AIDIC CONFERENCE SERIES

VOL. 11, 2013
Chief Editor: Sauro Pierucci
Copyright © 2013, AIDIC Servizi S.r.l.,
ISBN 978-88-95608-55-6; **ISSN** 2036-5969

A publication of AIDIC
The Italian Association of Chemical Engineering
www.aidic.it/acos

DOI: 10.3303/ACOS1311001

A Continuous Membrane Reactor for Benzene Hydroxylation to Phenol

Hamid A. Al-Megren[b], Teresa Poerio*[a], Adele Brunetti[a], Giuseppe Barbieri[a], Enrico Drioli[a], Bandar S. A AL-Hedaib[b], Abdulmohsen S. N. Al-Hamdan[b], Mohammed C. Al-Kinany[b]

[a]National Research Council - Institute for Membrane Technology (ITM–CNR) c/o The University of Calabria, Via Pietro Bucci, cubo 17C, I-87036 Rende (CS), Italy
[b]King Abdulaziz City for Science & Technology, P.O. Box 6086 , Riyadh 11442, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
t.poerio@itm.cnr.it

Phenol production from direct hydroxylation of benzene with H_2O_2 carried out in a membrane reactor operating in a continuous mode was studied for the first time. The performance was compared also with those of another membrane reactor operating in semi-batch configuration. In these systems the phenol produced was recovered by using water on the stripping side of the membrane reactor, where the membrane was always in contact with a "fresh" stripping stream, promoting a more efficient removal of the phenol present in the retentate side. The influence of the hydrophilic and hydrophobic character of the membrane material on the phenol recovery was investigated at different flow rates of the feed and the stripping phases. The results indicated that the better performance was achieved using a hydrophilic membrane, with a total feed flow rate of 2 mL min^{-1} and a stripping flow rate of 1 mL min^{-1}, in terms of phenol recovery (25%) and selectivity (94%). In addition the continuous removal of the phenol from the reaction side reduces the possible formation of by-products such as benzoquinone, avoiding completely biphenyl formation that was not detected in all the tests carried out in the continuous mode.

1. Introduction

Phenol is an important raw material for the synthesis of petrochemicals, agrochemicals, and plastics. The phenol consumption as an intermediate are in the production of bisphenol A, phenolic resins, caprolactam, alkyl phenols, aniline, and other useful chemicals. Today almost 95% of phenol is produced by the so called "cumene process" (Niwa et al., 2002). This process, although refined the cumene process has some disadvantages: poor ecology, an explosive intermediate (cumene hydroperoxide) and a multistep character and the production of a large amount of acetone as a by-product that makes difficult to achieve high phenol yields with respect to benzene. Indeed in this traditional process, the one-pass yield of phenol, based on the amount of benzene initially used, is less than 5%. The presence of acetone as by-product produced in a 1:1 stoichiometry is an inevitable disadvantage. This problem brings serious issues since the economics of this process significantly depends on the marketability of the acetone by-product (Bellussi and Perego, 2000). In order to solve this problem the Mitsui company started in to phenol production with a modified cumene process making acetone recycle. The acetone recycle includes two additional steps to convert acetone into propylene, via hydrogenation and dehydration, and then reused in the first step of cumene process.
The Mitsui 5-step technology increased the process complexity, therefore, the search for new routes for phenol production based on the direct benzene oxidation became more intensive in the last decade (Bianchi et al., 2000;

Please cite this article as: Al-Megren H.A., Poerio T., Brunetti A., Barbieri G., Drioli E., Al-Hedaib B. S. A., Al-Hamdan A. S. N. , Al-Kinany M.C., 2013, A continuous membrane reactor for benzene hydroxylation to phenol, AIDIC Conference Series, 11, 1-10 DOI: 10.3303/ACOS1311001

Molinari et al. 2006; Al-Megren et al., 2013). Indeed the one-step production of phenol by direct hydroxylation of benzene represents an attractive and challenging method not only for its economic advantage but also from a chemical transformation point of view, because the direct hydroxylation of the energetically stable benzene to produce phenol is one of the most difficult oxidation reactions. Indeed, its selectivity is usually rather poor since phenol is more reactive towards oxidation than benzene, and substantial formation of byproducts such as biphenyl and further oxidation compounds is found. Biphenyl is formed by coupling hydroxycyclohexadienyl radicals and subsequent dehydration, while catechols, hydroquinones and benzoquinones are formed by further oxidation of phenol Many studies report the innovative potentialities and the emerged role of the membrane reactors (MRs) (Armor, 1998) for improving existing industrial processes and for introducing new production methodologies. Higher energy efficiency, modularity and easy scale-up are some other advantages of MRs with respect to conventional fixed bed reactors (Coronas et al. 1999).

