

---

**DWSIM - Process Simulation, Modeling and Optimization**  
**Technical Manual**

---

*Version 3.2, Revision 0*  
*July 2014*

## License

DWSIM is released under the GNU General Public License (GPL) version 3.

## Contact Information

### **DWSIM - Process Simulation, Modeling and Optimization**

Author: Daniel Medeiros

Collaborator: Cecília Lenzi

Website: <http://dwsim.inforside.com.br> / <http://www.sourceforge.net/projects/dwsim>

Contact: [danielwag@gmail.com](mailto:danielwag@gmail.com)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Thermodynamic Properties</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Phase Equilibria Calculation . . . . .	3
2.1.1	Fugacity Coefficient calculation models . . . . .	4
2.1.2	Chao-Seader and Grayson-Streed models . . . . .	7
2.1.3	Calculation models for the liquid phase activity coefficient . . . . .	7
2.1.4	Models for Aqueous Electrolyte Systems . . . . .	12
2.2	Enthalpy, Entropy and Heat Capacities . . . . .	15
<b>3</b>	<b>Transport Properties</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	Density . . . . .	17
3.2	Viscosity . . . . .	19
3.3	Surface Tension . . . . .	20
<b>4</b>	<b>Thermal Properties</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1	Thermal Conductivity . . . . .	21
<b>5</b>	<b>Aqueous Solution Properties</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1	Mean salt activity coefficient . . . . .	23
5.2	Osmotic coefficient . . . . .	23
5.3	Freezing point depression . . . . .	23
<b>6</b>	<b>Reactions</b>	<b>23</b>
6.1	Conversion Reaction . . . . .	24
6.2	Equilibrium Reaction . . . . .	24
6.2.1	Solution method . . . . .	25
6.3	Kinetic Reaction . . . . .	25
<b>7</b>	<b>Property Estimation Methods</b>	<b>26</b>
7.1	Petroleum Fractions . . . . .	26
7.1.1	Molecular weight . . . . .	26
7.1.2	Specific Gravity . . . . .	27
7.1.3	Critical Properties . . . . .	27
7.1.4	Acentric Factor . . . . .	28
7.1.5	Vapor Pressure . . . . .	28
7.1.6	Viscosity . . . . .	29
7.2	Hypothetical Components . . . . .	29
<b>8</b>	<b>Other Properties</b>	<b>30</b>
8.1	True Critical Point . . . . .	30
8.2	Natural Gas Hydrates . . . . .	31
8.2.1	Modified van der Waals and Platteeuw (Parrish and Prausnitz) method . . . . .	31
8.2.2	Klauda and Sandler . . . . .	32
8.2.3	Chen and Guo . . . . .	33

---

8.3	Petroleum Cold Flow Properties . . . . .	34
8.3.1	Refraction Index . . . . .	34
8.3.2	Flash Point . . . . .	34
8.3.3	Pour Point . . . . .	34
8.3.4	Freezing Point . . . . .	34
8.3.5	Cloud Point . . . . .	35
8.3.6	Cetane Index . . . . .	35
8.4	Chao-Seader Parameters . . . . .	35
<b>References</b>		<b>36</b>

## 1 Introduction

The thermodynamic calculations are the basis for the simulations in DWSIM. It is important for a process simulator to cover a variety of systems, which can go from simple water handling processes to complex, more elaborated cases, such as simulations of processes in the petroleum/chemical industry.

Regarding phase equilibria, DWSIM is able to model equilibrium between solids, vapor and up to two liquid phases where possible. External CAPE-OPEN Property Packages may have different equilibrium capabilities.

The following sections describe the calculation methods used in DWSIM for the physical and chemical description of the elements of a simulation.

## 2 Thermodynamic Properties

### 2.1 Phase Equilibria Calculation

In a mixture which finds itself in a vapor-liquid equilibria state (VLE), the component fugacities are the same in all phases, that is [1]:

$$f_i^L = f_i^V \quad (2.1)$$

The fugacity of a component in a mixture depends on temperature, pressure and composition. in order to relate  $f_i^V$  with temperature, pressure and molar fraction, we define the fugacity coefficient,

$$\phi_i = \frac{f_i^V}{y_i P}, \quad (2.2)$$

which can be calculated from PVT data, commonly obtained from an equation of state. For a mixture of ideal gases,  $\phi_i = 1$ .

The fugacity of the  $i$  component in the liquid phase is related to the composition of that phase by the activity coefficient  $\gamma_i$ , which by itself is related to  $x_i$  and standard-state fugacity  $f_i^0$  by

$$\gamma_i = \frac{f_i^L}{x_i f_i^0}. \quad (2.3)$$

The standard state fugacity  $f_i^0$  is the fugacity of the  $i$ -th component in the system temperature, i.e. mixture, and in an arbitrary pressure and composition. in DWSIM, the standard-state fugacity of each component is considered to be equal to pure liquid  $i$  at the system temperature and pressure.

If an Equation of State is used to calculate equilibria, fugacity of the  $i$ -th component in the liquid phase is calculated by

$$\phi_i = \frac{f_i^L}{x_i P}, \quad (2.4)$$

with the fugacity coefficient  $\phi_i$  calculated by the EOS, just like it is for the same component in the vapor phase.

The fugacity coefficient of the  $i$ -th component either in the liquid or in the vapor phase is obtained from the same Equation of State through the following expressions

$$RT \ln \phi_i^L = \int_{V^L}^{\infty} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial n_i} \right)_{T,V,n_j} - \frac{RT}{V} \right] dV - RT \ln Z^L, \quad (2.5)$$

$$RT \ln \phi_i^V = \int_{V^V}^{\infty} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial n_i} \right)_{T,V,n_j} - \frac{RT}{V} \right] dV - RT \ln Z^V, \quad (2.6)$$

where the compressibility factor  $Z$  is given by

$$Z^L = \frac{PV^L}{RT} \quad (2.7)$$

$$Z^V = \frac{PV^V}{RT} \quad (2.8)$$

### 2.1.1 Fugacity Coefficient calculation models

**Peng-Robinson Equation of State** The Peng-Robinson equation [2] is an cubic Equation of State (characteristic related to the exponent of the molar volume) which relates temperature, pressure and molar volume of a pure component or a mixture of components at equilibrium. The cubic equations are, in fact, the simplest equations capable of representing the behavior of liquid and vapor phases simultaneously. The Peng-Robinson EOS is written in the following form

$$P = \frac{RT}{(V-b)} - \frac{a(T)}{V(V+b) + b(V-b)} \quad (2.9)$$

where

$P$	pressure
$R$	ideal gas universal constant
$v$	molar volume
$b$	parameter related to hard-sphere volume
$a$	parameter related to intermolecular forces

For pure substances, the  $a$  and  $b$  parameters are given by:

$$a(T) = [1 + (0.37464 + 1.54226\omega - 0.26992\omega^2)(1 - T_r^{(1/2)})]^2 0.45724(R^2 T_c^2) / P_c \quad (2.10)$$

$$b = 0.07780(RT_c) / P_c \quad (2.11)$$

where

$\omega$	acentric factor
$T_c$	critical temperature
$P_c$	critical pressure
$T_r$	reduced temperature, $T/T_c$

For mixtures, equation 2.9 can be used, replacing  $a$  and  $b$  by mixture-representative values.  $a$  and  $b$  mixture values are normally given by the basic mixing rule,

$$a_m = \sum_i \sum_j x_i x_j \sqrt{(a_i a_j)(1 - k_{ij})} \quad (2.12)$$

$$b_m = \sum_i x_i b_i \quad (2.13)$$

where

$x_{i,j}$  molar fraction of the  $i$  or  $j$  component in the phase (liquid or vapor)

$a_{i,j}$   $i$  or  $j$  component  $a$  constant

$b_{i,j}$   $i$  or  $j$  component  $b$  constant

$k_{ij}$  binary interaction parameter which characterizes the  $i$ - $j$  pair

The binary interaction parameters used by DWSIM are loaded from the databank and can be modified in the Property Package configuration window.

The fugacity coefficient obtained with the Peng-Robinson EOS is given by

$$\ln \frac{f_i}{x_i P} = \frac{b_i}{b_m} (Z - 1) - \ln (Z - B) - \frac{A}{2\sqrt{2}B} \left( \frac{\sum_k x_k a_{ki}}{a_m} - \frac{b_i}{b_m} \right) \ln \left( \frac{Z + 2.414B}{Z - 0.414B} \right), \quad (2.14)$$

where  $Z$  is the phase compressibility factor (liquid or vapor) and can be obtained from the equation 2.9,

$$Z^3 - (1 - B)Z^2 + (A - 3B^2 - 2B)Z - (AB - B^2 - 2B) = 0, \quad (2.15)$$

$$A = \frac{a_m P}{R^2 T^2} \quad (2.16)$$

$$B = \frac{b_m P}{RT} \quad (2.17)$$

$$Z = \frac{PV}{RT} \quad (2.18)$$

**Soave-Redlich-Kwong Equation of State** The Soave-Redlich-Kwong Equation [3] is also a cubic equation of state in volume,

$$P = \frac{RT}{(V - b)} - \frac{a(T)}{V(V + b)}, \quad (2.19)$$

The  $a$  and  $b$  parameters are given by:

$$a(T) = [1 + (0.48 + 1.574\omega - 0.176\omega^2)(1 - T_r^{(1/2)})]^2 0.42747(R^2 T_c^2) / P_c \quad (2.20)$$

$$b = 0.08664(RT_c) / P_c \quad (2.21)$$

The equations 2.12 and 2.13 are used to calculate mixture parameters. Fugacity is calculated by

$$\ln \frac{f_i}{x_i P} = \frac{b_i}{b_m} (Z - 1) - \ln (Z - B) - \frac{A}{B} \left( \frac{\sum_k x_k a_{ki}}{a_m} - \frac{b_i}{b_m} \right) \ln \left( \frac{Z + B}{Z} \right) \quad (2.22)$$

The phase compressibility factor  $Z$  is obtained from the equation 2.19,

$$Z^3 - Z^2 + (A - B - B^2)Z - AB = 0, \quad (2.23)$$

$$A = \frac{a_m P}{R^2 T^2} \quad (2.24)$$



$$B = \frac{b_m P}{RT} \quad (2.25)$$

$$Z = \frac{PV}{RT} \quad (2.26)$$

The equations 2.15 and 2.23, in low temperature and pressure conditions, can provide three roots for  $Z$ . In this case, if liquid properties are being calculated, the smallest root is used. If the phase is vapor, the largest root is used. The remaining root has no physical meaning; at high temperatures and pressures (conditions above the pseudocritical point), the equations 2.15 and 2.23 provides only one real root.

