

LIMITATIONS OF MODEL-FITTING METHODS FOR KINETIC ANALYSIS: POLYSTYRENE THERMAL DEGRADATION.

Pedro E. Sánchez-Jiménez*, Luis A. Pérez-Maqueda, Antonio Perejón, José M. Criado

Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales de Sevilla, C.S.I.C.-Universidad de Sevilla, C. Américo Vespucio nº49, 41092 Sevilla, Spain

Abstract

In this paper, some clarifications regarding the use of model-fitting methods of kinetic analysis are provided in response to the lack of plot linearity and dispersion in the activation energy values for the thermal degradation of polystyrene found in the literature and some results proposing an n th order model as the most suitable one. In the present work, two model-fitting methods based on the differential and integral forms of the general kinetic equation are evaluated using both simulated and experimental data, showing that the differential method is recommended due to its higher discrimination power. Moreover, the intrinsic limitations of model-fitting methods are highlighted: the use of a limited set of kinetic models to fit experimental data and the ideal nature of such models. Finally, it is concluded that a chain scission model is more appropriate than first order.

Keywords: Kinetic Analysis; Integral Methods; Chain Scission; Kinetic Model; Polystyrene

1. Introduction

An important volume of work has been devoted to the determination of the activation energy and kinetic model describing the thermal degradation of polystyrene (Brems et al. , 2011, Chen et al. , 2007, Chen and Vyazovkin, 2006, Faravelli et al. , 2001, Peterson et al. , 2001, Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012, Snegirev et al. , 2012, Sterling et al. , 2001, Westerhout et al. , 1997). However, results show a wide divergence in the activation energy values and the kinetic models proposed. Also, both complex and one-step mechanisms are suggested. A recent paper questions the application of general kinetic models such as diffusion or nucleation for the kinetic analysis of polymer pyrolysis (Brems et al. , 2011). In that paper, the pyrolysis of polystyrene is studied by fitting the experimental data, recorded under dynamic heating conditions, to some of the most widely used

*Corresponding author. Tel +34954489548 Fax +34954460665
e-mail address: pedro.enrique@icmse.csic.es

kinetic models by means of the Coats-Redfern integral model-fitting method (Coats and Redfern, 1964). A lack of plot linearity and inconsistent activation energy values are observed and the authors conclude that simple first or second order models are good enough for determining the activation energy and, therefore, constitute “the most suitable design approach”. Other works employing similar single-curve model-fitting kinetic procedures reached analogous conclusions (Ahmad et al. , 2010, Ahmed and Gupta, 2009, Krishna and Pugazhenti, 2011). However, some other works, employing isoconversional and non-linear model fitting methods, have revealed the unsuitability of n th order reaction models and suggest an acceleratory model instead (Chen et al. , 2007, Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2010, Snegirev et al. , 2012, Vyazovkin et al. , 2004). Such was confirmed by Sanchez-Jimenez *et al*, proposing a random chain scission model (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2010, Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012). Since several authors have found that the activation energy does not change with the reacted fraction (Peterson et al. , 2001, Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012, Snegirev et al. , 2012), it can reasonably be assumed that the process is single step and other results can be a consequence of both inappropriate kinetic procedures or non-adequately controlled experimental conditions since it has been proved that heat and mass transfer phenomena can affect greatly to the calculated kinetic parameters.

