

การคำนวณสมมูลระหว่างภูมิภาคของเหลว-ของเหลว-ไอโดยใช้สมการสภาวะ

นาย เจตน์ รัตนมาลากร

วิทยานิพนธ์นี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรปริญญาวิศวกรรมศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต

ภาควิชาวิศวกรรมเคมี

บัณฑิตวิทยาลัย จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

พ.ศ. 2533

ISBN 974-578-333-1

ลิขสิทธิ์ของบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

017180

COMPUTATION OF LIQUID-LIQUID-VAPOR EQUILIBRIUM
USING EQUATIONS OF STATE

Mr. Chet Rattanamalakorn

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Engineering
Department of Chemical Engineering
Graduate School
Chulalongkorn University

1990

ISBN 974-578-333-1

เจตน์ รัตนมาลากร : การคำนวณสมดุลระหว่างวัฏภาคของเหลว-ของเหลว-ไอโดยใช้สมการสถานะ (COMPUTATION OF LIQUID-LIQUID-VAPOR EQUILIBRIUM USING EQUATIONS OF STATE) อ.ปริกษา :
รศ.ดร.เกริกชัย สุกาญจน์จทิ, 16๘ หน้า. ISBN 974-578-333-1

สมการสถานะจำนวน 4 สมการคือ Soave-Redlich-Kwong (SRK), Harmens & Knapp (HK), Peng & Robinson (P&R) และ modified Soave-Redlich-Kwong (Graboski & Daubert) (G&D) นำมาใช้ทำนายปริมาตรโมลาร์ของของเหลว, ปริมาตรโมลาร์ของไอ และเศษส่วนโมลขององค์ประกอบของระบบ 3 วัฏภาค ของเหลว-ของเหลว-ไอ ของของผสม มีเทน-อีเทน-นอร์แมลโดโคเซน (Methane-Ethane-n-Docosane) ที่อุณหภูมิเท่ากับ 298.15 K และ 303.15 K และของผสม คาร์บอนไดออกไซด์-ไนโตรเจน-นอร์แมลโนนาดีเคนที่อุณหภูมิ 294.15 K, 297.15 K และ 301.15 K

สำหรับในวัฏภาคไอนั้นการคำนวณปริมาตรโมลาร์ของไอและเศษส่วนโมลโดยใช้สมการสถานะทั้ง 4 พบว่าส่วนใหญ่ทำนายได้ดีโดยที่สมการของ P&R สามารถทำนายปริมาตรโมลาร์ของไอได้ดีที่สุดคือให้ค่าความคลาดเคลื่อนเฉลี่ยสัมบูรณ์ (absolute error deviation) เท่ากับ 2.1490% ในขณะที่ HK ให้ผลการคำนวณเศษส่วนโมลของอีเทนได้ดีมากคือให้ค่าความคลาดเคลื่อนเฉลี่ยสัมบูรณ์เพียง 0.2284% เท่านั้นที่อุณหภูมิเท่ากับ 298.15 K สำหรับระบบของผสม คาร์บอนไดออกไซด์-ไนโตรเจน-นอร์แมลโนนาดีเคนที่อุณหภูมิเท่ากับ 297.15 K สมการ P&R สามารถทำนายปริมาตรโมลาร์ของไอโดยให้ค่าความคลาดเคลื่อนเฉลี่ยสัมบูรณ์เพียง 0.6817% เท่านั้น

ส่วนในวัฏภาคของเหลวนั้นพบว่าทุกสมการมีความสามารถในการทำนายน้อยกว่าในวัฏภาคไอโดยที่ HK สามารถทำนายปริมาตรโมลาร์ของของเหลวในระบบคาร์บอนไดออกไซด์-ไนโตรเจน-นอร์แมลโนนาดีเคนและมีเทน-อีเทน-นอร์แมลโดโคเซนได้ดีกว่าสมการของ SRK, P&R และ G&D โดยให้ความคลาดเคลื่อนเฉลี่ยสัมบูรณ์ในวัฏภาคของเหลวที่ 1 และ 2 น้อยกว่า 12% และ 5% ตามลำดับ นอกจากนี้ยังพบว่าทุกสมการสถานะใช้ทำนายเศษส่วนโมลในวัฏภาคของเหลวของระบบคาร์บอนไดออกไซด์-ไนโตรเจน-นอร์แมลโนนาดีเคนไม่ดัดกันอย่างไรรก็ตามสมการของ HK ให้ความคลาดเคลื่อนเฉลี่ยสัมบูรณ์ของ ไนโตรเจน น้อยกว่า 15% สำหรับระบบที่ประกอบด้วย มีเทน-อีเทน-นอร์แมลโดโคเซน พบว่า HK ให้ความคลาดเคลื่อนเฉลี่ยสัมบูรณ์ของ อีเทน ในวัฏภาคของเหลวที่ 1 และ 2 น้อยกว่า 6% และ 2% ตามลำดับ

