



First Study of Poly(3-Methylene-2-Pyrrolidone) as a Kinetic Hydrate Inhibitor

Abrahamsen, Eirin; Heyns, Ingrid Marié ; von Solms, Nicolas; Pfukwa, Rueben; Klumperman, Bert; Kelland, Malcolm A.

Published in:
Energy & Fuels

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b03006](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b03006)

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Abrahamsen, E., Heyns, I. M., von Solms, N., Pfukwa, R., Klumperman, B., & Kelland, M. A. (2017). First Study of Poly(3-Methylene-2-Pyrrolidone) as a Kinetic Hydrate Inhibitor. *Energy & Fuels*, 31(12), 13572–13577. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b03006>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

FIRST STUDY OF POLY(3-METHYLENE-2-PYRROLIDONE) AS A KINETIC HYDRATE INHIBITOR

Eirin Abrahamsen, Ingrid Marie Heyns, Nicolas von Solms,
Rueben Pfukwa, Bert Klumperman, and Malcolm A. Kelland

Energy Fuels, **Just Accepted Manuscript** • DOI: 10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b03006 • Publication Date (Web): 15 Nov 2017

Downloaded from <http://pubs.acs.org> on November 20, 2017

Just Accepted

“Just Accepted” manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides “Just Accepted” as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. “Just Accepted” manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. “Just Accepted” manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). “Just Accepted” is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the “Just Accepted” Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the “Just Accepted” Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these “Just Accepted” manuscripts.



1
2
3 **FIRST STUDY OF POLY(3-METHYLENE-2-PYRROLIDONE) AS**
4
5
6 **A KINETIC HYDRATE INHIBITOR**
7
8
9

10
11 Eirin Abrahamsen^{**}, Ingrid Marié Heyns[†], Nicolas von Solms[§], Rueben Pfukwa[†], Bert
12 Klumperman[†] and Malcolm A. Kelland[‡]
13
14
15

16
17
18
19 [‡] Department of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Faculty of Science and Technology,
20 University of Stavanger, N-4036 Stavanger, Norway
21

22
23
24 [§] Center for Energy Resources Engineering, Department of Chemical and Biochemical
25 Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, Søtoft Plads, Building 229, DK-2800 Kgs.,
26 Lyngby, Denmark
27
28

29
30
31 [†] Department of Chemistry and Polymer Science, Stellenbosch University, Private Bag X1,
32 Matieland 7602, South Africa
33
34
35

36
37
38
39
40 * Corresponding author: eirin.abrahamsen@uis.no
41
42
43
44

45 **ABSTRACT**
46

47
48 Formation of gas hydrates is a problem in the petroleum industry where the gas hydrates can
49 cause blockage of the flowlines. Kinetic hydrate inhibitors (KHIs) are water-soluble
50 polymers, sometimes used in combination synergistically or with non-polymeric synergists,
51 that are used to prevent gas hydrate blockages. They have been used in the field successfully
52 since 1995. In this paper, we present the first KHI results for the polymer, poly(3-methylene-
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2-pyrrolidone) (P(3M2P)), which is structurally similar to poly(*N*-vinylpyrrolidone) (PVP),
4
5 one of the first KHIs to be discovered. 3M2P polymers with different molecular weights
6
7 (5500 and 2500 g/mole) and at different concentrations (2500, 5000 and 7500 ppm) were
8
9 investigated for their KHI performance on SII hydrates in high-pressure rocking cells. We
10
11 also investigated the synergistic effect of P(3M2P) with *n*-butyl glycol ether (BGE), a known
12
13 synergist for some KHI polymers.
14
15

16
17 At the lower concentrations, P(3M2P) gives a similar performance to PVP ($M_w = 8000-9000$
18
19 g/mole). However, PVP outperforms both samples of P(3M2P) at 7500 ppm, with and without
20
21 BGE. We suggest that the reasons for the performance level of P(3M2P) are related to greater
22
23 resonance stabilization of the amide group in P(3M2P) compared to PVP. Also, the
24
25 pyrrolidone ring of the PVP repeat unit has a larger hydrophobic sequence of three methylene
26
27 units compared to the two methylene units in the pyrrolidone ring of P(3M2P). This relates
28
29 well to previous studies where larger hydrophobic groups are preferable in KHI polymers as
30
31 long as they are water-soluble at hydrate-forming temperatures.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 INTRODUCTION

