ_o	Continuous phase viscosity
\emptyset	Dispersed phase volume fraction
K2	Dispersed phase concentration
K	Ratio of dispersed to continuous phases
%W _s	Percentage water separation
V _{ws}	Volume of water separated
V _i	Initial water volume in emulsion
TE%	Percentage of time enhancement
T _b	Separation time for lower demulsifier concentration
T _a	Separation time for higher demulsifier concentration
W _{sb}	Maximum water separation at lower concentration
W _{sa}	Maximum water separation at higher concentration
h	Hours

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

W/O	Water in oil emulsion
O/O	Oil in oil emulsion
O/W	Oil in water emulsion
ME	Membrane emulsification
TAN	Total acid number
IFT	Interfacial tension
R/A	Resine to asphaltenes ratio
HLB	Hydrophil-Lipophil balance
CMC	Critical micelle concentration
PPO	Polypropylene –block-Polypropylene oxide

PEO	Polypropylene –block-Polyethylene oxide
SDS	Sodium Dodecylsulfate
DSC	Differential Scanning Calorimeter
RSM	Response surface Methodology
LSWR	Low sulfur wax residue
DTAB	Dodecyltrimethylammonium bromide
SPG	Shirasa-porous-glass
TOC	Total organic carbon concentration
OI	Operational index
TMP	Trans membrane pressure
PVDF	Hydrophilic polyvinylidene difluoride
PES	Polyether sulfate
MWCO	Molecular weight cut off

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The emulsion can be defined as the dispersion (suspension) of one liquid into another immiscible liquid in the form of droplets with the aid of surface active agents. Crude oil is rarely produced alone in commercial oil wells because most of the time it is combined with water in an emulsion form. Emulsions can be formed during almost all stages of crude oil production, starting with the deep oil wells, wellbores, and wellheads; at wet-crude handling facilities, during transportation through pipelines, and petroleum processing. The separation of the water from the crude oil emulsions is an initial step in any crude oil production and processing facility to control the quality of the final product. A good understanding of petroleum emulsions is necessary in order to control and enhance processes at all these stages.

Crude oil emulsions can be classified into three main categories, namely:

- 1- Weak emulsions: where the water is separated within a few minutes of production.
- 2- Medium emulsions: where the water requires more time than the weak emulsions to separate.
- 3- Tight emulsions: where the water is not separated completely even after a few days.

Generally speaking, emulsions are kinetically stable (stable over a period of time) because there is a natural driving force for the suspended droplets forming the emulsion to coalesce and separate in a single phase. The behaviour of emulsions is mainly controlled by the properties of the adsorbed layers which stabilise the oil-water surfaces. The complexity of petroleum emulsions stems from the oil composition in

terms of surface-active molecules (surfactants) contained in the crude, such as low molecular weight fatty acids, naphthenic acids and asphaltenes. These surfactants suppress the mechanisms involved in sedimentation, aggregation, coalescence, and phase inversion that would otherwise break down an emulsion.

The emulsion's stability is controlled by a large number of factors such as the solid's content (asphaltenes, waxes, clays, etc.), operation temperature, droplet size and distribution and the pH of the water. The surfactant type (anionic, cationic, amphoteric or non-ionic) also plays a major role in the emulsion formation process and will significantly control the stability of the emulsion and the tendency of the water layer to separate. All of these factors must be taken under consideration in order to achieve an efficient and effective water separation process (Demulsification).

Demulsification (emulsion breaking) is needed in many practical applications such as the petroleum industry, environment technology, and waste-water treatment. Demulsification is the process whereby water is separated from crude oil. Depending on the crude oil emulsion type, a suitable demulsification process is needed so as to ensure a highly efficient as well as low cost emulsion breaking process.

Currently, water-crude oil emulsions are typically destabilised through the use of chemical demulsifiers. The chemical structure of these demulsifiers is usually based on alkylphenol formaldehyde ethoxylated resins. These chemical demulsifiers are effective, but, unfortunately, are now believed to be endocrine disrupters, and thus it is likely that they may be banned by various national environmental protection agencies (Zaki, *et al.*, 1996, 1997, 1998).

Other means of destabilising asphaltene-stabilised W/O emulsions include thermal pressurisation and rapid depressurisation (Ohsol *et al.*, 1999), electrostatic droplet shattering and coalescence. Both of these methods are established around efforts at "cracking" or "disrupting" the rigid, viscoelastic film of asphaltenes which forms around the water droplets. One problem with these methods is the reformation of stabilised water droplets due to readsorption of displaced or "disrupted" asphaltenic film

fragments in shear fields under solvent conditions at which the asphaltenes are capable of reassembly (Hart, 1997; Mitchell, 1998).

