

Process Systems Engineering
PSE '85:

The Use of Computers in
Chemical Engineering

Process Systems Engineering PSE '85:

The Use of Computers in Chemical Engineering

Organised by The Institution of Chemical Engineers on behalf of the European Federation of Chemical Engineers and held at Robinson College, Cambridge, 31 March – 4 April 1985

Organising Committee

F.A. Perris (Chairman)

J.D. Perkins (Vice-Chairman)

P.S. Banks

D. Depeyre

D.W. Gillings

J.W. Ponton

M.L. Preston

G.V. Reklaitis

L.M. Rose

R.W.H. Sargent

T. Takamatsu

P. Winter

Air Products Ltd

Imperial College

BP Chemicals Ltd

EFCE CAD Working Party Secretary

Consultant

University of Edinburgh

ICI Ltd

Purdue University, USA

ETH Zurich, Switzerland

Imperial College

Kyoto University, Japan

Proslys Technology Ltd

**THE INSTITUTION OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERS
SYMPOSIUM SERIES NO 92**

ISBN 0 85295 188 4

PUBLISHED BY THE INSTITUTION OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERS

Copyright © 1985 The Institution of Chemical Engineers

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from the copyright owner.

First edition 1985 — ISBN 0 85295 188 4

MEMBERS OF THE INSTITUTION OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERS (Worldwide)
SHOULD ORDER DIRECT FROM THE INSTITUTION

Geo. E. Davis Building, 165-171 Railway Terrace, Rugby, Warks CV21 3HQ

Australian orders to:

R.M. Wood, School of Chemical Engineering and Industrial Chemistry,
University of New South Wales, PO Box 1. Kensington, NSW, Australia
2033.

*Distributed throughout the world (excluding Australia) by Pergamon
Press Ltd., except to I.Chem.E. members.*

U.K.	Pergamon Press Ltd., Headington Hill Hall, Oxford OX3 0BW, England
U.S.A.	Pergamon Press Inc., Maxwell House, Fairview Park, Elmsford, New York 10523, U.S.A.
CANADA	Pergamon Press Canada Ltd., Suite 104, 150 Consumers Rd., Willowdale, Ontario M2J 1P9, Canada
FRANCE	Pergamon Press SARL, 24 rue des Ecoles, 75240 Paris, Cedex 05, France
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY	Pergamon Press GmbH, 6242 Kronberg-Taunus Hammerweg 6, Federal Republic of Germany

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

PSE '85 (Conference: Robinson College)

Process systems engineering : PSE '85 : the use of computers in chemical engineering —
(EFCE event; no. 313) — (Institution of Chemical Engineers symposium series; no. 92)

1. Chemical engineering — Data processing

I. Title II. Institution of Chemical Engineers III. European Federation of Chemical Engineers

IV. Series V. Series

660.2'028'54 TP155

ISBN 0-08-031417-1

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

PSE '85 (1985 : Robinson College, Cambridge)

Process systems engineering.

(The Institution of Chemical Engineers symposium series; no. 92)

"EFCE event no. 313."

1. Chemical engineering — Data processing — Congresses.

I. Institution of Chemical Engineers (Great Britain) II. Title III. Series : Symposium series
(Institution of Chemical Engineers (Great Britain); no. 92.

TP184.P75 1985 660.2'028'54 85-6574

ISBN 0-08-031417-1

Preface

The second in a series entitled Process Systems Engineering, PSE '85 picks up the key themes of the previous PSE conference in Kyoto in 1982 and gives special emphasis to new topics and new directions.

The major sessions, each conducted by a Chairman-Rapporteur, concentrate on:-

- Operability Considerations at the Design Stage
- Design of Flowsheets
- Aids for Plant Operations
- Influence of new CAD Technology

In addition, a "poster session" is included where authors can present their latest ideas in the most effective way without the constraints imposed by a formal session. An exhibition of hardware/software runs concurrently with the conference and provides a shop window of the latest products relating to process engineering CAD.

PSE '85 is organised by the Institution of Chemical Engineers on behalf of the European Federation of Chemical Engineering in association with the Inter American Federation of Chemical Engineering and the Asian Pacific Confederation of Chemical Engineering. It continues a successful series of symposia held at the invitation of the EFCE Working Party on Computer Applications.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure to help organise the Conference. More than 120 papers of an excellent standard were submitted from all over the world — North, South, East and West! The task of reducing this number to a manageable volume was no easy one, and I am indebted to each and every one of my colleagues on the Technical Committee. The hours of lively debate being most stimulating! Finally, we are all of us especially indebted to Gillian Nelson and Julie Wearne for keeping us organised to our objectives and enduring our attempts to side-track their efforts.

