

**DEVELOPMENT OF A METHODOLOGY TO PREDICT STICKY DEPOSITS
DUE TO DISSOLVED AND COLLOIDAL MATERIAL DESTABILIZATION IN
PAPERMAKING - APPLICATION TO DIFFERENT SYSTEMS**

M. Concepción Monte^{*}, Angeles Blanco, Carlos Negro, Julio Tijero

Chemical Engineering Dpt., Complutense University of Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain

Abstract

Due to trends in papermaking like closed water systems or higher use of recovered paper as raw material, a large number of contaminants are accumulated in the system as dissolved and colloidal material (DCM). When the DCM is destabilized by a sudden change in the system conditions, it produces sticky deposits called secondary stickies that affect the papermaking processes and the quality of the final product. The laboratory methods existing to predict DCM destabilisation have limitations as low reproducibility or they do not distinguish between sticky and non-sticky materials and/or high volumes are necessary to perform the test, etc. In order to solve these problems, a methodology to predict the depositability potential of DCM has been developed by the Complutense University of Madrid. The methodology is based, first, on the destabilisation of the DCM by polymer addition, second, on its deposition on the collector surfaces and, third, on the quantification of the formed deposits by image analysis. Results show that the methodology has a good reproducibility with an error below 10%. Validation was carried out by application of the method to different cases. Results demonstrate that the developed methodology is a useful tool for researchers and papermakers to predict deposit problems due to the destabilisation of DCM in papermaking.

^{*} Corresponding author: Tel.: + 34 913944245; Fax: + 349139442 43
e-mail address: cmonte@quim.ucm.es
Address: Chemical Engineering Dept. Chemistry Faculty. Avda. Complutense s/n, 28040 Madrid (Spain)

1. Background

Recovery and recycling of paper is recognised as being an efficient raw material source for paper and board production and having desirable effect on reducing the volume of waste. The paper industry is now one of the most sustainable industries in Europe with almost 95 million tons of paper and board production and a consumption of 42 million tons of recovered paper, representing a reutilization rate as high as 51.6 % [1].

The use of recovered fibres as raw material in the paper industry presents many environmental and economic advantages. However, it also has serious drawbacks due to the high number of contaminants that are introduced in the system [2-4].

To solve the problems associated with the use of recycled raw materials, a higher number of process chemicals are used during papermaking. These additives become potential contaminants when they are introduced again in the system with the recycled paper or with the reused water. The excess of chemicals, the interaction with the contaminants already present in the water and the incompatibility between different additives represent a potential problem that has to be considered when chemicals are selected because they may destabilise the DCM and form deposits known as secondary stickies within the paper industry. These problems are worse when the water system is closed due to the accumulation of contaminants in the process waters [5-10]. Furthermore, DCM not only interacts with organic substances but also with inorganic and microbial compounds forming combined deposits that favour foaming, scaling, corrosion, etc. [11]. In this case, it is necessary to know the origin of the deposit to be able to control its effect.

During papermaking the problems associated with the accumulation and destabilisation of DCM are of great importance because the following detrimental effects can occur:

- Effects on machine productivity: lower retention and drainage, presence of deposits, scaling, holes, breaks, cleaning downtime, etc.
- Effects on additive efficiency: optical aids, sizing agents, wet-end and dry strength additives, retention aids, flocculants, etc.
- Effects on product quality: formation problems, lower optical properties, holes, spots, lower strength, lower printability performance, etc.

Composition of recycled paper is very heterogeneous and, therefore, the presence of contaminants in secondary fibre pulp is highly variable. Potential DCM pollutants include pressure sensitive adhesives (PSA), hot melts, ink binders, coating binders and additives. Additives can include fillers, starch, sizing agents, wet strength additives, deinking chemicals agents, pigments, drainage and retention aids, formation aids, and pH control agents [6]. In general, DCM is anionic and is known as anionic trash.

