

Design and optimization of 3D reactor technologies

for the production of light olefins Kevin M. Van Geem

Laboratory for Chemical Technology, Ghent, Belgium







The von Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics

IMPROOF Workshop, Ghent, Belgium, 27/01/120120

The "old" LCT



LCT's new vision

GHENT UNIVERSITY



3/90

What is Process intensification?

"any chemical engineering development that leads to a substantially smaller, cleaner, and more energy-efficient technology"

A. Stankiewicz, J. Moulijn



Stankiewicz, A. I.; Moulijn, J. A., Process Intensification: Transforming Chemical Engineering. Chemical Engineering Progress 8500, 22. https://www.ugent.be/csc/en







Chemical engineering – length and time scales





Computational fluid dynamics (CFD)

"cleverly forged data"

"contract for difference"

"colors for directors"

Simulate fluid flow based on conservation equations



Computational fluid dynamics (CFD)

Simulate fluid flow based on conservation equations



Momentum (~velocity)





Control volume approach



LCT: Innovation through Supercomputing



Innovation through Supercomputing

Laboratory for Chemical Technology, Ghent University









Laboratory for Chemical Technology

Design and **optimization** of sustainable products and processes



Circular process design Low carbon technology **Renewable chemicals and technology**



The chemical industry is the enemy











Chemical industry

Belgium is the N°1 chemical country in the world (per capita basis) •



Sales of chemicals and plastics per capita (2009)





Source: Feri, NIS 2009 Figures

Process transformation

Industrial CO₂ emissions (Flanders, 85120)



Source: MIRA op basis van EIL (VMM)







atozforex.com; pnnl.org; districtenergy.org; scade.fr; schmidt-clemens.de; Linde Group; IHS Chemical Insight

Steam cracking furnace 101



DRIVING CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY

GHENT

UNIVERSITY

S. Vangaever, P. A. Reyniers, C. Visser, D. Jakobi, G. J. Heynderickx, G. B. Marin, et al., "Computational Fluid Dynamics-Based Study of a High Emissivity Coil Coating in an Industrial Steam Cracker," Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, vol. 57, pp. 120782-120794, 12018.

Process Intensification in steam cracking

Improve reactor design by accelerating heat input







Fig.4.3: Thermal boundary layer flow past a flat surface

- Thermal efficiency
- **Product selectivity**
- Decoking procedures
- More reactor material needed
- More friction with wall ~ Δp



Disrupt the boundary layer

3D reactor technologies for flow modulation



IHT





I. Mayo, B. C. Cernat, M. Virgilio, A. Pappa, T. Arts, and Asme, "Aerothermal Investigation of the Flow and Heat Transfer in a Helically Corrugated Cooling Channel," (in English), Proceedings of the Asme Turbo Expo: Turbine Technical Conference and Exposition, 120120, Vol 5b, Proceedings Paper p. 11, 120120.

D. Bai, Y. Zong, M. Zhou, L. Zhao, "Novel cracking coil design based on positive constructing of synergetic flowing field," submitted to International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer.

HCD

This sounds easy but reality is different

What do you need:

- 1. Accurate experimental data
- 2. A kinetic model
- 3. Accurate boundary conditions
- Properly accounting for turbulence 4.
- 5. Automated geometry optimisation



LCT's Steam cracking setups

Detailed Feedstock Characterization

- Elemental analysis
- D2887 SimDist
- D11200 distillation
- ✓ GC×GC-FID/TOF-MS



GC×GC-FID/SCD GC×GC-FID/NCD



Process Conditions

- Internal standard based product quantification On-line GC×GC-FID/TOF-MS analyses

- ✓ High temperature on-line product sampling \checkmark \checkmark ✓ On-line GC×GC-SCD/NCD analyses Computer controlled process conditions