39
40 Gas hydrates formed from produced water and natural gas can potentially block production
41
42 flowlines in the upstream petroleum industry.¹⁻³ Increased pressure and low temperatures are
43
44 stable conditions for gas hydrate formation as long as there is free water and smaller
45
46 hydrocarbons present. Typical hydrocarbons present in natural gas include methane, propane,
47
48 *iso*-butane as well as carbon dioxide and hydrogen sulfide.⁴⁻⁶
49
50
51

52
53 Kinetic hydrate inhibitors (KHIs) are a class of low dosage hydrate inhibitor (LDHI) which
54
55 have been used to mitigate against hydrate plug formation for over 2 decades.^{1,7,8}
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 KHIs delay gas hydrate nucleation and/or crystal growth within the thermodynamically stable
4 hydrate region. The mechanisms for inhibition are not fully understood, but include both
5 nucleation and crystal growth inhibition.⁹⁻¹¹ All gas hydrate KHIs are oligomers or polymers
6 with multiple active functional groups. Non-polymeric molecules can be added to the
7 polymers to boost the performance synergistically, but alone these molecules are poor KHIs
8 for gas hydrate inhibition.^{12, 13}

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 One of the very first KHI polymers discovered was poly(*N*-vinylpyrrolidone) (PVP) (Figure
18 1).^{14, 15} Not only was it found that this polymer delayed hydrate formation, but when the first
19 crystals formed they did not immediately agglomerate.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ However, as water conversion to
20 hydrate progressed a plug was formed as with all KHIs when applied outside their
21 performance window. The subcooling to which you can prevent hydrate formation for a
22 certain time interval is generally used as a measure of the KHI performance. The subcooling
23 to which PVP delays gas hydrate formation is fairly low compared to the best KHI polymers
24 on the market today such as those based on *N*-vinylcaprolactam (VCap), *N*-*iso*-
25 propylmethacrylamide or poly(ester amide)s. However, PVP has a high cloud and deposition
26 point, compared to some KHI polymers, even in high salinity waters and is therefore used in
27 some KHI formulations.¹⁹ The cloud point temperature (T_{CI}) is important for the production
28 and transport of oil and gas as the production fluids are often very hot. However, will cool
29 down if there is a shut-in of the flow lines, or as the transport lines stretch over longer
30 distances, for example across the seabed offshore.^{1, 20}

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Poly(*N*-vinyl pyrrolidone) (left) and poly(3-methylene-2-pyrrolidone) (right).

Sometimes the solvent used in KHI formulations is a synergist in its own right. *n*-butyl glycol ether (or 2-butoxyethanol, BGE) is a known synergist used with commercial KHIs such as poly(*N*-vinylcaprolactam) (PVCap), PVP and copolymers of VCap and *N*-vinyl pyrrolidone (VP).^{12, 21, 22} BGE has negligible KHI effect by itself at typical KHI doses (< 1 wt.%), like other small alcohols and glycols.²³

Recently, a related class of polymer has been developed based on the 3-methylene-2-pyrrolidone (3M2P) monomer (Figure 1).²⁴ As with PVP, the 3M2P homopolymer, poly(3-methylene-2-pyrrolidone) P(3M2P), also contains a pendant pyrrolidone ring, however the polyvinyl backbone originates from the conjugated methylene group in the alpha position of the pyrrolidone. In addition, the first reports of this polymer suggest a high cloud point, which as previously discussed is a useful property for injection into hot fluids at the wellhead.

This report describes the first KHI study with P(3M2P) and compares the results to PVP. The synergism of these polymers with added BGE was also investigated.

EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

Chemicals and Polymer Synthesis

PVCap was obtained from BASF as Luvicap EG HM, a 41 wt.% solution of polymer in monoethylene glycol (MEG) with a molecular weight of 7000-12000 g/mole. PVP was obtained from Ashland Chemical as PVP K-15, with a molecular weight of approximately 8000-9000 g/mole and as a pure powder. All chemicals for synthesis and BGE for the KHI studies were purchased from VWR and Sigma-Aldrich. All solvents were used without further purification. ^1H and ^{13}C NMR spectra were obtained with a Varian VXR-Unity (300 MHz) spectrometer. Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS) was obtained with a Waters Synapt G2 with Electron Spray Ionization (ESI) in the positive mode. Synthesis of 3M2P was performed by^{24,25} the crossed Claisen condensation of *N*-*boc*-2-pyrrolidone and diethyl oxalate in a basic medium, followed by β -elimination with paraformaldehyde, yielding a methylene moiety at the alpha position of the ring. Subsequently the *N*-*boc*-protecting group was removed with trifluoroacetic acid. *3M2P monomer*: ^1H NMR (300 MHz, $\text{CDCl}_3\text{-d}_1$) δ : 7.39 (bs, 1H, $-\text{NH}$), 6.06 (t, $J = 2.8$ Hz, 1H, $=\text{CH}_b$), 5.47 (td, $J = 2.4, 0.7$ Hz, 1H, $=\text{CH}_a$), 3.54 – 3.48 (m, 2H, $-\text{CH}_2\text{-NH}$), 2.93 – 2.85 (m, 2H, $-\text{CH}_2\text{-C=}$). ^{13}C NMR (300 MHz, DMSO-d_6) δ : 175.45, 141.62, 114.47, 38.90, 26.32. MS (ESI): $m/z = 98.1$ (calculated: 98.06 for $[\text{M} + \text{H}]^+$). Polymerization of 3M2P was successfully carried out as described earlier²⁴ by the use of a reversible deactivation radical polymerization technique (RDRP), namely reversible addition fragmentation (chain) transfer (RAFT) polymerization (Figure 2). The M_n of the polymers were determined via NMR spectroscopy (Table 1). *P(3M2P)*: ^1H NMR (300 MHz, $\text{D}_2\text{O-d}_2$) δ : 3.4 – 3.3 (broad), 2.4 – 1.3 (broad).




Figure 2. RAFT polymerization of 3M2P.

Table 1. Polymer samples synthesized.

Polymer	M_n [g/mole] ($^1\text{H NMR}$)
P(3M2P)-1	5500
P(3M2P)-2	2500

Cloud Point Temperature (T_{Cl}) Measurement

An increase in temperature of the polymer solution causes a phase separation, which can be observed as a cloud or fog appearing in the solution. If the temperature increases, the polymer can eventually precipitate out of solution. The temperature at the first sign of cloudiness gives the cloud point temperature (T_{Cl}). The T_{Cl} was measured by heating the sample approximately 2 °C/min and closely observing phase changes throughout the measurement. The sample was cooled well below the T_{Cl} and the test was repeated for reproducibility.^{26, 27}

High Pressure Rocker Rig Tests with Synthetic Natural Gas

The procedure used for the KHI tests is the same as done in previous work by our group, using two steel cell rocker rigs, both supplied by PSL Systemtechnik, Germany.^{28, 29} One of the rigs is located in the laboratories at the University of Stavanger (UiS) and one at the Technical University of Denmark (DTU). All the steel cells on both rigs are new and made of

Swagelok high pressure fittings. They are very similar to the original cells used by our group in past work, but are easier to tighten and therefore less prone to leakages. The volume for each cell is approximately 40 mL, where 20 mL of an aqueous sample is added per cell for a test. In addition to the rocking, a steel ball is placed in each cell to agitate the test liquid. The loaded cells are then pressurized with a synthetic natural gas (SNG) mixture that will theoretically form the structure II (SII) hydrate as the most stable hydrate. The components of the SNG mixtures used for these tests are listed in Table 2. For the pressure used in these tests (76 bar), the equilibrium temperature (T_{eq}) has previously been reported to be $20.2\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 0.05\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$.³⁰⁻³² This value is similar to $20.5\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, which is the calculated value at 76 bar using PVTsim from Calsep. The two gases are very similar and give very similar equilibrium curves. Most of the KHI tests were carried out in the one rig (DTU) during an external research stay by the first author. The P(3M2P)-2 with and without BGE was tested with the SNG 2 mixture (UiS).

Table 2. Synthetic natural gas (SNG) mixtures used in the KHI performance tests.

Component	mole %	
	SNG 1	SNG 2
Methane	79.03	80.67
Ethane	10.20	10.20
Propane	5.53	4.90
<i>iso</i> -butane	1.20	1.53
<i>n</i> -butane	2.49	0.76
N ₂	0.30	0.10
CO ₂	1.24	1.84

