Empirical Modeling and Optimization of Base Activated Ngbo Catalysts in Esterification Reaction Using Response Surface Methodology
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ABSTRACT

In this work, Box-Behnken's Response Surface Methodology (RSM) was applied to study the esterification reaction effectiveness of base-activated Ngbo clay catalyst. The esterification was monitored based on temperature, time duration, amount of reactant, catalyst weight, and particle size. The Box-Behnken's Response Surface Methodology indicates that the base clay-catalyzed esterification reactions proceed through dual Acid-complex and Alcohol-complex mechanisms, with the alcohol mechanism dominating. The acetic acid and ethanol esterification efficiencies by base-activated Ngbo clay catalyst optimized using RSM models indicated the esterification percentage was >99%. The predicted and experimental values under the same conditions showed less than 5% difference, thereby making the Box-Behnken design approach an efficient, effective, and reliable method for the esterification of acetic acid with ethanol. The produced catalyst was optimized using A-One way ANOVA modelled, which indicated that the correlation coefficient of the regression was 0.9940. The result implied that 99.40% of the total variation in the esterification reaction was due to the experimental
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variables. The obtained data in this study indicated that this process could be applied in the esterification of acetic acid to avoid the drawbacks of corrosion, loss of catalyst, and environmental problems.
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1. INTRODUCTION

There is increased research on the development of solid acid catalysts for esterifications, adsorption of contaminants in wastewater, and other various organic transformations. Even though there are sets of regulations established to aid in the substitution of unfriendly and corrosive liquids used in chemical and petrochemical industries, the use of solid acid catalysts for esterifications and adsorption of water contaminants is essential [1,2].

Esterification reactions have long been carried out in a homogeneous phase in acid catalysts such as sulphuric acid, hydrochloric acid, and p-toluene sulfonic acid (p–TSOH), which have drawbacks of corrosion, loss of catalyst, and environmental problems [3,4]. Therefore, research has been focused on developing eco-friendly heterogeneous catalysts to synthesize fatty acid esters. The most popular solid acids catalyst used to produce esters were ion-exchange organic resins, such as Amberlyst – 15 [5,6], Zeolites [7,8,9], and Silica-supported heteropoly acid [10] and [11]. Nevertheless, they have shown limitations in the applicability for modelled esterification reaction due to low thermal stability (Amberlyst-15 < 140°C), mass transfer resistance (Zeolites) [12,13], or loss of active acid sites in the presence of a polar medium (HPA/silica) [11].

Clay is one of the raw materials in abundance in Nigeria. It is readily available in Nigeria in large deposits, yet its potential has not been fully explored. However, there is recent interest in exploring the possibility of clays, such as the bleaching of palm oil [14,15], in adsorption of dyes [16–18], among others. In a quest to develop green processes, clay is mainly used to synthesize catalysts. However, Nigerian clays from Ningbo, Ohaukwu-Ebonyi State, for producing clay catalysts are limited in the literature. The kinetics of clay-catalyzed esterification reactions is abundant in literature but with little or no data on the mechanistic and empirical 2models2 of the use of Ngbo clay.

Response Surface Methodology (RSM) collects statistical and mathematical techniques that use quantitative data. Central composite design (CCD), Box-Behnken, and Doehlert designs (BBD) are the principal response surface methodologies used in experimental design. This method is suitable for fitting a quadratic surface. It helps optimize the effective parameters with a minimum number of experiments and analyzes the interaction between the parameters [6]. The objective is to optimize a response (output variable) influenced by several independent variables (input variables). The application of RSM to design optimization aims to reduce the cost of numerous expensive experiments, save time, reduce stress, etc. [19–22].

This work investigated the use of local clay from Ngbo in Ohaukwu Local Government Area of Ebonyi State, Nigeria, to produce a base-activated catalyst and optimize the clay catalyst's effectiveness for the esterification acetic acid with ethanol using Response Surface Methodology.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Source of Raw Materials

The clay sample was obtained from Ngbo in Ohaukwu L.G.A. of Ebonyi State (N 06°30’32.8’’), (E 007°58’13.7’’). The dye was purchased from a chemical shop at Ogbete main market, Enugu, Enugu State. Other chemicals such as conc. Sodium hydroxide, distilled water, etc., were all of the standard grades.