Pilot Plant







Detailed Product Characterization

Bench Scale Setup

History of Pilot Plant

- Furnace is originally built in 1968
- Continuous improvement:
 - 12008: new RGA (GC)
 - 12009: first GC×GC
 - 12010: improved flow regulation
 - 12011: new TLE design
 - 12012: automation and feed section
 - upgrade
 - 12013: Online sulfur speciation
 - 12014: Online nitrogen speciation
 - 12018: new refractory/coatings and 3D coils









20

LCT's Pilot plant

Extreme flexibility - the major advantage of the pilot plant

For operating companies or engineering contractors:

- To explore ...
 - Wide range of feedstock
 - hydrocarbons ranging from gases to heavy crude oils
 - Wide range of operating conditions
 - COT, dilution, COP, temperature profile, residence time ...
 - Inhibition of coke deposition by additives
 - in the radiant coil
 - in the transfer line heat exchanger
- To get information about
 - expected product spectrum
 - optimal operating conditions
 - coke deposition (run length)





Pilot plant steam cracking setup





Control Room

DRIVING CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY



Steam cracking pilot plant







The LCT's Pilot plant









Analysis section

• on-line sampling • powerful analytics \checkmark 2 GC×GC's FID, SCD, NCD ✓ RGA for C_{4min} \checkmark IR-CO/CO₂ meter

Features



Universal On-line quantification







Methane = Reference Component GC×GC temperature program: $-40^{\circ}C \rightarrow 300^{\circ}C$



GC x GC Principle





- Analytes are separated using two different columns with two different stationary phases.
- The modulator quickly traps, then "injects" the • analytes from the first dimension column onto the second dimension.
- This process creates a retention plane of the 1st • dimension separation x 2nd dimension separation.





Highly beneficial to analyze complex samples

Dalluge, Beens, & Brinkman (12003), Comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography: a powerful and versatile analytical tool. Journal of Chromatography A. 69-108

GC×GC-TOF-MS/NCD/SCD setups





Qualitative analysis

- Quantitative analysis
- Selective to N- compounds
- Quantitative analysis
- Selective to S- compounds

GC x GC modulation







✓ Enhanced Resolution ✓ Enhanced Signal/Noise Ratio

GC x GC data processing







Dallüge et al., J. Chrom. A 12003

On line GCxGC-FID analysis



ON-LINE

effluent analysis Methane \rightarrow Pyrene+

30

Nitrogen compounds

GHENT



Al in Experimental Analysis – QUANTIS

- Analysis of experimental consistency
- Analysis/detection of outliers
- Improvement of experimental datasets
- PCA: consistency of experiments, outliers
- t-SNE: clustering visualization

Different colors represent datapoints from different experimental runs

GHENT

UNIVERSITY



Symoens, S. H.; Aravindakshan, S. U.; Vermeire, F. H.; De Ras, K.; Djokic, M. R.; Marin, G. B.; Reyniers, M.-F.; Van Geem, K. M., QUANTIS: Data quality assessment tool by clustering analysis. International Journal of Chemical Kinetics 12019, 51, (11), 872-885.













Good data was the start of COILSIM

Fundamental modeling strategy

from feed to product







28th EPC, Houston, TX, April 13th, 120120



Key elements of COILSIM

GHENT







SIMCO: Feedstock Reconstruction



COILSIM1D





DRIVING CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY

GHENT

UNIVERSITY



- Broadest and most accurate kinetic model for steam cracking
 - 785+ molecules •
 - 43 radicals
 - 300,000+ reactions
- industrial)
- cracking reactions with exceptional validation facilities

https://www.lct.ugent.be/ https://www.avgi.be/



Based on high level Ab initio data, and kinetics re-fitted with experimental data (pilot and

The result of decades of expertise in independent research and modelling of thermal
Pyrolysis chemistry

Radical chemistry – radicals are molecules with an unpaired valence electron



Reactions can be classified in so-called **reaction families**:

1) Scission

C-C $C_1-C_2 \rightarrow \cdot C_1 + \cdot C_2$ C-H $C_1-H \rightarrow \cdot C_1 + \cdot H$ Net formation of radicals,

