

One Stop Solution for Ceramic Tower Packing

Founded in the year 1962, we cater to Fertilizer industries, Chemical, Petrochemicals, Drugs, Pharmaceuticals, and environmental industry.

MBC in fact is pioneers in the field of Ceramic Tower Packing. Our factories at MANDSAUR (Madhya Pradesh) situated 85 kilometers from Ratlam (Madhya Pradesh), which is center of Bombay and Delhi Western Railway route.

The nearest airports are UDAIPUR \& INDORE, which are 160 \& 220 kilometers respectively away from Mandsaur.

We are making all types and sizes of Ceramic Tower Packing like Ceramic Saddles, Mini Rings, Berl Saddles, HoneyComb, Ceramic Ball, Gridblock etc. MBC's high quality precision and compositional perfection are made possible because of our continuous research and development at every stage. Our Packing conforms to International Standards and Customer's specification.

Made from 7500M3/Annum production capacity of Ceramic packing increased to 100003/Annum owing to support from our regular buyers.

Ceramic packing is manufactured, in various grades according, to the needs of the industries such as fertilizers, chemicals, petrochemicals, oil refineries, regenerative thermal oxidizing and allied industries. Supplying Ceramic packing for Sulphuric acid industries of capacity 7500 TPD. is a landmark in the history of MBC.

## The Introduction

Tower Packings play an important role in any Chemical plant and these are used in Distillation Towers, Absorption Towers, Stripping Towers etc. With fast changing environment of Chemical Industry, Tower Packings have also changed drastically over years. New forms of packings have been gradually developed to improve efficiency of mass transfer in column.

In early stages Towers were packed by random Packings like broken Chinaware etc. First regular Packing developed was Raschig Ring. This provided a predictable and scientifically designed Tower Packings. Over years these have been replaced by newer forms such as Pall Rings and intalox Saddles. With each new form of Packing bodies developed, through put in Tower would go up 10 to 20\%. Till now Intalox Saddles were considered to be most efficient Packings having about 30\% more efficiency as compared to Raschig Rings. Moreover latest development in Tower Packings are 20\% more efficient compared to 50MM intalox Saddles. These Packings are larger sized specially designed intalox Saddles and Mini Rings. These packings have been replaced in number of Towers to increase the through put of existing Towers and get higher efficiency and less energy consumption.

We at Madhya Bharat Ceramics have kept pace with developments in Tower Packings and can give you latest designs of Tower Packings. We maintain strict quality control to meet specifications as laid by IS. We can also supply tailor made Tower Packings as per any design specified by customers. We can also guide you regarding bottlenecking of Towers.

## Developments in Ceramic Packings

Developments in this area are directed mainly towards efficient packing bodies, having good mechanical strength, for large irrigated surface area with minimum resistance to gas flow, uniform acid distribution system, packing support plates offering less pressure drop and finally compact, high efficiency absorbers.

Packing bodies: Raschig Rings offer larger pressure drops because of free flow of gas and liquid along the axis and these are replaced with Intalox Saddles in modern designs. The non symmetrical nature of saddle shape minimizes 'pattern' packing and combines randomness with packing homogeneity. Further improvement of Intalox Saddles by introducing perforations or internal structure is not possible because of difficulties in working with ceramics.

Ceramic Mini Rings developed have a ring structure with a number of slots on the periphery and cross stiffening bars. High gas phase velocities without excessive liquid hold up increase the capacity of tower. Effective turbulent interaction between the phases while allowing free passage of gas gives low pressure drop and higher efficiencies as greater portion of surface is wetted presenting uniform liquid film in contact with turbulent gas stream. These packing bodies have $20 \%$ higher capacity than Intalox Saddles per unit transfer efficiency and higher efficiency per unit surface area.

## Tower Packings

GRADES : Tower Packings are made either in white porcelain (acid \& alkali resistant) or in chemical stoneware bodies which is resistant to acid

GLAZING : Tower Packings if required can be glazed.