DCM is only considered as potential deposit former until it is destabilised, forming secondary stickies [12-14]. This may occur at any point in the machine where a physicochemical shock occurs. The most common destabilisation mechanisms are electrostatic shocks, temperature shocks and evaporative destabilisation. Electrostatic destabilisation mainly results from the use of cationic polyelectrolytes as retention, dewatering or wet strength aids. These chemicals may react with anionic colloids and dissolved materials present in the process water forming precipitates. Electrostatic destabilisation may also occur by a conductivity or hardness shock. Evaporative destabilisation results from the evaporation of water in the dry section. In this case any DCM present in the water, not only anionic material, may precipitate. When free water is present between fibres, as in the first part of the drying, water will move towards the paper surface and will take the concentrated DCM with it. Since the temperature for many of the synthetic polymers, is above the softening temperature they will

agglomerate forming sticky deposits that may remain with the paper or stick to the driers or to the felts [15-18].

Determination of the contaminants present in different pulps and their potential depositability, monitoring of potential stickies accumulation along the process and the conditions for its destabilisation are very important for the paper industry due to the economical impact of stickies [19]. This justifies the interest of many research groups that try to develop methods to predict DCM destabilisation to control the disturbance substances during papermaking. With this aim several deposition testers, summarised in table1, have been proposed in the literature to quantify deposits [20-29].

In general reproducibility, the distinction between sticky and non-sticky material, the need of a higher contaminant concentration to perform the test than the normal contamination level present in paper mills, the possibility of extracting the deposits if a further analysis is needed are the key issues for this type of methods.

Table 1. - Methods for the determination of sticky deposits

METHOD	DEPOSIT COLLECTOR		QUANTIFICATION	MECHANISM
Impinging-jet	Methacrylate surface	S T	Gravimetric Microscopic analysis	Collision
Doshi	Spheres or polystyrene foam films	A	Gravimetric	Undefined
Berol	Polyethylene films	T	Gravimetric	Undefined
CTP	Polyester wires	I C	Image analysis	Undefined
Vibromixer TAPPI UM223	Stainless steel surfaces	M O	Gravimetric	Undefined
Buckman	Plastic bottles	B	Gravimetric	Undefined
PIRA	Polyester wires	I L E	Gravimetric Image analysis	Undefined

The industry is still looking for a reproducible and easy method to determine the adherent material contained in a pulp suspension, responsible for the sticky deposit formation, as the deposition rotor patented by the UCM [30]. This method is characterized for: reliable and accurate results, reproducible data, easy to use in the mill, representative for the fluid-dynamics of the system, formation of deposits by both collision and transference mechanisms, it differentiates sticky and non-sticky material contained in the suspensions and it is possible to extract the deposits if a further analysis is needed.

Therefore, the purpose of the present work was, first, to evaluate the methodology to quantify the destabilisation of the DCM with a system based on image analysis technique and, secondly, to validate the methodology by its application to different cases.

2. Experimental

2.1. Description of the methodology

The methodology developed to determine the tendency to form deposit because of the destabilization of DCM contained in a white water has three stages:

1. Preparation of the white water containing DCM to study in the same conditions as in papermaking.
2. Depositability test to determine the tendency of DCM to form deposits.
3. Quantification of the collected deposits.

The raw material is soaked for 10 minutes in tap water to facilitate the defibration of the furnish. Disintegration was carried out in a lab disintegrator ENJO-D-33.73/D. Table 2 shows the disintegration conditions used to reproduce mill conditions [15, 22, 29].

Alkaline pH conditions, used in most of the mills, were adjusted adding 1% NaOH o.d. fibres.

Table 2.- Disintegration conditions for the raw materials

Consistency (%)	3.5
pH	10
Temperature (°C)	50
Time (min)	20
Speed (rpm)	3000
Water volume (L)	2

The pulp obtained was diluted to 0.5% consistency and it was homogenised by a gentle agitation at 100 rpm. Finally, the white water was obtained by filtering the diluted pulp through a Dynamic Drainage Jar (DDJ) with a mesh of 100 μm and an agitation of 500 rpm to simulate the forming section of the paper machine.