2) Hydrogen abstraction

Intermolecular

by H^{\bullet} $C_1 - H + \bullet H \rightarrow \bullet C_1 + H - H$ by $C \bullet C_1 - H + \bullet C_2 \rightarrow \bullet C_1 + C_2 - H$ Intramolecular $\bullet C_1 - (C)_n - C_2 - H \rightarrow H - C_1 - (C)_n - C_2 \bullet$

3) β-scission & reverse radical addition

Intermolecular $\bullet C_1 - C_2 - C_3 \rightarrow C_1 = C_2 + \bullet C_3$

 $\bullet C_1 - C_2 - H \rightarrow C_1 = C_2 + \bullet H$

Intramolecular $\cdot C_1 - (C)_n - C_2 = C_3 \rightarrow cy(C_1 - (C)_n - C_2 - C_3)$ $\bullet C_1 - (C)_n - C_2 = C_3 \rightarrow Cy(C_1 - (C)_n - C_2) - C_3 \bullet$





^J very reactive species

How does this occur?



Network generators





39/172

Network generation



GENESYS : GENEration of reacting SYStems









- Computer sciences, chemistry and mathematics
- Open source projects
- Advanced species representation
- Advanced algorithms (e.g. structure based virtual screening)
- Widely applicable
 - Pharmacophore discovery
 - Protein structure elucidation
 - Quantitative structure-activity relationships

COILSIM1D ~ Microkinetic network



µ network \bullet

Application of <u>PSSA</u> on μ -radicals (C₊₆) leads to a significant reduction of differential equations to solve

β network \bullet

Bi and monomolecular reactions of considered species

ing of heavy feedstocks." Oil & Gas Science and Technology-Revue de l'IFP 63(1): 79-94 **GHENT** UNIVERSITY DRIVING CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY



Per feed/primary product molecule Per initiation mode

- Bond scission
- Hydrogen abstraction
- Various radical additions

Library of independent sub-networks



COILSIM1D ~ Microkinetic network

Thermal Cracking of Hydrocarbons







he thermal decomposition of organic compounds from the standpoint of free radicals. I. Saturated hydrocarbons." Journal of the American Chemical Society 53(5): 1959-1972. product distributions from pyrolysis of normal and branched paraffins." Ind. Eng. Chem. Fundam.;(United States) 22(1) , and G. Froment (1984), "Computer-generation of reaction paths and rate equations in the thermal cracking of normal and branched paraffins," Computers & Chemical Engineering 8(2): 137-142.



Relative reaction rates



Orders of magnitude difference between bi- and monomolecular reactions

"Monomolecular reactions dominate for long chain radicals"

Distinction between 2 sub-networks

COILSIM1D ~ Microkinetic network

Example : H-abstraction of 2,4 dimethyl pentane

µ network





$$R_{fO} = k_5 C_{\mu_2} = k_5$$

 $feed \rightarrow$



C724DM

ived normal and branched alkanes: Influence of branching on product distribution and formation of aromatics." Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis 122(Supplement C): 468-478.

DRIVING CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY





$$\rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^{n_{ol}} \frac{k^{pseudo}(O_j)}{\sum_{i}^{r} k_i} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_{rad}} \frac{k^{pseudo}(\beta_j)}{\sum_{i}^{r} k_i}$$

Equivalent single step reaction





GHENT

How accurate is our kinetic model?





Experimental yields during steam cracking of bio-derived hydrocarbons Feedstock composition: $MW_{average} = 230g/mol 51wt\%$ normal alkanes – 49wt% branched alkanes $F_{HC,0} = 0.04 \text{ g/s}, F_{H2O,0} = 0.02 \text{ g/s}, P = 0.17 \text{ MPa}$

Model calculated yields, calculated using CHEMKIN using the plug flow reactor module



COILSIM1D ~ key features

Possibilities with COILSIM1D

- Boost profitability with highly accurate simulation Yield maximization
 - Process optimization
- High flexibility
 - Model validated for broad range of feeds
 - Main reactor geometries supported
 - User-defined reactor geometry (a.k.a. 'open version')
 - User-defined operating conditions







47/32

3D reactor technologies: coking



Enhanced heat transfer & mixing -> Less cokes?