This volume contains a compendium of some of the valuable work in progress in Process Systems Engineering today. Alas, there was no more room to publish the many worthy papers that we were forced to omit.

I sincerely hope you get as much pleasure from reading its contents as we did from compiling it.

F. A. PERRIS

Contents

FORMAL SESSIONS

The Design of Flowsheets I

Session Chairman: Dr J.W. Ponton, University of Edinburgh

1. Representing Distributed Units in an Equation-Oriented Simulator. 1
W.R. Paterson, S.J. Bartram, D.M. Boulton and D.B. Topcliffe (University of Cambridge, UK)
2. Simultaneous Solution and Optimization of Process Flowsheets with Differential Equation Models. 13
J.E. Cuthrell and L.T. Biegler (Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA)
3. Simultaneous Modular Process Simulation and Optimization. 25
L.B. Evans, R.A. Trevino-Lozano (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA)
H.I. Britt and J.F. Boston (Aspen Technology Inc, Massachusetts, USA)
4. A Dual-Level Flowsheeting System. 37
W.R. Johns (Polytechnic of the South Bank, London, UK) and V. Vadhvana (BP Research, Sunbury-on-Thames, UK)
5. Development of a Dynamic Flowsheeting Program. 55
M.R. Aylott (KBC Process Consultants Ltd, Surrey)
J.W. Ponton (University of Edinburgh, Scotland) and D.H. Lott (ICI plc, Cheshire, UK)
6. Process Flowsheeting on Supercomputers. 67
M.A. Stadtherr and J.A. Vegeais (University of Illinois, USA)

Aids for Plant Operation

Session Chairman: B.R. Harris, ICI

7. Approximate Scheduling Algorithms for Network Flowshops. 79
K. Kuriyan and G.V. Reklaitis (Purdue University, USA)
8. Batch Process Schedule Generation — ICI's BatchMASTER. 91
D.H. Cherry, M.L. Preston (ICI Engineering Dept, Northwich) and G.W.H. Frank (ICI Organics Division, UK)
9. Making the Most of your Plant Data. 101
E.W. Gorczynski (BP Research Centre, UK)
10. Analysis of Measured Plant Data Based on a Steady State Mathematical Model. 111
J. Lutchka, J. Klemsa and B. Holcak (Research Institute of Chemical Equipment, Czechoslovakia)
11. Material Balance Rectification via Interval Arithmetic. 121
D.M. Himmelblau (University of Texas, USA)

12. Fault Diagnosis Algorithms Based on the Signed Directed Graph and its Modifications. 133
Y. Tsuge, J. Shiozaki, H. Matsuyama (Kyushu University, Japan) and E.O'Shima (Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan)
13. Fault Diagnosis using Intelligent Knowledge Based Systems. 145
P.K. Andow (Loughborough University, UK)

The Design of Flowsheets II

Session Chairman: Dr J.W. Ponton, University of Edinburgh

14. The Generation of Heat Load Distributions in Heat Exchanger Network Synthesis. 157
S.A. Jones and D.W.T. Rippin (ETH Zentrum, Switzerland)
15. Energy Integration in Distillation Systems. 179
N. Marcopoulos and A.R.H. Cornish (Imperial College London, UK)
16. Choice of Variables and Approximations in the Optimization of Heat Exchanger Networks. 197
O.A. Asbjornsen (University of Houston, USA) and M. Haug (Oil Industry Services, Norway)
17. Simulation and Optimization of Multi-Product Plants for Batch and Semibatch Operation. 209
M. Lazaro and L. Puigjaner (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain)
18. Optimal Equipment Sizing Under Technical Uncertainty. 223
W.R. Johns and M. Lakshmanan (Polytechnic of the South Bank, London, UK)
19. A Basic Approach to Optimal Common Use of Energy Among Process Industries. 239
M. Nishio, T. Umeda (Chiyoda Chemical Engineering and Construction Co Ltd, Japan) and T. Takamatsu (Kyoto University, Japan)

POSTER SESSION

Aids for Plant Operation

20. Computer Simulation of Plant Operation. 251
P.J. Billing and P.L. Yue (University of Bath, UK)
21. Computer Supervision of Process Plant — A User Report. 263
M.R. West (Shell UK Oil)