2.2 Physico-Chemical Characterization of Ngbo Clay

The Ngbo clay sample was subjected to physical analysis to obtain their physical properties. The analysis carried out includes: Bulk density, Moisture content, pH, and Loss of Ignition (LOI).
2.3 Characterization of the Raw Clay and Base Activated Sample

The Ngbo clay sample was characterized using XRF and XRD.

2.4 Base Activation

The base activation method used in this work is reported by [23]. A 100g of pulverized and screened clay was mixed into a slurry with 50ml of diluted water, and 30ml of 1M NaOH was added and stirred vigorously and placed in an oven where it was maintained at a temperature of 100°C. The sample was washed after that and left to sediment. Complete removal of all residual bases was achieved by repeating washing and decanting until a pH of six was obtained. The final slurry was filtered and dried at 100°C. The dried, activated, and washed clay was then pulverized, screened and stored in desiccators prior to use.

2.5 Optimization of Process Conditions on the Catalyst Quality Produced Using Esterification Process

2.5.1 Sample preparation/procedure

The raw clay sample was crushed and sieved at 100 microns, 200 microns, and 300 microns. After that, the clay sample was activated using the base (NaOH) method. The base-activated clay sample was used in the esterification reaction to assess the effectiveness. The predetermined weight of the clay sample was weighed; one mole of ethanol and acetic acid was each modeled into the clay sample to ensure that the ethanol did not block the active sites of the catalyst. The container was tightly closed; the contents were shaken vigorously and immersed in a water bath shaker maintained at the experimental design conditions in Table 1. The summary of the reaction equation is:

\[ \text{CH}_3\text{COOH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{OH} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{COOC}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \]  

On titration, the equation becomes:

\[ \text{CH}_3\text{COOH} + \text{NaOH} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{COONa} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \]

Table 1. The natural and coded values of the independent variables used

| Variables                  | Natural values | Coded values |
|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Temperature (°C), A        | 50  70  90     | -1  0  +1    |
| Process duration (minutes), B | 30  195  360 | -1  0  +1    |
| Excess reactant (ml), C     | 2.5  3.75  5  | -1  0  +1    |
| Catalyst weight (grammes), D | 0.25 0.38 0.5 | -1  0  +1    |
| Particle size (microns), E  | 100 200 300   | -1  0  +1    |

The clay-catalyzed esterification was modeled using Box-Behnken Response Surface Methodology.

For five factors inputs of \(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\), and \(x_5\), the equation of the quadratic response is given as:

\[ Y = b_0 + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + b_4 x_4 + b_5 x_5 + b_{12} x_1 x_2 + b_{13} x_1 x_3 + b_{14} x_1 x_4 + b_{15} x_1 x_5 + b_{23} x_2 x_3 + b_{24} x_2 x_4 + b_{25} x_2 x_5 + b_{34} x_3 x_4 + b_{35} x_3 x_5 + b_{45} x_4 x_5 + b_1 x_1^2 + b_2 x_2^2 + b_3 x_3^2 + b_4 x_4^2 + b_5 x_5^2. \]  

2.6 Response Surface Methodology

The response surface technique applying the Box-Behnken design matrix was used to study the interaction and effects among the factors and their level of contribution and significance in the clay-
catalyzed esterification. This method determines the needed best working conditions in a shorter time and provides detailed processes conditions. This was achieved through a designed experimental design applying the Box-Behnken Response Surface Methodology design of 46 steps of an experiment consisting of five factors and three levels (Table 2). The numerical optimization method of RSM was used in the optimization.