Destabilisation of DCM was carried out by an electrostatic shock with a cationic polymer. The polymer dosage selection was based on the cationic demand of the white water. The cationic demand, defined as the equivalents of a cationic polymer necessary to neutralize the anionic charge presents in a sample, was measured in the supernatant of the white water after centrifugation at 3000 rpm during 10 minutes by a colloidal titration with the polymer used for the DCM destabilization e.g. Poly(ethylenimine) . The titration of the white water was carried out by an automatic titrator CRISON connected to a Particle Charge Detector, Mütek PCD 03, which determines the final point of the titration when the isoelectric point is reached [34]. From this value, the theoretical volume (V_{th}) of the cationic polymer that is necessary to add for the destabilisation of DCM contained in the 1800 mL of white water used in the deposition experiment, is assessed.

As summary, figure 1 shows a scheme for white water preparation for depositability tests.




Figure 1.- Scheme for the depositability test

The UCM deposition rotor consists of a rotor, a collector and an axial flow propeller as shown in figure 2 (30). The rotor has holes on the top, on the bottom and on the side in such a way that the pulp suspension entered through the top and bottom surfaces and goes out through the side holes due to the centrifugal force. Therefore, if a surface is placed in front to the side holes, the sample hits it and the sticky material is deposited by a collision mechanism. At the same time the fluid-dynamic of the system allows us to have a parallel flow in the outside surface of the collector that favours the formation of stickies by a transference mechanism.




Figure 2.- Deposition rotor tester and fundamentals

The lab equipment consists of:

1.- The **rotor** consisting of:

- a 15 W and at 12 v electric drill of continuous current with a reduction of 5.34:1, allowing maximum turning speeds 750 rpm.
- a stainless steel shaft, with a length of 210 mm and a diameter of 8 mm, is connected to a PVC axial flow propeller in the bottom consisting of 3 blades with slope 25° and radius 30 mm from the centre of the axis to the end of the blades.

- a cylindrical disc (height 20 mm and diameter 50 mm) having four holes on the top, four on the bottom and four on the side, with diameter 10 mm is interconnected through an inner conduct. The disc is made of Teflon because of its low deposition potential.

2.- The **collector** formed by:

- a stainless steel tube-support (height 90 mm, diameter 65 mm and thickness 1 mm) where collector surfaces are fixed 2 cm away from the Teflon disc.
- the collector surfaces are two stainless steel films with a thickness of 0.05 mm. These are fixed to the tube-support by the attachments: one film is located centrally and inside the tube-support and the other in the outer side of the tube-support. The attachments are designed to fix both films whose size is different. The dimensions of the external stainless steel film are 90 x 225 mm and the dimensions of the internal one are 50 x 220 mm

3.- The stainless steel **baffles** with width 23 mm, height 114 mm and thickness 3 mm are joined to the tube-support by screws and to the stainless steel structure that supports the electric drill.

The time of the experiment and the agitation speed are very important variables to take into account in order to obtain enough amount of deposits. A short experimental time and/or too low agitation speed would produce a low amount of deposits. On the contrary, a high experimental time would produce too many deposits that would unstuck from the collector and a too high turbulence would remove the deposits from the surface, in both cases a low amount of deposits would be obtained. Therefore, previous experiments at different times and at different agitation speeds were carried out to define a compromise situation and to determine the optimum operational conditions [31]. Optimal conditions are shown in table 3. Deposition temperature was fixed to

50°C because it is a typical temperature of white waters in many paper mills and it is above the softening temperature of synthetic polymers favoring its deposition on the collector surfaces.

Table 3.- Operating conditions of deposition rotor

Agitation speed (rpm)	250
Time (min)	60
Temperature (°C)	50
Volume (mL)	1800

Quantitative determination of the deposits depends on the characteristics of the deposits and on the required precision. The films from contaminants that produce a high amount of deposits may be analysed gravimetrically e.g. to study wood extractives. But when contaminants produce a low amount of deposits e.g. recycled paper, adhesives, coating binders or deinking soaps, it is not possible to use gravimetric methods because of the relative error of the results. In these cases image analysis is more precise.