Here, we aim to provide some clarifications regarding the use of model-fitting methods that might explain such discrepancy. Model-fitting methods are frequently used for performing the kinetic modeling of the pyrolysis of polymers and plastic waste because of their simplicity. A number of methods have been proposed, but all basically consist on fitting the experimental data to a conversion function, also known as kinetic model, which relates the extent of conversion with the reaction rate (Perez-Maqueda et al. , 2005b). Kinetic models are mathematical functions developed from certain physico-geometrical assumptions regarding the reactants shape and the reaction driving force. Therefore, they can be identified with a reaction mechanism (Khawam and Flanagan, 2006). However, two important limitations must be considered when such models are applied to real systems. Firstly, the kinetic models are built on strict assumptions that might not be fulfilled in a real process. Certainly, most of the models were proposed for solid state reactions in general and some of them, such as the nucleation and growth or the geometrical shrinkage ones, might not seem entirely appropriate for polymer degradation processes. Other models such as those based on a power law were developed by assuming a mechanism of nucleation and growth of nuclei without overlap of the growth nuclei (Jacobs and Tompkins, 1955, Khawam and Flanagan, 2006). Thus, the power kinetic laws cannot be applied to the whole reaction range but only to the acceleratory period at which the overlapping of nuclei has not yet started. The potential laws become the well-known Avrami-Erofeev kinetic models if the overlapping of

growing nuclei is taken into account. Thus, Avrami-Erofeev kinetic equations instead of power laws should be used for performing the kinetic analysis on the whole reacted fraction. Secondly, any list of models is inevitably incomplete and it is perfectly possible that the studied process is not described by any of them. For example, a kinetic model of random scission, based on the cleavage and ulterior volatilization of polymeric chains, was recently proposed (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2010). That model is especially suitable to polymeric degradation studies, and has a clear physical meaning. Actually, since its publication, we have found a number of polymers such as cellulose, polystyrene and polybutylen terephthalate, that decompose according to a random scission model (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2010, Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2011, Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012). Here, we attempt to provide some insight about the use of model-fitting methods and highlight some of its limitations in order to clarify why in some cases the experimental data cannot be properly fitted by any kinetic model (Brems et al. , 2011).

2. Experimental

The polystyrene studied was supplied by Goodfellow (powder, product number 261595). Thermogravimetric (TGA) measurements were carried out in a TA Instruments Q5000IR thermobalance (TA Instruments, Crawley, UK) connected to a gas flow system to work in inert atmosphere (150 mL min^{-1}). Small mass samples ($\sim 10 \text{ mg}$) were used in order to minimize mass and heat transfer phenomena. Experiments were recorded under linear heating rate conditions, at 0.5, 1, 2 and 5 K min^{-1} . The α -T plots obtained from these two methods were differentiated by means of the Origin software (OriginLab) to get the differential curves employed in the kinetic analysis.

3. Results and Discussion

Figure 1 includes a set of curves simulated according to the following kinetic parameters: $E_a=200\text{kJ/mol}$, $A=3*10^{15} \text{ s}^{-1}$, and L2 random scission kinetic model $f(\alpha)=2(\alpha^{1/2}-\alpha)$. Such were the parameters obtained for the degradation of polystyrene in a previous study and will serve to compare experimental and simulated results (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012). The simulations were performed by means of a numerical integration method (Runge-Kutta) using the Mathcad software and assuming heating rates of 0.5, 1, 2 and 5 K/min . The selected conversion function, $f(\alpha)$, corresponds to a L2 chain scission kinetic model, as described elsewhere (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2010). All four simulated curves have been fitted to some of the most common kinetic models using the same Coats-Redfern integral method employed in Brems' work (Brems et al. , 2011). The

resulting plots are shown in Figure 2. When dealing with real experimental data it is common to restrict the fit to data within a limited range of conversion because the low and high ends of the conversion range are often distorted due to experimental errors. Such restriction was also employed in Brems' paper (Brems et al. , 2011). Thus, we have carried out the fitting procedure using data within the range $0.1 \leq \alpha \leq 0.9$. Figure 2 shows the plots obtained from fitting the simulated curves to the different kinetic models employed, along with the activation energies deduced from the slope of each plot. In principle, when the data is fitted to the correct kinetic model, a straight line is expected. However, all F1, A2 and L2 models yields a linear plot, but only when the data are fitted to L2, the activation energy yielded by the method is the correct one, i.e. 200 kJ/mol. Thus, unless the activation energy is previously known, it would be difficult to discriminate the correct kinetic model obeyed by the process using this method because more than one kinetic model can provide a good fit to the data. Additionally, it is clear that the fits of the data simulated assuming different heating rates to a certain model are parallel in every case. Consequently, since the activation energy is deduced from the slopes, the value delivered by the method must be the same whatever the heating rate.