| Std | Run | Factor A (°C) | Factor B (min) | Factor C (ml) | Factor D(g) | Factor E (mic) |
|-----|-----|--------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| 37  | 1   | 70           | 30             | 3.75          | 0.25        | 200           |
| 22  | 2   | 70           | 360            | 2.5           | 0.38        | 200           |
| 23  | 3   | 70           | 30             | 5             | 0.38        | 200           |
| 29  | 4   | 70           | 195            | 2.5           | 0.38        | 100           |
| 26  | 5   | 90           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.25        | 200           |
| 1   | 6   | 50           | 30             | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 32  | 7   | 70           | 195            | 5             | 0.38        | 200           |
| 46  | 8   | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 10  | 9   | 70           | 360            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 34  | 10  | 90           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 21  | 11  | 70           | 30             | 2.5           | 0.38        | 200           |
| 35  | 12  | 50           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 8   | 13  | 70           | 195            | 5             | 0.5         | 200           |
| 4   | 14  | 90           | 360            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 2   | 15  | 90           | 30             | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 11  | 16  | 70           | 30             | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 31  | 17  | 70           | 195            | 2.5           | 0.38        | 200           |
| 3   | 18  | 50           | 360            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 24  | 19  | 70           | 360            | 5             | 0.38        | 200           |
| 16  | 20  | 90           | 195            | 5             | 0.38        | 200           |
| 44  | 21  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 12  | 22  | 70           | 360            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 36  | 23  | 90           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 17  | 24  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.25        | 100           |
| 18  | 25  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.5         | 100           |
| 45  | 26  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 33  | 27  | 50           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 25  | 28  | 50           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.25        | 200           |
| 20  | 29  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.5         | 200           |
| 27  | 30  | 50           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.5         | 200           |
| 30  | 31  | 70           | 195            | 5             | 0.38        | 100           |
| 42  | 32  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 41  | 33  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 39  | 34  | 70           | 30             | 3.75          | 0.5         | 200           |
| 6   | 35  | 70           | 195            | 5             | 0.25        | 200           |
| 43  | 36  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.38        | 200           |
| 38  | 37  | 70           | 360            | 3.75          | 0.25        | 200           |
| 19  | 38  | 70           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.25        | 200           |
| 40  | 39  | 70           | 360            | 3.75          | 0.5         | 200           |
| 7   | 40  | 70           | 195            | 2.5           | 0.5         | 200           |
| 28  | 41  | 90           | 195            | 3.75          | 0.5         | 200           |
| 14  | 42  | 90           | 195            | 2.5           | 0.38        | 200           |
| 5   | 43  | 70           | 195            | 2.5           | 0.25        | 200           |
| 13  | 44  | 50           | 195            | 2.5           | 0.38        | 200           |
| 9   | 45  | 70           | 30             | 3.75          | 0.38        | 100           |
| 15  | 46  | 50           | 195            | 5             | 0.38        | 200           |
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Physical Properties of the Raw Clay

The result of the physical properties of raw Ngbo clay is presented in Table 3. The result showed that the clay has a moisture content of 3.3 % and bulk density of 1.25 g/ml, which is in agreement with the previous research [24–26] that reported the moisture content of kaolinite clay is between 3.0 – 4.0%, and the bulk density is 1.2 – 1.4 g/ml.

3.2 Characterization of Raw Clay and Base Activated Clay

The chemical properties of the raw Ngbo clay were analyzed using XRF and XRD. The XRF composition analysis of raw Ngbo clay and base activated Ngbo clays (BAC) results are presented in Table 4. The result showed that raw and activated clays have oxides and other impurities contaminations. Still, the clay minerals compositions are not meaningfully affected by base treatments even under strong conditions and below 500°C, as reported by [27,28] and [29]. This shows that improvement on the properties of the clay by chemical methods below 500°C is difficult due to its low reactivity. This result of the XRF on the Ngbo raw clay and base-activated Ngbo clays, as shown in Table 4, also indicates a high content of silicon and aluminum oxides compared to other oxides.

The results of the XRD pattern analysis of raw Ngbo clay are presented in Fig. 1. The XRD pattern results showed several characteristic peaks due to mineral compositions present. The peak obtained at a position corresponding to 2θ = 22.64° indicated the presence of large quantities of quartz. Minor impurities, such as illite, muscovite, halloysite, quartz hydrated mica, non-crystalline hydroxide iron, and halloysite, are present. The presence of these minor impurities and quartz content of Ngbo clay needs to be reduced to a minimum before its usage for industrial purposes, especially in catalysts development in line with [30 and 31] research. The XRD analysis corroborates the results obtained with the XRF analysis.

| Clay type | Bulk density (g/ml) | % moisture content | pH | LOI (%) |
|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|----|---------|
| Ngbo clay | 1.25                | 3.33               | 7.5 | 10.52   |

