

IN THE NAME OF GOD

COMPUTER SIMULATION OF UREA THERMAL HYDROLYSIS REACTOR

BY

ABBAS AZARPOUR HASANKIADEH

THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE (M. Sc.)

IN

CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

SHIRAZ UNIVERSITY

SHIRAZ, IRAN

EVALUATED AND APPROVED BY THE THESIS COMMITTEE AS: EXCELLENT

M. R. RAHIMPOUR..... M. R. RAHIMPOUR, Ph. D., ASSISTANT PROF.
OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING(CHAIRMAN)

J. FATHI KALAJAHI..... J. FATHI KALAJAHI, Ph. D., PROF.
OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

A. ALAMDARI..... A. ALAMDARI, Ph. D., ASSISTANT
PROF. OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

FEBRUARY 2001

۳۴۸۵۷

**To My Devoted Parents, Affable Sister,
and Deceased Sister**

PEAST

Acknowledgment

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. M. R. Rahimpour for his supervision and support during the course of this work. I would like to thank Professor J. Fathikalajahi and Dr. A. Alamdari who contributed to this work through their encouragement, valuable guidance and many helpful suggestions.

Abstract

Computer Simulation of Urea Thermal Hydrolysis Reactor

By

Abbas Azarpour Hasankiadeh

Two kinetic models for the urea thermal hydrolysis reaction have been developed. Kinetic model 1 has been considered as the reverse steps of urea synthesis reaction. Kinetic model 2 is an irreversible reaction in which carbon dioxide and ammonia gases are produced as products. The validity of the proposed kinetic models has been checked by comparing the results predicted by the models with design and plant data. The kinetic model 1 is a good one to predict the conversion of urea, but it is not a good kinetic model to predict the concentration of carbon dioxide and ammonia gases. The kinetic model 2 gives much better results than the kinetic model 1.

The two kinetic models were used to investigate the steady state behavior of the industrial urea thermal hydrolysis reactor. A detailed steady state model described by a set of ordinary differential and nonlinear algebraic equations (ODAEs) was developed to predict the behavior of the urea thermal hydrolysis reactor. The model was implemented in MATLAB 5.3 software. The implementation of the model in this package was primarily concerned with the solution of the ODAEs to carry out steady state simulation of the process. The model has been validated against design and plant data.

Results of the simulation of the reactor show that the conversion of urea and the concentrations of carbon dioxide and ammonia gases increase along the reactor. Also, the temperature of the fluid passing through the reactor decreases along the reactor slowly. By using the model, the influence of a number of operating parameters was assessed and considerable insight into the reactor performance was obtained. The results of this study suggest that we could make some improvement by changing the operating conditions.

Keywords: urea, thermal hydrolysis, urea removal plant, UNIQUAC equation of state, urea thermal hydrolysis reactor, and nonlinear equations.

Table of Contents

Content	Page
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xii
List of Symbols	xvii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Urea Hydrolysis Techniques.....	6
1.2 Theory of Urea Hydrolysis.....	11
1.3 Chemical Affecting Waste water Quality.....	11
1.4 Thesis Outline.....	12
Chapter 2: Urea and Its Derivatives	14
2.1 Chemical Properties.....	14
2.2 Physical Properties.....	19
Chapter 3: Urea Removal Plant	20
3.1 Description.....	20
3.2Hydrolyzer.....	22
3.3 Desorber.....	22
3.4 Reflux Condenser.....	22
3.5 Energy Management in the Desorption System.....	23
3.6 Urea Removal Plant of Shiraz Petrochemical Complex.....	24

Content	Page
Chapter 4: Literature Review	28
4.1 Urea Hydrolysis Reactions (Kinetic Model 1)	28
4.2 Thermodynamic Framework.....	29
4.3 Chemical Equilibrium.....	33
4.4 Rate of Urea Hydrolysis Reaction According to Kinetic Model 1.....	36
4.5 Nonlinear Equations.....	38
4.6 Using Half-Method to Satisfy the Activity Coefficients.....	41
4.7 Urea Hydrolysis Reactions (Kinetic Model 2).....	42
4.8 Rate of Urea Hydrolysis Reaction According to Kinetic Model 2.....	43
Chapter 5: Model Development of a Urea Thermal Hydrolysis Reactor	45
5.1 The Proposed Models for the Urea Thermal Hydrolysis Reactor.....	46
5.2 Mathematical Model of Urea Hydrolysis Reactor.....	46
5.2.1 Series of Stirred Tanks Model (CSTR).....	46
5.2.1.1 Mass Balance at Each Stage.....	47

Content	Page
5.2.1.2 Energy Balance at Each Stage.....	51
5.2.2 Plug-Flow Model.....	52
5.2.2.1 Mass Balance for the Plug-Flow Model.....	53
5.2.2.2 Energy Balance for the Plug-Flow Model.....	54
5.2.3 Partially Axial Mixing Model	55
5.2.3.1 Assumptions.....	56
5.2.3.2 Mass Balance for the Partial Axial Mixing Model.....	56
5.2.3.3 Energy Balance.....	59
5.2.4 Boundary Conditions.....	62
Chapter 6: Model Implementation, Validation and Simulation of a Urea Thermal Hydrolysis Reactor.....	64
6.1 Numerical Solution (CSTR Model (Kinetic Model 1)).....	64
6.2 Numerical Solution (Partial Axial Mixing Model).....	66
6.3 Model Testing and Validation.....	68
6.4 Results and Discussion.....	74
Chapter 7: Conclusions and Recommendations.....	83
7.1 Conclusions.....	84
7.2 Recommendations for Future Work.....	85
References.....	88

Content

Page

Abstract and Title Page in Persian.....