An alternative to the previous method consists on fitting the experimental data to the different kinetic models using directly the differential form of the general kinetic equation. After reorganizing terms and taking logarithms, it presents the following form (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2009):

$$\ln \left(\frac{d\alpha/dt}{f(\alpha)} \right) = \ln A - \frac{E}{RT} \quad (1)$$

The plot of the left hand side of the equation above versus the inverse of the temperature yields a straight line when the right $f(\alpha)$ is selected. Moreover, when data from curves recorded under different heating rates are plotted together, all of them will lie along a straight line if the right $f(\alpha)$ is selected since the intercept now depends exclusively on the pre-exponential factor. The reduced chance of selecting an incorrect model constitutes an important advantage over model-fitting methods based on the integral form of the kinetic equation. This is clearly shown in Figure 3, which includes the plots obtained when the curves in Figure 1 are fitted to several models according to Eq. (1). It is evident that L2 is the only model that correctly fits all the simulated data, yielding an activation energy of 200 kJ/mol and a preexponential factor of $4.8 \cdot 10^{15} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Thus, both the activation energy and the kinetic model can be unambiguously determined by this method. It is also worth noticing that when fitting to inappropriate models, the plots corresponding to different heating rates do not yield straight lines but lead to parallel plots. This behavior allows to

conclude that the same activation energy would be obtained from the Coats-Redfern method when applied to individual α -T curves recorded at different heating rates

Finally, a set of experimental curves corresponding to the thermal degradation of polystyrene, one of the two polymers studied in Brems' work, is used to confirm the observations made with the simulated curves. The experimental curves, shown in Figure 4, were recorded at heating rates of 0.5, 1, 2 and 5 K/min (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012). When the Coats-Redfern integral method is used to perform the kinetic analysis, the plots in Figure 5 are obtained. As happened with the simulated data, it is difficult to discriminate between the different models. The fits to F1, R2, L2 and A2 all give good linearity and reasonable values of the activation energy. Figure 6 shows the plots resulting from fitting the experimental data to different kinetic models using the differential method (Eq. (1)). Only when the experimental data is fitted to a L2 random scission kinetic model, an approximately straight line is obtained. The slope leads to an activation energy of 221 kJ/mol, reasonably close to the value obtained by a previous study using a different methodology (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012). Note that, if the L2 model is not considered, none of the other five kinetic models here employed really meet the linearity requirements. This might explain why no kinetic models was found to properly fit the decomposition reactions of polystyrene and polyethylene terephthalate at Brems' work (Brems et al. , 2011), since the option of a chain scission model was not tested. It is interesting to note that the results provided by both methods yields slightly different activation energy values from the same experimental data. The discrepancy is due to the nature of each method. While the differential method uses the data as is, the integral method uses an approximation to the temperature integral, that does not have an analytical solution (Perez-Maqueda et al. , 2005a, b). It should also be mentioned that the activation energy obtained by these fitting procedures is also slightly different to that obtained by isoconversional and combined analysis methods in previous works, i.e 204 kJ/mol, using the same experimental data (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012). Both Coats-Redfern and differential methods consist on fitting the experimental data to a theoretical kinetic model, based on certain physic-geometrical assumptions difficult to fulfill in real systems. Therefore, deviations from ideality are expected. On the other hand, the isoconversional method is model-free and the combined method deducts the kinetic model directly from the experimental data without making any previous assumption so it can be assumed the latter methods provide more accurate values of the activation energy.