RANGE : Special shapes and sizes can be developed as per customers requirements.

| S.No. | Type | Size |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Raschig Rings Plain | $15 \mathrm{~mm}-200 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| 2 | Raschig Rings with partition | $25 \mathrm{~mm}-350 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| 3 | Intalox Saddles / Berl Saddles | $12 \mathrm{~mm}-200 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| 4 | Honey comb | 25 mm \& 40 mm |
| 5 | Triangular Shapes | 50 mm |
| 6 | Porcelain Balls | $6 \mathrm{~mm}-100 \mathrm{~mm}$ |
| 7 | Ceramic Mini Rings | $\mathrm{No.2-5A}$ |

Standards : Generally, we manufacture ceramic packings conforming to IS : 7087:1979 \& according to buyers specifications.

## Technical Specifications

| GRADE | Sio2 | Al203 | Fe203 | TiO2 | Na2O | K2O | CaO | MgO | LOI |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MB-S | $70-75 \%$ | $17-22 \%$ | $2 \%$ MAX | $<1 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ MAX | $2.5-3.5 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $<1.0 \%$ | $<0.5 \%$ |  |
| MB-SP | $65-74 \%$ | $18-24 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ MAX | $<1 \%$ | $1.0-1.5 \%$ | $2.0-4.0 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $<1.0 \%$ | $<0.5 \%$ |  |
| MB-P | $60-65 \%$ | $27-32 \%$ | $1 \%$ MAX | $<1 \%$ | $1.0-2 \%$ | $2.5-4.5 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $<1.0 \%$ | $<0.5 \%$ |  |

## Physical Characteristics

| GRADE | TYPES <br> AVAILABLE | COLOUR | \% WATER <br> ABSORPTION | RESISTANCE TO <br> ACID | SPECIFIC <br> GRAVITY | CRUSHING <br> STRENGTH | RECOMMENDATION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Raschig Rings Plain

| Size(Nominal) | - | $15 \times 15 \times 3$ | $19 \times 19 \times 3$ | $25 \times 25 \times 4$ | $35 \times 35 \times 4$ | $50 \times 50 \times 6$ | $75 \times 75 \times 8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diameter D mm | - | $15 \pm 1$ | $19 \pm 1$ | $25 \pm 2$ | $35 \pm 2$ | $50 \pm 3$ | $75 \pm 3$ |
| Height H mm | - | $15 \pm 1$ | $19 \pm 1$ | $25 \pm 2$ | $35 \pm 2$ | $50 \pm 3$ | $75 \pm 3$ |
| Thickness T mm | - | $3 \pm 1$ | $3 \pm 1$ | $4 \pm 1$ | $4 \pm 1$ | $6 \pm 2 / \mathrm{td}>$ | $6 \pm 2$ |
| Quantity(Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Nos. per cubic meter | Dumped Stacked | $190000$ | $112000$ | $44000$ | $16250$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5700 \\ & 7000 \end{aligned}$ | $2200$ |
| Weight (Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Kg per cubic meter | Dumped Stacked | 825 - | $840$ | $650$ | $600$ | $\begin{aligned} & 570 \\ & 700 \end{aligned}$ | $560$ |
| \%Free space (Aprx) | Dumped Stacked | 62 | 68 | 72 | 74 | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & 74 \end{aligned}$ | $72$ |
| Contact surface $\mathrm{M}^{\mathbf{2}} / \mathrm{M}^{\mathbf{3}}$ (Aprx ) | Dumped Stacked | 293 | 257 - | 193 | $133$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \\ & 113 \end{aligned}$ | $79$ |
| Relative efficiency $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ of free space | Dumped Stacked | 473 - | 378 - | 268 | $180$ | $\begin{aligned} & 121 \\ & 153 \end{aligned}$ | $110$ |
| Relative scrubbing capacity $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3} \mathrm{X}$ Free space | Dumped Stacked | 181 | 175 | 191 | 98 | 70 84 | - |