Niwa et al. [2] reported a single stage method of benzene oxidation to phenol using a palladium membrane reactor. In this reactor, hydrogen and oxygen were separately supplied on opposite sides of the membrane. The active hydrogen species, formed by the permeation from one side of the Pd membrane, produces active oxygen species on the opposite side by reacting with oxygen gas. Then, the active oxygen species reacted with the adsorbed benzene on Pd and the benzene directly was converted into phenol. This one-step process permitted to obtain a phenol selectivity of 80 to 97% and benzene conversions of 2 to 16% below 250°C(phenol productivity: 1.5 kg per kilogram of catalyst per hour at 150 °C).

Vulpescu (Vulpescu et al., 2004) confirmed the possibility of carrying out the direct hydroxylation of benzene to phenol claimed by Niwa and additionally observed the total oxidation of benzene. Under the process conditions used, side-reactions such as total oxidation of hydrogen and benzene to water and CO were favoured.

The authors also doubted the effective formation, but it appeared very clearly that the ‘‘in situ H_2O_2’’ route was more attractive compared with the ‘‘classical H_2O_2’’ route as far as variable costs and investment costs were concerned. This was in line with expectations since the ‘‘in situ’’ route avoids separation, purification and transport of H_2O_2 solution. With respect to the industrial Hock process, this new route presented the advantage of significantly lower investment costs but owing to the poor yield it was much more expensive in terms of variable costs (by about three times).

Otsuka. (Otsuka et al.,1989) was the firs to study another kind of membrane reactor, the fuel cells, to perform the one-step oxidation of benzene to phenol using H_2–O_2 fuel cells both in liquid phase and in gas phase. The fuel cells are electrochemical reactors that allow the direct conversion of the chemical energy of a fuel into electricity. In the H_2–O_2 fuel cell system reactor, the oxygen is activated by the permeated hydrogen from the electrolyte membrane.

Further studies were performed (Cai et al., 2005) by using a H_2–O_2 proton exchange membrane fuel cell (PEMFC) with Nafion membrane as the electrolyte. In this system it was found that phenol was the only product detected with a yield equal to 0.35% at 100 mA/cm^2 at 80 °C.

An approach to avoid/reduce the by-products formation, was based on the control of the contact time of phenol with the catalyst (Molinari et al., 2009). Indeed the secondary reactions have been reduced, by controlling the contact time of benzene and phenol with the catalyst using a catalytic polymeric membrane. Indeed, when a catalyst was entrapped in a polymer matrix, a well-chosen polymeric environment, it can regulate the selective sorption of reagents and products with a beneficial effect on the catalyst performance. Another attempt involved (Molinari et al., 2010) was the use of Fe-zeolite catalyst filled in a PVDF (polyvinylidenefluoride). The experiments were carried out in batch reactor and the highest phenol yield, 5.5%, was achieved in a single pass using the PVDF membrane filled with Na Fe Silicalite-1 at 35°C. The use of different catalyst forms (free or entrapped in the polymeric matrix) in an open batch reactor evidenced the best performance in terms of selectivity for the entrapped catalyst (97% vs. 69%).

A novel reactor design (Bortolotto et al., 2010) to perform the direct hydroxylation of benzene was achieved with separate membranes for distributed dosage of hydrogen (Pd60Cu40, 50μm) and oxygen (Ag 15μm), respectively, into micro-structured reaction channels. The idea was that the H_2/O_2 concentration ratio along the reactor can be kept within an optimum range to maximize the hydroxylation area while limiting the influence of undesired oxidation and hydrogenation reactions. According to the authors hydrogen and oxygen conversion was always incomplete, i.e., both gases were present in the reactor effluent in significant quantities of 4–5% or higher. Also in this case the data showed that there was a clear influence of the H_2/O_2 concentration ratio on the results in particular, an excess of oxygen greatly reduced the phenol selectivity: the phenol rate passed through a maximum at H_2/O_2 = 1.4 at which the selectivity reaches its highest value of 9.6%.