Increased pressure drop Lower olefin selectivity?





Long term performance and stability?





3D reactor technologies - coking



Enhanced heat transfer & mixing -> Less cokes?

Increased pressure drop Lower olefin selectivity?





Long term performance and stability?



3D Steam Cracking Reactor Technology: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly

Carl M. Schietekat, David Van Cauwenberge, Kevin M. Van Geem, Guy B. Marin

Laboratory for Chemical Technology, Ghent University http://www.lct.UGent.be

2013 AIChE Spring Meeting, May 2nd, 2013, San Antonio, TX







Reduction of hot regions - less overcracking - higher propylene selectivity

Coke formation in steam cracking

Endothermic process at temperatures of 800–900 °C

Deposition of a carbon layer on the reactor surface

- Reduced thermal efficiency
- High pressure causes loss of product selectivity
- Coil carburization and thermal stress
- Coke reduction method: 3D reactor technology





Nova Chemicals, 12002; Linde Group; Muños et al., 12013; Albright et al., 1988; Muños et al., 12014





$$A_i \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-E_{a,i}}{RT_{int}}\right)$$



Coil cracking due to differences in thermal expansion rate



Hot spots due to inhomogeneous coke formation



Ideally mixed lab scale reactor

- Flexible, fast and low-cost experiments for intrinsic kinetics
- Quasi-homogeneous gas phase composition
- Jet stirred reactor (JSR)

High velocity jets induce mixing via turbulence generation

Gas-phase kinetics study

- ✓ Oxidation of fuels
- ✓ Pyrolysis of hydrocarbons
- ✓ Nitrous oxide formation
- ✓ Ignition phenomena

Gas-solid kinetics study

- ✓ Chemical vapor deposition
- ✓ Coke formation in steam cracking















Jet stirred reactor at the Laboratory for Chemical Technology



Reyniers, P. A. et al. Int. J. Chem. Kinet. 120120, 48, 556.



Analysis section



Three proposed geometries to maximize the gas phase homogeneity via residence time distribution simulations and reactive simulations of ethane cracking



Reyniers, P. A. et al. Int. J. Chem. Kinet. 120120, 48, 556.



Distinctive differences in the flow pattern between geometries, with the 45° case exhibiting the highest degree of homogeneity





MSB data post processing

Determination of the coking rate



Initial (catalytic) coking rate = Average coking rate value from 15 min to 1 hour of cracking

Asymptotic (pyrolytic) coking rate = Average coking rate value during the last hour of cracking

1D simulations are not sufficient to capture all phenomena

1D Simulation	BARE	FINNED	RIBBED
$\Delta P / \Delta P_{Bare}$	1.00	1.22	2.17
U/U _{Bare}	1.00	1.21	1.50
T _{gas/cokes} [K]	1079.4	1066.4	1054.5
Rel. r _{coke}	-	-4.8%	-43.1%
Rel. yield C_2H_4	-	-0.27%	-1.47%
Rel. yield C_3H_6	-	+0.03%	+0.13%
~ 10 ¹ CPU seconds			

3D CFD simulations are **computationally expensive** but **necessary** to obtain correct results







~ 10⁶ CPU seconds

MODELING and measuring Turbulence





The in-between: large eddy simulation

- Resolve the large flow-determining eddies
- Model the smaller, more uniform eddies

Particle Image Velocimetry



3D reactor technologies - 12017 & 12018



Enhanced heat transfer & mixing -> Less cokes?

Increased pressure drop Lower olefin selectivity?





Long term performance and stability?