Influence of New CAD Technology

22. Prosub — A Thermophysical Property Database for Microcomputer Systems. 271
P.E. Sawyer and K.S. Lim (University of Bath, UK)
23. Computer Applications in the Nuclear Reprocessing Industry. 283
H.G. McKenzie and G.T. Swartfigure (British Nuclear Fuels plc, UK)

24. A New Methodology for Engineer Programmers — LSD a Structured Fortran Code Generator. 295
M.H. Proudler and M.L. Preston (ICI plc, UK)
25. The Design of Design Software. 303
W. Toller and L.M. Rose (ETH Zentrum, Switzerland)

Design of Flowsheets

A. Simulation

26. A Multiple Purpose Phase Equilibrium Package for Separation Process Simulation and Design. 313
P.M. Andersen, E.A. Brignole and A. Fredenslund (Technical University of Denmark)
27. Multi-Phase Problems and their Solution with the "MPFPL" Simulator. 329
P.S. Burr (Linde AG, Germany)
28. The Incorporation of Procedures in an Equation-Oriented Flowsheeting Environment. 341
A.J. Field, R.P. Maddams and W. Morton (University of Cambridge, UK)
29. Studies in the Dynamics of Distillation Trains. 353
R. Gani, C.A. Ruiz and I.T. Cameron (PLAPIQUI, Argentina)
30. CHEMASIM — Experience with BASF's Simultaneous Process Simulator. 365
B. Hegner and H. Schoenmakers (BASF AG, Germany)
31. Solution Techniques for Processes Described by Mixed Sets of Equations and Procedures. 377
S. Macchietto (Imperial College London, UK)
- 32.* The Simulation Study of a Reactor-Three Phases Azeotropic Distillation Tower System. 675
W. Jing, Q. Wang, W. Ling, X. Wang, and Y. Yang (Beijing Institute of Chemical Technology, China)

B. Synthesis

33. Chemical Reactors in Process Synthesis. 391
G.A.P. Conti and W.R. Paterson (University of Cambridge, UK)
34. A New Cost Diagram Approach for Preliminary Process Design. 403
J.M. Douglas (University of Massachusetts, USA) and D.C. Woodcock (ICI plc, UK)
35. Reactors-Separators Sequences Synthesis by a Tree Searching Algorithm. 415
P. Floquet, L. Pibouleau and S. Domenech (Institut du Genie Chimique, France)
36. Synthesis in Process Development: Issues and Solution Methodologies. 427
G. Stephanopoulos (MIT, USA) and D.W. Townsend (ICI plc, UK)

* This paper is numbered out of page sequence

FORMAL SESSIONS

Operability Considerations at Design Stage I

Session Chairman: Prof O.A. Asbjornsen, University of Houston, USA

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 37. | Control System Development Without Dynamic Simulation.
R.D. Johnston and G.W. Barton (University of Sydney, Australia) | 443 |
| 38. | Studies on the Design of Robust Chemical Plants.
A. Palazoglu and Y. Arkun (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, USA) | 457 |
| 39. | Dynamic Resiliency of Heat-Integrated Distillation Systems.
H. Ohno and E. Nakanishi (Kobe University, Japan) | 469 |
| 40. | Assessing Controllability of Chemical Plants.
M.P.F. Wong and J.D. Perkins (Imperial College London, UK) | 481 |
| 41. | Effect of Model Uncertainty on Dynamic Resilience.
M. Morari and S. Skogestad (California Institute of Technology, USA) | 493 |
| 42. | The Integration of Process Design, Simulation, and Control Systems.
D.J. Herman, G.R. Sullivan (University of Waterloo, Canada) and S. Thomas (Imperial College London, UK) | 505 |

The Influence of New CAD Technology

Session Chairman: Prof C. McGreavy, University of Leeds

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 43. | An Expert System for Computer-Aided Flowsheet Synthesis.
M.D. Lu and R.L. Motard (Washington University, USA) | 517 |
| 44. | Some Expert System Experiments in Process Engineering.
K. Niida, J. Itoh, T. Umeda (Chiyoda Chemical Engineering & Construction, Japan) S. Kobayashi and A. Ichikawa (Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan) | 529 |
| 45. | Graphical Input to a Process Simulator.
L. Naess (Norsk Hydro, Norway) and P.A. Loeken (The Norwegian Institute of Technology, Norway) | 541 |
| 46. | Selection Criteria for an Integrated CAE System.
A.J. James (Fluor (GB) Ltd, UK) | 553 |
| 47. | The Impact of CAD and Database Techniques in Process Engineering.
J. Craft (ChemShare Process Systems Ltd, UK) | 565 |
| 48. | An Engineering Data Model for Computer Aided Design Databases.
M. Benayoune and P.E. Preece (University of Leeds, UK) | 581 |
| 49. | An Engineering Database for Process Design.
C.J. Angus and P. Winter (Prosys Technology Limited, UK) | 593 |