In this work a continuous membrane reactor is compared with a semi-batch configuration, to reduce the tar formation and to enhance the recovery of the phenol using the iron(II) as catalyst. The main advantage of operating in a continuous system is that the performance does not depend on time, as in the case of the semi-batch system. Therefore, for a defined set of operating conditions, the performance of the system was univocally defined. In both the configurations, semi-batch system and continuous membrane reactor, the membrane was always in contact with a “fresh” stripping stream; therefore, a more efficient removal of the phenol present in the retentate side could be obtained. Moreover, the use of water as a stripping stream is an attractive pathway for the direct synthesis of phenol via “green” process with the aim to develop more efficient and environmentally benign processes. The influence of hydrophilic and hydrophobic character of the membrane material on the MR performance was also investigated at different flow rates of the feed and the stripping phases.

2. Experimental

2.1 Apparatus, materials, methods and operating conditions of catalytic tests

The experimental measurements were mainly carried out with different membrane unit configurations: semi-batch membrane system (Figure 1 a) and continuous stirred membrane reactor (Figure 1 b).

For both configurations, the core of the system was the flat sheet membrane hosted in a module. The flat sheet membranes of polypropylene (PP) and polyethersulfone (PES), pore size 0.2 μm, manufactured by Membrana, were used. The module was a stainless steel cell with two chambers, the feed/reaction and the stripping sides. The feed/reaction chamber had three lines, one for the feed, another for the retentate and a third one for loading or empty out the module during its assembling, start-up or cleaning phase. The stripping side was provided with three lines too, two of them for feeding the stripping liquid and for the permeate removal, the other for loading or emptying out. The net membrane area available for contact is 19.6 cm^2. All the feed streams and the stripping stream are fed to the module by means of pumps, opportunely calibrated for the different phases. A back pressure gauge with a regulation valve was placed on the exit side of the aqueous phase in order to manage opportunely the trans-membrane pressure difference during the experiments. Moreover, each line was equipped with an on/off valve in order to switch the reactor configuration changing among batch, semi-bath and continuous scheme. Two regulation valves tune the flow rates on both membrane sides. The flow rates of the outlet streams were measured by means of flow meters. In the semi-batch configuration the system operated as follows: The benzene was contained in a tank together with catalyst in homogeneous phase (solubilized in water and acetic acid). The hydrogen peroxide was added periodically (every ten minutes) into this tank, so that the reaction occurred.

The scheme of the oxidation reaction is below reported.

$$Fe^{2+} + H_2O_2 + H^+ \longrightarrow Fe^{3+} + OH^{\cdot} + H_2O$$





Figure 1: Scheme of semi-batch membrane (a) and continuous membrane systems (b)

This solution, completely stirred, was pumped to the membrane module to favour the removal of phenol through the membrane itself. In this case, the membrane acted as a separation device, whereas the reaction mainly occurred in the tank. Once the phenol was produced and kept in contact with the membrane, it had to be passed selectively through the membrane by means of the stripping action of benzene. In the continuous membrane reactor (Figure 1 b), both reaction and stripping phases were fed continuously to the membrane module. The latter operated, in this case, not only as a separation device but as a reactor itself, since both the catalyst and the reactants were directly fed in it and the reaction occurred in the retentate side of the membrane module. The operating conditions of catalytic tests carried out in both configurations of membrane units schematized in Figures 1 are reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Operating conditions of catalytic tests used in semi-batch and continuous membrane reactors.

	Continuous membrane reactor	**Semi batch configuration**
Temperature	35°C	35°C
Feed flow rates	Stream 1: 1.8 mL min^{-1} Stream 2: 0.1 mL min^{-1} Stream 3: 0.1 mL min^{-1}	Feed phase: 2 and 5 mL min^{-1} Stripping phase: 2 and 5 mL min^{-1}
Phase composition	Stream 1: benzene Stream 2: aqueous solution of $FeSO_4 \times 7H_2O$ (0.075 M) and of CH_3COOH (0.3 M); Stream 3: aqueous solution of H_2O_2 (0.75 M) Stripping phase: distilled water	Feed phase composition: H_2O: 5.5 mol; Benzene: 2.9 mol; H_2O_2: 1.2 mmol every 10 minutes; CH_3COOH: 7.5 mmol; $FeSO_4 \times 7H_2O$: 1.8 mmol. Stripping phase: distilled water
Stripping phase flow rate	1 and 2 mL min^{-1}	