There are numerous studies in the bibliography based on image analysis of deposit collectors [35-42]. In this case, the deposit image is taken with a flatbed scanner HP Scanjet 6100C with a optical resolution 600 dpi (dots per inch). The resolution of the imaging device is very important because it determines the detail of the image which is the basis of the calculations performed by the image analysis programme for the quantitative determination of the deposits.

When the deposition experiment is finished, the stainless steel films with the deposits are withdrawn from the tube-support and dried in an oven at 105 °C for a few minutes (they may be also dried at room temperature overnight). Then, stickies are covered by a transparent plastic film and the image of the collector surfaces is taken. The image is

analysed using the *Stickies Measurement System*, developed by the British Research Centre PIRA International and ourselves. The SMS relies on the contrast differences between the deposits and the background [43]. The programme suggests the grey level or *threshold* usually relative to the average grey scale value, at which the deposit is considered. It can also be selected by the user depending on the type of the deposit. Results are given as: covered area of deposits expressed as mm², mm² of deposits per m² of surface (ppm) and percentage of covered area of deposits (%).

As the sizes of the external and internal films are different, the percentage of deposits can be assessed taking into account the size of the stainless steel films. This is possible calculating the pondered deposits retained in each surface. These results, called *pondered areas (PA)*, are obtained using the expressions (1) and (2). According to this way it is possible to add the results, as the expression (3) shows, to give one deposition value for each experiment as the sum of the two pondered areas (external and internal) [31].

$$\text{EPA (\%)} = \frac{\text{mm}^2 \text{ of deposits}_{\text{EA}} \times \frac{\text{EA}}{\text{TA}}}{\text{TA}} \times 100 = \frac{\text{mm}^2 \text{ of deposits}_{\text{EA}} \times 0.65}{\text{TA}} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

$$\text{IPA (\%)} = \frac{\text{mm}^2 \text{ of deposits}_{\text{IA}} \times \frac{\text{IA}}{\text{TA}}}{\text{TA}} \times 100 = \frac{\text{mm}^2 \text{ of deposits}_{\text{IA}} \times 0.35}{\text{TA}} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

$$\text{TPA (\%)} = \text{EPA} + \text{IPA} \quad (3)$$

where:

EA: Area of the external film (20250 mm²)

IA: Area of the internal film (11000 mm²)

TA: Total area of the films (31250 mm²)

EPA: External pondered area covered by deposits

IPA: Internal pondered area covered by deposits

TPA: Total pondered area

2.2. Raw materials

Different raw materials were used for the deposition tests:

1. Deinking soap: Deinking soaps are additives used as collectors to remove the inks in the flotation stage [32]. In this case the deinking soap was a sodium soap of fatty acids soluble in water because it is one of the most commonly used in paper mills. This system was chosen because when calcium ions are present in the medium, calcium soaps are formed which are practically insoluble in water and have a high tendency to deposit on the surfaces. To carry out the deposition experiments a 1.0 g/l of the deinking soap solution was prepared. The soap was destabilized by adding the stoichiometric amount of calcium (60 ppm Ca²⁺), from a commercial CaCl₂ solution.
2. Adhesives: Recovered paper grades contain high amount of adhesives (0.5% as average), so they are considered to be the main source of stickies in paper recycling. Five adhesives were tested as source of DCM: three of them supported on labels (a conventional adhesive, a 100% acrylic hydrodispersable adhesive and a based acrylic hydrodispersable adhesive) and two of them as commercial solutions (polyvinyl acetate with plasticizer and polyvinyl alcohol). 20% of adhesive was supported on labels.

Acrylic hydrodispersable adhesives are the basis of the pressure sensitive adhesives applied in labels and tapes. These adhesives are designed to break up into fine

particles or virtually dissolved under pulping conditions [33]. Therefore, they have a strong tendency to form secondary stickies. The conventional adhesive used was an acrylate based adhesive, containing 70% 2-ethyl-hexylacrylate, which is extremely tacky and 30% tackifier. The commercial polyvinyl alcohol is a totally water-soluble adhesive which is an important source of DCM in papermaking. The polyvinyl acetate, the base for the common household 'white glue', is a non water-soluble adhesive which is generally available as solvent solution or emulsion.