ภาควิชา
สาขาวิชา
ปีการศึกษา 2533

ลายมือชื่อนิสิต
ลายมือชื่ออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา
ลายมือชื่ออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาร่วม

CHET RATTANAMALAKORN : COMPUTATION OF LIQUID-LIQUID
-VAPOR EQUILIBRIUM USING EQUATIONS OF STATE.
THESIS ADVISER : ASSO. PROF. KROEKCHAI SUKANJANAJTEE,
Ph.D., 167 PP. ISBN 974-578-333-1

Four equations of state Soave-Redlich-Kwong(SRK),
Harmens & Knapp(H&K), Peng & Robinson(P&R) and modified SRK
(Graboski & Daubert)(G&D) are used to evaluate liquid molar
volume, vapor molar volume and phase compositions of liquid-
liquid-vapor system of Methane-Ethane-n-Docosane mixtures at
T=298.15 K, 303.15 K and CO₂-N₂-n-Nonadecane mixtures at
T=294.15 K, 297.15 K and 301.15 K.

For vapor phase, prediction of vapor molar volume and
composition by all the equation of state are generally good.
P&R equation could predict vapor molar volume best with an
absolute deviation of 2.1490% .While H&K gave very good
result in ethane mole fraction with an absolute deviation of
0.2284% at T=298.15 K .For CO₂-N₂-n-Nonadecane system at
T=297.15 K, the P&R equation could predict the vapor molar
volume with an absolute deviation of only 0.6819%.

For liquid phase, predictions are not as good as those
of vapor phase. Regarding liquid molar volume prediction, H&K
equation predicted liquid molar volumes of both methane-
ethane-n-Docosane and CO₂-N₂-n-Nonadecane systems better
than SRK, P&R and G&D equations. Absolute deviation of
liquid molar volume in L' and L'' phases evaluated by
H&K equation is less than 12% and 5% respectively. For liquid
phase mole fraction, all equation of state gave poor value of
liquid mole fraction for the CO₂-N₂-n-Nonadecane. However,
H&K equation gave N₂ mole fraction with an absolute
deviation of less than 15%. For methan-ethane-n-Docosane, H&K
equation gave absolute deviation of ethane mole fraction in
L' and L'' phases less than 6% and 2% respectively.

ภาควิชา
สาขาวิชา
ปีการศึกษา 2533

ลายมือชื่อนิติกร
ลายมือชื่ออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา
ลายมือชื่ออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาร่วม

Contents

	Page
Abstract(In Thai).....	vi
Abstract(In English).....	viii
Acknowledgments.....	x
List of tables	xi
List of figures	xviii
Notation.....	xxiii
Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
Objective of work.....	3
Scope of work.....	4
II. Phase equilibrium flash vaporization and partial condensation.....	8
Two-phase flash vapourization.....	8
Three-phase flash vapourization.....	10
Vapour-liquid-liquid equilibrium.....	10
Isothermal-isobaric flash.....	11
Criteria of Phase Equilibria.....	16
III. Equations of state.....	20
The Soave-Redlich-Kwong equation of state.....	21
The Harmens & Knapp three-parameter Cubic equation of state.....	27
The Peng-Robinson equation of state.....	31
The modified SRK(Graboski & Daubert) equation	

of state.....	33
IV. Algorithm and calculation.....	36
The criteria for initial estimate in three- phase flash system.....	36
Example calculation for Soave Redlich Kwong equation of state.....	40
Example calculation for Harmens and Knapp equation of state.....	48
V. Results of computation by equations of state....	54
VI. Discussions and Conclusion.....	121
References.....	137
Appendix	140
Appendix A Pascal program criteria for initial estimate.....	141
Appendix B Pascal program three-phase flash computation by S-R-K	142
Appendix C Pascal program three-phase flash computation by H&K	148
Appendix D Pascal program three-phase flash computation by P&R	155
Appendix E Pascal program three-phase flash computation by G&D	161
Biography	168

Acknowledgments

I am wish to express my sincere appreciation to Associate Professor Kroekchai Sukanjanajtee for his invaluable suggestions and encouragement. I am grateful to my father and mother for financial support throughout the course of this study. Finally, I am wish to thank the committee for commentation in this work.