## Raschig Rings Plain



| Size(Nominal) | - | $80 \times 80 \times 8$ | $100 \times 100 \times 10$ | $120 \times 120 \times 12$ | $150 \times 150 \times 15$ | $150 \times 150 \times 25$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diameter D mm | - | $15 \pm 1$ | $19 \pm 1$ | $25 \pm 2$ | $35 \pm 2$ | $50 \pm 3$ |
| Height H mm | - | $15 \pm 1$ | $19 \pm 1$ | $25 \pm 2$ | $35 \pm 2$ | $50 \pm 3$ |
| Thickness T mm | - | $3 \pm 1$ | $3 \pm 1$ | $4 \pm 1$ | $4 \pm 1$ | $6 \pm 2 / \mathrm{td}>$ |
| Quantity(Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Nos. per cubic meter | Dumped Stacked | $190000$ | $112000$ | $44000$ | $16250$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5700 \\ & 7000 \end{aligned}$ |
| Weight (Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Kg per cubic meter | Dumped Stacked | $825$ | 840 - | $650$ | $600$ | $\begin{aligned} & 570 \\ & 700 \end{aligned}$ |
| \%Free space (Aprx) | Dumped Stacked | 62 | 68 | $72$ | $74$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & 74 \end{aligned}$ |
| Contact surface $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ (Aprx) | Dumped Stacked | 293 | 257 - |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \\ & 113 \end{aligned}$ |
| Relative efficiency $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ of free space | Dumped Stacked | $473$ | 378 - | $268$ | 180 - | $\begin{aligned} & 121 \\ & 153 \end{aligned}$ |
| Relative scrubbing capacity $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ X Free space | Dumped <br> Stacked | 181 | 175 | 191 | 98 | 70 84 |

## Raschig Rings With Partition

|  | $25 \times 25 \times 3$ | $35 \times 35 \times 3$ | $50 \times 50 \times 6$ | $80 \times 80 \times 8$ | $100 \times 100 \times 10$ | $150 \times 150 \times 15$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Raschig Rings With Partition

|  | Size(Nominal) |  | $\underset{3 \text { cell }}{80 \times 80 \times 8}$ | $80 \times 80 \times 3$ <br> Corrugated 3 Cell | $\begin{aligned} & 120 \times 120 \times 12 \\ & 3 \text { cell } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \times 50 \times 5 \\ & 4 \text { cell } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \times 80 \times 8 \\ & 4 \text { cell } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \times 100 \times 10 \\ & 4 \text { cell } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120 \times 120 \times 12 \\ & 4 \text { cell } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \times 150 \times 15 \\ & 4 \text { cell } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Diameter D mm | - | $80 \pm 4$ | $80 \pm 4$ | $120 \pm 5$ | $50 \pm 3$ | $80 \pm 4$ | $100 \pm 5$ | $120 \pm 5$ | $150 \pm 5$ |
| S | Length L mm | - | $80 \pm 4$ | $80 \pm 4$ | $120 \pm 5$ | $50 \pm 3$ | $80 \pm 4$ | $100 \pm 5$ | $120 \pm 5$ | $150 \pm 5$ |
| $\xrightarrow{\sim} \rightarrow$ | Thickness T mm | - | $80 \pm 2$ | $8 \pm 2$ | $12 \pm 3$ | $6 \pm 2$ | $8 \pm 2$ | $10 \pm 2$ | $12 \pm 3$ | $5 \pm 3$ |
|  | Quantity(Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Nos. per cubic meter | Dumped Stacked | $1720$ | $1720$ | $416$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5700 \\ & 7000 \end{aligned}$ | $1720$ | $730$ | $416$ | $280$ |
| $(0 \pi)^{-t}$ | Weight (Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Kg per cubic meter | Dumped <br> Stacked | $821$ | $844$ | $770$ | $\begin{aligned} & 860 \\ & 1057 \end{aligned}$ | $1003$ | $788$ | $707$ | $972$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \boxed{D} \longrightarrow \mathrm{D} \longrightarrow \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | \% Free space (Aprx) | Dumped Stacked | $67$ | $67$ | $66$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66 \\ & 56 \end{aligned}$ | $61$ | $75$ | $62$ | $60$ |
|  | Contact surface $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathbf{M}^{3}$ (Aprx ) | Dumped <br> Stacked | $91$ | $98$ | $53$ | $\begin{aligned} & 131 \\ & 164 \end{aligned}$ | $95$ | $68$ | $54$ | $55$ |
| - | Relative efficiency $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ of free space | Dumped Stacked | $136$ | $146$ | $80$ | $\begin{aligned} & 198 \\ & 293 \end{aligned}$ | $156$ | $91$ | $87$ | $92$ |
|  | Relative scrubbing capacity $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ Free space | Dumped Stacked | $61$ | $66$ | $35$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86 \\ & 92 \end{aligned}$ | $58$ | $51$ | $33$ | - 33 |