IN FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

DEPARTMENT OF MATERIALS, TEXTILES AND CHEMICAL ENGINEERING (MATCH) LABORATORY FOR CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY

124B 479642 IMPROOF: INTEGRATED MODEL GUIDED PROCESS OPTIMIZATION OF STEAM CRACKING FURNACES

<u>K.M. Van Geem</u>, F. Battin-Leclerc, G. Bellos, G. Heynderickx, W. Buysschaert, B. Cuenot, M.R. Djokic, T. Faravelli, G. Theis, D. Jakobi, P. Lenain, A.E. Muñoz, J. Olver, J.N. Dedeyne, S. Vangaever, P. Honnerová, Z. Veselý, P. Oud

2017 Spring National Meeting, San Antonio, Texas, March, 28, 2017



Advances in coil material

- increased run length
- increased coil lifetime

Full-scale reactor simulation (length: 10 m)

~ 10⁸ – 10⁹ cells

 $\sim 10^5 - 10^6$ iterations required to reach steady-state solution

Trick: streamwise periodicity



Patankar, S. V. et al. J. Heat Transfer 1977, 99, 180.





Computational domain can be reduced by using **streamwise periodic** boundary conditions

Assume velocity as **fully-developed** over the short computational volume

Use transient velocity field to evaluate species and enthalpy radial mixing

Translate transient results back to the true steady-state by **reconstructing** the position from the bulk velocity:

Transformation: Time \rightarrow Position

$$\Delta z = U_{bulk} \, \Delta t = \frac{\int_{\partial V} \rho u_z dA}{\int_{\partial V} \rho dA} \, \Delta t$$

Speedup factors of 1200+







Enhanced reactor designs



Van Cauwenberge, D. J. et al. Chem. Eng. J. 12015, 282, 66.



Simulation of a bare, finned and ribbed reactor

Improve the reactor by decreasing T_{gas/coke}

- Increase tube area (A)
- Increase heat transfer coefficient (U)





Reyniers, P. A. et al. 24th International Symposium on Chemical Reaction Engineering, Minneapolis, MN, USA, 120120.



Importance of 3D simulations – instantaneous temperature [K]



Reyniers, P. A. et al. 24th International Symposium on Chemical Reaction Engineering, Minneapolis, MN, USA, 120120.



Lower average wall temperature

High temperature at trailing edge of the rib

Importance of 3D simulations – instantaneous rate of coke formation [kg m⁻² s⁻¹]



Reyniers, P. A. et al. 24th International Symposium on Chemical Reaction Engineering, Minneapolis, MN, USA, 120120.



Lower rate of coke formation due to lower average wall temperature

Coke formation highest at trailing edge

Steam cracking furnace modeling





Coupling between individual parts

Assess influence of furnace improvements on overall heat balance

DRIVING CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY





Coupling between individual parts





67

furnace modeling – the past

1D simulations of the furnace side, accounting for flue gas flow pattern, turbulent mixing and combustion in a crude way





Plehiers, P. M. et al. Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 1990, 29, 636-641. | Heynderickx, G. J. et al. AIChE J. 12001, 47, 388-400. | Stefanidis, G. D. et al. Comput. Chem. Eng. 12006, 30, 635-649. | Hu, G. et al. Comput. Chem. Eng. 12012, 38, 24-34.



68

furnace modeling – the present



Detailed burner geometry







Heat flux and product yield



Flue gas radiative properties

GHENT



Spectral window

 $I = I_0$

Length **Absorption band**

$$I = I_0 e^{-\kappa s}$$

Length

Gray gas/non-gray gas model



> Average absorption coefficient over entire spectrum





Absorption bands (K₂) Spectral windows (K₁ and K₃)
Validation of our non-gray gas model

GHENT



73

Gray vs. Non-gray





Gray gas model (WSGGM gray)2015 AICINOningray model (Nine-band)



UNIVERSITY

DRIVING CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY

furnace modeling – the present











furnace modeling – the present









Dynamic run length simulation



Vandewalle, L. A. et al. Chem. Eng. J. 12017, 329, 77-87.