The composition of the feed phase in the semi-batch unit was the following: 5.5 mol of distilled water, 2.9 mol of benzene, 1.8 mmol of $FeSO_4 \times 7H_2O$, 7.5 mmol of CH_3COOH and 1.2 mmol of H_2O_2 every 10 minutes. Each run lasted 180 minutes. During the catalytic tests, samples of the organic phase were withdrawn every 30 minutes and analysed. After sampling, the analysis of organic phase composition was performed analysing the solutions by gas chromatograph mass spectrometer (GC–MS QP2010S) from Shimadzu. A high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC, Agilent 1100 Series instrument) was used for measuring the concentrations of phenol and oxidation by-products (benzoquinone, hydroquinone, resorcinol (dihydroxybenzene)) in the aqueous and organic phases. The HPLC was provided of a Kinetex C18 (150 mm × 4.60 mm) column by UV readings at 265 nm wavelength and the mobile phase was made up of an aqueous solution of formic acid (0.1 % v/v) and an acetonitrile solution of formic acid (0.1 % v/v) fed at a flow-rate of 0.5 mL min^{-1}. The column pressure was 155 bars and an injection volume of 20 µL was used. The results of experimental tests were elaborated using the following parameters:

Phenol concentration in the retentate and permeate, and amount of by-products (mg) detected in the both phases.

Phenol recovery, it compares the moles of phenol recovered in the permeate with the ones totally produced by the reaction and shared between the retentate and the permeate:

$$\text{Phenol recovery} = \frac{(\text{moles of Phenol})^{\text{Permeate}}}{(\text{moles of Phenol})^{\text{Permeate}} + (\text{moles of Phenol})^{\text{Retentate}}} \times 100$$

Phenol selectivity compares the moles of phenol with respect to the eventual presence of by-products recovered in the permeate and it gives an indication of the capability of the membrane system to separate the phenol selectively with respect to the other species present in the reaction phase.

$$\text{Phenol Selectivity} = \frac{(\text{moles of Phenol})^{\text{Permeate}}}{(\text{moles of all oxidized products})^{\text{Permeate}}} \times 100$$

Conversion of hydrogen peroxide to phenol:

$$\text{Conversion} = \frac{(\text{moles of phenol produced})}{(\text{moles of } H_2O_2 \text{ fed to the reactor})} \times 100$$

Phenol Overall Produced is the sum of the overall phenol amount presents both in retentate and permeate.

$$\text{Phenol Overall Produced} = (\text{mass of phenol})^{\text{Permeate}} + (\text{mass of phenol})^{\text{Retentate}}, \text{mg}$$

Phenol productivity

$$\text{Phenol productivity} = \frac{(\text{moles of Phenol})^{\text{Permeate + Retentate}}}{\text{Catalyst weight} \times \text{hours}}, \text{mol } g^{-1}_{\text{Catalyst}} \; h^{-1}$$

3. Results and discussion

3.1 . Catalytic tests in semi-batch and continuous membrane systems.

The catalytic tests were carried out following the scheme reported in Figure1. Both PES and PP membranes were used, in semi-batch mode as well as for the continuous systems, to evaluate which membrane type was most suitable for the application in the benzene oxidation to phenol. The results of catalytic tests are summarized in Tables 2 and 3 in terms of overall phenol produced and phenol recovered in the permeate at different stripping flow rate for both continuous membrane reactor and semi-batch system. With respect to the semi-batch system, the continuous system showed a much higher percentage of phenol recovered in the permeate. As can be seen, the PES membranes gave the best results in terms of phenol recovered for the continuous system at a flow rate of 2 mL min^{-1}. The PES membrane offered better performance than the PP membrane, mainly owing to its hydrophilic character, favoured a very good contact between the retentate and stripping side with an easier passage of the phenol produced through the membrane. As a consequence the amount of phenol removed from the reaction side and recovered was higher. The lower phenol recovery obtained in the semi-batch systems can be due to fouling formation on the membrane surface. Indeed the reaction takes places in the tank, where the consecutive catalytic reactions happen on the phenol produced with consequent by-products and tars formation and thus membrane fouling.