## Intalox Saddles

$R-D \rightarrow 1$

| Size MM (Nominal) |  | 19 mm | 25 mm | 38 mm | 50 mm | 75 mm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | $26 \pm 2.6$ | $34 \pm 3$ | $51 \pm 3$ | $68 \pm 4$ | $102 \pm 5$ |
| B |  | $18 \pm 1.8$ | $24 \pm 2$ | $35 \pm 2$ | $47 \pm 2.8$ | $72 \pm 3$ |
| C |  | $13 \pm 1.3$ | $17 \pm 2$ | $25.5 \pm 2$ | $34 \pm 3$ | $51 \pm 2$ |
| D |  | $10.5 \pm 1$ | $14 \pm 1$ | $22 \pm 1$ | $30 \pm 1.8$ | $45 \pm 3$ |
| E |  | $2.5 \pm 0.25$ | $3.5 \pm 0.5$ | $4.5 \pm 0.5$ | $6 \pm 1$ | $9 \pm 1$ |
| F |  | 1.75 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 5 | $7.5 \pm 1$ |
| G |  | 1.75 | 2.5 | 1.75 | 2.5 | $3.5 \pm 0.5$ |
| Quantity(Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Nos. per cubic meter | Dumped | 162500 | 70000 | 21000 | 9300 | 3000 |
| Weight (Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Kg per cubic meter | Dumped | 593 | 586 | 594 | 560 | 540 |
| \% Free space (Aprx) | Dumped | 71 | 77 | 80 | 79 | 80 |
| Contact surface $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ (Aprx ) | Dumped | 239 | 199 | 139 | 108 | 96 |
| Relative efficiency $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ of free space | Dumped | 337 | 258 | 174 | 137 | 120 |
| Relative scrubbing capacity $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ Free space | Dumped | 170 | 153 | 111 | 85 | 77 |
| Packing Factor |  | 110 | 98 | 52 | 40 | 22 |

## Honeycomb \& Traingular Shapes



SINGLE HONEYCOMB


| Size(Nominal) | - | Single | Double | Triangular |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | - | $25 \pm 2$ | $40 \pm 2$ | $50 \pm 3$ |
| B | - | $25 \pm 2$ | $25 \pm 2$ | $15 \pm 2$ |
| C | - | $15 \pm 2$ | $15 \pm 2$ |  |
| Quantity (Aprx $\pm 10 \%)$ <br> cubic meter | Nos. per | Dumped | 94000 | 50000 |
| Weight (Aprx $\pm 10 \%)$ <br> cubic meter per | Dumped | 693 | 725000 |  |
| \% Free space (Aprx) | Dumped | 63 | 72 | 700 |
| Contact surface $\mathbf{M}^{2} / \mathbf{M}^{3}$ <br> $($ Aprx) | Dumped | 243 | 238 | 137 |
| Relative efficiency $\mathbf{M}^{2} / \mathbf{M}^{3}$ of <br> free space | Dumped | 386 | 331 | 101 |