Operability Considerations at Design Stage II
 Session Chairman: Prof O.A. Asbjornsen (University of Houston, USA)

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 50. | Structural Flexibility of Heat Integrated Distillation Columns.
Prof A. Westerberg and Chen Bingzhen (University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA) | 607 |
| 51. | A New Approach for Evaluating Flexibility in Chemical Process Design.
C. Floudas and I.E. Grossmann (Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA) | 619 |
| 52. | Tolerance Problems for Uncertainties in MILP Formulation of a Process System.
E. Kunugita, H. Nishitani and Y. Kutsuwa (Osaka University, Japan) | 631 |
| 53. | Steady-State Control as a Prelude to Dynamic Control.
W.R. Fisher, M.F. Doherty and J.M. Douglas (University of Massachusetts, USA) | 643 |
| 54. | Designing for Reliability and Safety Control.
E.J. Henley (University of Houston, USA) and K. Kumamoto (Kyoto University, Japan) | 651 |
| 55. | Variability Analysis for Intermediate Storage in Noncontinuous Processes: Stochastic Case.
I.A. Karimi and G.V. Reklaitis (Purdue University, USA) | 663 |

REPRESENTING DISTRIBUTED-UNITS IN AN EQUATION-ORIENTED SIMULATOR

W.R. Paterson, S.J. Bartram, D.M. Boulton, D.B. Topcliffe

Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Cambridge

Summary

Equation-oriented flowsheeting programs work with algebraic equations, but some common process units are modelled by differential equations. Previous attempts to cope with the resultant difficulties are unsatisfactory. A new method is described, called the "black-box approach", in which subroutines are used which disguise the nature of the unit model, and instead pass to the main program a set of algebraic equations of the form it requires. The method is illustrated by successful application to a two-dimensional model of a packed bed catalytic reactor within a simple process flowsheet.

1. Introduction

In an equation-oriented simulator such as QUASILIN (1), the units are not represented by a modular simulator's familiar unit subroutines whose purpose is to calculate unit outputs given unit inputs. Instead the unit subroutine's job is to set equations. The algebraic equations describing the unit are divided into linear and non-linear. The former are retained unchanged and have appended to them the linear equations resulting from linearising, about some starting values, the non-linear equations. The equations thus set are combined with those of the other units in the flowsheet and solved. Iteration proceeds to converge.

If a unit is essentially distributed (i.e. is represented by ordinary differential equations (ODE's) or partial differential equations (PDE's), lacking a closed form solution) it does not fit naturally into this scheme, since it is not described by algebraic equations. There are currently two ways of overcoming this difficulty.

Sarma and Reklaitis (2) used an equation-oriented model to represent a wall-cooled plug-flow tubular ethylene oxidation reactor. To convert their ODE's to algebraic form "approximate response surfaces had to be fit to the numerical solutions generated over a range of anticipated operating conditions. The response surfaces inherently have only a limited range of validity and hence may need to be refitted if their limits are exceeded during use of the model". Given the large number of variables which might be involved - feed composition and temperature, pressure, tube length and other reactor parameters (tube diameter, coolant temperature and so forth) - this approach has limited applicability. Kreule (3) developed a QUASILIN representation of a two-dimensional model (i.e. one with both axial and radial gradients) of a packed bed reactor using an intricate two-dimensional network of CSTR's. This has the disadvantages that:

- (a) A new reactor model is required to replace an existing PDE model.

- (b) As explained below, excessive storage requirements readily arise.
- (c) There is no easy, cheap way of finding the derivative of an output variable w.r.t. reactor size, so limiting the usefulness of the model to simulation, as distinct from design or optimisation, calculations.

2. Direct Reduction to Algebraic Equations

An obvious alternative is to reduce the differential equation(s) to algebraic equations using some approximate method e.g. orthogonal collocation (OC). Unlike finite differencing, where the derivative at a point is replaced by a linear combination of the variable values at that point and neighbouring points only, OC replaces the derivative of a variable C w.r.t. some co-ordinate x by a linear combination of the variable values at a number of points x_i spaced over the whole domain of x :

$$\frac{dc}{dx} = \sum A_{ij} C_i; \quad \nabla^2 C = \sum B_{ij} C_i, \quad \text{where } C_i \equiv C(x_i) \quad (1)$$

The points x_i , and weights A_{ij} , B_{ij} are calculated following Finlayson (4): double precision calculation was found to be essential. The method was applied to a two-point boundary value ODE model of an isothermal tubular reactor with axial dispersion superimposed on plug flow, effecting a 2nd order reaction ((4), pp 126-9). After substitution of (1), the differential equation of the model becomes a set of nonlinear algebraic equations which QUASILIN handles successfully.