The present work will present and evaluate a new demulsification technique using ultrasonic force. Four different types of emulsifiers will be used in the formation of crude oil emulsions, namely Triton-X, Span 83, SDDS and Cocoamide. The Cocoamide is applied for the first time as an emulsifier in the crude oil emulsions. The most stable emulsions will be selected and tested for the demulsification processes. Two methods of demulsification process will be adopted, namely the chemically-assisted demulsification process and the Ultrasonic-chemically-assisted demulsification process. The chemically-assisted demulsification process will be adopted with different types of demulsifiers, including Hexylamin, Octylamine, Polyethylene Glycole (600 and 1000), and Cocamine. Cocamine is used for the first time as an alternative environmental friendly demulsification agent. The Ultrasonic-chemically-assisted demulsification process will be applied to the same emulsion and a comparison of the water separation performances will be conducted.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Most of the crude oils produced from the oil wells are in the form of emulsions. Generally speaking, crude oil emulsions do exist in the form of oil-in-water (O/W) or water-in-oil (W/O) formation whilst on other occasions it will be in a more complex form such as water-in-oil-in-water (W/O/W) or oil-in-water-in-oil (O/W/O). Indeed, this depends on the operation factors, including type of emulsifier and the mixing intensity.

Oilfield crude oil usually contains natural emulsifiers which stabilise the emulsion and include surface active agents (surfactants) and fine solids. The value of any crude oil is highly dependent on the type and the tightness of the emulsion formed, which in turn depends on the type of natural emulsifier involved. This is why the price of crude oil varies from country to country. Indeed, the natural emulsifiers usually exist in the heavy fraction of the crude oil. The emulsification intensity of the natural emulsifiers is significantly controlled by the type of crude oil, i.e. different crude oils

will have different amounts of heavy components. At a glance, crude oil emulsions with low amounts of natural emulsifier will result in a weak emulsion which can be separated easily whilst other crudes which contain the right type and amount of emulsifier, will result in a very stable emulsion. Artificial emulsifiers are more often used to maintain the emulsion structure and stability during the production of crude oil from the oil wells as well as during the transportation of these crude oils through pipelines. Crude oil emulsions form when oil and water (brine) come into contact with each other, when there is sufficient mixing, and when an emulsifying agent or emulsifier is present. Different types of artificial emulsifying agent exist (mostly anionic and non-ionic surfactants) and are applied commercially in different oil fields depending on the type of crude oil produced. Most of these surfactants are not environmental friendly and their emulsification efficiency can be controlled by operation conditions including pressure, temperature and mixing intensity. Indeed, a more environmental friendly additive is needed. In the present work, natural and environmental friendly emulsifying agents are introduced for the first time in the form of Cocoamide emulsifiers.

One of the key factors controlling crude oil value in the market is the speed and efficiency of water separation in the refining facility. This water separation process is called “Demulsification”. Traditionally, the separation of water from crude oil emulsion is achieved using any, or a combination, of different methods such as the addition of chemical demulsifiers, increasing the temperature of the emulsion, applying electrostatic fields which promote coalescence or lowering the crude oil speed to allow for gravitational separation. Choosing one or more separation processes depends on the type and tightness of the emulsion. Beside the advantages of these methods, several disadvantages also emerge, including the high cost of the chemical demulsifiers involved and the long period of time needed to complete the separation. In addition, most of the demulsifiers used are artificial, chemical, and not environmental friendly. This is why an environmental friendly demulsification agent together with a more efficient and less time consuming demulsification technique are needed. In the present work, ultrasonic force will be utilised to enhance the chemically-assisted demulsification process. A comparison between the water separation performances will be conducted with and without the use of the ultrasonic force to determine its effect in terms of enhancing the water separation and demulsification time.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH

The objectives of this research are:

1. To evaluate the performance of ultrasonic-assisted chemicals as an alternative and cost effective method for demulsification of crude oil emulsions.
2. To examine and evaluate the performance of a new environmental friendly Cocamide DEA as stabilizer for crude oil emulsions.
3. To introduce Cocamine as a new and environmental friendly chemical for separation of crude oil emulsions.
4. To optimize and analyze the overall potentials of ultrasonic-assisted chemicals demulsification method as an alternative to the conventional chemical demulsification method in demulsifying water-in-oil emulsions.
5. To evaluate the rheological characteristics and stability of W/O emulsions formulated from two different crude oils.

SCOPES OF RESEARCH

1. Characterization of oil and aqueous phases:

Different emulsions are prepared using different operating and emulsification factors such as:

- a. Crude oil type; two types of crude oil are investigated (Tapis and Miri crude oils blends) with two blending percentages (30%-70% and 50%-50%).
- b. Water cut percentages; to form emulsions the water will be introduced to the crude oil with three different percentages (30, 40 and 50 Vol.%).
- c. Emulsifier type; four types of emulsifying agent will be investigated, namely Triton-X100, SDDS, Span83 and Cocamide DEA.