**Peng-Robinson with Volume Translation** Volume translation solves the main problem with two-constant EOS's, poor liquid volumetric predictions. A simple correction term is applied to the EOS-calculated molar volume,

$$v = v^{EOS} - c, \quad (2.27)$$

where  $v$  =corrected molar volume,  $v^{EOS}$  =EOS-calculated volume, and  $c$  =component-specific constant. The shift in volume is actually equivalent to adding a third constant to the EOS but is special because equilibrium conditions are unaltered.

It is also shown that multicomponent VLE is unaltered by introducing the volume-shift term  $c$  as a mole-fraction average,

$$v_L = v_L^{EOS} - \sum x_i c_i \quad (2.28)$$

Volume translation can be applied to any two-constant cubic equation, thereby eliminating the volumetric deficiency suffered by all two-constant equations [4].

### **Peng-Robinson-Stryjek-Vera**

#### **PRSV1**

A modification to the attraction term in the Peng-Robinson equation of state published by Stryjek and Vera in 1986 (PRSV) significantly improved the model's accuracy by introducing an adjustable pure component parameter and by modifying the polynomial fit of the acentric factor.

The modification is:

$$\kappa = \kappa_0 + \kappa_1 \left(1 + T_r^{0.5}\right) (0.7 - T_r) \quad (2.29)$$

$$\kappa_0 = 0.378893 + 1.4897153 \omega - 0.17131848 \omega^2 + 0.0196554 \omega^3 \quad (2.30)$$

where  $\kappa_1$  is an adjustable pure component parameter. Stryjek and Vera published pure component parameters for many compounds of industrial interest in their original journal article.

#### **PRSV2**

A subsequent modification published in 1986 (PRSV2) [5] further improved the model's accuracy by introducing two additional pure component parameters to the previous attraction term modification.

The modification is:

$$\kappa = \kappa_0 + \left[ \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 (\kappa_3 - T_r) \left( 1 - T_r^{0.5} \right) \right] \left( 1 + T_r^{0.5} \right) (0.7 - T_r) \quad (2.31)$$

$$\kappa_0 = 0.378893 + 1.4897153 \omega - 0.17131848 \omega^2 + 0.0196554 \omega^3 \quad (2.32)$$

where  $\kappa_1$ ,  $\kappa_2$ , and  $\kappa_3$  are adjustable pure component parameters.

PRSV2 is particularly advantageous for VLE calculations. While PRSV1 does offer an advantage over the Peng-Robinson model for describing thermodynamic behavior, it is still not accurate enough, in general, for phase equilibrium calculations. The highly non-linear behavior of phase-equilibrium calculation methods tends to amplify what would otherwise be acceptably small errors. It is therefore recommended that PRSV2 be used for equilibrium calculations when applying these models to a design. However, once the equilibrium state has been determined, the phase specific thermodynamic values at equilibrium may be determined by one of several simpler models with a reasonable degree of accuracy.

### 2.1.2 Chao-Seader and Grayson-Streed models

Chao-Seader ([6]) and Grayson-Streed ([7]) are older, semi-empirical models. The Grayson-Streed correlation is an extension of the Chao-Seader method with special applicability to hydrogen. In DWSIM, only the equilibrium values produced by these correlations are used in the calculations. The Lee-Kesler method is used to determine the enthalpy and entropy of liquid and vapor phases.

**Chao Seader** Use this method for heavy hydrocarbons, where the pressure is less than 10 342 kPa (1 500 psia) and the temperature is between the range -17.78 °C and 260 °C.

**Grayson Streed** Recommended for simulating heavy hydrocarbon systems with a high hydrogen content.

### 2.1.3 Calculation models for the liquid phase activity coefficient

The activity coefficient  $\gamma$  is a factor used in thermodynamics to account for deviations from ideal behaviour in a mixture of chemical substances. In an ideal mixture, the interactions between each pair of chemical species are the same (or more formally, the enthalpy of mixing is zero) and, as a result, properties of the mixtures can be expressed directly in terms of simple concentrations or partial pressures of the substances present. Deviations from ideality are accommodated by modifying the concentration by an activity coefficient. . The activity coefficient is defined as

$$\gamma_i = \left[ \frac{\partial(nG^E/RT)}{\partial n_i} \right]_{P,T,n_{j \neq i}} \quad (2.33)$$

where  $G^E$  represents the excess Gibbs energy of the liquid solution, which is a measure of how far the solution is from ideal behavior. For an ideal solution,  $\gamma_i = 1$ . Expressions for  $G^E/RT$  provide values for the activity coefficients.

**UNIQUAC and UNIFAC models** The UNIQUAC equation considers  $g \equiv G^E/RT$  formed by two additive parts, one combinatorial term  $g^C$  to take into account the size of the molecules, and one residual term  $g^R$ , which take into account the interactions between molecules:

$$g \equiv g^C + g^R \quad (2.34)$$

The  $g^C$  function contains only pure species parameters, while the  $g^R$  function incorporates two binary parameters for each pair of molecules. For a multicomponent system,

$$g^C = \sum_i x_i \ln \phi_i / x_i + 5 \sum_i q_i x_i \ln \theta_i / \phi_i \quad (2.35)$$

and

$$g^R = - \sum_i q_i x_i \ln \left( \sum_j \theta_j \tau_{ji} \right) \quad (2.36)$$

where

$$\phi_i \equiv (x_i r_i) / \left( \sum_j x_j r_j \right) \quad (2.37)$$

and

$$\theta_i \equiv (x_i q_i) / \left( \sum_j x_j q_j \right) \quad (2.38)$$

The  $i$  subscript indicates the species, and  $j$  is an index that represents all the species,  $i$  included. All sums are over all the species. Note that  $\tau_{ij} \neq \tau_{ji}$ . When  $i = j$ ,  $\tau_{ii} = \tau_{jj} = 1$ . In these equations,  $r_i$  (a relative molecular volume) and  $q_i$  (a relative molecular surface area) are pure species parameters. The influence of temperature in  $g$  enters by means of the  $\tau_{ij}$  parameters, which are temperature-dependent:

$$\tau_{ij} = \exp(u_{ij} - u_{jj}) / RT \quad (2.39)$$

This way, the UNIQUAC parameters are values of  $(u_{ij} - u_{jj})$ .

An expression for  $\gamma_i$  is found through the application of the following relation:

$$\ln \gamma_i = \left[ \partial(nG^E/RT) / \partial n_i \right]_{(P,T,n_{j \neq i})} \quad (2.40)$$

The result is represented by the following equations:

$$\ln \gamma_i = \ln \gamma_i^C + \ln \gamma_i^R \quad (2.41)$$

$$\ln \gamma_i^C = 1 - J_i + \ln J_i - 5q_i(1 - J_i/L_i + \ln J_i/L_i) \quad (2.42)$$

$$\ln \gamma_i^R = q_i(1 - \ln s_i - \sum_j \theta_j \tau_{ij} / s_j) \quad (2.43)$$

where

$$J_i = r_i / (\sum_j r_j x_j) \quad (2.44)$$

$$L = q_i / (\sum_j q_j x_j) \quad (2.45)$$

$$s_i = \sum_l \theta_l \tau_{li} \quad (2.46)$$

Again the  $i$  subscript identify the species,  $j$  and  $l$  are indexes which represent all the species, including  $i$ . all sums are over all the species, and  $\tau_{ij} = 1$  for  $i = j$ . The parameters values ( $u_{ij} - u_{jj}$ ) are found by regression of binary VLE/LLE data.

The UNIFAC method for the estimation of activity coefficients depends on the concept of that a liquid mixture can be considered a solution of its own molecules. These structural units are called subgroups. The greatest advantage of this method is that a relatively small number of subgroups can be combined to form a very large number of molecules.

The activity coefficients do not only depend on the subgroup properties, but also on the interactions between these groups. Similar subgroups are related to a main group, like "CH<sub>2</sub>", "OH", "ACH" etc.; the identification of the main groups are only descriptive. All the subgroups that belongs to the same main group are considered identical with respect to the interaction between groups. Consequently, the parameters which characterize the interactions between the groups are identified by pairs of the main groups.

The UNIFAC method is based on the UNIQUAC equation, where the activity coefficients are given by the equation 2.40. When applied to a solution of groups, the equations 2.42 and 2.43 are written in the form:

$$\ln \gamma_i^C = 1 - J_i + \ln J_i - 5q_i(1 - J_i/L_i + \ln J_i/L_i) \quad (2.47)$$

$$\ln \gamma_i^R = q_i(1 - \sum_k (\theta_k \beta_{ik}/s_k) - e_{ki} \ln \beta_{ik}/s_k) \quad (2.48)$$

The parameters  $J_i$  e  $L_i$  are still given by eqs. 2.58 and ???. Furthermore, the following definitions apply:

$$r_i = \sum_k v_k^{(i)} R_k \quad (2.49)$$

$$q_i = \sum_k v_k^{(i)} Q_k \quad (2.50)$$

$$e_{ki} = (v_k^{(i)} Q_k) / q_i \quad (2.51)$$

$$\beta_{ik} = \sum_m e_{mk} \tau_{mk} \quad (2.52)$$

$$\theta_k = (\sum_i x_i q_i e_{ki}) / (\sum_i x_i q_i) \quad (2.53)$$

$$s_k = \sum_m \theta_m \tau_{mk} \quad (2.54)$$

$$s_i = \sum_l \theta_l \tau_{li} \quad (2.55)$$

$$\tau_{mk} = \exp(-a_{mk})/T \quad (2.56)$$

The  $i$  subscript identify the species, and  $j$  is an index that goes through all the species. The  $k$  subscript identify the subgroups, and  $m$  is an index that goes through all the subgroups. The parameter  $\nu_k^{(i)}$  is the number of the  $k$  subgroup in a molecule of the  $i$  species. The subgroup parameter values  $R_k$  and  $Q_k$  and the interaction parameters  $-a_{mk}$  are obtained in the literature.