Consider next a second example from Finlayson: a two-dimensional plug-flow model of a packed bed catalytic reactor which is host to an exothermic isomerisation $A \rightarrow B$ at constant density. The model equations are shown in Table 1 where they are written in terms of G_A , the molar flowrate of A per unit cross-section area of reactor; T the temperature; a , the dimensionless tube radius and z , the dimensional distance from the reactor entrance. First, (1) is applied to the radial co-ordinate, reducing the coupled PDE's to a set of coupled ODE's in the axial co-ordinate

$$\frac{dG_{Aj}}{dz} = \alpha_m \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} B_{ij} G_{Ai} - \beta_m e^{-\gamma} \frac{G_{Aj}}{G} \quad j = 1, 2 \dots (N+1)$$

$$\frac{dT_j}{dz} = \alpha_h \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} B_{ij} T_j + \beta_h e^{-\gamma} \frac{G_{Aj}}{G^2} \quad j = 1, 2 \dots (N+1)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N+1} A_{N+1,i} G_{Ai} = 0; \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} A_{N+1,i} T_i = Bi (T_w - T_{N+1})$$

$$z = 0; \quad G_{Aj} = G_A \text{ in, } T_j = T_{in} \quad (2)$$

Here $G_{Aj} \equiv G_A(a_j)$ and $T_j \equiv T(a_j)$. Then OC is applied to (2). Here a difficulty arises: because of the shape of the axial profiles (Fig. 1) with their severe changes of gradient, the power of OC is much reduced,

because e.g. the temperatures near the reactor inlet tell us nothing about the temperature gradients near the reactor outlet. This difficulty is avoided by applying OC within each of a sequence of 40 steps of z (4). Two interior collocation points were used within each step. This results in a total of 968 variables (and hence equations to be linearised) for QUASILIN: as shown below, probably 10 interior collocation points should have been used radially implying a total of 2904 variables. However, our operating system until recently imposed a limit of about 1000 variables for all the streams in a flowsheet. Thus direct reduction to algebraic equations may lead to exceeding permissible storage size. This same objection applies to attempts to model such a packed bed reactor by a network of CSTR's.

The escape from this restriction is obvious - a method must be found of modelling such reactors which requires QUASILIN to handle the variables in reactor inlet and outlet streams and not the variables relevant only to the interior of the reactor. Such an approach will hide from QUASILIN the detailed modelling of the reactor, so a reasonable name is:-

3. The "black box" Approach

For any process unit let the column vectors of input and output variables be \underline{u} and \underline{v} respectively. Then, from the point-of-view of QUASILIN, the unit may be treated as a "black-box", with its output related to its input by some functional relation

$$\underline{v} = \underline{h}(\underline{u}) \quad \text{or} \quad \underline{v} - \underline{h}(\underline{u}) = 0 \quad \{3,4\}$$

A Newton linearisation of {4} w.r.t. both \underline{v} and \underline{u} yields

$$\underline{I} \underline{v}^{(m+1)} - \left[\frac{\partial \underline{h}}{\partial \underline{u}} \right] \underline{u}^{(m+1)} = \left[-(\underline{v} - \underline{h}(\underline{u})) + \underline{I} \underline{v} - \frac{\partial \underline{h}}{\partial \underline{u}} \underline{u} \right]$$

which simplifies to

$$\underline{I} \underline{v}^{(m+1)} - [\underline{J}] \underline{u}^{(m+1)} = [\underline{h}(\underline{u}) - \underline{J} \underline{u}] \quad \{5\}$$

$$\text{where } \underline{J} \text{ is the Jacobian } \frac{\partial \underline{h}}{\partial \underline{u}} \text{ i.e. } J_{ji} = \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial u_i} \quad \{6\}$$

Thus the set of linearised relations which QUASILIN requires, between the elements of \underline{v} and \underline{u} , is given by {5}, whose use requires values for the elements of \underline{J} , \underline{h} and \underline{u} within the square brackets. In contrast to a module in a modular simulator, the "black-box" must, for given \underline{u} , provide not only values of \underline{h} but also of \underline{J} . Two methods for finding these elements have been used, which will be illustrated with reference to plug-flow reactors.