List of Tables

	Page
3.1 The Harmens & Knapp three-parameter cubic equation of state.....	29
4.1 Values of Q_1, Q_2 and $Q_1 - Q_2$ at the vertices.....	37
4.2 Initial parameters (SRK-EOS).....	40
4.3 Initial K-values for(SRK-EOS).....	41
4.4 Parameters for pure component(SRK-EOS).....	42
4.5 Parameters for mixture of(SRK-EOS).....	45
4.6 Molar volume of mixture of(SRK-EOS).....	45
4.7 Fugacity coefficients of mixture(SRK-EOS).....	46
4.8 Mole fraction and K-values(SRK-EOS).....	48
4.9 Initial parameters (HK-EOS).....	48
4.10 Parameters for pure component(HK-EOS).....	49
4.11 Parameters for mixture of(HK-EOS).....	50
4.12 Molar volume of mixture of(HK-EOS).....	51
4.13 Fugacity coefficients of mixture(HK-EOS).....	51
4.14 Mole fraction and K-values(HK-EOS).....	52
5.1 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L ^I -L ^{II} phases(SRK-EOS)of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=298.15 K.....	55
5.2 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L ^I -L ^{II} phases(HK-EOS)of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=298.15 K.....	56
5.3 Comparisons of experimental and predicted	

	equilibrium mole fraction in V-L ^I -L ^{II} phases(PR-EOS)of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=298.15 K.....	57
5.4	Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L ^I -L ^{II} phases(G&D-EOS)of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=298.15 K.....	58
5.5	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (SRK-EOS) of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=298.15 K.....	59
5.6	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (HK-EOS) of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=298.15 K.....	60
5.7	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (PR-EOS) of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=298.15 K.....	61
5.8	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (G&D-EOS) of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=298.15 K.....	62
5.9	Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L ^I -L ^{II} phases(SRK-EOS)of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=303.15 K.....	71
5.10	Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L ^I -L ^{II} phases(HK-EOS)of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=303.15 K.....	72
5.11	Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L ^I -L ^{II} phases(PR-EOS)of C ₁ +C ₂ +n-Docosane system T=303.15 K.....	73

5.12 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L^I-L^{II} phases(G&D-EOS)of C₁+C₂+n-Docosane system T=303.15 K..... 74

5.13 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (SRK-EOS) of C₁+C₂+n-Docosane system T=303.15 K..... 75

5.14 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (HK-EOS) of C₁+C₂+n-Docosane system T=303.15 K..... 76

5.15 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (PR-EOS) of C₁+C₂+n-Docosane system T=303.15 K..... 77

5.16 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (G&D-EOS) of C₁+C₂+n-Docosane system T=303.15 K..... 78

5.17 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L^I-L^{II} phases(SRK-EOS)of CO₂+N₂+n-Nonadecane system T=294.15 K.. 87

5.18 Comparisons of Experimental and Predicted equilibrium mole Fraction in V-L^I-L^{II} Phases(HK-EOS)of CO₂+N₂+n-Nonadecane System T=294.15 K.. 88

5.19 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in V-L^I-L^{II} phases(PR-EOS)of CO₂+N₂+n-Nonadecane system T=294.15 K.. 89

5.20 Comparisons of Experimental and Predicted equilibrium mole Fraction in V-L^I-L^{II} Phases(G&D-

EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ System $T=294.15$ K..	90
5.21 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (SRK-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=294.15$ K.....	91
5.22 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (HK-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=294.15$ K.....	91
5.23 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (PR-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=294.15$ K.....	92
5.24 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (G&D-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=294.15$ K.....	92
5.25 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in $V-L^I-L^{II}$ phases(SRK-EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=297.15$ K..	100
5.26 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in $V-L^I-L^{II}$ phases(HK-EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=297.15$ K..	101
5.27 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in $V-L^I-L^{II}$ phases(PR-EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=297.15$ K..	102
5.28 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in $V-L^I-L^{II}$ phases(G&D-EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=297.15$ K..	103
5.29 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar	