**Modified UNIFAC (Dortmund) model** The UNIFAC model, despite being widely used in various applications, has some limitations which are, in some way, inherent to the model. Some of these limitations are:

1. UNIFAC is unable to distinguish between some types of isomers.
2. The  $\gamma - \phi$  approach limits the use of UNIFAC for applications under the pressure range of 10-15 atm.
3. The temperature is limited within the range of approximately 275-425 K.
4. Non-condensable gases and supercritical components are not included.
5. Proximity effects are not taken into account.
6. The parameters of liquid-liquid equilibrium are different from those of vapor-liquid equilibrium.
7. Polymers are not included.
8. Electrolytes are not included.

Some of these limitations can be overcome. The insensitivity of some types of isomers can be eliminated through a careful choice of the groups used to represent the molecules. The fact that the parameters for the liquid-liquid equilibrium are different from those for the vapor-liquid equilibrium seems not to have a theoretical solution at this time. One solution is to use both data from both equilibria to determine the parameters as a modified UNIFAC model. The limitations on the pressure and temperature can be overcome if the UNIFAC model is used with equations of state, which carry with them the dependencies of pressure and temperature.

These limitations of the original UNIFAC model have led several authors to propose changes in both combinatorial and the residual parts. To modify the combinatorial part, the basis is the suggestion given by Kikic et al. (1980) in the sense that the Staverman-Guggenheim correction on the original term of Flory-Huggins is very small and can, in most cases, be neglected. As a result, this correction was empirically removed from the UNIFAC model. Among these modifications, the proposed by Gmehling and coworkers [Weidlich and Gmehling, 1986; Weidlich and Gmehling, 1987; Gmehling et al., 1993], known as the model UNIFAC-Dortmund, is one of the most promising. In this model, the combinatorial part of the original UNIFAC is replaced by:

$$\ln \gamma_i^C = 1 - J_i + \ln J_i - 5q_i(1 - J_i/L_i + \ln J_i/L_i) \quad (2.57)$$

$$J_i = r_i^{3/4} / \left( \sum_j r_j^{3/4} x_j \right) \quad (2.58)$$

where the remaining quantities is defined the same way as in the original UNIFAC. Thus, the correction in-Staverman Guggenheim is empirically taken from the template. It is important to note that the in the UNIFAC-Dortmund model, the quantities  $R_k$  and  $Q_k$  are no longer calculated on the volume and surface area of Van der Waals forces, as proposed by Bondi (1968), but are additional adjustable parameters of the model.

The residual part is still given by the solution for groups, just as in the original UNIFAC, but now the parameters of group interaction are considered temperature dependent, according to:

$$\tau_{mk} = \exp(-a_{mk}^{(0)} + a_{mk}^{(1)}T + a_{mk}^{(2)}T^2) / T \quad (2.59)$$

These parameters must be estimated from experimental phase equilibrium data. Gmehling et al. (1993) presented an array of parameters for 45 major groups, adjusted using data from the vapor-liquid equilibrium, excess enthalpies, activity coefficients at infinite dilution and liquid-liquid equilibrium. enthalpy and entropy of liquid and vapor.

**NRTL model** Wilson (1964) presented a model relating  $g^E$  to the molar fraction, based mainly on molecular considerations, using the concept of local composition. Basically, the concept of local composition states that the composition of the system in the vicinity of a given molecule is not equal to the overall composition of the system, because of intermolecular forces.

Wilson's equation provides a good representation of the Gibbs' excess free energy for a variety of mixtures, and is particularly useful in solutions of polar compounds or with a tendency to association in apolar solvents, where Van Laar's equation or Margules' one are not sufficient. Wilson's equation has the advantage of being easily extended to multicomponent solutions but has two disadvantages: first, the less important, is that the equations are not applicable to systems where the logarithms of activity coefficients, when plotted as a function of  $x$ , show a maximum or a minimum. However, these systems are not common. The second, a little more serious, is that the model of Wilson is not able to predict limited miscibility, that is, it is not useful for LLE calculations.

Renon and Prausnitz [8] developed the *NRTL* equation (*Non-Random, Two-Liquid*) based on the concept of local composition but, unlike Wilson's model, the NRTL model is applicable to systems of partial miscibility. The model equation is:

$$\ln \gamma_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \tau_{ji} x_j G_{ji}}{\sum_{k=1}^n x_k G_{ki}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{x_j G_{ij}}{\sum_{k=1}^n x_k G_{kj}} \left( \tau_{ij} - \frac{\sum_{m=1}^n \tau_{mj} x_m G_{mj}}{\sum_{k=1}^n x_k G_{kj}} \right), \quad (2.60)$$

$$G_{ij} = \exp(-\tau_{ij} \alpha_{ij}), \quad (2.61)$$

$$\tau_{ij} = a_{ij}/RT, \quad (2.62)$$

where

$\gamma_i$	Activity coefficient of component $i$
$x_i$	Molar fraction of component $i$
$a_{ij}$	Interaction parameter between $i$ - $j$ ( $a_{ij} \neq a_{ji}$ ) (cal/mol)
$T$	Temperature (K)
$\alpha_{ij}$	non-randomness parameter for the $i$ - $j$ pair ( $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ji}$ )

The significance of  $G_{ij}$  is similar to  $\Lambda_{ij}$  from Wilson's equation, that is, they are characteristic energy parameters of the  $ij$  interaction. The parameter is related to the non-randomness of the mixture, i.e. that the components in the mixture are not randomly distributed but follow a pattern dictated by the local composition. When it is zero, the mixture is completely random, and the equation is reduced to the two-suffix Margules equation.

For ideal or moderately ideal systems, the NRTL model does not offer much advantage over Van Laar and three-suffix Margules, but for strongly non-ideal systems, this equation can provide a good representation of experimental data, although good quality data is necessary to estimate the three required parameters.

#### 2.1.4 Models for Aqueous Electrolyte Systems

**Revised LIQUAC model (LIQUAC\*)** In electrolyte systems, different properties, such as mean activity coefficients, osmotic coefficients, boiling point elevations, freezing point depressions and salt solubilities can be calculated using the new electrolyte models like LIQUAC and LIFAC.

Common usage scenarios:

- desalination processes
- crystallization processes
- waste water treatment

In the LIQUAC\* model [9], the activity coefficient is calculated by three different terms:

$$\ln \gamma_i = \ln \gamma_i^{LR} + \ln \gamma_i^{MR} + \ln \gamma_i^{SR} \quad (2.63)$$

These three terms, the long range term (LR), the middle range term (MR) and the short range term (SR), consider the different kinds of interactions in electrolyte solutions. The long range term is taken into account by the Debye–Hückel theory as modified by Fowler and Guggenheim to consider different solvents and solvent mixtures. This term takes into account direct charge effects like attraction and repulsion between ions and the formation of a solvate shell in solution and is calculated differently for ions and solvents. The middle range term was developed from the semiempirical Pitzer model and takes into account the indirect charge effects such as interactions between dipoles–dipoles and dipoles–indirect dipoles. The short range term was developed from

the corresponding local composition model and takes into account direct neighborhood effects of the compounds in solution. For the calculation of the short range term the part consists of a combinatorial (C) and a residual (R) part. While the combinatorial part takes into account the entropic interactions, i.e. the size and the form of the molecules the residual part considers the enthalpic interactions.

**Extended UNIQUAC [10]** Sander et al. presented in 1986 an extension of the UNIQUAC model by adding a Debye-Hückel term allowing this Extended UNIQUAC model to be used for electrolyte solutions. The model has since been modified and it has proven itself applicable for calculations of vapor-liquid-liquid-solid equilibria and of thermal properties in aqueous solutions containing electrolytes and non-electrolytes. The model is shown in its current form here as it is presented by Thomsen (1997). The extended UNIQUAC model consists of three terms: a combinatorial or entropic term, a residual or enthalpic term and an electrostatic term

$$G^{ex} = G_{Combinatorial}^{ex} + G_{Residual}^{ex} + G_{Extended\ Debye-Hückel}^{ex} \quad (2.64)$$

The combinatorial and the residual terms are identical to the terms used in the traditional UNIQUAC equation. The electrostatic term corresponds to the extended Debye-Hückel law. The combinatorial, entropic term is independent of temperature and only depends on the relative sizes of the species:

$$\frac{G_{Combinatorial}^{ex}}{RT} = \sum_i x_i \ln \left( \frac{\phi_i}{x_i} \right) - \frac{z}{2} \sum_i q_i x_i \ln \left( \frac{\phi_i}{\theta_i} \right) \quad (2.65)$$

The two model parameters  $r_i$  and  $q_i$  are the volume and surface area parameters for component  $i$ . In the classical application of the UNIQUAC model, these parameters are calculated from the properties of non electrolyte molecules. In the Extended UNIQUAC application to multi component electrolyte solutions, this approach gave unsatisfactory results. The volume and surface area parameters were instead considered to be adjustable parameters. The values of these two parameters are determined by fitting to experimental data. Especially thermal property data such as heat of dilution and heat capacity data are efficient for determining the value of the surface area parameter  $q$ , because the UNIQUAC contribution to the excess enthalpy and excess heat capacity is proportional to the parameter  $q$ . The residual, enthalpic term is dependent on temperature through the parameter  $\psi_{ji}$ :

$$\frac{G_{Residual}^{ex}}{RT} = - \sum_i \left[ x_i q_i \ln \left( \sum_j \theta_j \psi_{ji} \right) \right] \quad (2.66)$$

the parameter  $\psi_{ji}$  is given by:

$$\psi_{ji} = \exp \left( - \frac{u_{ji} - u_{ii}}{T} \right) \quad (2.67)$$

$u_{ji}$  and  $u_{ii}$  are interaction energy parameters. The interaction energy parameters are considered symmetrical and temperature dependent in this model

$$u_{ji} = u_{ij} = u_{ij}^0 + u_{ij}^T (T - 298.15) \quad (2.68)$$

The values of the interaction energy parameters are determined by fitting to experimental



data.