List of Tables

Table		Page
Table 2.1	General properties of urea.....	15
Table 2.2	Specific Heat of Urea.....	15
Table 2.3	Properties of saturated aqueous solutions of urea.....	16
Table 2.4	Properties of saturated solutions of urea in ammonia.....	18
Table 2.5	Properties of saturated solutions of urea in methanol and ethanol.....	19
Table 4.1	Assignment of subscripts to system components.....	30
Table 4.2	Extended UNIQUAC model: Pure component parameters.....	31
Table 4.3	Extended UNIQUAC model: Binary interaction parameters $\{u_{ij}\}$	34
Table 4.4	Equilibrium constant parameters.....	34
Table 6.1	Industrial reactor specifications, and input plant data (Shiraz petrochemical complexes of Iran, 2000).....	69

Table		Page
Table 7.1	Comparison between design data and simulation results for kinetic model 1 (CSTR model).....	86
Table 7.2	Comparison between design data and simulation results for kinetic model 2 (Dispersion model).....	86

List of Figures

Figure		Page
Figure 1.1	Stamicarbon process for production of urea.....	4
Figure 1.2	Flow diagram of perforated plates column fermenter.....	9
Figure 3.1	Desorption section with cocurrent hydrolysis reactor.....	21
Figure 3.2	Urea removal plant of Shiraz petrochemical complex.....	25
Figure 5.1	(a) An ideal stirred tank, (b) A series of ideal stirred-tank reactors.....	48
Figure 5.2	The element volume of the plug-flow.....	53
Figure 5.3	Element thin-layer of the reactor.....	57
Figure 6.1	Conversion profile of urea along the reactor at two different feed volumetric flow rates where steam mass flow rate and inlet feed temperature are constant at 3.2 <i>Ton/hr</i> and 138 °C , respectively.....	70
Figure 6.2	Temperature profile along the reactor at two different feed volumetric flow rates where steam mass flow fate and inlet feed temperature are constant at 3.2 <i>Ton/hr</i> and 138 °C , respectively.....	71

Figure		Page
Figure 6.3	6.3 Conversion profile of urea along the reactor at two different steam mass flow rates where feed volumetric flow rate and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$ and $138 \text{ }^\circ C$, respectively.....	72
Figure 6.4	Temperature profile along the reactor at two different steam mass flow rates where feed volumetric flow rate and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$ and $138 \text{ }^\circ C$, respectively.....	73
Figure 6.5	Conversion profile of urea along the reactor at two different inlet feed temperatures where feed volumetric flow rate and steam mass flow rate are constant at $33 \frac{m^3}{hr}$ and $2.6 \frac{Ton}{hr}$, respectively.....	74
Figure 6.6	Conversion profile of urea along the reactor considering equilibrium reactions and CSTR model where feed volumetric flow rate, steam mass flow rate and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$, $2.76 \frac{Ton}{hr}$, and $138 \text{ }^\circ C$, respectively.....	75

Figure	Page
Figure 6.7	76
<p>The molar flow rate of produced NH_3 and CO_2 gases along the reactor for kinetic model 1 and CSTR model where feed volumetric flow rate, steam mass flow rate, and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$, $2.76 \frac{Ton}{hr}$, and $138^\circ C$, respectively.....</p>	
Figure 6.8	77
<p>The conversion profile of urea along the reactor for kinetic model 1 according to dispersion model where feed volumetric flow rate, steam mass flow rate, and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$, $2.76 \frac{Ton}{hr}$, and $138^\circ C$, respectively.....</p>	
Figure 6.9	78
<p>Temperature profile along the reactor for kinetic model 1 and dispersion model where feed volumetric flow rate, steam mass flow rate, and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$, $2.76 \frac{Ton}{hr}$, and $138^\circ C$, respectively.....</p>	

Figure	Page
<p>Figure 6.10 Comparison between kinetic model 1 (Using CSTR model) and kinetic model 2 (Using dispersion model) where feed volumetric flow rate, steam mass flow rate, and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$, $2.76 \frac{Ton}{hr}$, and $138 \text{ }^\circ C$, respectively.....</p>	79
<p>Figure 6.11 Comparison between the proposed models of the reactor for kinetic model 1 where feed volumetric flow rate, steam mass flow rate, and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$, $2.76 \frac{Ton}{hr}$, and $138 \text{ }^\circ C$, respectively.....</p>	80
<p>Figure 6.12 molar flow rate of the produced gases along the reactor for kinetic model 1 (Using dispersion model) where feed volumetric flow rate, steam mass flow rate, and inlet feed temperature are constant at $39 \frac{m^3}{hr}$, $2.76 \frac{Ton}{hr}$, and $138 \text{ }^\circ C$, respectively.....</p>	81