3. Coated papers: Coated papers are responsible for a specific stickies problem known in this industry as 'white pitch'. A silk coated paper (37% coating on dry fibre) was used for the study of the reproducibility of the method. Its formulation contains calcium carbonate, clay, latex and pigments. This paper was selected because of its high depositability trend [44].
4. Recovered papers (RP): The recovered paper grades, used for this study, are an Ordinary Grade (1.05) and a Medium Grade (2.05) from the 'European List of Standard Grades of Recovered Paper and Board' published jointly by the Confederation of European Paper Industry (CEPI) and the Bureau of International Recycling (BIR). The grade 1.05 (called RP 1) is composed by boards and it is used as raw material for packaging paper. The grade 2.05 (called RP 2) mainly consists of office paper and it is used as raw material for deinking pulp. In this case, it is necessary to add deinking chemicals during disintegration to reproduce mill conditions.

In all cases the cationic polymer used for destabilising the DCM contained in the white waters was the (poly)ethyleneimine (PEI). PEI has high molecular weight and very high cationic charge. PEI charge concentration was determined by titration with an

anionic polymer, 0.0025 N potassium poly-vinyl sulphate, of known anionic charge.

Final point was determined with the Müttek PCD 03.

The talc used in the study of the efficiency of stickies control agents was a commercial product used in papermaking and commercialised by Talc of Luzenac .

All other chemicals CaCl₂, NaOH, HCl, etc. were of analytical grade.

3. Results and discussions

Reproducibility is defined as the value below which the absolute difference between two single test results obtained with the same method with the same material under **different conditions** (operators, apparatus, laboratory and/or different times) may be expected to lie. *Repeatability* is defined as the value below which the absolute difference between two single test results obtained with the same method with the same material under the **same conditions** (operators, apparatus, laboratory and/or a short interval of times) may be expected to lie. The reproducibility and repeatability of the method were estimated based on the error of the experiments calculated statistically from the confidence interval (CI) using the expression (4). The confidence interval (CI) was determined from both arithmetic mean and standard deviation for a confidence level of 95 % ($\alpha = 0.05$) with the equation (5) [45].

$$\varepsilon(\%) = \frac{|\overline{X} \pm CI| - \overline{X}}{\overline{X}} \times 100 = \frac{|\pm CI|}{\overline{X}} \times 100 \quad (4)$$

where:

\overline{X} : mean value

CI: confidence interval

$$CI = \pm t \times \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n-1}} \quad (5)$$

where:

CI: confidence interval

t: t-Student for confidence level of 95 % and (n-1) degrees of freedom.

σ : standard deviation of the sample.

n: size of the sample.

Table 4 shows the experiments carried out to assess the reliability of the methodology.

Table 4.-Set of experiments to assess the reliability of the method

Conditions	REPRODUCIBILITY		REPEATABILITY	
	High deposition	Low deposition: different pulps	Low deposition: same pulp	
Raw material	Deinking soap	Labels	Labels	Coated paper
Contaminant concentration	1 (g/l)	20% conventional adhesive	20% conventional adhesive	37% coating
Destabilisation agent	Ca ²⁺ (60 ppm)	PEI (V _{th})	PEI (V _{th})	PEI (V _{th})
Number of experiments	5	3 pulps x 3 = 9	5	6

The **reproducibility study** was carried out with high and low deposition conditions. Deinking soap was used as an example of high deposition conditions because their high tendency to form sticky deposits in the presence of calcium is well known in papermaking. A set of five experiments was carried out with the deposition rotor with the 1.0 g/L solution of deinking soap. After destabilising the soap with calcium, deposits were formed and the TPA covered by deposits was 22.2%. The obtained error was 8.6%.

As an example of low deposition labels, raw material containing 20% conventional adhesive was used. In this case the amount of deposits is lower than that with deinking

soaps but they are more spread on the collector films. In this case three different disintegrations were carried out to obtain three white waters and a set of three deposition experiments was carried out for each white water. The average TPA was 3.0% and the error of the method was 9.1%.