Finally, the activation energies included in Figures 5 and 6 correspond to an average value. Anyway, less than 5% variation is found because the plots corresponding to different heating rates are almost perfectly parallel, as it was observed when the method was applied to simulated data. Thus, the activation energy yielded by this method is confirmed to be independent of the

heating rate used to obtain the experimental data. Such independency is not observed in the values reported in Brems' work, where a significant dispersion in the activation energies obtained is found. This can be attributed to deficiencies in the experimental curves. The influence of experimental factors such as the heat or mass transfer is important and cannot be disregarded, especially when experimental data are recorded at very high heating rates. At those rates, they can mask the real process and complicate the extraction of experimental data that are really representative of the reaction, leading to the inaccurate estimation of kinetic parameters. It is even possible that the reaction mechanism changes. Thus, curves recorded at heating rates as different as 15 and 120 K/min are probably not directly comparable. The importance of obtaining accurate kinetic parameters cannot be overstated since the assumption of incorrect models or activation energies would render useless any attempt to predict the behavior of the system to conditions different of those under which the experimental data was recorded.

4. Conclusions

Here, it has been shown that, due to the intrinsic limitations of ideal models, model fitting methods should be employed cautiously because it might be possible they cannot exactly represent a real process. Moreover, the possibility that no model in a set could be used to describe a process should be taken into consideration when a reasonable fit is not found. Additionally, recent publications seem to support that the random chain scission model might be very adequate to describe polymer degradation reactions and, therefore, it should be included in the list of tested models when studying such kind of processes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Financial support from projects TEP-03002 from Junta de Andalucía, CTQ2011-27626 from the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad and FEDER funds is acknowledged. Additionally, one of the authors (PESJ) is supported by a JAE-Doc grant (CSIC-FSE).

References

Ahmad Z, et al. Pyro-GC/MS and thermal degradation studies in polystyrene-poly(vinyl chloride) blends. *J Anal Appl Pyrolysis*. 2010;87:99-107.

Ahmed II, Gupta AK. Hydrogen production from polystyrene pyrolysis and gasification: Characteristics and kinetics. *Int J Hydrogen Energy*. 2009;34:6253-64.

Brems A, et al. Thermogravimetric pyrolysis of waste polyethylene-terephthalate and polystyrene: A critical assessment of kinetics modelling. *Resources Conservation and Recycling*. 2011;55:772-81.

Coats AW, Redfern JP. Kinetic Parameters from Thermogravimetric Data *Nature*. 1964;201:68-&. Chen K, et al. Tacticity as a factor contributing to the thermal stability of polystyrene. *Macromol Chem Phys*. 2007;208:2525-32.

Chen K, Vyazovkin S. Mechanistic differences in degradation of polystyrene and polystyrene-clay nanocomposite: Thermal and thermo-oxidative degradation. *Macromol Chem Phys*. 2006;207:587-95.

Faravelli T, et al. Thermal degradation of polystyrene. *J Anal Appl Pyrolysis*. 2001;60:103-21. Khawam A, Flanagan DR. Solid-state kinetic models: Basics and mathematical fundamentals. *J Phys Chem B*. 2006;110:17315-28.

Krishna SV, Pugazhenth G. Properties and Thermal Degradation Kinetics of Polystyrene/Organoclay Nanocomposites Synthesized by Solvent Blending Method: Effect of Processing Conditions and Organoclay Loading. *Journal of Applied Polymer Science*. 2011;120:1322-36.

Perez-Maqueda LA, et al. Evaluation of the integral methods for the kinetic study of thermally stimulated processes in polymer science. *Polymer*. 2005a;46:2950-4.

Perez-Maqueda LA, et al. Kinetic analysis of solid-state reactions: Precision of the activation energy calculated by integral methods. *International Journal of Chemical Kinetics*. 2005b;37:658-66.

Peterson JD, et al. Kinetics of the thermal and thermo-oxidative degradation of polystyrene, polyethylene and poly(propylene). *Macromol Chem Phys*. 2001;202:775-84.

Sanchez-Jimenez PE, et al. Combined kinetic analysis of thermal degradation of polymeric materials under any thermal pathway. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*. 2009;94:2079-85.