The combinatorial and the residual terms of the UNIQUAC excess Gibbs energy function are based on the rational, symmetrical activity coefficient convention. The Debye-Hückel electrostatic term however is expressed in terms of the rational, symmetrical convention for water, and the rational, unsymmetrical convention for ions.

The electrostatic contributions to the water activity coefficients and the ionic activity coefficients are obtained by partial molar differentiation of the extended Debye-Hückel law excess Gibbs energy term. The term used for water is

$$\ln \gamma_w^{DH} = \frac{2}{3} M_w A I^{3/2} \sigma (b I^{1/2}) \quad (2.69)$$

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{3}{x^3} \left\{ 1 + x - \frac{1}{1+x} - 2 \ln(1+x) \right\} \quad (2.70)$$

In this expression,  $b = 1.5 \text{ (kg/mol)}^{1/2}$ . The term used for ions is:

$$\ln(\gamma_i^{*DH}) = -Z_i^2 \frac{A\sqrt{I}}{1+b\sqrt{I}} \quad (2.71)$$

Based on table values of the density of pure water, and the relative permittivity of water,  $\epsilon_r$ , the Debye-Hückel parameter  $A$  can be approximated in the temperature range  $273.15 \text{ K} < T < 383.15 \text{ K}$  by:

$$A = \left[ 1.131 + 1.335E - 3(T - 273.15) + 1.164E - 5(T - 273.15)^2 \right] \quad (2.72)$$

The activity coefficient for water is calculated in the Extended UNIQUAC model by summation of the three terms:

$$\ln \gamma_w = \ln \gamma_w^C + \ln \gamma_w^R + \ln \gamma_w^{DH} \quad (2.73)$$

The activity coefficient for ion  $i$  is obtained as the rational, unsymmetrical activity coefficient according to the definition of rational unsymmetrical activity coefficients by adding the three contributions:

$$\ln \gamma_i^* = \ln \frac{\gamma_i^C}{\gamma_i^{C\infty}} + \ln \frac{\gamma_i^R}{\gamma_i^{R\infty}} + \ln \gamma_i^{*DH} \quad (2.74)$$

The rational, unsymmetrical activity coefficient for ions calculated with the Extended UNIQUAC model can be converted to a molal activity coefficient. This is relevant for comparison with experimental data.

The temperature dependency of the activity coefficients in the Extended UNIQUAC model is built into the model equations as outlined above. The temperature dependency of the equilibrium constants used in the Extended UNIQUAC model is calculated from the temperature dependency of the Gibbs energies of formation of the species. Parameters for water and for the following ions can be found in [10]  $\text{H}^+$ ,  $\text{Na}^+$ ,  $\text{K}^+$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ,  $\text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,  $\text{HSO}_4^-$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ,  $\text{OH}^-$ ,  $\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ ,  $\text{HCO}_3^-$ ,  $\text{S}_2\text{O}_8^{2-}$ .

A significant advantage of the Extended UNIQUAC model compared to models like the Bromley model or the Pitzer model is that temperature dependence is built into the model. This enables the model to also describe thermodynamic properties that are temperature derivatives of the

excess Gibbs function, such as heat of mixing and heat capacity.

## 2.2 Enthalpy, Entropy and Heat Capacities

$H^{id}$  values are calculated from the ideal gas heat capacity. For mixtures, a molar average is used. The value calculated by the EOS is for the phase, independently of the number of components present in the mixture.

**Peng-Robinson, Soave-Redlich-Kwong** For the cubic equations of state, enthalpy, entropy and heat capacities are calculated by the *departure functions*, which relates the phase properties in the conditions of the mixture with the same mixture property in the ideal gas state. This way, the following departure functions are defined [11],

$$\frac{H - H^{id}}{RT} = X; \quad \frac{S - S^{id}}{R} = Y \quad (2.75)$$

values for  $X$  and  $Y$  are calculated by the PR and SRK EOS, according to the table 1:

Table 1: Enthalpy/Entropy calculation with an EOS

	$\frac{H - H^{id}}{RT}$	$\frac{S - S^{id}}{R}$
PR	$Z - 1 - \frac{1}{2^{1.5}bRT} \left[ a - T \frac{da}{dT} \right] \times$ $\times \ln \left[ \frac{V+2.414b}{V+0.414b} \right]$	$\ln(Z - B) - \ln \frac{P}{P^0} - \frac{A}{2^{1.5}bRT} \left[ \frac{T}{a} \frac{da}{dT} \right] \times$ $\times \ln \left[ \frac{V+2.414b}{V+0.414b} \right]$
SRK	$Z - 1 - \frac{1}{bRT} \left[ a - T \frac{da}{dT} \right] \times$ $\times \ln \left[ 1 + \frac{b}{V} \right]$	$\ln(Z - B) - \ln \frac{P}{P^0} - \frac{A}{B} \left[ \frac{T}{a} \frac{da}{dT} \right] \times$ $\times \ln \left[ 1 + \frac{B}{Z} \right]$

In DWSIM,  $P_0 = 1 \text{ atm}$ .

Heat capacities are obtained directly from the EOS, by using the following thermodynamic relations:

$$C_p - C_p^{id} = T \int_{\infty}^V \left( \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial T^2} \right) dV - \frac{T(\partial P / \partial T)_V^2}{(\partial P / \partial V)_T} - R \quad (2.76)$$

$$C_p - C_v = -T \frac{\left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial T} \right)_V^2}{\left( \frac{\partial P}{\partial V} \right)_T} \quad (2.77)$$

**Lee-Kesler** Enthalpies, entropies and heat capacities are calculated by the Lee-Kesler model [12] through the following equations:

$$\frac{H - H^{id}}{RT_c} = T_r \left( Z - 1 - \frac{b_2 + 2b_3/T_r + 3b_4/T_r^2}{T_r V_r} - \frac{c_2 - 3c_3/T_r^2}{2T_r V_r^2} + \frac{d_2}{5T_r V_r^2} + 3E \right) \quad (2.78)$$

$$\frac{S - S^{id}}{R} + \ln \left( \frac{P}{P_0} \right) = \ln Z - \frac{b_2 + b_3/T_r^2 + 2b_4/T_r^3}{V_r} - \frac{c_1 - 2c_3/T_r^3}{2V_r^2} + \frac{d_1}{5V_r^5} + 2E \quad (2.79)$$

$$\frac{C_v - C_v^{id}}{R} = \frac{2(b_3 + 3b_4/T_r)}{T_r^2 V_r} - \frac{3c_3}{T_r^3 V_r^2} - 6E \quad (2.80)$$

$$\frac{C_p - C_p^{id}}{R} = \frac{C_v - C_v^{id}}{R} - 1 - T_r \frac{\left(\frac{\partial P_r}{\partial T_r}\right)_{V_r}^2}{\left(\frac{\partial P_r}{\partial V_r}\right)_{T_r}} \quad (2.81)$$

$$E = \frac{c_4}{2T_r^3 \gamma} \left[ \beta + 1 - \left( \beta + 1 + \frac{\gamma}{V_r^2} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{\gamma}{V_r^2} \right) \right] \quad (2.82)$$

$$Z = \frac{P_r V_r}{T_r} = 1 + \frac{B}{V_r} + \frac{C}{V_r^2} + \frac{D}{V_r^3} + \frac{c_4}{T_r^3 V_r^2} \left( \beta + \frac{\gamma}{V_r^2} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{\gamma}{V_r^2} \right) \quad (2.83)$$

$$B = b_1 - b_2/T_r - b_3/T_r^2 - b_4/T_r^3 \quad (2.84)$$

$$C = c_1 - c_2/T_r + c_3/T_r^3 \quad (2.85)$$

$$D = d_1 + d_2/T_r \quad (2.86)$$

Each property must be calculated based in two fluids apart from the main one, one simple and other for reference. For example, for the compressibility factor,

$$Z = Z^{(0)} + \frac{\omega}{\omega^{(r)}} \left( Z^{(r)} - Z^{(0)} \right), \quad (2.87)$$

where the (0) superscript refers to the simple fluid while the (r) superscript refers to the reference fluid. This way, property calculation by the Lee-Kesler model should follow the sequence below (enthalpy calculation example):

1.  $V_r$  and  $Z^{(0)}$  are calculated for the simple fluid at the fluid  $T_r$  and  $P_r$ . using the equation 2.78, and with the constants for the simple fluid, as shown in the table 3,  $(H - H^0)/RT_c$  is calculated. This term is  $[(H - H^0)/RT_c]^{(0)}$ . in this calculation,  $Z$  in the equation 2.78 is  $Z^{(0)}$ .
2. The step 1 is repeated, using the same  $T_r$  and  $P_r$ , but using the constants for the reference fluid as shown in table 3. With these values, the equation 2.78 allows the calculation of  $[(H - H^0)/RT_c]^{(r)}$ . In this step,  $Z$  in the equation 2.78 is  $Z^{(r)}$ .
3. Finally, one determines the residual enthalpy for the fluid of interest by

$$\begin{aligned} [(H - H^0)/RT_c] &= [(H - H^0)/RT_c]^{(0)} + \\ &\frac{\omega}{\omega^{(r)}} \left( [(H - H^0)/RT_c]^{(r)} - [(H - H^0)/RT_c]^{(0)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.88)$$

where  $\omega^{(r)} = 0,3978$ .