(a) Perturbation

Here a subroutine is written to integrate the model ODE's with initial values available as \underline{u} from the previous iteration. At the reactor exit, the values of \underline{h} are obtained. By repeating the solution with one element of \underline{u} , u_i , perturbed to the value $u_i + \delta u_i$ where δu_i is typically ca. 1% of u_i , a new value of \underline{h} is obtained, say \underline{h}' . Then $J_{ji} = \frac{\partial h_j}{\partial u_i} = (h'_j - h_j) / \delta u_i$ is calculated for each element of \underline{h} . This perturbation-

plus-re-resolution is repeated for each element of \underline{u} . The values of \underline{u} , \underline{h} and \underline{J} are used in the square brackets of {5}. The advantage of this method is that it allows use of a unit model originally devised for stand-alone or sequential-modular flowsheeting use. The disadvantage is that it requires $(n+1)$ solutions of the model per flowsheet iteration, where n is the number of stream variables in the reactor input stream.

(b) Sensitivity coefficients

The set of ordinary differential equations describing a one-dimensional distributed model may be written generally as

$$\frac{dy}{dz} = \underline{f}(y, p, z) \quad (7)$$

with initial values (IV's) $\underline{y}(0) = \underline{y}_0$.

Here z is the independent variable i.e. axial co ordinate, \underline{y} is the column vector of dependent variables (temperature (T), molar flowrate of substance A (F_A) ...), \underline{f} is the column vector of functional forms, and \underline{p} is a vector of parameters. Differentiate the LHS of one eqn of the set w.r.t. one element of \underline{y}_0 and then reverse the order of differentiation on the LHS and apply the chain rule to the RHS.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{0j}} \frac{dy_i}{dz} = \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial y_{0j}} \Rightarrow \frac{d}{dz} \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial y_{0j}} = \sum_l \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial y_l} \frac{\partial y_l}{\partial y_{0j}}$$

Or, defining

$$\lambda_{ij} \equiv \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial y_{0j}}, \quad S_{il} \equiv \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial y_l} \quad (8)$$

the result for all i, j summaries to

$$\frac{d}{dz} \underline{\lambda} = \underline{S} \underline{\lambda} \text{ with i.c. } \underline{\lambda}(0) = \underline{I} \quad (9)$$

An alternative derivation is given in Rosenbrock and Storey (5), whose eqn (68) on p. 202 should be corrected.

Thus a set of coupled linear ODE's, called the auxiliary equations, describes the evolution of the sensitivity coefficients λ_{ij} along the reactor, where λ_{ij} summarises how y_i responds to some small change in the input variable y_{0j} . The matrix $\underline{\lambda}$ evaluated at the reactor outlet, $z = L$, therefore is identical to the matrix \underline{J} of {5} and {6}. Thus, to obtain \underline{h} and \underline{J} for the square brackets in {5}, all that's required is the integration of the conservation equations {7} simultaneously with the auxiliary equations {9} to the reactor outlet. The IV's used for {7} are the values of \underline{y}_0 determined from the previous flowsheet iteration. For the isomerisation $A \rightarrow B$ at constant density, the particular form of {3} is

$$F_{A \text{ out}} = h_1 (F_{A \text{ in}}, F_{B \text{ in}}, T_{\text{in}}); \quad T_{\text{out}} = h_2 (F_{A \text{ in}}, F_{B \text{ in}}, T_{\text{in}}) \quad (10)$$

$$F_{B \text{ out}} = F_{A \text{ in}} + F_{B \text{ in}} - F_{A \text{ out}}; \quad F_{\text{out}} = F_{A \text{ out}} + F_{B \text{ out}} \quad (11)$$

Hence from {10}

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_{A \text{ out}} - (\lambda_{AA}^{\text{out}}) F_{A \text{ in}} - (\lambda_{AB}^{\text{out}}) F_{B \text{ in}} - (\lambda_{AT}^{\text{out}}) T_{\text{in}} \\
 = (F_{A \text{ out}} - \lambda_{AA}^{\text{out}} F_{A \text{ in}} - \lambda_{AB}^{\text{out}} F_{B \text{ in}} - \lambda_{AT}^{\text{out}} T_{\text{in}}) \\
 \text{and } T_{\text{out}} - (\lambda_{TA}^{\text{out}}) F_{A \text{ in}} - (\lambda_{TB}^{\text{out}}) F_{B \text{ in}} - (\lambda_{TT}^{\text{out}}) T_{\text{in}} \\
 = (T_{\text{out}} - \lambda_{TA}^{\text{out}} F_{A \text{ in}} - \lambda_{TB}^{\text{out}} F_{B \text{ in}} - \lambda_{TT}^{\text{out}} T_{\text{in}})
 \end{aligned} \quad \{12\}$$

where, for instance, $\lambda_{AA}^{\text{out}} \equiv \partial F_{A \text{ out}} / \partial F_{A \text{ in}} = \partial h_1 / \partial F_{A \text{ in}}$, evaluated at the reactor outlet $z = L$. Equations {11} are retained unchanged since they are already linear, so {11} and {12} together correspond to {5}.