Table 4. Results of XRF analysis of raw Ngbo clay and acid-activated Ngbo clay

| Chemical constituent | Raw clay (Wt. %) | Base activated (BAC), (Wt. %) |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| SiO₂                 | 62.70            | 73.100                      |
| TiO₂                 | 1.52             | 1.468                       |
| Al₂O₃                | 19.70            | 18.155                      |
| Fe₂O₃                | 2.06             | 4.521                       |
| P₂O₅                 |                 | 0.167                       |
| CaO                  | 0.789            | 0.479                       |
| MgO                  | 0.026            | 0.490                       |
| Na₂O                 | 0.20             | 0.101                       |
| K₂O                  | 0.85             | 0.943                       |
| MnO₃                 |                 | 0.208                       |
| V₂O₅                 | 0.071            |                             |
| Cr₂O₃                | 0.035            | 0.006                       |
| CuO                  | 0.044            |                             |
| BaO                  | 0.19             |                             |
| L.O.I                | 11.82            |                             |
| SO₃                  |                 | 0.329                       |
| Cl                   |                 | 0.017                       |
| ZnO                  |                 | 0.011                       |
| SrO                  |                 | 0.007                       |
The results of XRD pattern analysis of Ngbo base activated clay; BAC is presented in Fig. 1. The XRD pattern results showed several characteristic peaks due to mineral compositions present. The analysis of the peaks showed sharp peaks with low intensity at $2\theta = 11.30^\circ$. This is the main peak used in identifying kaolinite clay, as reported in the literature by [32].

3.3 Esterification Process Results

The esterification technique was used to obtain the responses and yield of Base Activated Catalyst (BAC), as shown in Table 5.

3.4 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for BAC

The ANOVA result of BAC is shown in Table 6. The ANOVA results show that the regression model is highly significant, as evident from the calculated F-value (207.52) and a very low probability value ($P = 0.0001$). The lack of fit F-value of 2.50 implies that it was not significant relative to the pure error, and there is a 15.67% chance that a “Lack of Fit” F-value this large could occur due to noise. All the terms in the regression models are not equally important.

The significant terms of the model were determined by F- value and P- values. The F – value is the mean square of regression (MRR) ratio to the error (MRe). The larger the magnitude of the F – value, the smaller the p-value and the more significant is the corresponding parameter in the regression model [33].

Values of “Prob > F” less than 0.0500 indicate that the model terms are significant, while values greater than 0.100 indicate insignificant model terms. ANOVA involves subdividing the total variation of a data set into parts. If the P-value of lack of fit is less than 0.05, there is a statistically significant lack of fit at a 95% confidence level [34]. Table 6 indicates that the significant model terms are A, B, C, E, AB, AC, BC, CE, $B^2$, and $E^2$. This implies that linear effects of temperature, process duration, amount of reactant, particle size, interactive effects of temperature and process duration, temperature and amount of reactant, process duration and amount of reactant, amount of reactant and particle size, and quadratic effects of process duration and particle size were significant. Other effects included in the model were used to support the hierarchy.
The quality of the model developed was evaluated based on the correlation coefficient, $R^2$ value. A developed model should be best at low standard deviation and high $R^2$ statistics, closer to unity. It will give a predicted value closer to the actual value for the response (Ahmad et al., 2009). The model accuracy was confirmed by the regression model's correlation coefficient, which is 0.9940. The correlation coefficient showed that 99.40% of the total variation in the final concentration was attributed to the experimental variables considered in this research work. The