## Porcelain Balls

| Diameter in mm | 6 | 10 | 12 | 15 | 25 | 35 | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quantity (Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Nos. per cubic meter | 4700000 | 1100000 | 575000 | 332000 | 71000 | 25000 | 9400 |
| Weight (Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Kg per cubic meter | 1300 | 1290 | 1280 | 1290 | 1265 | 1200 | 1300 |
| Contact surface $\mathrm{M}^{2} / \mathrm{M}^{3}$ (Aprx ) | 425 | 315 | 240 | 210 | 128 | 85 | 65 |
| \%Free space (Aprx) | 45 | 45 | 45 | 46 | 46 | 48 | 45 |

## Ceramic Mini Rings

| Ceramic Mini Rings | No. 2 | No.3 | No.5 | No. 5A |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Quantity (Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Nos. per cubic meter | Dumped | 4600 | 1950 | 1140 | 610 |
| Weight (Aprx $\pm 10 \%$ ) Kg per cubic meter | Dumped | 690 | 660 | 670 | 670 |
| \%Free space (Aprx) | Dumped | 73 | 78 | 81 | 75 |
| Contact surface $M^{2} / \mathbf{M}^{3}$ <br> (Aprx) | Dumped | 98 | 79 | 59 | 66 |
| Packing Factor |  | 38 | 24 | 18 | 15 |

Ceramic Mini Rings are dumped packing. The configuration of the individual rings results in a composite array in a tower that maximizes effective turbulent interaction between the phases, while allowing free passage of the gas phase, giving low specific pressure drop per unit efficiency. The structure of the matrix formed by a mass of Mini-Rings ensures that the principal contribution to momentum loss in the gas phase is due to skin friction, while form frag is kept to a minimum. This enables high gas phase velocity to be achieved without excessive liquid hold-up occurring and consequently the capacity of Mini-Ring packings is far greater than Pall type rings and saddles.

## Quality Flow / Test Methods

WATER ABSORPTION


Water absorption is of particular interest in
the ceramic packing as it indicates the degree of firing and vitreousity
of the packing material.

RESISTANCE TO ACID
 the resistance of the solubility of the material subjected to the attack of concentrated acid.

CRUSHING STRENGTH


Crushing strength is the load required to break the packing. In Ceramic rings it is applied diametrically and strength is usually expressed in Kg/linear Cm. While in case of saddles \& other items, the total load required in Kg . to break the piece is expressed as crushing strength

CHEMICAL ANALYSIS



In packing materials, the chemical analysis is only indicative since the versatility of the packing depends on the performance than on more chemical analysis

## Quality Flow

## RAW MATERIAL TEST

INPROCESS TEST
QUALITY NORMS


FINAL PRODUCT TESTS
analysis

- Density of slip • Filter cake moisture content
- Extruded blank moisture after drying to leather hard condition
- Random tests for dimensions
- Visual Inspections
- Pre Kiln moisture content tests

Quality norms are maintained as per ASTM/DIN/As per
Customers specifications

- Dimensional Checks
- Weight
- Water absorption
- Resistance to Acids and Alkalis
- Crushing strengths
- Tests conducted as per ASTM 279C, DIN and Customers specifications


## Transfer Coefficients

RELATIVE OVERALL MASS TRANSFER COEFFICIENTS
MASS TRANSFER COEFFICIENTS
(Ceramic Packing)



Both packings are compared at the same approach to flooding over a wide range of operating systems.


## Contact Us

## MADHYA BHARAT CERAMICS

Chandarpura Road, Mandsaur (MP) - 458001.
INDIA
madhyabharatceramics@gmail.com
+91-9425105256|+91-8827697111
www.mbctower.in