1
2
3
4
5
6 The constant cooling KHI test procedure was as follows:
7

- 8
9 1. The additives were dissolved in distilled water and diluted to desired concentration at
10
11 least one day before testing.
- 12
13 2. 20 mL sample was added to each cell at 20.5 °C.
- 14
15 3. 3 – 5 bars SNG mixture was used to purge the cells after applying vacuum. This was
16
17 done to remove the air from the system. After depressurizing the system, vacuum was
18
19 applied once more before pressurizing to approximately 76 bars.
- 20
21 4. The constant cooling parameters were set to a rocking rate of 20 rocks per minute,
22
23 rocking angle of 40° and an approximate cooling rate of 1 °C/hour from 20.5 °C to 2
24
25 °C.
26
27
- 28
29 5. Data logging for each cell on a local computer is possible for both pressure and
30
31 temperature, as there are sensors connected to each test cell. In addition, there is also
32
33 a temperature sensor in the cooling bath.
34
35

36 From the pressure and temperature data, we can generate a pressure and temperature graph for
37
38 each cell as shown in Figures 3 and 4. These are typical plots generated after a constant
39
40 cooling program. Figure 3 shows a summary chart of all the cells. Here only four cells are
41
42 used. Figure 4 shows the result of a single cell. As seen from these figures, the pressure in the
43
44 beginning of the test will decrease by as much as two bars as the gas dissolves in the aqueous
45
46 phase during initial rocking. Since it is a closed system, the pressure will decrease with a
47
48 constant rate as the temperature also decreases from 20.5 °C to 2.0 °C. The experiment
49
50 finishes after about 1230 minutes at which point the cells are warmed to 25 °C (*i.e.* well
51
52 outside the hydrate stability region), depressurized, cleaned and made ready for a new
53
54 experiment.
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3. Summary of the results from a constant cooling test with 4 cells.

Figure 4 shows an example of a plot generated for one of the cells, here the data for cell 1 from Figure 3 is shown. P1 shows the pressure and T1 shows the temperature at any given time for cell 1 during the experiment. The hydrate onset temperature (T_o) is the most relevant result, as it indicates the temperature where macroscopic hydrate formation is first detected (increased pressure drop). T_o , as shown in Figure 4, is found after approximately 422 minutes at a temperature of 14.0 °C and T_a , which is the rapid growth temperature, is found after approximately 466 minutes at a temperature of 13.4 °C. The nucleation process is not visible in these graphs and may have started some time before the first pressure drop due to hydrate formation. T_a is the temperature for rapid hydrate formation. The difference in T_o and T_a can give an indication of the KHIs ability to delay the rapid hydrate formation.




Figure 4. Determination of T_o and T_a from cell 1 after a constant cooling test.

When using the standard constant cooling test method for screening of KHIs, usually 8-10 experiments are carried out for each polymer to obtain better statistical information. In general, for the results in this paper, we observe a maximum scattering of 15-25% in the T_o data points. This observed maximum percentage may be higher than reported before in our group, possibly due to the use of new rocking cells. The cells were run for a few weeks prior to carrying out this study. However we still observed somewhat larger scattering. The scattering reflects the stochastic nature of hydrate nucleation. However, as the new cells are used even more, the scattering will also be reduced.²⁹ Another reason for the higher scattering in T_o values is the mediocre performance of the P(3M2P), an effect which has often been observed previously for KHIs with mediocre performance in our research. No systematic error was observed in any of the cells, *i.e.* none of the cells showed consistently better or worse

1
2
3 results for each experiment. All of the samples used are either fresh or heated well above the
4
5 equilibrium temperature so there are no residual hydrates in the system at test start.
6
7

8 9 10 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

11 12 13 **KHI performance comparison of different concentrations with and without a synergist.**

14
15
16 Table 3 lists the results from the KHI tests in addition to the cloud point values. Figure 5
17
18 shows the average T_o and T_a values of the different concentrations of all the polymers tested.
19
20 Results with two known KHI polymers, PVP, $M_w = 8000-9000$ g/mole and PVCap, $M_w =$
21
22 $7000-12000$ g/mole, are also added for comparison. In addition, PVP was also tested at 2500
23
24 ppm on both rocker rigs as a reference. For the lower molecular weight sample, P(3M2P)-2,
25
26 only 4 tests with a concentration of 2500 ppm and 3 tests with 2500 ppm doped with 1 wt%
27
28 BGE were carried out. This is because of the limited amount of polymer available.
29
30

31
32 Both the 3M2P polymers were initially difficult to dissolve and the solutions were slightly
33
34 hazy even when refrigerated at 4 °C. Previously, P(3M2P) has been reported to exhibit no
35
36 cloud point in water up to 100 °C.²⁵ We think the haziness of our solutions could be due to the
37
38 RAFT agent used in the RAFT-mediated polymerization of 3M2P. Since our P(3M2P) is a
39
40 low molar mass polymer, the RAFT's ω Z-endgroup, which is a *n*-butyl moiety, could
41
42 possibly be influencing aqueous solubility.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3. Constant cooling KHI tests, average of 10 tests unless otherwise stated.