| Std | Run | Factor 1A (°C) | Factor 2B (min) | Factor 3C (ml) | Factor 4D(g) | Factor 5E (mic) | Response (ml) | Yield (%) |
|-----|-----|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|
| 37  | 1   | 70             | 30              | 3.75           | 0.25         | 200             | 32.7          | 26.68     |
| 22  | 2   | 70             | 360             | 2.5            | 0.38         | 200             | 19.0          | 57.40     |
| 23  | 3   | 70             | 30              | 5              | 0.38         | 200             | 41.7          | 6.50      |
| 29  | 4   | 70             | 195             | 2.5            | 0.38         | 100             | 18.5          | 56.37     |
| 26  | 5   | 90             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.25         | 200             | 28.0          | 37.22     |
| 1   | 6   | 50             | 30              | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 31.0          | 30.49     |
| 32  | 7   | 70             | 195             | 5              | 0.38         | 300             | 37.5          | 12.79     |
| 46  | 8   | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 29.0          | 34.98     |
| 10  | 9   | 70             | 360             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 27.1          | 36.08     |
| 34  | 10  | 90             | 360             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 100             | 28.0          | 33.96     |
| 21  | 11  | 70             | 30              | 2.5            | 0.38         | 200             | 22.0          | 50.67     |
| 35  | 12  | 50             | 195             | 2.5            | 0.38         | 300             | 30.0          | 30.23     |
| 8   | 13  | 70             | 195             | 5              | 0.5          | 200             | 38.0          | 14.80     |
| 4   | 14  | 90             | 360             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 24.60         | 44.84     |
| 2   | 15  | 90             | 30              | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 32.40         | 27.35     |
| 11  | 16  | 70             | 30              | 3.75           | 0.38         | 300             | 32.10         | 25.35     |
| 31  | 17  | 70             | 195             | 2.5            | 0.38         | 300             | 20.0          | 53.49     |
| 3   | 18  | 50             | 360             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 29.70         | 33.41     |
| 24  | 19  | 70             | 360             | 5              | 0.38         | 200             | 36.00         | 19.28     |
| 16  | 20  | 90             | 195             | 5              | 0.38         | 200             | 36.30         | 18.61     |
| 44  | 21  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 28.80         | 35.43     |
| 12  | 22  | 70             | 360             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 300             | 27.60         | 35.81     |
| 36  | 23  | 90             | 195             | 2.5            | 0.38         | 300             | 28.00         | 34.88     |
| 17  | 24  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.25         | 100             | 29.90         | 29.48     |
| 18  | 25  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.5          | 100             | 29.30         | 30.90     |
| 45  | 26  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 29.10         | 34.75     |
| 33  | 27  | 50             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 100             | 32.00         | 24.53     |
| 25  | 28  | 50             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.25         | 200             | 31.20         | 30.04     |
| 20  | 29  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.5          | 300             | 29.00         | 32.56     |
| 27  | 30  | 50             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.5          | 200             | 31.70         | 28.92     |
| 30  | 31  | 70             | 195             | 5              | 0.38         | 100             | 38.50         | 9.20      |
| 42  | 32  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 29.50         | 33.86     |
| 41  | 33  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 28.40         | 36.32     |
| 39  | 34  | 70             | 30              | 3.75           | 0.5          | 200             | 32.00         | 28.25     |
| 6   | 35  | 70             | 195             | 5              | 0.25         | 200             | 38.40         | 13.90     |
| 43  | 36  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.38         | 200             | 29.50         | 33.86     |
| 38  | 37  | 70             | 360             | 3.75           | 0.25         | 200             | 28.00         | 37.22     |
| 19  | 38  | 70             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.25         | 300             | 29.50         | 31.40     |
| 40  | 39  | 70             | 360             | 3.75           | 0.5          | 200             | 28.10         | 37.00     |
| 7   | 40  | 70             | 195             | 2.5            | 0.5          | 200             | 19.50         | 56.28     |
| 28  | 41  | 90             | 195             | 3.75           | 0.5          | 200             | 28.80         | 35.43     |
| 14  | 42  | 90             | 195             | 2.5            | 0.38         | 200             | 18.00         | 59.64     |
| 5   | 43  | 70             | 195             | 2.5            | 0.25         | 200             | 19.40         | 56.50     |
| 13  | 44  | 50             | 195             | 2.5            | 0.38         | 200             | 20.50         | 54.04     |
| 9   | 45  | 70             | 30              | 3.75           | 0.38         | 100             | 32.40         | 23.58     |
| 15  | 46  | 50             | 195             | 5              | 0.38         | 200             | 42.00         | 5.83      |
high value of the $R^2$ showed that the predicted value would be more accurate and closer to its actual value [33,35]. The standard deviation for the model was 1.41, which indicated that the predicted values for this model are still considered suitable to correlate with the experimental data. The adequate precision which measured the signal-to-noise ratio was 56.041, which indicated a sufficient signal. Also, the “Pred R-squared” of 0.9774 was in reasonable agreement with the “Adj R-squared” of 0.9892 as reported in the literature by [33,35].

Final equation in terms of coded factors gives:

$$Yield = + 34.87 + 3.40A + 5.14B - 21.47C + 0.11D + 0.78E + 3.64AB + 1.79AC - 0.17 AD - 1.19AE + 1.51BC - 0.45BD - 0.51BE + 0.28CD + 1.62CE - 0.065DE - 0.63A^2 - 1.42B^2 + 0.70C^2 - 0.86D^2 - 3.03E^2. \tag{4}$$

The coefficient with one factor represents the effect of the particular factor. In contrast, the coefficients with two factors and those with second-order terms represent the interaction between two factors and quadratic effect, respectively [33].