This technique has been applied successfully to the wall-cooled plug flow reactor (6) and to the isothermal plug flow reactor with multiple reactions (7). It is also possible to calculate other derivatives commonly required in design or optimisation. Thus $\partial y_i / \partial L$ is simply the value of the LHS of the i th member of {7} at the completion of integration at $z = L$. Further, the derivatives of the outlet values of y w.r.t. some of the parameter values might be required. Writing $\kappa \equiv \partial y_i / \partial p_j$ and $T_{ij} \equiv \partial f_i / \partial p_j$,

$$\frac{d}{dz} \underline{\kappa} = \underline{S} \underline{\kappa} + \underline{T} \text{ with i.c. } \underline{\kappa}(0) = \underline{0} \quad \{13\}$$

The required members of this additional set of auxiliary equations may also be integrated with the conservation equations {7}; the values of the elements of $\underline{\kappa}$ at the reactor outlet are the desired derivatives.

4. Application to a two-dimensional reactor model

There are two ways of applying sensitivity coefficients to PDE's. Either the PDE's are first discretised radially into ODE's - e.g. by OC using {1} - and then the method is applied to them; or the auxiliary PDE's are derived and then discretised radially for solution, which gives the same result. The auxiliary equations for the latter are shown in table 1, where, for simplicity, the parameters B_i , α_m , α_h are treated as being independent of F_A , F_B , T . The solution to the PDE's consists of quantities such as $\lambda_{AA}^{\text{out}}$ at a number of radial positions a_j . However QUASILIN requires J_{ij} of {3-6}, which is clearly the derivative, with respect to inlet molar flowrate of A, of the radial (mixing cup) mean outlet molar flowrate of A, given by

$$F_{A \text{ out}} = 2 \int_0^1 a F_A(L, a) da. \quad \{14\}$$

$$\lambda_{AA}^{\text{out}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial F_A} \int_0^1 2 a F_A(L, a) da =$$

$$2 \int_0^1 a \frac{\partial F_A(L, a)}{\partial F_A} da = 2 \int_0^1 a \lambda_{AA}(L, a) da \quad \{15\}$$

The integrals in {14} and {15} are calculated numerically from the integrand values at the a_j 's.

In this way, all outlet variables and derivatives required in {11} and {12} are calculated. Calculations were performed using the parameter values listed in (8) which were derived from the dimensionless values of Finlayson. Axial integration was effected by three different methods (Runge-Kutta-Merson, Adams, Gear), and radial discretisation by two (OC, finite differencing). Figure 1 shows results obtained using 10 radial points. The (radial mean) temperature rises to a hot-spot, at which point the conversion of A is 98%. Thereafter the temperature sinks approximately exponentially towards the wall temperature and F_A falls towards zero. Hence at the outlet, all the sensitivity coefficients plotted are almost zero since only alteration of T_w could alter T_{out} , and F_A and F_B are scarcely alterable by any small change. At $z = 0.65$ m, just before the hot-spot, λ_{TT} goes through a maximum, because if T_{in} were raised a little, the hot-spot would occur nearer the entrance, and so T at 0.65 m would be much higher. Thereafter λ_{TT} falls to a negative value, since if T_{in} were raised, and hot-spot moved forward, near-exhaustion of reactants would mean that T at 0.80 m would be much lower. The other sensitivity coefficient plots can be explained similarly.

As a useful approximation, these reactor outlet results could be used in {12}, and integration of the auxiliary equations dispensed with altogether, if one could be sure that, at all flowsheet iterations, the reactor would be long enough, and T_{in} high enough, for profiles of this shape to develop. Figure 2 shows the results for the same case, but with only four radial points used. An unphysical kink appears in the F_A and T plots - an artefact of the poorer approximation to the PDE. The effect on the sensitivity coefficients at the bed exit is unimportant, but the effect at the kink is dramatic. If, during the flowsheet iterations, such misbehaviour should happen at the reactor outlet, then convergence would presumably be hampered. This implies, unusually, that for refined calculations towards the end of a simulation, it might be that a comparatively crude 4-point radial approximation to the PDE would suffice, whereas for preliminary calculations a more accurate 10-point radial approximation might be necessary. A cheaper solution would probably be to replace the two-dimensional model with a one-dimensional model in early iterations.