Table 2 Comparison of phenol produced and recovered at different flow rates of the stripping phase (permeate side) in a continuous and semi-batch systems using PES membranes

Membrane System/ Stripping flow rate (mL min^{-1})	Phenol produced (mg)	Phenol recovered (wt. %)
Semi-batch /2	554.1	0.17
Semi-batch/ 5	1670.9	0.51
Continuous/1	74.3	17.18
Continuous/2	106.3	27.29

Table 3 Comparison of phenol produced and recovered at different flow rates of the stripping phase (permeate side) in a continuous and semi-batch systems using PP membranes

Membrane System/ Stripping flow rate (mL min^{-1})	Phenol produced (mg)	Phenol recovered (wt. %)
Semi-batch /2	823.7	0.22
Semi-batch/ 5	1175.5	0.12
Continuous/1	58.32	13.01
Continuous/2	72.90	22.11

The selectivity at the beginning of the catalytic test carried out in the semi-batch system using PP membrane was very high (ca. 97%) and gradually lowered down to ca. 80% (Figure 3) while the reaction was running. Instead in a continuous membrane reactor the selectivity value was kept constant for all duration of the catalytic tests (Figure 4). The use of a continuous system avoided the formation of the biphenyl; a by-product always detected using the semi-batch system. In this last operational mode, in fact, the feed/retentate side operated as a "traditional batch" reactor where the conversion of the reactants evolved with time until reaching a plateau. Once the phenol was produced by reaction, part of it was continuously removed by the stripping phase; however, the phenol that was not removed remained in the reaction side and, in contact with the oxidant, leading to the formation of over-oxidation products whose concentration in the retentate side increased, thus, during time. Since the permeation through the membrane was based on a concentration gradient process, this higher concentration of by-products in the retentate side also favoured their passage in the permeate. As a consequence, the selectivity decreased. The hydrophilic membrane wetted by the aqueous solution of reaction phase allows the recovery of the phenol, increasing also the phenol productivity (Figure 5).



Figure 3: Selectivity permeate side using PP membranes at different flow rates in the semi-batch system.



Figure 4: Selectivity permeate side using PES and PP membranes at different flow rates in the continuous membrane reactor.



Figure 5. Phenol productivity (%) using the PES and PP membrane at different flow rates in the semi-batch systems

With respect to the semi batch system, the continuous system showed a lower productivity (Figures 6). However, the results evidenced, that, for both the membranes used, a lower flow rate (1 mL min^{-1}) implied a higher contact time, therefore an improved phenol recovery respect to a flow rate of 2 mL min^{-1}. However, as it happened in the semi batch system the hydrophilic PES membrane system offered better performances than the PP membrane, owing mainly to the better contact between the reaction and the stripping phases.



Figure 6. Phenol productivity (%) using PES and PP membranes at different flow rates in the continuous membrane reactor.

In Tables 4 and 5 the comparison of amount of the by-products detected in the retentate for PES and PP membranes at different flow rates of the stripping phase (permeate side) in a continuous and semi-batch membrane systems was reported. These results confirmed the formation of larger amount of by-products in the semi-batch system with respect to the continuous membrane reactor.

Table 4. Comparison of amount of by-products detected in the retentate for PES membranes at different flow rates of the stripping phase (permeate side) in a continuous and semi-batch membrane systems

Membrane System/ Stripping flow rate (mL min^{-1})	Benzoquinone (mg)	Hydroquinone (mg)	Biphenyl (mg)
Semi-batch /2	23.3	n.d.	13.7
Semi-batch/ 5	37.3	n.d.	17.0
Continuous/1	3.07	n.d.	n.d.
Continuous/2	6.86	n.d.	n.d.

Table 5. Comparison of amount of by-products detected in the retentate for PP membranes at different flow rates of the stripping phase (permeate side) in a continuous and semi-batch membrane systems.

Membrane System/ Stripping flow rate (mL min^{-1})	Benzoquinone (mg)	Hydroquinone (mg)	Biphenyl (mg)
Semi-batch/2	21.4	n.d.	14.8
Semi-batch/5	30.0	n.d	12.8
Continuous/1	4.45	n.d.	n.d.
Continuous/2	3.42	n.d.	n.d.