The **repeatability studies** were carried out in low deposition conditions. A set of five deposition experiments with white waters obtained from labels out and a set of six deposition experiments with white waters obtained from a coated paper were carried out. In all cases, the DCM was destabilized using the theoretical volume (V_{th}) of PEI in the deposition rotor. For the labels the TPA was 2.9% and for the coated paper that was 3.9%. The error of the method was 9.0% and 8.8%, respectively.

As summary, the results of the TPA and the error for all reproducibility and repeatability experiments are shown in the table 5. In all cases the errors are below 10% that shows the reliability of the developed methodology to study the potential of DCM to form stickies deposits.

Table 5.- Deposited area and error of the methodology for different conditions

	REPRODUCIBILITY		REPEATABILITY	
Raw material	Deinking soap	Labels	Labels	Coated paper
TPA mean (%)	22.2	3.0	2.9	3.9
Error (%)	8.6	9.1	9.0	8.8

Validation was carried out by applying the methodology to study the potential of different formulations of adhesives to form stickies, the formation of deposits at different contaminant concentrations, the efficiency of deposit control agents and the behaviours of different recovered paper grades.

3.1. Depositability potential of different adhesive formulations

Five different adhesive formulations have been studied. White waters obtained from papers containing 0.5% of adhesive were studied using the proposed deposition methodology. Results show that, from point of view of deposit formation, polyvinyl alcohol is the most problematic adhesive (figure 3). However, the measured values of cationic demand and turbidity (figure 4) show that there is no relationship between these parameters and the depositability potential of these contaminants. During last years, these parameters have been measured in the process waters of the mills in order to predict the possible problems of secondary stickies. However, nowadays, these correlations are being questioned since some DCM present in white waters do not contribute to cationic demand or turbidity values but, however, they have a high tendency to form deposits. This is, for example, the case of polyvinyl alcohol which form the largest amount of deposits when it is destabilised but it contributes to the cationic demand and to the turbidity less than other adhesives.




Figure 3.- Depositability potential of white waters obtained from papers containing different adhesives




Figure 4.- Parameters measured in white waters obtained from papers containing different adhesives

3.2. DCM from different contaminants

Contaminants of different nature were studied adding different concentrations in the raw materials. The contaminants compared were: an adhesive, the polyvinyl alcohol applied at different concentrations on a base paper, a coating formulation from the mix of the different ratios of the silk coated paper with a base paper and a deinking soap dissolved in distilled water at different concentrations. The DCM was destabilized in the first two cases by PEI and, in the case, by CaCl_2 . Figure 5 shows the different behaviour of each contaminant as a function of the concentration.




Figure 5.- Depositability results of waters containing DCM from different sources

While DCM from the polyvinyl alcohol presents a maximum depositability for a 0.5% concentration of adhesive in the raw material, when the coating and the deinking soap concentration increase in the raw material the deposit formation increases proportionally. As it has been already mentioned, DCM from deinking soap form a higher amount of deposits. Both collision and transference deposition mechanisms are important. However, in the case of the adhesive and the coating formulation the deposition due to collision mechanisms could be negligible.

3.3. Efficiency of deposit control agents

Talc is a common additive used in papermaking as control agent of the DCM, because of its adsorption properties that involve the removal of adhesion characteristics, frequently associated with the potential secondary stickies formers [46, 47]. Talc is a mineral with a layered structure, large hydrophobic surface, and hydrophilic edges. The hydrophobic surface interacts with the tacky material surface, also hydrophobic [2] reducing their potential to form deposits. Therefore, it is possible to stabilize DCM and to avoid its agglomeration with the use of talc. In order to study this behaviour, deposition tests were carried out with white waters from paper containing 0.5% polyvinyl alcohol and from coated paper, adding different talc concentrations. Figure 6 shows how the talc decreases the tackiness of the deposits at low concentration (0.1 g/L).




Figure 6.- Effect of talc concentration on depositability of white waters

From 0.1 g/L of talc concentration, the amount of deposits increases due to the adhesion of talc particles to the deposits. An over dosage of talc increases the deposit formation considerably due to the accumulation of the talc on the formed stickies deposits. This fact confirms the deposit problems existing sometimes in paper mills that use talc as control agent of DCM.