Time on stream [days]

78

3D reactor technologies - 12019



Enhanced heat transfer & mixing -> Less cokes?

Increased pressure drop Lower olefin selectivity?





Long term performance and stability?



Improved coil design for a hole-in-one





Golf and turbulent flow







Golf meets a steam cracking coil









Experimental investigation – PIV setup









The von Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics



Experimental investigation – Heat transfer setup











The von Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics

Flow in a dimpled coil









The von Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics

Perpendicular streamlines away from the wall → effect focused in near-wall region → low pressure drop

> → high near-wall velocities → small thermal boundary layer → good heat transfer

Flow in dimpled coil exhibits desired properties



CFD validation







Impact of dimple depth











Wainaina M, Kimathi M, Malonza D, "Simulation of Dimple Characteristics on the Trajectories of a Dimpled Sphere (Golf Ball) in Motion," J Appl Computat Math, 12018, Vol 7, p. 386.

Impact of dimple depth (e)









J. N. Dedeyne, D. J. Van Cauwenberge, P. A. Reyniers, K. M. Van Geem, and G. B. Marin, "Large eddy simulation of tubular reactors with spherical dimples," Chemical Engineering Journal, p. 122463, 12019.

Comparison with other reactor technologies

Process conditions

11 m Reactor length Feedstock Steam dilution 903 K Coil Inlet Temperature Coil Outlet Pressure Conversion

118.54 kg/h propane

0.326 kg/kg

170 kPa

80.6 %







Reduced metal temperatures

Outside ~ TMT limitations

Inside ~ **Coking rate**







Higher Δp & more uniform T_{gas}



Substantial Δp due to relatively deep dimples (e/D = 0.066)

Lower coking rate will reduce this difference over time

Spherical dimples realize the most narrow distribution



T_{gas} much more uniform for dimpled coils

Reactor technology – P/E



Lower peak temperatures

→ 3D reactors result in higher P/E at same X

Yields [wt%]	C3H6	C2H4	C4H6	CH4	C3H4	Benzene
Bare	17.41	34.02	1.66	19.27	0.65	1.54
Helical Swirl	17.99	33.71	1.60	19.30	0.65	1.48
Advanced Rifled	18.32	33.54	1.57	19.21	0.65	1.45
Spherically Dimpled	18.33	33.55	1.58	19.33	0.63	1.43





→ Less overcracking = higher propylene selectivity

Impact of dimple shape



#DIMPLEGATE — TITLEIST SUES 10 SMALL BALL COMPANIES

BY JOHN BARBA

MAY 21, 2015 | 88 COMMENTS

Back in April Acushnet filed suit in Federal Court in Boston, claiming that ten competitors are violating Acushnet's patented "triangular dipyramid dimple pattern" with their offerings.











How to come up with the best shape?

Best shape = best combination of geometrical parameter values

5 important surface points



1: most upstream point of dimple

- 2 & 4: Determining maximum dimple width
- 3: Determining max dimple depth
- 5: most downstream point of dimple

Large variety of geometries possible with these parameters



However: no control over slope of surface

Best shape = best combination of geometrical parameter values

5 important surface points connected via 4 quadratic Bézier curves





Easy to calculate, parametric curves Wide range of smooth curves possible Used in animation, robotics, automobile design, ...

Curvature completely described by 4 points/parameters → Start and end points defined by 2 surface points ➔ 2 additional points (weights) describing slope of curve



Best shape = best combination of geometrical parameter values

5 important surface points connected via 4 quadratic Bézier curves



Degrees of freedom

- Position of surface points (5 points x 3 coordinates = 15) - Curvature of slope (4 curves x 2 points x 3 coordinates = 24)

Optimization of 39 parameters too demanding

- → Imposed rules
 - Point 1 completely fixed
 - Points 1, 2, 4 and 5 on cylinder with fixed radius
 - Tangential position of 1, 3 and 5 identical
 - Curve 2-3 & 4-3 are symmetrical.
 - Axial position of 2, 3 and 4 identical