Final model equation after eliminating the insignificant terms in terms of coded variables:

$$Yield = + 34.87 + 3.40A + 5.14B - 21.47C + 0.78E + 3.64AB + 1.79AC + 1.51BC + 1.62CE - 1.42B^2 - 3.03E^2. \tag{5}$$

### Table 6. ANOVA Table for BAC

| Source                  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F-Value | P-Value Prob > F |
|-------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-----------------|
| Model                   | 8194.88        | 20 | 409.74      | 207.52  | < 0.0001        |
| A - Temperature         | 185.23         | 1  | 185.23      | 93.81   | < 0.0001        |
| B - Process duration    | 421.99         | 1  | 421.99      | 213.73  | < 0.0001        |
| C - Excess reactant     | 7373.66        | 1  | 7373.66     | 3734.54 | < 0.0001        |
| D - Effect of Catalyst  | 0.18           | 1  | 0.18        | 0.091   | 0.7648          |
| E - Particle size       | 9.63           | 1  | 9.63        | 4.88    | 0.0366          |
| AB                      | 53.07          | 1  | 53.07       | 26.88   | < 0.0001        |
| AC                      | 12.89          | 1  | 12.89       | 6.53    | 0.0171          |
| AD                      | 0.11           | 1  | 0.11        | 0.057   | 0.8135          |
| AE                      | 5.71           | 1  | 5.71        | 2.89    | 0.1014          |
| BC                      | 9.15           | 1  | 9.15        | 4.63    | 0.0412          |
| BD                      | 0.80           | 1  | 0.80        | 0.41    | 0.5300          |
| BE                      | 1.04           | 1  | 1.04        | 0.53    | 0.4746          |
| CD                      | 0.31           | 1  | 0.31        | 0.16    | 0.6936          |
| CE                      | 10.47          | 1  | 10.47       | 5.30    | 0.0299          |
| DE                      | 0.017          | 1  | 0.017       | 8.559E-003 | 0.9270 |
| A^2                     | 3.42           | 1  | 3.42        | 1.73    | 0.2003          |
| B^2                     | 17.55          | 1  | 17.55       | 8.89    | 0.0063          |
| C^2                     | 4.25           | 1  | 4.25        | 2.15    | 0.1549          |
| D^2                     | 6.49           | 1  | 6.49        | 3.29    | 0.0819          |
| E^2                     | 79.94          | 1  | 79.94       | 40.49   | < 0.0001        |
| Residual                | 49.36          | 25 | 1.97        |         |                 |
| Lack of fit             | 44.88          | 20 | 2.24        | 2.50    | 0.1567 not significant |
| Pure Error              | 4.48           | 5  | 0.90        |         |                 |
| Cor Total               | 8244.24        | 45 |             |         |                 |
The regression model developed was further assessed using residual plots. Residual is the difference between the experimental value and the value predicted by the model. Some of the residual plots used were: a plot of residuals vs. predicted values which tests the assumption of constant variance of the experimental data, a plot of residuals vs. run, which checks for lurking variables that may have influenced the response during the experiment, the normal plot of residuals which indicates whether the residuals follow a normal distribution, and plot of predicted vs. Actual response values which helps to detect a value, group of values that the model does not easily predict.

3.4.1 Residual plots for BAC

Figs. 3–5 showed the plots of predicted vs. Actual response values. The plots indicate values that the model does not easily predict. The plot of residuals against run checks for lurking variables that may have influenced the response during the experiment. The normal plot of residuals indicates whether the residuals follow a normal distribution, and the plot of predicted against actual response values helps to detect a value, group of values that the model does not easily predict from the Fig. 2 below, the trends of the residual plots showed that the model could be easily obtained.

3.4.2 Contour plots for BAC

The contour plots were depicted in Figs. 3 to 24. The circular nature of the contour plots signifies that the interactive effects between the variables are not significant, and the optimum values of the test process variables cannot be easily obtained [36]. The non-circular nature of the contour plots reveals an interaction between the process variables studied, and the optimum value of the process variables can be easily obtained.