Chemical	Synergist [ppm]	2500 ppm		5000 ppm		7500 ppm		
	BGE	$T_o / ^\circ\text{C}$	$T_a / ^\circ\text{C}$	$T_o / ^\circ\text{C}$	$T_a / ^\circ\text{C}$	$T_o / ^\circ\text{C}$	$T_a / ^\circ\text{C}$	$T_{Cl} / ^\circ\text{C}$
No additive		17.2	16.4					
PVCap		9.9	8.2	7.3	6.4	5.6	5.1	31
PVP		13.8 ^c	10.3 ^c					
PVP		13.6	10.5	13.7	10.3	10.5	8.9	>95
PVP	10000	13.3	12.6	12.4	11.8	11	10.4	>95
P(3M2P)-1		15.5	15.3	15.2	15	14.8	14.6	*
P(3M2P)-1	10000	14.1	13.4	14.3	13.5	14.4	13.5	*
P(3M2P)-2		15.5 ^{a, c}	15.3 ^{a, c}					*
P(3M2P)-2	10000	15.4 ^{b, c}	14.3 ^{b, c}					*

^a4 tests, ^b3 tests, ^cresult from UiS rocker rig

*Solutions cloudy down to at 4 °C, except P(3M2P)-2 with added BGE.

PVCap is a well-known KHI that delays hydrate nucleation and crystal growth. As seen from the results, PVCap is the best performing KHI of the polymers tested here. Increasing concentration gives increasing performance.

At the lower concentrations, P(3M2P)-1 and P(3M2P)-2 ($M_n = 2500-5500$ g/mole) perform quite similar to PVP ($M_w = 8000-9000$ g/mole). However, PVP outperforms P(3M2P) at 7500 ppm, with and without BGE. The addition of BGE to the PVP solutions increases the performance at 5000 ppm. However this glycol does not really change the performance for the sample containing 2500 ppm or 7500 ppm PVP. Carstensen *et al.* also reported no significant synergy with PVP and BGE. However this was in a THF hydrate system.³³




Figure 5. Summary of results found in Table 3.

We carried out t-tests to check for significant difference between two sets of T_o or T_a values.³⁴

The different P(3M2P)-1 concentrations showed quite similar results over all, where 5000 ppm is not significantly different from either 7500 ppm or 2500 ppm. 2500 ppm is significantly different from 7500 ppm with a P-value of less than 0.05.

There is no statistically significant difference between the T_o values of the P(3M2P)-1 samples without BGE in comparison to the samples with added BGE. Interestingly there is a small but significant difference in these sets of results for the T_a values. This suggests that BGE has some synergistic effect, or that BGE in itself has some inhibiting effect on hydrate crystal growth.

We assumed that the structural similarities of P(3M2P) to PVP would give a similar T_{Cl} and KHI performance. Both polymers contain a nitrogen atom and a carbonyl group (C=O) that

1
2
3 are believed to be a very suitable hydrophilic moiety for the interaction to either free water or
4
5 the hydrate surface.³⁵⁻³⁷ One possibility for the mediocre performance of P(3M2P) can be that
6
7 the structure of the P(3M2P) allows for a possible resonance stabilization of the double bond
8
9 from the C=O group to C=N, as shown in Figure 6. This is not possible for PVP as the
10
11 nitrogen atom is tertiary. The resonance stabilization in P(3M2P) will energetically lower the
12
13 bonding preference of the carbonyl group to water molecules compared to PVP.
14
15
16
17
18
19




Figure 6. Resonance stabilization of the amide group in P(3M2P).

33
34 Another explanation is related to the size of the hydrophobic area of the pendant groups in
35
36 PVP and P(3M2P), as shown in Figure 7. The larger pendant hydrophobic groups generally
37
38 give increasing KHI performance, as long as the polymer is kept water-soluble.^{31, 38, 39} This
39
40 can also explain the slightly better performance of PVP, where the lactam group is not a part
41
42 of the polymer backbone, but bound via the nitrogen.
43
44

45
46 A third explanation can be that since the lactam group is directly bound to the polymer
47
48 backbone, this may cause more sterical hindrance for the pendant group.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 7. PVP (left), P(3M2P) (right). Blue area indicates hydrophobic part of the pendant groups.