Comparison of numerical methods was not exhaustive, nor was any attempt made to optimise the subroutines used. However, it is noteworthy that OC was faster than finite differencing when only 4 radial points were used, as the literature (4) would lead one to expect. Unexpectedly, with 10 radial points finite differencing proved faster (9). With the same number of radial points, OC is the more accurate. Runge-Kutta-Merson was the fastest of the axial integration routines.

Satisfactory tests were made with the reactor module placed in a simple recycle loop with different values of L and F_{A-in} used (9). The perturbation method was used successfully to check several of the sensitivity coefficient calculations.

Discussion and Conclusions.

- (i) For one-dimensional plug flow reactor models, the black-box method works well. In a real flowsheet application, much of run-time will be spent in thermopacks i.e. on calculating thermodynamic properties (3). There will then be a heavy penalty for the multiple integrations of the perturbation method so the sensitivity coefficient method is preferred. This will require modification of existing modular flowsheeting routines by addition of the auxiliary equations. This is the recommended technique for any operation to be modelled by first-order ordinary differential equations with given initial values.
- (ii) For a two-dimensional model, with its need for radial integration of output variables, there is no attractive alternative to a black-box module. Again, the sensitivity coefficient method is recommended.
- (iii) As an alternative to the black-box approach, direct reduction to algebraic equations worked well for an isothermal boundary value problem. For more demanding non-isothermal boundary value problems, it seems likely that a black-box approach must be developed. Advances here may also prove useful for countercurrent cascades of stages (10).
- (iv) It would be worth investigating the reduction in computing time realised by exploiting the linearity of the auxiliary equations (11).
- (v) Some methods of integrating the conservation ordinary differential equations generate the matrix \underline{S} within the integration routine (12, 13). It should therefore be recovered and used in the auxiliary equations, which will thus be solved at almost no extra cost beyond that required for the conservation equations.
- (vi) If resort is to be made to a response surface fit, it might best be derived by exploiting a black-box unit which provides both responses and their derivatives w.r.t. input variables and parameters.
- (vii) Beginners find writing QUASILIN units difficult, partly because of the use of MORTRAN statements. Black-box units consist of FORTRAN coding, and might therefore be exploited as a route to making QUASILIN more user-friendly.

- (viii) The sensitivity equation plots give some hint at the difficulties any flowsheeting method might face in representing a short reactor performing an irreversible exothermic reaction.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. W. Morton for instruction in the use of QUASILIN.

References

- (1) Jackson, D.J., Hutchison, H.P. and Morton, W., submitted to Comput. Chem. Eng. 1984.
- (2) Sarma, P.V.L.N. and Reklaitis, G.V., Math. Prog. Study 1982, 20, 113.
- (3) Kreule, T., Tripos Project Report, Dept. Chem. Eng., U. Cambridge, 1982.
- (4) Finlayson, B.A., "The Method of Weighted Residuals and Variational Principles", Acad Press, N.Y. 1972.
- (5) Rosenbrock, H.H. and Storey, C., "Computational Techniques for Chemical Engineers", Pergamon, Oxford 1966.
- (6) Topliffe, D.B., Tripos Project Report, Dept. Chem. Eng., U. Cambridge, 1983.
- (7) Conti, G.A.P. and Paterson, W.R., this symposium.
- (8) Boulton, D.M., Tripos Project Report, Dept. Chem. Eng., U. Cambridge, 1983.
- (9) Bartram, S.J., Tripos Project Report, Dept. Chem. Eng. U. Cambridge, 1984.
- (10) Stewart, W.E., Levien, K.L. and Morari, M., 2nd Conf. Found. Comp. Aided Proc. Design, Snowmass CO, 1983.
- (11) Tilden, J.W., Costanza, V., McRae, G.J., Seinfeld, J.H. in Ebert, K.H., Deuflhard, P., Jager, W., "Modelling of Chemical Reaction Systems", Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1981.
- (12) Gear, C.W., "Numerical initial value problems in ordinary differential equations", Prentice-Hall, N.J., 1971.
- (13) Herzberg, T. and Asbjørnsen, O.A. in "Computer Applications in the Analysis of Chemical Data and Plants", Science Press, Princeton, N.J., 1977.