An iterative method is required to calculate  $V_r$ . The user should always watch the values generated by DWSIM in order to detect any issues in the compressibility factors generated by the Lee-Kesler model.

Table 3: Constants for the Lee-Kesler model

Constant	Simple Fluid	Reference Fluid
$b_1$	0.1181193	0.2026579
$b_2$	0.265728	0.331511
$b_3$	0.154790	0.027655
$b_4$	0.030323	0.203488
$c_1$	0.0236744	0.0313385
$c_2$	0.0186984	0.0503618
$c_3$	0.0	0.016901
$c_4$	0.042724	0.041577
$d_1 \times 10^4$	0.155488	0.48736
$d_2 \times 10^4$	0.623689	0.0740336
$\beta$	0.65392	1.226
$\gamma$	0.060167	0.03754

### Aqueous Electrolyte Solutions

## 3 Transport Properties

### 3.1 Density

**Liquid Phase** Liquid phase density is calculated with the Rackett equation [11],

$$V_s = \frac{RT_C}{P_C} Z_{RA}^{[1+(1-T_r)^{2/7}]}, \quad (3.1)$$

where:

$V_s$	Saturated molar volume (m <sup>3</sup> /mol)
$T_c$	Critical temperature (K)
$P_c$	Critical pressure (Pa)
$T_r$	Reduced temperature
$Z_{RA}$	Rackett constant of the component (or the mixture)
$R$	Ideal Gas constant (8,314 J/[mol.K])

For mixtures, the equation 3.1 becomes

$$V_s = R \left( \sum \frac{x_i T_{c_i}}{P_{c_i}} \right) Z_{RA}^{[1+(1-T_r)^{2/7}]}, \quad (3.2)$$

with  $T_r = T/T_{cm}$ , and

$$T_{cm} = \sum \sum \phi_i \phi_j T_{c_{ij}}, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\phi_i = \frac{x_i V_{c_i}}{\sum x_i V_{c_i}}, \quad (3.4)$$

If  $T \geq T_{cm}$ , the Rackett method does not provide a value for  $V_s$  and, in this case, DWSIM uses the EOS-generated compressibility factor to calculate the density of the liquid phase.

$$T_{c_{ij}} = \left[ \frac{8 (V_{c_i} V_{c_j})^{1/2}}{(V_{c_i}^{1/3} + V_{c_j}^{1/3})^3} \right] (T_{c_i} T_{c_j})^{1/2}, \quad (3.5)$$

where:

$x_i$  Molar fraction

$V_{c_i}$  Critical volume (m<sup>3</sup>/mol)

If  $Z_{RA}$  isn't available, it is calculated from the component acentric factor,

$$Z_{RA} = 0.2956 - 0.08775\omega, \quad (3.6)$$

If the component (or mixture) isn't saturated, a correction is applied in order to account for the effect of pressure in the volume,

$$V = V_s \left[ 1 - (0.0861488 + 0.0344483\omega) \ln \frac{\beta + P}{\beta + P_{vp}} \right], \quad (3.7)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta}{P} = & -1 - 9.070217 (1 - T_r)^{1/3} + 62.45326 (1 - T_r)^{2/3} - 135.1102 (1 - T_r) + \\ & + \exp \left( 4.79594 + 0.250047\omega + 1.14188\omega^2 \right) (1 - T_r)^{4/3}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where:

$V$  Compressed liquid volume (m<sup>3</sup>/mol)

$P$  Pressure (Pa)

$P_{vp}$  Vapor pressure / Bubble point pressure (Pa)

Finally, density is calculated from the molar volume by the following relation:

$$\rho = \frac{MM}{1000V}, \quad (3.9)$$

where:

$\rho$  Density (kg/m<sup>3</sup>)

$V$  Specific volume of the fluid (m<sup>3</sup>/mol)

$MM$  Liquid phase molecular volume (kg/kmol)

*For the Ideal Gas Property Package, the compressibility factor is considered to be equal to 1.*

**Vapor Phase** Vapor phase density is calculated from the compressibility factor generated by the EOS, according with the following equation:

$$\rho = \frac{MM P}{1000 Z R T}, \quad (3.10)$$

where:

$\rho$	Density (kg/m <sup>3</sup> )
$MM$	Molecular weight of the vapor phase (kg/kmol)
$P$	Pressure (Pa)
$Z$	Vapor phase compressibility factor
$R$	Ideal Gas constant (8,314 J/[mol.K])
$T$	Temperature (K)

**Mixture** If there are two phases at system temperature and pressure, the density of the mixture is calculated by the following expression:

$$\rho_m = f_l \rho_l + f_v \rho_v, \quad (3.11)$$

where:

$\rho_{m,l,v}$	Density of the mixture / liquid phase / vapor phase (kg/m <sup>3</sup> )
$f_{l,v}$	Volumetric fraction of the liquid phase / vapor phase (kg/kmol)

### 3.2 Viscosity

**Liquid Phase** When experimental data is not available, liquid phase viscosity is calculated from

$$\eta_L = \exp \left( \sum_i x_i \ln \eta_i \right), \quad (3.12)$$

where  $\eta_i$  is the viscosity of each component in the phase, which depends on the temperature and is calculated from experimental data. Dependence of viscosity with the temperature is described in the equation

$$\eta = \exp \left( A + B/T + C \ln T + DT^E \right), \quad (3.13)$$

where  $A$ ,  $B$ ,  $C$ ,  $D$  and  $E$  are experimental coefficients (or generated by DWSIM in the case of pseudocomponents or hypotheticals).

**Vapor Phase** Vapor phase viscosity is calculated in two steps. First, when experimental data is not available, the temperature dependence is given by the *Lucas* equation [11],

$$\eta \zeta = \left[ 0,807 T_r^{0,618} - 0,357 \exp(-0,449 T_r) + 0,34 \exp(-4,058 T_r) + 0,018 \right] \quad (3.14)$$

$$\zeta = 0,176 \left( \frac{T_c}{MM^3 P_c^4} \right)^{1/6}, \quad (3.15)$$

where

$\eta$	Viscosity ( $\mu P$ )
$T_c, P_c$	Component (or mixture) critical properties
$T_r$	Reduced temperature, $T/T_c$
$MM$	Molecular weight (kg/kmol)

In the second step, the experimental or calculated viscosity with the Lucas method is corrected to take into account the effect of pressure, by the *Jossi-Stiel-Thodos* method [11],

$$\left[ (\eta - \eta_0) \left( \frac{T_c}{MM^3 P_c^4} \right)^{1/6} + 1 \right]^{1/4} = 1.023 + 0.23364 \rho_r + 0.58533 \rho_r^2 - 0.40758 \rho_r^3 + 0.093324 \rho_r^4, \quad (3.16)$$

where

$\eta, \eta_0$	Corrected viscosity / Lucas method calculated viscosity ( $\mu P$ )
$T_c, P_c$	Component critical properties
$\rho_r$	Reduced density, $\rho/\rho_c = V/V_c$
$MM$	Molecular weight (kg/kmol)

If the vapor phase contains more than a component, the viscosity is calculated by the same procedure, but with the required properties calculated by a molar average.

### 3.3 Surface Tension

When experimental data is not available, the liquid phase surface tension is calculated by doing a molar average of the individual component tensions, which are calculated with the *Brock-Bird* equation [11],

$$\frac{\sigma}{P_c^{2/3} T_c^{1/3}} = (0.132 \alpha_c - 0.279) (1 - T_r)^{11/9} \quad (3.17)$$

$$\alpha_c = 0.9076 \left[ 1 + \frac{T_{br} \ln(P_c/1.01325)}{1 - T_{br}} \right], \quad (3.18)$$

where

$\sigma$	Surface tension (N/m)
$T_c$	Critical temperature (K)
$P_c$	Critical pressure (Pa)
$T_{br}$	Reduced normal boiling point, $T_b/T_c$

## 4 Thermal Properties

### 4.1 Thermal Conductivity

**Liquid Phase** When experimental data is not available, the contribution of each component for the thermal conductivity of the liquid phase is calculated by the *Latini* method [11],

$$\lambda_i = \frac{A(1 - T_r)^{0.38}}{T_r^{1/6}} \quad (4.1)$$

$$A = \frac{A^* T_b^{0.38}}{MM^\beta T_c^\gamma}, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $A^*$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  depend on the nature of the liquid (Saturated Hydrocarbon, Aromatic, Water, etc). The liquid phase thermal conductivity is calculated from the individual values by the *Li* method [11],

$$\lambda_L = \sum \sum \phi_i \phi_j \lambda_{ij} \quad (4.3)$$

$$\lambda_{ij} = 2(\lambda_i^{-1} + \lambda_j^{-1})^{-1} \quad (4.4)$$

$$\phi_i = \frac{x_i V_{c_i}}{\sum x_i V_{c_i}}, \quad (4.5)$$

where

$\lambda_L$  liquid phase thermal conductivity (W/[m.K])

**Vapor Phase** When experimental data is not available, vapor phase thermal conductivity is calculated by the *Ely and Hanley* method [11],

$$\lambda_V = \lambda^* + \frac{1000\eta^*}{MM} 1.32 \left( C_v - \frac{3R}{2} \right), \quad (4.6)$$

where

$\lambda_V$  vapor phase thermal conductivity (W/[m.K])

$C_v$  constant volume heat capacity (J/[mol.K])

$\lambda^*$  and  $\eta^*$  are defined by:

$$\lambda^* = \lambda_0 H \quad (4.7)$$

$$H = \left( \frac{16.04E - 3}{MM/1000} \right)^{1/2} f^{1/2} / h^{2/3} \quad (4.8)$$



$$\lambda_0 = 1944\eta_0 \quad (4.9)$$

$$f = \frac{T_0\theta}{190.4} \quad (4.10)$$

$$h = \frac{V_c}{99.2}\phi \quad (4.11)$$

$$\theta = 1 + (\omega - 0.011)(0.56553 - 0.86276 \ln T^+ - 0.69852/T^+) \quad (4.12)$$

$$\phi = [1 + (\omega - 0.011)(0.38650 - 1.1617 \ln T^+)] 0.288/Z_c \quad (4.13)$$

If  $T_r \leq 2$ ,  $T^+ = T_r$ . If  $T_r > 2$ ,  $T^+ = 2$ .

$$h = \frac{V_c}{99.2}\phi \quad (4.14)$$

$$\eta^* = \eta_0 H \frac{MM/1000}{16.04E - 3} \quad (4.15)$$

$$\eta_0 = 10^{-7} \sum_{n=1}^9 C_n T_0^{(n-4)/3} \quad (4.16)$$

$$T_0 = T/f \quad (4.17)$$

## 5 Aqueous Solution Properties

### 5.1 Mean salt activity coefficient

The mean salt activity coefficient is calculated from the activity coefficients of the ions,

$$\ln(\gamma_{\pm}^{*,m}) = \frac{\nu_+}{\nu} \ln(\gamma_+^{*,m}) + \frac{\nu_-}{\nu} \ln(\gamma_-^{*,m}) \quad (5.1)$$

In this equation  $\nu_+$  and  $\nu_-$  are the stoichiometric coefficients of the cations and anions of the salt, while  $\nu$  stands for the sum of these stoichiometric coefficients. With the mean salt activity coefficient the real behavior of a salt can be calculated and it can, e.g. be used for the calculation of electromotoric forces EMF.