CONCLUSION

The polymer poly(3-methylene-2-pyrrolidone) (P(3M2P)), closely related to PVP, has been tested for the first time as a KHI. P(3M2P) was reported to have a high cloud point (>90 °C in aqueous solution) which is useful for high temperature injection of KHIs.

High-pressure rocker rigs with an SNG mixture and the constant cooling program was used for the experiments. Two samples of P(3M2P) with different molecular weights were tested with and without BGE (1.0 wt%). In addition, one of the samples was also tested at three different concentrations (2500, 5000 and 7500 ppm) where all concentrations were also doped with BGE (1 wt%).

BGE was reported as a synergist by Hu *et al.* for PVP.²² In our hands, we find that there is little or no synergy. For both P(3M2P)-1 and P(3M2P)-2, BGE as dopant shows some weak synergy, however no significant difference. This is in agreement with a report from Carstensen *et al.* who also found no significant synergy with PVP and BGE.³³

The KHI performance for P(3M2P) reported in this paper can be explained by a possible resonance stabilization of the double bond from the oxygen to the nitrogen, which is not

1
2
3 possible for PVP. In addition to this phenomenon, the hydrophobic moiety of P(3M2P) is
4
5 smaller than that of the hydrophobic pendant moiety of PVP. This can also affect the KHI
6
7 performance and has been observed before for other KHIs, *i.e.* with increasing
8
9 hydrophobicity, KHI performance increases, provided that aqueous solubility is maintained.

10
11
12 We hope to investigate variations on P(3M2P) with larger, more hydrophobic rings, as well as
13
14 copolymers with more hydrophobic monomers and possibly also other synergists in order to
15
16 improve the performance of this new class of polymer.
17
18
19
20

21 22 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

23
24
25 BK, IH and RP acknowledge support by the South African Research Chairs Initiative of the
26
27 Department of Science and Technology (DST) and National Research Foundation (NRF) of
28
29 South Africa (Grant No 46855).
30
31
32
33
34