Sanchez-Jimenez PE, et al. A new model for the kinetic analysis of thermal degradation of polymers driven by random scission. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*. 2010;95:733-9.

Sanchez-Jimenez PE, et al. An improved model for the kinetic description of the thermal degradation of cellulose. *Cellulose*. 2011;18:1487-98.

Sanchez-Jimenez PE, et al. Nanoclay Nucleation Effect in the Thermal Stabilization of a Polymer Nanocomposite: A Kinetic Mechanism Change. *Journal of Physical Chemistry C*. 2012;116:11797-807.

Snegirev AY, et al. Formal kinetics of polystyrene pyrolysis in non-oxidizing atmosphere. *Thermochim Acta*. 2012;548:17-26.

Sterling WJ, et al. Experimental study of polystyrene thermolysis to moderate conversion. *Polymer Degradation and Stability*. 2001;73:75-82.

Vyazovkin S, et al. Kinetics of the thermal and thermo-oxidative degradation of a polystyrene-clay nanocomposite. *Macromol Rapid Commun*. 2004;25:498-503.

Westerhout RWJ, et al. Kinetics of the low-temperature pyrolysis of polyethene, polypropene, and polystyrene modeling, experimental determination, and comparison with literature models and data. *Ind Eng Chem Res*. 1997;36:1955-64.

Figure Captions.

Figure 1. Kinetic curves simulated according the following kinetic parameters: $E_a=200\text{kJ/mol}$, $A=3 \cdot 10^{15} \text{ s}^{-1}$, and $f(\alpha)=2(\alpha^{1/2}-\alpha)$.

Figure 2. Plots obtained from fitting the simulated curves in Figure 1 to some of the most usual kinetic models by means of the integral model-fitting procedure employed by Brems'. (Brems et al. , 2011) The activation energy is obtained from the slope of the curves.

Figure 3. Plots obtained from fitting the simulated curves in Figure 1 to some of the most usual kinetic models by means of a differential model-fitting method (Eq.1). The activation energy is obtained from the slope of the curves.

Figure 4. Experimental curves corresponding to the thermal degradation of polystyrene.(Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012)

Figure 5. Plots obtained from fitting the simulated curves in Figure 4 to some of the most usual kinetic models by means of the integral model-fitting procedure employed by Brems'. (Brems et al. , 2011) The activation energy is obtained from the slope of the curves.

Figure 6. Plots obtained from fitting the thermal degradation curves in Figure 4 to some of the most usual kinetic models by means of a differential model-fitting method (Eq.1). The activation energy is deduced from the slope of the curves.

FIGURE 1




Figure 1. Kinetic curves simulated according the following kinetic parameters: $E_a=200\text{kJ/mol}$, $A=3 \cdot 10^{15} \text{ s}^{-1}$, and $f(\alpha)=2(\alpha^{1/2}-\alpha)$.

FIGURE 2




Figure 2. Plots obtained from fitting the simulated curves in Figure 1 to some of the most usual kinetic models by means of the integral model-fitting procedure employed by Brems'. (Brems et al. , 2011) The activation energy is obtained from the slope of the curves.

FIGURE 3




Figure 3. Plots obtained from fitting the simulated curves in Figure 1 to some of the most usual kinetic models by means of a differential model-fitting method (Eq.1). The activation energy is obtained from the slope of the curves.

FIGURE 4




Figure 4. Experimental curves corresponding to the thermal degradation of polystyrene (Sanchez-Jimenez et al. , 2012).

FIGURE 5




Figure 5. Plots obtained from fitting the simulated curves in Figure 4 to some of the most usual kinetic models by means of the integral model-fitting procedure employed by Brems'. (Brems et al., 2011) The activation energy is obtained from the slope of the curves.

FIGURE 6




Figure 6. Plots obtained from fitting the thermal degradation curves in Figure 4 to some of the most usual kinetic models by means of a differential model-fitting method (Eq.1). The activation energy is deduced from the slope of the curves.