### 5.2 Osmotic coefficient

The osmotic coefficient represents the reality of the solvent in electrolyte systems. It is calculated by the logarithmic ratio of the activity and mole fraction of the solvent:

$$\Phi = - \frac{\ln a_i}{M_s \sum_{ion} m_{ion}} \quad (5.2)$$

### 5.3 Freezing point depression

The Schröder and van Laar equation is used:

$$\frac{\ln a_i}{(1 - (T_{m,i}/T))} = \frac{\Delta_m h_i}{RT_{m,i}} \quad (5.3)$$

On the right hand side of the equation a constant factor is achieved, while on the left hand side the activity depends on temperature and composition. For a given composition the freezing point of the system can be calculated iteratively by varying the system temperature. The best way to do this is by starting at the freezing point of the pure solvent. This equation also allows calculating the freezing point of mixed solvent electrolyte systems.

## 6 Reactions

DWSIM includes support for chemical reactions through the Chemical Reactions Manager. Three types of reactions are available to the user:

**Conversion**, where you must specify the conversion (%) of the limiting reagent as a function of temperature

**Equilibrium**, where you must specify the equilibrium constant (K) as a function of temperature, a constant value or calculated from the Gibbs free energy of reaction ( $\Delta G/R$ ). The orders of reaction of the components are obtained from the stoichiometric coefficients.

**Kinetic**, where you should specify the frequency factor (A) and activation energy (E) for the direct reaction (optionally for the reverse reaction), including the orders of reaction (direct and inverse) of each component.

For each chemical reaction is necessary to specify the stoichiometric coefficients of the compounds and a base compound, which must be a reactant. This base component is used as reference for calculating the heat of reaction.

## 6.1 Conversion Reaction

In the conversion reaction it is assumed that the user has information regarding the conversion of one of the reactants as a function of temperature. By knowing the conversion and the stoichiometric coefficients, the quantities of the other components in the reaction can be calculated.

Considering the following chemical reaction:



where  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  are the stoichiometric coefficients of reactants and product, respectively.  $A$  is the limiting reactant and  $B$  is in excess. The amount of each component at the end of the reaction can then be calculated from the following stoichiometric relationships:

$$N_A = N_{A_0} - N_{A_0}X_A \quad (6.2)$$

$$N_B = N_{B_0} - \frac{b}{a}N_{A_0}X_A \quad (6.3)$$

$$N_C = N_{C_0} + \frac{c}{a}(N_{A_0}X_A) \quad (6.4)$$

where  $N_{A,B,C}$  are the molar amounts of the components at the end of the reaction,  $N_{A_0,B_0,C_0}$  are the molar amount of the components at the start of the reaction and  $X_A$  is the conversion of the base-reactant  $A$ .

## 6.2 Equilibrium Reaction

In the equilibrium reaction, the quantity of each component at the equilibrium is related to equilibrium constant by the following relationship:

$$K = \prod_{j=1}^n (q_j)^{\nu_j}, \quad (6.5)$$

where  $K$  is the equilibrium constant,  $q$  is the basis of components (partial pressure in the vapor phase or activity in the liquid phase)  $\nu$  is the stoichiometric coefficient of component  $j$  and  $n$  is the number of components in the reaction.

The equilibrium constant can be obtained by three different means. One is to consider it a constant, another is considering it as a function of temperature, and finally calculate it automatically from the Gibbs free energy at the temperature of the reaction. The first two methods require user input.

### 6.2.1 Solution method

For each reaction that is occurring in parallel in the system, we can define  $\xi$  as the *reaction extent*, so that the molar amount of each component in the equilibrium is obtained by the following relationship:

$$N_j = N_{j0} + \sum_i \nu_{ij} \xi_i, \quad (6.6)$$

where  $\xi_i$  is the coordinate of the reaction  $i$  and  $\nu_{ij}$  is the stoichiometric coefficient of the  $j$  component at reaction  $i$ . Defining the molar fraction of the component  $i$  as  $x_j = n_j/n_t$ , where  $n_t$  is the total number of mols, including inerts, we have the following expression for each reaction  $i$ :

$$f_i(\xi) = \sum_j \ln(x_j) - \ln(K_i) = 0, \quad (6.7)$$

where the system of equations  $F$  can be easily solved by Newton-Raphson's method [13].

## 6.3 Kinetic Reaction

The kinetic reaction is defined by the parameters of the equation of Arrhenius (frequency factor and activation energy) for both the direct order and for the reverse order. Suppose we have the following kinetic reaction:



The reaction rate for the  $A$  component can be defined as

$$r_A = k[A][B] - k'[C][D] \quad (6.9)$$

where

$$k = A \exp(-E/RT) \quad (6.10)$$

$$k' = A' \exp(-E'/RT) \quad (6.11)$$

The kinetic reactions are used in Plug-Flow Reactors (PFRs) and in Continuous-Stirred Tank Reactors (CSTRs). In them, the relationship between molar concentration and the rate of reaction is given by

$$F_A = F_{A0} + \int_0^V r_A dV, \quad (6.12)$$

where  $F_A$  is the molar flow of the  $A$  component and  $V$  is the reactor volume.

## 7 Property Estimation Methods

### 7.1 Petroleum Fractions

#### 7.1.1 Molecular weight

Riazi and Al Sahhaf method [14]

$$MM = \left[ \frac{1}{0.01964} (6.97996 - \ln(1080 - T_b)) \right]^{3/2}, \quad (7.1)$$

where

$MM$  Molecular weight (kg/kmol)

$T_b$  Boiling point at 1 atm (K)

If the specific gravity ( $SG$ ) is available, the molecular weight is calculated by

$$MM = 42.965 [\exp(2.097 \times 10^{-4} T_b - 7.78712 SG + 2.08476 \times 10^{-3} T_b SG)] T_b^{1.26007} SG^{4.98308} \quad (7.2)$$

Winn [15]

$$MM = 0.00005805 PEme^{2.3776} / d15^{0.9371}, \quad (7.3)$$

where

$PEme$  Mean Boiling Point (K)

$d15$  Specific Gravity @ 60 °F

Riazi[15]

$$MM = 42.965 \exp(0.0002097 PEme - 7.78 d15 + 0.00208476 \times PEme \times d15) \times PEme^{1.26007} d15^{4.98308} \quad (7.4)$$

Lee-Kesler[15]

$$t_1 = -12272.6 + 9486.4 d15 + (8.3741 - 5.9917 d15) PEme \quad (7.5)$$

$$t_2 = (1 - 0.77084 d15 - 0.02058 d15^2) \times (0.7465 - 222.466 / PEme) \times 10^7 / PEme \quad (7.6)$$

$$t_3 = (1 - 0.80882 d15 - 0.02226 d15^2) \times (0.3228 - 17.335 / PEme) \times 10^{12} / PEme^3 \quad (7.7)$$

$$MM = t_1 + t_2 + t_3 \quad (7.8)$$

**Farah**

$$MM = \exp(6.8117 + 1.3372A - 3.6283B) \quad (7.9)$$

$$MM = \exp(4.0397 + 0.1362A - 0.3406B - 0.9988d_{15} + 0.0039PEMe), \quad (7.10)$$

where

$A, B$  Walther-ASTM equation parameters for viscosity calculation

**7.1.2 Specific Gravity****Riazi e Al Sahhaf [14]**

$$SG = 1.07 - \exp(3.56073 - 2.93886MM^{0.1}), \quad (7.11)$$

where

$SG$  Specific Gravity

$MM$  Molecular weight (kg/kmol)

**7.1.3 Critical Properties****Lee-Kesler [14]**

$$T_c = 189.8 + 450.6SG + (0.4244 + 0.1174SG)T_b + (0.1441 - 1.0069SG)10^5/T_b \quad (7.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \ln P_c = & 5.689 - 0.0566/SG - (0.43639 + 4.1216/SG + 0.21343/SG^2) \times \\ & \times 10^{-3}T_b + (0.47579 + 1.182/SG + 0.15302/SG^2) \times 10^{-6} \times T_b^2 - \\ & - (2.4505 + 9.9099/SG^2) \times 10^{-10} \times T_b^3, \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

where

$T_b$  NBP (K)

$T_c$  Critical temperature (K)

$P_c$  Critical pressure (bar)