35 36 **REFERENCES**

- 37
38
39 1. Kelland, M. A., *Production chemicals for the oil and gas industry*. 2nd ed. ed.; CRC
40
41 Press: Boca Raton, Fla, 2014.
42
43 2. Sloan, E. D.; Koh, C. A., *Clathrate hydrates of natural gases*. 3rd ed. ed.; CRC Press:
44
45 Boca Raton, Fla, 2008; Vol. 119.
46
47 3. Sloan, E. D., *Natural gas hydrates in flow assurance*. Elsevier Gulf Professional Publ.:
48
49 Amsterdam, 2011.
50
51 4. Schicks, J. M.; Naumann, R.; Erzinger, J.; Hester, K. C.; Koh, C. A.; Sloan, E. D.,
52
53 Phase Transitions in Mixed Gas Hydrates: Experimental Observations versus Calculated
54
55 Data. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **2006**, 110, (23), 11468-11474.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 5. Ohno, H.; Moudrakovski, I.; Gordienko, R.; Ripmeester, J.; Walker, V. K., Structures
4 of Hydrocarbon Hydrates during Formation with and without Inhibitors. *The Journal of*
5 *Physical Chemistry A* **2012**, 116, (5), 1337-1343.
6
7
- 8
9 6. Walsh, M. R.; Koh, C. A.; Sloan, E. D.; Sum, A. K.; Wu, D. T., Microsecond
10 Simulations of Spontaneous Methane Hydrate Nucleation and Growth. *Science* **2009**, 326,
11 (5956), 1095-1098.
12
13
- 14 7. Frostman, L. M.; Thieu, V.; Crosby, D. L.; Downs, H. H., Low-Dosage Hydrate
15 Inhibitors (LDHIs): Reducing Costs in Existing Systems and Designing for the Future. In
16 Society of Petroleum Engineers.
17
18
- 19 8. Clark, L. W.; Anderson, J.; Crosby, D.; Frostman, L.; Poynton, N.; Thieu, V., LDHI
20 Opportunities For Offshore Mediterranean Production. In Offshore Mediterranean
21 Conference.
22
23
- 24 9. Perrin, A.; Goodwin, M. J.; Musa, O. M.; Berry, D. J.; Corner, P.; Edkins, K.; Yufit,
25 D. S.; Steed, J. W., Hydration Behavior of Polylactam Clathrate Hydrate Inhibitors and Their
26 Small-Molecule Model Compounds. *Crystal Growth & Design* **2017**, 17, (6), 3236-3249.
27
28
- 29 10. Storr, M. T.; Taylor, P. C.; Monfort, J.-P.; Rodger, P. M., Kinetic Inhibitor of Hydrate
30 Crystallization. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **2004**, 126, (5), 1569-1576.
31
32
- 33 11. Yang, J.; Tohidi, B., Characterization of inhibition mechanisms of kinetic hydrate
34 inhibitors using ultrasonic test technique. *Chemical Engineering Science* **2011**, 66, (3), 278-
35 283.
36
37
- 38 12. Cohen, J. M.; Wolf, P. F.; Young, W. D., Enhanced Hydrate Inhibitors: Powerful
39 Synergism with Glycol Ethers. *Energy & Fuels* **1998**, 12, (2), 216-218.
40
41
- 42 13. Kelland, M. A.; Moi, N.; Howarth, M., Breakthrough in Synergists for Kinetic
43 Hydrate Inhibitor Polymers, Hexaalkylguanidinium Salts: Tetrahydrofuran Hydrate Crystal
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Growth Inhibition and Synergism with Polyvinylcaprolactam. *Energy & Fuels* **2013**, *27*, (2),
4
5 711-716.
6
7
8 14. Sloan, E. D., Method for controlling clathrate hydrates in fluid systems. In Google
9 Patents: 1995.
10
11
12 15. Anselme, M. J.; Reijnhout, M. J.; Muijs, H. M.; Klomp, U. C., A method for inhibiting
13 gas hydrate formation. In Google Patents: 1993.
14
15
16 16. Kelland, M. A.; Svartaas, T. M.; Dybvik, L., A New Generation of Gas Hydrate
17 Inhibitors. In Society of Petroleum Engineers.
18
19
20 17. Kelland, M. A.; Grinrød, A.; Milanovic, J., Benchtop Euler wheel for kinetic hydrate
21 inhibitor screening: Comparison to Rocking cells. *Energy & Fuels* **submitted aug. 2017**.
22
23
24 18. Cohen, J. M.; Wolf, P. F.; Young, W. D., Method for preventing or retarding the
25 formation of gas hydrates. In Google Patents: 1998.
26
27
28 19. Sohn, Y. H.; Seo, Y., Effect of monoethylene glycol and kinetic hydrate inhibitor on
29 hydrate blockage formation during cold restart operation. *Chemical Engineering Science*
30 **2017**, *168*, 444-455.
31
32
33 20. Klomp, U.; Mehta, A. In *Validation of Kinetic Inhibitors for Sour Gas Fields*, IPTC
34 2007: International Petroleum Technology Conference, 2007; 2007.
35
36
37 21. Fu, B., The development of advanced kinetic hydrate inhibitors. In *Chemistry in the*
38 *Oil Industry VII: Performance in a Challenging Environment*, Balson, T.; Craddock, H. A.;
39 Dunlop, J.; Frampton, H.; Payne, G.; Reid, P., Eds. The Royal Society of Chemistry: 2002; pp
40 264-276.
41
42
43 22. Hu, J.; Wang, Y.; Lang, X.; Du, J.; Li, Q.; Fan, S., Synthesis and application of a