Fig. 2. Normal plot of residual for BAC, the plot of Residual verse predicted for BAC and Plot of predicted verse actual for BAC
Fig. 3. The contour plots for process duration against temperature and yield of BAC and The contour plots for excess reactants against temperature and yield of BAC

Fig. 4. The contour plots for the effect of catalyst against temperature and yield of BAC and The contour plots for particle size against temperature and yield of BAC

Fig. 5. The contour plots for excess reactants against process duration and yield of BAC and contour plots for the effect of catalyst against process duration and yield of BAC
Fig. 6. The contour plots for particle size against process duration and yield of BAC and the contour plots for the effect of catalyst against excess reactant and yield of BAC

Fig. 7. The contour plots for particle size against excess reactant and yield of BAC and the contour plots for the effect of catalyst against excess reactant and yield of BAC

Fig. 8. The contour plots for particle size against the effect of catalyst and yield of BAC and the contour plots for process duration against temperature and yield of BAC
Fig. 9. The contour plots for excess reactants against temperature and yield of BAC and the contour plots for the effect of catalyst against temperature and yield of BAC.

Fig. 10. The contour plots for particle size against temperature and yield of BAC and the contour plots for excess reactant against process duration and yield of BAC.

Fig. 11. The contour plots for the effect of catalysts against process duration and yield of BAC and The contour plots for particle size against process duration and yield of BAC.
Fig. 12. The contour plots for the effect of catalysts against excess reactants and yield of BAC and the contour plots for the effect of catalysts against excess reactants and yield of BAC.

Fig. 13. The contour plots for particle size against excess reactants and yield of BAC and the contour plots for particle size against the effect of catalyst and yield of BAC.

Fig. 14. The contour plots for process duration against temperature and yield of BAC and the contour plots for excess reactants against temperature and yield of BAC.
Fig. 15. The contour plots for the effect of catalyst against temperature and yield of BAC and the contour plots for particle size against temperature and yield of BAC

Fig. 16. The contour plots for excess reactants against process duration and yield of BAC and the contour plots for effect catalyst against process duration and yield of BAC

Fig. 17. The contour plots for particle size against process duration and yield of BAC and the contour plots for the effect of catalyst against excess reactants and yield of BAC
Fig. 18. The contour plots for particle size against excess reactants and yield of BAC and the contour plots for particle size against the effect of catalyst and yield of BAC

3.4.3 3-D plot for BAC

The 3 – Dimensional plots of the response surface model are shown in Figs. 19 and 20. The results showed that the optimum value of the conversion was 42 for the process variables studied, which are similar to results obtained by [25,35] and [37]. The excess reactants increase with process duration as the yield also increases. The response surface plots showed clear peaks, implying that the maximum values of the response were attributed to the factors in the design space. The three-dimensional surfaces provide useful information about the behaviour of the system within the experiment design, facilitate an examination of the effects of the experimental factors on the responses and contour plots between the factors [36,38,39,40] and [41].

Fig. 19. The 3 - D Plot for particle size against yield and effect of catalyst of BAC
Fig. 20. The 3-D Plot for process duration against yield and temperature of BAC and 3-D Plot for process duration against yield and temperature of BAC

Fig. 21. The 3-D Plot for effect of catalyst against yield and temperature of BAC and 3-D Plot for particle size against yield and temperature of BAC

Fig. 22. The 3-D Plot for excess reactants against process duration and temperature of BAC and The 3-D Plot for the effect of catalyst against process duration and yield of BAC
4. CONCLUSIONS
The study presented the optimum conditions for acetic acid and ethanol esterification reaction using base activated Ngbo clay catalyst. The optimum conditions for esterification reaction for the process conditions of temperature, duration, amount of reactant, catalyst weight, and particle size was determined using Response Surface Methodology (RSM) approach. The optimum process conditions for the variables studied for a time, temperature, excess reactant, catalyst weight, and particle size were 359.99 min, 90°C, 4.30ml, 0.50g, and 297.63 microns, respectively. The maximum predicted esterification yield was 30.3979. The XRF analysis showed that the clay was made of mainly SiO₂ and aluminum, while the XRD indicated quartz as the significant composition. The predicted and experimental values from the model showed less than 5% difference, thereby making the Box-Behnken design approach an efficient, effective, and reliable method for the esterification of acetic acid and ethanol using base-activated clay catalyst.
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