**Farah**

$$T_c = 731.968 + 291.952A - 704.998B \quad (7.14)$$

$$T_c = 104.0061 + 38.75A - 41.6097B + 0.7831PEMe \quad (7.15)$$

$$T_c = 196.793 + 90.205A - 221.051B + 309.534d_{15} + 0.524PEMe \quad (7.16)$$

$$P_c = \exp(20.0056 - 9.8758 \ln(A) + 12.2326 \ln(B)) \quad (7.17)$$

$$P_c = \exp(11.2037 - 0.5484A + 1.9242B + 510.1272/PEMe) \quad (7.18)$$

$$P_c = \exp(28.7605 + 0.7158 \ln(A) - 0.2796 \ln(B) + 2.3129 \ln(d15) - 2.4027 \ln(PEMe)) \quad (7.19)$$

**Riazi-Daubert[15]**

$$T_c = 9.5233 \exp(-0.0009314PEMe - 0.544442d15 + 0.00064791 \times PEMe \times d15) \times \\ \times PEMe^{0.81067} d15^{0.53691} \quad (7.20)$$

$$P_c = 31958000000 \exp(-0.008505PEMe - 4.8014d15 + 0.005749 \times PEMe \times d15) \times \\ \times PEMe^{-0.4844} d15^{4.0846} \quad (7.21)$$

**Riazi[15]**

$$T_c = 35.9413 \exp(-0.00069PEMe - 1.4442d15 + 0.000491 \times PEMe \times d15) \times \\ \times PEMe^{0.7293} d15^{1.2771} \quad (7.22)$$

**7.1.4 Acentric Factor****Lee-Kesler method [14]**

$$\omega = \frac{-\ln \frac{P_c}{1.10325} - 5.92714 + 6.09648/T_{br} + 1.28862 \ln T_{br} - 0.169347T_{br}^6}{15.2518 - 15.6875/T_{br} - 13.472 \ln T_{br} + 0.43577T_{br}^6} \quad (7.23)$$

**Korsten[15]**

$$\omega = 0.5899 \times ((PEMV/T_c)^{1.3}) / (1 - (PEMV/T_c)^{1.3}) \times \log(P_c/101325) - 1 \quad (7.24)$$

**7.1.5 Vapor Pressure****Lee-Kesler method[14]**

$$\ln P_r^{pv} = 5.92714 - 6.09648/T_{br} - 1.28862 \ln T_{br} + 0.169347T_{br}^6 + \\ + \omega(15.2518 - 15.6875/T_{br} - 13.4721 \ln T_{br} + 0.43577T_{br}^6), \quad (7.25)$$

where

$P_r^{pv}$  Reduced vapor pressure,  $P^{pv}/P_c$

$T_{br}$  Reduced NBP,  $T_b/T_c$

$\omega$  Acentric factor

**7.1.6 Viscosity****Letsou-Stiel [11]**

$$\eta = \frac{\xi_0 + \xi_1}{\xi} \quad (7.26)$$

$$\xi_0 = 2.648 - 3.725T_r + 1.309T_r^2 \quad (7.27)$$

$$\xi_1 = 7.425 - 13.39T_r + 5.933T_r^2 \quad (7.28)$$

$$\xi = 176 \left( \frac{T_c}{MM^3 P_c^4} \right)^{1/6} \quad (7.29)$$

where

$\eta$	Viscosity (Pa.s)
$P_c$	Critical pressure (bar)
$T_r$	Reduced temperature, $T/T_c$
$MM$	Molecular weight (kg/kmol)

**Abbott[15]**

$$t_1 = 4.39371 - 1.94733Kw + 0.12769Kw^2 + 0.00032629API^2 - 0.0118246KwAPI + (0.171617Kw^2 + 10.9943API + 0.0950663API^2 - 0.869218KwAPI) \quad (7.30)$$

$$\log v_{100} = \frac{t_1}{API + 50.3642 - 4.78231Kw'} \quad (7.31)$$

$$t_2 = -0.463634 - 0.166532API + 0.000513447API^2 - 0.00848995APIKw + (0.080325Kw + 1.24899API + 0.19768API^2) \quad (7.32)$$

$$\log v_{210} = \frac{t_2}{API + 26.786 - 2.6296Kw'} \quad (7.33)$$

where

$v_{100}$	Viscosity at 100 °F (cSt)
$v_{210}$	Viscosity at 210 °F (cSt)
$K_w$	Watson characterization factor
$API$	Oil API degree

**7.2 Hypothetical Components**

The majority of properties of the hypothetical components is calculated, when necessary, using the group contribution methods, with the UNIFAC structure of the hypo as the basis of calculation. The table 4 lists the properties and their calculation methods.



Table 4: Hypo calculation methods.

Property	Symbol	Method
Critical temperature	$T_c$	Joback [11]
Critical pressure	$P_c$	Joback [11]
Critical volume	$V_c$	Joback [11]
Normal boiling point	$T_b$	Joback [11]
Vapor pressure	$P^{pv}$	Lee-Kesler (Eq. 7.25)
Acentric factor	$\omega$	Lee-Kesler (Eq. 7.23)
Vaporization enthalpy	$\Delta H_{vap}$	Vetere [11]
Ideal gas heat capacity	$C_p^{gi}$	Harrison-Seaton [16]
Ideal gas enthalpy of formation	$\Delta H_f^{298}$	Marrero-Gani [17]

## 8 Other Properties

### 8.1 True Critical Point

The Gibbs criteria for the true critical point of a mixture of  $n$  components may be expressed of various forms, but the most convenient when using a pressure explicit cubic equation of state is

$$L = \begin{vmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & \dots & A_{1n} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & & \\ \vdots & & & \\ A_{n1} & \dots & \dots & A_{nn} \end{vmatrix} = 0 \quad (8.1)$$

$$M = \begin{vmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & \dots & A_{1n} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & & \\ \vdots & & & \\ A_{n-1,1} & \dots & \dots & A_{n-1,n} \\ \frac{\partial L}{\partial n_1} & \dots & \dots & \frac{\partial L}{\partial n_n} \end{vmatrix} = 0, \quad (8.2)$$

where

$$A_{12} = \left( \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial n_1 \partial n_2} \right)_{T,V} \quad (8.3)$$

All the  $A$  terms in the equations 8.1 and 8.2 are the second derivatives of the total Helmholtz energy  $A$  with respect to mols and constant  $T$  and  $V$ . The determinants expressed by 8.1 and 8.2 are simultaneously solved for the critical volume and temperature. The critical pressure is then found by using the original EOS.

DWSIM utilizes the method described by Heidemann and Khalil [18] for the true critical point calculation using the *Peng-Robinson* and *Soave-Redlich-Kwong* equations of state.

## 8.2 Natural Gas Hydrates

The models for natural gas hydrates equilibrium calculations are mostly based in statistical thermodynamics to predict in which temperature and pressure conditions there will be formation or dissociation of hydrates. In these conditions,

$$f_w^i = f_w^H, \quad (8.4)$$

that is, the fugacity of water in hydrate is the same as in the water in any other phase present at equilibria.

The difference in the models present in DWSIM is mainly in the way that water fugacity in the hydrate phase is calculated. In the modified van der Waals and Platteeuw model, the isofugacity criteria is used indirectly through chemical potentials, which must also be equal in the equilibria:

$$\mu_w^i = \mu_w^H \quad (8.5)$$

remembering that

$$f_i = x_i P \exp((\mu_i - \mu_i^{gi})/RT). \quad (8.6)$$

### 8.2.1 Modified van der Waals and Platteeuw (Parrish and Prausnitz) method

The classic model for determination of equilibrium pressures and temperatures was developed by van der Waals and Platteeuw. This model was later extended by Parrish and Prausnitz [19] to take into account multiple "guests" in the hydrate structures. The condition of equilibrium used in the *vdwP* model is the equality of the chemical potential of water in the hydrate phase and in the other phases, which can be liquid, solid or both.

**Chemical potential of water in the hydrate phase** In the modified van der Waals method, the chemical potential of water in the hydrate phase is calculated by:

$$\mu_w^H = \mu_w^\beta + RT \sum_m \nu_m \ln(1 - \sum_j \theta_{mj}), \quad (8.7)$$

where  $\mu_w^\beta$  is the chemical potential of water in the empty hydrate lattice (something like an "ideal" chemical potential) and  $\nu_m$  is the number of  $m$  cavities by water molecule in the lattice. The fraction of cavities  $m$ -type cavities occupied by the gaseous component  $l$  is

$$\theta_{ml} = (C_{ml} f_l) / ((1 + \sum_j C_{mj} f_j)), \quad (8.8)$$

where  $C_{mj}$  is the Langmuir constant and  $f_l$  is the fugacity of the gaseous component  $l$ . The Langmuir constant takes into account the interactions between the gas and the molecules of water in the cavities. Using the Lennard-Jones-Devonshire cell theory, van der Waals e Platteeuw showed that the Langmuir constant can be given by

$$C(T) = 4\pi/kT \int_0^\infty \exp[(-w(r))/kT] r^2 dr, \quad (8.9)$$

where  $T$  is the absolute temperature,  $k$  is the Boltzmann constant and  $w(r)$  is the spherically

symmetric potential which is a function of the cell radius, the coordination number and the nature of the gas-water interaction. In this method, the Kihara potential with a spherical core is used,

$$w(r) = 2ze[\sigma^{12}/(R^{11}r)(\delta^{10} + a/R\delta^{11}) - \sigma^6/(R^5r)(\delta^4 + a/R\delta^5)], \quad (8.10)$$

$$\delta^N = [(1 - r/R - a/R)^{-N} - (1 + r/R - a/R)^{-N}]/N, \quad (8.11)$$

where  $N$  is equal to 4, 5, 10 or 11;  $z$  and  $R$  are, respectively, the coordination number and the cavity cell radius.

**Supported hydrate formers** CH<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub>, C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>, iC<sub>4</sub>H<sub>10</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S, N<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>.

**Model applicability range** Temperature: 211 to 303 K; Pressure: 1 to 600 atm.

### 8.2.2 Klauda and Sandler

The model proposed by Klauda and Sandler [20] uses spherically symmetric Kihara potentials determined from viscosity data and the second virial coefficient, in opposition to the traditional models which adjust these parameters to experimental hydrate data. In general, this method predicts hydrate formation data more precisely than the other models.