3.4. Behaviour of different grades

Two different grades of recovered paper were tested with the developed methodology in order to study the potential of DCM present in the different raw materials to form deposits. Disintegration conditions were adjusted to reproduce the situation of brown grades and white grades paper mills. RP 1 was disintegrated at 35°C while RP 2, a typical raw material for deinking mills, was disintegrated at 45 °C using deinking chemicals: 1%NaOH, 1% deinking soap, 1% H₂O₂ and 2.5% sodium silicate.

Figure 7 shows the obtained results. It is observed that the white waters from the ordinary paper grade (RP 1) produce a higher amount of deposits. However, as it is shown in figure 8, the cationic demand, the conductivity and the turbidity values of the waters obtained from RP 2 (medium grade) are higher. Again, it is possible to conclude that it is not possible always to establish a direct relationship between the measured parameters in the white waters and the tendency of DCM present in the waters to form deposits.




Figure 7.- Depositability of white waters from different recovered papers (RP)




Figure 8.- Comparison between the parameters measured in white waters from different recovered papers

4. Conclusions

- The deposition methodology developed to study the potential of DCM, present in white waters, to destabilise and to form deposits is reliable and can be used under papermaking conditions. It presents the following advantages:
 - A good reproducibility and repeatability, the error is below 10%.
 - Easy to handle and to control the studied parameters.
 - It is possible to study collision and transference deposition mechanisms.
 - It differentiates between sticky materials and non-sticky materials.
 - It is possible to quantify the obtained deposits by image analysis.
 - If necessary the deposits may be extracted for further analysis.
- The methodology has been validated by studying the destabilisation of different types of DCM.
- With this method, it is possible to assess the recyclability of different formulations because it has potential to form sticky deposits and to determine the efficiency of control agents.
- It is not always possible to correlate traditional parameters, such as the cationic demand or the turbidity of the white waters, with the tendency of DCM to form sticky deposits. These traditional measurements have to be complemented with deposition tests to predict problems at industrial scale.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Raisio Chemicals Ltd. for the financial support to carry out the industrial validation of the Deposition Rotor, to the European Commission for the support to the project FAIR5-PL97-3993, and to UK Paper, SCA Lucca, BASF and ATOFINA for the supply of the chemicals and raw materials used in these studies.

REFERENCES

- [1] Annual Report 2003. CEPI (2003)
- [2] Blanco M.A., Negro C., and Tijero J., Paper Recycling: An Introduction to Problems and their Solutions. ISBN 92-828-1801-2. Luxembourg (1998)
- [3] Blanco A., Negro C., Monte M.C. and Tijero, Prog. Pap. Rec., 2 (2002), 14-25
- [4] Blanco A., Negro C., Monte M.C., Fuente H. and Tijero, Prog. Pap. Rec., 2 (2002), 26-37
- [5] Hutten I.M., Diaz R., Roberts M.K., Jeffrey C. and Benerjee, S., Tappi J. 80:4, (1997) 193-197
- [6] Carre B., Fabry B., and Brun J., Prog. Pap. Rec., 11 (1995), 68-72
- [7] Bourgogne G., Pöyry Oy J. and Laaine J.E., Pap. and Timber, 83 (2001), 190-203
- [8] Francis D.W. and Ouchi M.D., J. Pulp Pap. Sci., 27:9 (2001), 289-295
- [9] Tay S., Tappi J., 84:8, (2001), 43-59
- [10] Zang X., Stebbing D.W., Soong G., Saddler J.N. and Beatson R.P., Tappi J, 1:3 (2002), 26-32
- [11] Olson C.O. and Letscher M.K., Appita J. 45:2 (1992), 58-61
- [12] Doshi M.R., Prog. Pap. Rec., 7:1 (1997), 84-85
- [13] Ling T.F., Tappi J., 81:3 (1998), 161-165
- [14] Kochanik W.S., TAPPI Proceedings, Papermarker Conference, TAPPI Press, Atlanta (1988)
- [15] Allen L.H. and Filion, D., TAPPI Proceedings, Papermakers Conference, TAPPI Press (1995), 539-550