4. Conclusions

In this work the phenol production from direct hydroxylation of benzene was for the first time carried out in a membrane reactor operating in a continuous mode. The performance was compared also with that of another membrane system operating in semi-batch configuration. The experimental results indicated that these systems allowed phenol production to be obtained by direct oxidation. The selectivity was significantly high, exceeding 90%, in some cases and ca. 0.557 mmol h^{-1} g^{-1}catalyst was the productivity.
The use of the hydrophilic membrane, in the continuous membrane reactor, assured a better contact between the reactants and stripping phases allowing the attainment of higher phenol recovery and higher selectivity when referred to the hydrophobic membrane.
The continuous removal of the phenol from the reaction side reduces the formation of by-products such benzoquinone, avoiding completely biphenyl formation that was not detected in all tests carried out in the continuous mode. In the continuous membrane reactor, tars formation was avoided.
Comparing the two configurations, the continuous system resulted more promising than the semi-batch system, mainly regarding the total amount of phenol recovered in the permeate. The continuous system showed a better capability of stripping as well as a significantly higher selectivity. In particular, with the continuous membrane reactor more than 25% of the phenol produced was recovered in the stripping phase with respect to less than 1% achieved in the semi-batch membrane system.

References

Al-Megren H.A., Poerio T., Brunetti A., Barbieri G., Drioli E., AL-Hedaib B.S.A., Al-Hamdan A.S.N., Al-Kinany M.C., 2013, Liquid phase benzene hydroxylation to phenol using semi-batch and continuous membrane reactors, Sep. Pur. Technol, 107 195–203.

Armor J.N., 1998, Applications of catalytic inorganic membrane reactors to refinery products, J. Mem. Sci., 147, 217-233.

Bellussi G. and Perego C., 2000, Industrial catalytic aspects of the synthesis of monomers for nylon production 4 4-16.

Bianchi D., Bortolo R., Tassinari R., Ricci M., Vignola R., 2000, A novel Iron-based catalyst for the biphasic oxidation of benzene to phenol with hydrogen peroxide, Angew Chem Int Edit, 39, 4321- 4323.

Bortolotto L., Dittmeyer R., 2010, Direct hydroxylation of benzene to phenol in a novel microstructured membrane reactor with distributed dosing of hydrogen and oxygen Sep Pur Technol, 73 51–58.

Cai R., Song S., Ji B., Yang W., Sun G., Xin Q., 2005, Phenol cogeneration with electricity by using in situ generated H_2O_2 in a H_2–O_2 PEMFC reactor Catal. Today, 104: 200-204

Coronas J., Santamaria J., 1999, Catalytic reactors based on porous ceramic membranes, Catal. Today, 51, 377-389.

Molinari R., Poerio T., Argurio P., 2006, One-step production of phenol by selective oxidation of benzene in a biphasic system, Catal Today, 118, 52- 56.

Molinari R., Poerio T., 2009, Preparation, characterisation and testing of catalytic polymeric membranes in the oxidation of benzene to phenol Appl Catal A: General 358 119–128.

Molinari R., Poerio T., Granato T., Katovic A., 2010, Fe-zeolites filled in PVDF membranes in the selective oxidation of benzene to phenol Micropor Mesopor Mat 129 136–143.

Niwa S., Eswaramoorthy M., Jalajakumari N., Anuj R., Naotsugu I., Hiroshi S., Takemi N., Fuji M., 2002, A One-Step Conversion of Benzene to Phenol with a Palladium Membrane, Sci, 295 105-106.

Otsuka K., Hosokawa K., Yamanaka I., Wada Y., Morikawa A., 1989, One-step oxidation of benzene to phenol applying a fuel cell system, Electrochim. Acta, 34 1485-1488.

Yamanaka I., Akimoto T., Otsuka K., 1994, Gas phase oxidation of benzene to phenol and hydroquinone by using an H2/O2 fuel cell system Electrochim. Acta, 1, 39 2545-2549.

Vulpescu G. D., Ruitenbeek M., van Lieshout, L. L.. Correia L. A, Meyer D., Pex P. P.A.C. 2004 One-step selective oxidation over a Pd-based catalytic membrane; evaluation of the oxidation of benzene to phenol as a model reaction, Catal Commun, 5 347–351.