#### Fugacity of water in the hydrate phase

$$\begin{aligned} f_w^H = & \exp(A_g^\beta \ln T + (B_g^\beta)/T + 2,7789 + D_g^\beta T) \times \\ & \exp V_w^\beta [P - \exp(A_g^\beta \ln T + (B_g^\beta)/T + 2,7789 + D_g^\beta T)]/RT \times \\ & \exp[\sum_m \nu_m \ln(1 - \sum_j (C_{mj}f_j)/(1 + \sum_j C_{mj}f_j))] \end{aligned} \quad (8.12)$$

The  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $D$  constants are specific for each hydrate former and represent the vapor pressure of the component in the empty hydrate lattice.  $V_w^\beta$  represents the basic hydrate molar volume (without the presence of guests) and the Langmuir constant ( $C$ ) is calculated by the following equation:

$$C(T) = 4\pi/kT \int_0^{R-a} \exp[(-w(r))/kT] r^2 dr \quad (8.13)$$

In the Klauda e Sandler method the spherically symmetric Kihara potential is also used,

$$w(r) = 2ze[\sigma^{12}/(R^{11}r)(\delta^{10} + a/R\delta^{11}) - \sigma^6/(R^5r)(\delta^4 + a/R\delta^5)] \quad (8.14)$$

$$\delta^N = [(1 - r/R - a/R)^{-N} - (1 + r/R - a/R)^{-N}]/N \quad (8.15)$$

with a modifications in the potential to include the effects of the second and third cell layers,

$$w(r) = w(r)^{[1]} + w(r)^{[2]} + w(r)^{[3]}. \quad (8.16)$$

**Supported hydrate formers** CH<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub>, C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>, iC<sub>4</sub>H<sub>10</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S, N<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>.

**Model applicability range** Temperature: 150 to 320 K; Pressure: 1 to 7000 atm

### 8.2.3 Chen and Guo

Chen and Guo [21] developed a model based in a formation mechanism based in two steps, the first being a quasi-chemical reaction to form the "basic hydrate" and the second as being a small gas absorption process in the linking cages of the basic hydrate. The results showed that this model is capable of predict hydrate formation conditions for pure gases and mixtures.

**Fugacity of water in the hydrate phase** In the Chen and Guo model, a different approximation is used for the equilibrium condition. Here the equilibrium is verified by means of an isofugacity criteria of the hydrate formers in the hydrate and vapor phase. The fugacity of the component in the vapor phase is calculated by:

$$f_i^H = f_i^0(1 - \theta_i)^\alpha, \quad (8.17)$$

where  $\alpha$  depends on the structure of the hydrate formed, and

$$f_i^0 = f^0(P)f^0(T)f^0(x_w\gamma_w), \quad (8.18)$$

$$f^0(P) = \exp(\beta P/T), \quad (8.19)$$

$$f^0(T) = A' \exp(B'/(T - C')), \quad (8.20)$$

$$f^0(x_w\gamma_w) = (x_w\gamma_w)^{(-1/\lambda_2)}, \quad (8.21)$$

where  $\beta$  and  $\lambda_2$  depend on the structure of the hydrate formed and  $A'$ ,  $B'$  and  $C'$  depends on the hydrate former.  $x_w$  and  $\gamma_m$  are, respectively, the water molar fraction and activity coefficient in the liquid phase.

In the Chen and Guo model, the Langmuir constants are calculated with an Antoine-type equation with parameters obtained from experimental data, for a limited range of temperature:

$$C(T) = X \exp(Y/(T - Z)) \quad (8.22)$$

**Supported hydrate formers** CH<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub>, C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>, iC<sub>4</sub>H<sub>10</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S, N<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and nC<sub>4</sub>H<sub>10</sub>.

**Model applicability range** Temperature: 259 to 304 K, Pressure: 1 to 700 atm.

### 8.3 Petroleum Cold Flow Properties

#### 8.3.1 Refraction Index

##### API Procedure 2B5.1

$$I = 0.02266 \exp(0.0003905 \times (1.8MeABP) + 2.468SG - 0.0005704(1.8MeABP) \times SG) \times (1.8MeABP)^{0.0572} SG^{-0.72} \quad (8.23)$$

$$r = \left( \frac{1 + 2I}{1 - I} \right)^{1/2} \quad (8.24)$$

where

$r$  Refraction Index

$SG$  Specific Gravity

$MeABP$  Mean Averaged Boiling Point (K)

#### 8.3.2 Flash Point

##### API Procedure 2B7.1

$$PF = \{[0.69 \times ((t_{10ASTM} - 273.15) \times 9/5 + 32) - 118.2] - 32\} \times 5/9 + 273.15 \quad (8.25)$$

where

$PF$  Flash Point (K)

$t_{10ASTM}$  ASTM D93 10% vaporized temperature (K)

#### 8.3.3 Pour Point

##### API Procedure 2B8.1

$$PFL = [753 + 136(1 - \exp(-0.15v_{100})) - 572SG + 0.0512v_{100} + 0.139(1.8MeABP)] / 1.8 \quad (8.26)$$

where

$PFL$  Pour Point (K)

$v_{100}$  Viscosity @ 100 °F (cSt)

#### 8.3.4 Freezing Point

##### API Procedure 2B11.1

$$PC = -2390.42 + 1826SG + 122.49K - 0.135 \times 1.8 \times MeABP \quad (8.27)$$

where

$PC$  Freezing Point (K)

$K$  API characterization factor (API)

### 8.3.5 Cloud Point

#### API Procedure 2B12.1

$$PN = \left[ 10^{(-7.41 + 5.49 \log(1.8MeABP) - 0.712 \times (1.8MeABP)^{0.315} - 0.133SG)} \right] / 1.8 \quad (8.28)$$

where

$PN$  Cloud Point (K)

### 8.3.6 Cetane Index

#### API Procedure 2B13.1

$$IC = 415.26 - 7.673API + 0.186 \times (1.8MeABP - 458.67) + 3.503API \times \log(1.8MeABP - 458.67) - 193.816 \times \log(1.8MeABP - 458.67) \quad (8.29)$$

where

$IC$  Cetane Index

$API$  API degree of the oil

## 8.4 Chao-Seader Parameters

The Chao-Seader parameters needed by the CS/GS models are the Modified Acentric Factor, Solubility Parameter and Liquid Molar Volume. When absent, the Modified Acentric Factor is taken as the normal acentric factor, either read from the databases or calculated by using the methods described before in this document. The Solubility Parameter is given by

$$\delta = \left( \frac{\Delta H_v - RT}{V_L} \right)^{1/2} \quad (8.30)$$

where

$\Delta H_v$  Molar Heat of Vaporization

$V_L$  Liquid Molar Volume at 20 °C

## References

- [1] Smith J. *Intro to Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies. 1996.
- [2] Peng DY, Robinson DB. A New Two-Constant Equation of State. *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Fundamentals*. 1976;15(1):59–64.
- [3] Soave G. Equilibrium constants from a modified Redlich-Kwong equation of state. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 1972;27(6):1197–1203.
- [4] Whitson CH, Brule MR. *Phase Behavior (SPE Monograph Series Vol. 20)*. Society of Petroleum Engineers. 2000.
- [5] Stryjek R, Vera JH. PRSV2: A cubic equation of state for accurate vapor-liquid equilibria calculations. *The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering*. 1986;64:820–826.
- [6] Chao KC, Seader JD. A General Correlation of Vapor-Liquid Equilibria in Hydrocarbon Mixtures. *AIChE Journal*. 1961;7:599–605.
- [7] Grayson HG, Streed CW. Vapor-Liquid Equilibria for High Temperature, High Pressure Hydrogen-Hydrocarbon Systems. *N/A*. 1963;VII.
- [8] Renon H, Prausnitz JM. Local Compositions in Thermodynamic Excess Functions for Liquid Mixtures. *AIChE Journal*. 1968;14:135–144.
- [9] Mohs A, Gmehling J. A revised {LIQUAC} and {LIFAC} model (LIQUAC\*/LIFAC\*) for the prediction of properties of electrolyte containing solutions. *Fluid Phase Equilibria*. 2013; 337(0):311 – 322.  
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378381212004426>
- [10] Thomsen K. Aqueous electrolytes: model parameters and process simulation. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Chemical Engineering, Technical University of Denmark. 1997.
- [11] Reid R. *The Properties of Gases and Liquids*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1987.
- [12] Lee BI, Kesler MG. A generalized thermodynamic correlation based on three-parameter corresponding states. *AIChE Journal*. 1975;21(3):510–527.
- [13] Michelsen M, Mollerup J. *Thermodynamic Models: Fundamentals and Computational Aspects*. Denmark: Tie-Line Publications. 2007.
- [14] Riazi MR, Al-Adwani HA, Bishara A. The impact of characterization methods on properties of reservoir fluids and crude oils: options and restrictions. *Journal of Petroleum Science and Engineering*. 2004;42(2-4):195–207.
- [15] Riazi MR. *Characterization and properties of petroleum fractions*. ASTM. 2005.
- [16] Harrison BK, Seaton WH. Solution to missing group problem for estimation of ideal gas heat capacities. *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Research*. 1988;27(8):1536–1540.
- [17] Marrero J, Gani R. Group-contribution based estimation of pure component properties. *Fluid Phase Equilibria*. 2001;183-184:183–208.

- 
- [18] Heidemann RA, Khalil AM. The calculation of critical points. *AIChE Journal*. 1980; 26(5):769–779.
- [19] Parrish WR, Prausnitz JM. Dissociation Pressures of Gas Hydrates Formed by Gas Mixtures. *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Process Design and Development*. 1972;11(1):26–35.
- [20] Klauda J, Sandler S. A Fugacity Model for Gas Hydrate Phase Equilibria. *Industrial and Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2000;39(9):3377–3386.
- [21] Chen GJ, Guo TM. A new approach to gas hydrate modelling. *Chemical Engineering Journal*. 1998;71(2):145–151. Url.