- [16] Blanco M.A., Negro C., Monte M.C., García J., Otero D. and Tijero J., Deinking Symposium & Exhibition. Munich, May (1998)
- [17] Dykstra G.M., Hoekstra P.M. and Suzuki T., TAPPI Proceedings, Papermaker Conference, TAPPI Press, Atlanta (1988), 327-340
- [18] Elsby L.E., TAPPI Proceedings, Pulping Conference, TAPPI Press, Apr. (1988), 327-340
- [19] Friberg T., Prog. Pap. Rec., 2:1 (1996), 70-72
- [20] Doshi M.R., Prog. Pap. Rec., 2:1 (1992), 45-48
- [21] Doshi M.R., TAPPI Proceedings, Contaminant Problems and Strategies Conference, TAPPI Press (1989)
- [22] Cathie K., Haydock R. and Dias I., Pulp Pap Canada 93:12 (1992), 157-160
- [23] Pelton R. and Lawrence D., J. Pulp Pap. Sci., 17:3 (1991), J80-J84
- [24] Krauthauf T., Ackermann C. and Putz H-J., Wochenbl. Papierfabr., 7:3 (1998), 81-84
- [25] Abraham S., Tappi J., 81:2 (1998), 79-84
- [26] Dyer J., Prog. Pap. Rec., 6:4 (1997), 44-51
- [27] McKinney R.W.J., TAPPI Proceedings, Pulping Conference. TAPPI Press, Washington (1987), 451-454.
- [28] Ling T.F., Pulp Pap. Canada, 94:10, (1993), 17-23
- [29] Negro C., Blanco A., Monte M.C., Otero D., and Tijero J, Pap. Tech., 4, (1999), 29-34
- [30] Blanco M.A., García J., Monte M.C., Negro C. and Tijero J., European Pat. No. 98901981.5 (1998)
- [31] Monte M.C., Thesis. Dept. Chemical Engineering, Complutense University of Madrid (2000)

- [32] Ferguson L.D., Tappi J., 8 (1992), 49-58
- [33] Hayes P.J. and Kauffman T.F., Tappi J. (1993), 162-165
- [34] Bley L., Pap. Tech., 4 (1992), 32-37
- [35] Jordan B.D., Nguyen N.G. and Bidmade M.L., J. Pulp Pap. Sci., 6 (1983), TR60-TR64
- [36] McCool M.A. and Taylor C.J., Tappi J., 66:8 (1983), 69-71
- [37] Klungness J.H., Fernandez L.E. and Plantinga P.L., TAPPI Proceedings, Pulping Conference, TAPPI Press, Washington (1988), 180-181
- [38] Vidotti R.M., Johnson D.A. and Thompson E.U., Prog. Pap. Rec., 8 (1993), 30-39
- [39] Gustafson F. and Delgado J., Tappi J., 79:7 (1996), 127-134
- [40] Blais S., Chabot P., Gaudreault R. and Tremblay C., Prog. Pap. Rec., 6:2 (1997), 85-92
- [41] Zeyer C., Venditti R.A., Puangchinda K.W. and Heitmann J.A., Tappi J., 78:2 (1995), 168-175
- [42] Zeyer C., Venditti R.A. and Heitmann J.A., Tappi J., 78:2 (1995), 176-179
- [43] Negro C., Blanco A., Monte M.C., Otero D and Tijero J., Paper Technology, 40:3 (1999), 29-34
- [44] Blanco A., Negro C., Monte M.C., Otero D. And Tijero J., Appita J., 54:2 (2001), 132-135
- [45] Spiegel M.R., "Estadística" 2ª Edición. Mc Graw-Hill/Interamericana de España, S.A. ISBN 84-7615-562X, (1993)
- [46] Biza P., Pap. Technol., 42:3 (2001), 22-24
- [47] Willfor S., Sundberg A., Sihvonen A.L. and Holmbom B., Pap. Puu, 82:6 (2000), 398-402