volume (HK-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	104
5.30 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (SRK-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	104
5.31 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (PR-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	105
5.32 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (G&D-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	105
5.33 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in $V-L^I-L^{II}$ phases(SRK- EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=301.15 \text{ K}$..	112
5.34 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in $V-L^I-L^{II}$ phases(HK- EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=301.15 \text{ K}$..	113
5.35 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in $V-L^I-L^{II}$ phases(PR- EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=301.15 \text{ K}$..	114
5.36 Comparisons of experimental and predicted equilibrium mole fraction in $V-L^I-L^{II}$ phases(G&D- EOS)of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=301.15 \text{ K}$..	115
5.37 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (HK-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system $T=301.15 \text{ K}$	116

5.38	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (SRK-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system $T=301.15$ K.....	116
5.39	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (PR-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system $T=301.15$ K.....	117
5.40	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume (G&D-EOS) of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system $T=301.15$ K.....	117
6.1	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of C_1 of $\text{C}_1 + \text{C}_2 + n$ -Docosane $T=298.15$ K	124
6.2	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of C_2 of $\text{C}_1 + \text{C}_2 + n$ -Docosane $T=298.15$ K.....	124
6.3	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of molar volume of $\text{C}_1 + \text{C}_2 + n$ -Docosane $T=298.15$ K.....	125
6.4	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of C_1 of $\text{C}_1 + \text{C}_2 + n$ -Docosane $T=303.15$ K	125
6.5	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of C_2 of $\text{C}_1 + \text{C}_2 + n$ -Docosane $T=303.15$ K.....	126
6.6	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of molar volume of $\text{C}_1 + \text{C}_2 + n$ -Docosane $T=303.15$ K.....	126
6.7	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of CO_2 of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane $T=294.15$ K	127
6.8	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of N_2 of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane $T=294.15$ K.....	127
6.9	Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of	

molar volume of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{n-Nonadecane}$ $T=294.15 \text{ K}$	128
6.10 Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of CO_2 of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{n-Nonadecane}$ $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	128
6.11 Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of N_2 of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{n-Nonadecane}$ $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	129
6.12 Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of molar volume of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{n-Nonadecane}$ $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	129
6.13 Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of CO_2 of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{n-Nonadecane}$ $T=301.15 \text{ K}$	130
6.14 Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of N_2 of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{n-Nonadecane}$ $T=301.15 \text{ K}$	130
6.15 Average absolute derivation of mole fraction of molar volume of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{n-Nonadecane}$ $T=301.15 \text{ K}$	131
6.16 Values of u and w in equation 6.1.....	132

List of Figure

	Page
2.1 Continuous single-stage equilibrium separation...	8
2.2 Equilibrium relationships between immiscible Liquids and vapor.....	9
3.1 Reduced vapor pressure.....	22
3.2 K-Value for methane in propane at cryogenic conditions.....	23
3.3 K-Value for propane in methane at cryogenic conditions.....	24
3.4 Plots of 250 F isotherms of sulfur dioxide with the Harmens & Knapp, Soave, and Van der waals equations, and comparison with the true saturation curve.....	28
4.1 Location of the zero of P_1 , P_2 and P_3 for normal three-phase behavior.....	38
4.2 Algorithm for isothermal three-phase equilibrium calculations.....	39
4.3 Newton-Raphson algorithm.....	44
5.1 Comparisons of experimental and predicted methane mole fraction in L' phase by SRK, HK G&D, PR-EOS of $C_1 + C_2 + n$ -Docosane system at $T = 298.15$ K	63
5.2 Comparisons of experimental and predicted	

	methane mole fraction in L^{II} phase by SRK HK,G&D,PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=298.15 K	64
5.3	Comparisons of experimental and predicted ethane mole fraction in L^I phase by SRK, HK G&D,PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=298.15 K	65
5.4	Comparisons of experimental and predicted ethane mole fraction in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK G&D,PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=298.15 K	65
5.5	Comparisons of experimental and predicted ethane mole fraction in vapor-phase by SRK,HK,G&D,PR- EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=298.15 K....	67
5.6	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^I phase by SRK,HK,G&D,PR-EOS of C_1 + C_2+n - Docosane system at T=298.15 K	68
5.7	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^{II} phase by SRK,HK,G&D,PR-EOS of C_1 + C_2+n -Docosane system at T=298.15 K	69
5.8	Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in vapor phase by SRK,HK,G&D,PR-EOS of C_1 + C_2+n -Docosane system at T=298.15 K	70
5.9	Comparisons of experimental and predicted methane mole fraction in L^I phase by SRK,HK, G&D,PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at	