44 novel combined kinetic hydrate inhibitor. *Science China Technological Sciences* **2011**, *54*,
45 (12), 3289-3295.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 23. Sefidroodi, H.; Cheng Chua, P.; Kelland, M. A., THF hydrate crystal growth inhibition
4 with small anionic organic compounds and their synergistic properties with the kinetic
5 hydrate inhibitor poly(N-vinylcaprolactam). *Chemical Engineering Science* **2011**, 66, (10),
6 2050-2056.
7
8
9
10
11 24. Heyns, I. M.; Pfukwa, R.; Klumperman, B., Synthesis, Characterization, and
12 Evaluation of Cytotoxicity of Poly(3-methylene-2-pyrrolidone). *Biomacromolecules* **2016**, 17,
13 (5), 1795-1800.
14
15
16
17
18 25. Ueda, M.; Takahashi, M.; Suzuki, T.; Imai, Y.; Pittman, C. U., Polymerization of α -
19 methylene-N-methylpyrrolidone. *Journal of Polymer Science: Polymer Chemistry Edition*
20 **1983**, 21, (4), 1139-1149.
21
22
23
24
25 26. Sekikawa, H.; Hori, R.; Arita, T.; Ito, K.; Nakano, M., Application of the Cloud Point
26 Method to the Study of the Interaction of Polyvinylpyrrolidone with Some Organic
27 Compounds in Aqueous Solution. *Chemical & Pharmaceutical Bulletin* **1978**, 26, (8), 2489-
28 2496.
29
30
31
32
33
34 27. Kelland, M. A.; Abrahamsen, E.; Ajiro, H.; Akashi, M., Kinetic Hydrate Inhibition
35 with N-Alkyl-N-vinylformamide Polymers: Comparison of Polymers to n-Propyl and
36 Isopropyl Groups. *Energy & Fuels* **2015**, 29, (8), 4941-4946.
37
38
39
40
41 28. Chua, P. C.; Kelland, M. A., Tetra(iso-hexyl)ammonium Bromide—The Most
42 Powerful Quaternary Ammonium-Based Tetrahydrofuran Crystal Growth Inhibitor and
43 Synergist with Polyvinylcaprolactam Kinetic Gas Hydrate Inhibitor. *Energy & Fuels* **2012**,
44 26, (2), 1160-1168.
45
46
47
48
49 29. Lone, A.; Kelland, M. A., Exploring Kinetic Hydrate Inhibitor Test Methods and
50 Conditions Using a Multicell Steel Rocker Rig. *Energy & Fuels* **2013**, 27, (5), 2536-2547.
51
52
53
54 30. Mady, M. F.; Kelland, M. A., Tris(tert-heptyl)-N-alkyl-1-ammonium bromides—
55 Powerful THF hydrate crystal growth inhibitors and their synergism with poly-
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 vinylcaprolactam kinetic gas hydrate inhibitor. *Chemical Engineering Science* **2016**, 144,
4
5 275-282.
6
7 31. Chua, P. C.; Kelland, M. A., Poly(N-vinyl azacyclooctanone): A More Powerful
8
9 Structure II Kinetic Hydrate Inhibitor than Poly(N-vinyl caprolactam). *Energy & Fuels* **2012**,
10
11 26, (7), 4481-4485.
12
13 32. Kelland, M. A.; Reyes, F. T.; Trovik, K. W., Tris(dialkylamino)cyclopropenium
14
15 chlorides: Tetrahydrofuran hydrate crystal growth inhibition and synergism with
16
17 polyvinylcaprolactam as gas hydrate kinetic inhibitor. *Chemical Engineering Science* **2013**,
18
19 93, 423-428.
20
21 33. Carstensen, A.; Creek Jefferson, L.; Koh Carolyn, A., Investigating the performance of
22
23 clathrate hydrate inhibitors using in situ Raman spectroscopy and differential scanning
24
25 calorimetry. In *American Mineralogist*, 2004; Vol. 89, p 1215.
26
27 34. Walpole, R. E., *Probability & statistics for engineers & scientists*. 9th ed. ed.;
28
29 Pearson: Boston, Mass, 2012.
30
31 35. Kelland, M.; Wytherst, M., A review of kinetic hydrate inhibitors: Tailor-made water-
32
33 soluble polymers for oil and gas industry applications. In Nova Science Publishers, Inc.: New
34
35 York: 2011; Vol. 8.
36
37 36. Lederhos, J. P.; Long, J. P.; Sum, A.; Christiansen, R. L.; Sloan Jr, E. D., Effective
38
39 kinetic inhibitors for natural gas hydrates. *Chemical Engineering Science* **1996**, 51, (8), 1221-
40
41 1229.
42
43 37. Moon, C.; Hawtin, R. W.; Rodger, P. M., Nucleation and control of clathrate hydrates:
44
45 insights from simulation. *Faraday Discussions* **2007**, 136, (0), 367-382.
46
47 38. Abrahamsen, E.; Kelland, M. A., Carbamate Polymers as Kinetic Hydrate Inhibitors.
48
49 *Energy & Fuels* **2016**, 30, (10), 8134-8140.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 39. O'Reilly, R.; Jeong, N. S.; Chua, P. C.; Kelland, M. A., Missing Poly(N-vinyl lactam)
4
5 Kinetic Hydrate Inhibitor: High-Pressure Kinetic Hydrate Inhibition of Structure II Gas
6
7 Hydrates with Poly(N-vinyl piperidone) and Other Poly(N-vinyl lactam) Homopolymers.
8
9 *Energy & Fuels* **2011**, 25, (10), 4595-4599.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60