T=303.15 K	79
5.10 Comparisons of experimental and predicted methane mole fraction in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=303.15 K	80
5.11 Comparisons of experimental and predicted ethane mole fraction in L^I phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=303.15 K	81
5.12 Comparisons of experimental and predicted ethane mole fraction in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=303.15 K	82
5.13 Comparisons of experimental and predicted ethane mole fraction in vapor phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=303.15 K	83
5.14 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^I phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n - Docosane system at T=303.15 K	84
5.15 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n - Docosane system at T=303.15 K	85
5.16 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in vapor phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of C_1+C_2+n -Docosane system at T=303.15 K	85

- 5.17 Comparisons of experimental and predicted CO_2 mole fraction in L^I phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system at $T=294.15$ K..... 93
- 5.18 Comparisons of experimental and predicted N_2 mole fraction in L^I phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system at $T=294.15$ K... 94
- 5.19 Comparisons of experimental and predicted N_2 mole fraction in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system at $T=294.15$ K.... 95
- 5.20 Comparisons of experimental and predicted CO_2 mole fraction in vapor phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system at $T=294.15$ K.. 96
- 5.21 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^I phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ - Nonadecane system at $T=294.15$ K 97
- 5.22 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system at $T=294.15$ K 98
- 5.23 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in vapor phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system at $T=294.15$ K..... 99
- 5.24 Comparisons of experimental and predicted CO_2 mole fraction in L^I phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n$ -Nonadecane system at $T=297.15$ K.. 106
- 5.25 Comparisons of experimental and predicted CO_2 mole fraction in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR

-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system at $T=297.15 \text{ K}..$	107
5.26 Comparisons of experimental and predicted CO_2 mole fraction in vapor phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system at $T=297.15\text{K}.....$	108
5.27 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^I phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system at $T=297.15 \text{ K} ...$	109
5.28 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system at $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	110
5.29 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in vapor phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system at $T=297.15 \text{ K}$	111
5.30 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^I phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system at $T=301.15 \text{ K}..$	118
5.31 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in L^{II} phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system at $T=301.15 \text{ K}$	119
5.32 Comparisons of experimental and predicted molar volume in vapor phase by SRK, HK, G&D, PR-EOS of $\text{CO}_2 + \text{N}_2 + n\text{-Nonadecane}$ system at $T=301.15 \text{ K}$	120

NOTATION

- A, B = Parameters in the equation of state
 a, b = Parameters in the equation of state
 D = Determinant of the Jacobian matrix, equation 12
 F = Total moles of feed to the flash
 f_i = Mole of component i in feed to flash
 f_i = Fugacity of component i for mixture
 f_i° = Fugacity of component i for pure
 G = Gibbs free energy
 H = Enthalpy per mole
 K = Vapor-liquid equilibrium ratio (K-value)
 k_{ij} = Binary interaction parameter
 L = Liquid flow rate
 n_j = Moles of component j
 P_c = Pure component critical pressure
 P = Pressure
 P_r = Reduce pressure = P/P_c
 p = Partial pressure
 p_1, p_2, P_3 = Functions defined by equation (3.21-3.23)
 Q_1, Q_2 = Functions defined by equation (3.24, 3.25)
 Q = Heat transfer rate
 R = Gas constant
 S = Entropy
 T = Absolute temperature
 T_c = Pure component critical temperature

- T_r = Reduced temperature = T/T_c
 u_1, u_2 = Fraction of feed in liquid phase 1,2
 ($u_1 = L^1/F, u_2 = L^{1'}/F$)
 V = Vapor flow rate; volume
 v = Molar volume
 \bar{v} = Partial molal volume
 w = Pitzer's eccentricity
 x = Liquid mole fraction
 y = Vapor mole fraction
 z = Feed mole fraction
 Z = Compressibility factor

Greek Letters

- ϕ_i^o = Fugacity coefficient of pure component i
 ϕ_i = Fugacity coefficient of component i of mixture
 μ_i = Chemical potential of component i
 δ_i = Activity coefficient of component i

Subscripts

- v = Vapor phase
 L = Liquid phase
 F = Feed
 i, j, k = Component number

superscripts

- I, II = indexes for liquid phase