Underlying assumption: asymmetric dimple shape not optimal 96

Best shape = best combination of geometrical parameter values

5 important surface points connected via 4 quadratic Bézier curves



GHFN1 UNIVERSITY G CHEMICAL TECHNOLOG Actual degrees of freedom

- 1 for axial position of 2, 3, 4
- 1 for radial position of 3
- 1 for tangential position of 2, 4 -
- 1 for axial position of 5
- 2 for curvature of 1-3
- 2 for curvature 3-5
- 2 for curvature 2-3, 4-3

 \rightarrow 10 parameters to define shape = 10 parameters to tune for optimization

Optimization of 10 parameters

10 times 1D optimization \Leftrightarrow 1 time 10D optimization

Parameters could be dependent on each other \rightarrow 1 x 10D optimization for accurate results

This requires a very high number of CFD evaluations

➔ Automation of evaluations







Automated postprocessing & evaluation

Automation of evaluations

Scripted grid generation



- + Excellent grid control
- + Lots of design options available
- Scripting language is bloated and cumbersome
- + Journaling option makes scripting easier

CFD evaluations



- + Open source
- + Wide range of applications
- User experience required for complex cases
- + Start from previously converged similar case



vailable oated and cumbersome s scripting easier

ons ed for complex cases nverged similar case

Optimization of 10 parameters

10 times 1D optimization \Leftrightarrow 1 time 10D optimization

Parameters could be dependent on each other \rightarrow 1 x 10D optimization for accurate results

This requires a very high number of CFD evaluations

- ➔ Automation of evaluations
- → Smart selection of designs to evaluate



Automated postprocessing & evaluation

Systematic sampling

time consuming







Systematic sampling

time consuming

Sampling towards improved solution

risk of local optimum result depending on initial case





Systematic sampling

time consuming

Sampling towards improved solution

risk of local optimum result depending on initial case

Sampling towards improved solution with randomization

given sufficient time always reaches global optimum delicate balance between order and chaos High order: waste time near local optima High chaos: previously information "lost"





Genetic algorithm = theory of evolution

```
Parameter values = genes
```

Best designs pass their genes to next generation

How to determine what are the best designs?

- 1. Select an appropriate **objective function**
- 2. **Evaluate** the objective function value for all designs
- 3. **Rank** designs according to objective function value
- 4. Highest ranks are the best designs

Mutations can occur and introduce a random element in the gene pool







Optimization results - TEF







Upstream part elongated & flattened Downstream part compressed > Formation of cusp at downstream edge

Close up to optimization results

Objective function can be debated.

Constituting elements can give a more detailed impression







Rapid change in TEF due to rapid decrease in Δp = flattening & elongating upstream section

Final increase in TEF due to improved heat transfer = cusp formation

Deep dive

What is the impact of each geometric parameter on performance?







Objective function

What is the immediate impact of 3D reactors?

- Change in olefin yield Assertes differences bing ceachas signal case +
- Improved heat transfer +
- Increased pressure drop -

Can be assessed with fast non-reactive simulations




... leads to a longer run length ...





... and reduces fuel consumption.







Conclusions

- Experiments show promising flow behavior
- Minimal dimple depth required to sustain vortices ullet
- Reduced wall temperature can extend run length ullet
- Uniform gas temperature results in a higher propylene yield ullet
- Shape optimization via genetic algorithm leads to ullet
 - Lower pressure drop penalty
 - Additional run length extension
 - Reduced fuel consumption and reduced emissions





Acknowledgement

- Jens Dedeyne
- Pieter Reyniers
- David Van Cauwenberge
- Yu Zhang
- Laurien Vandewalle
- Stijn Vangaever
- Marko Djokic
- Thomas Dijckmans
- Ismaël Amghizar
- Geraldine Heynderickx
- Guy Marin
- Marie-Françoise Reyniers



. . .



118/12 0



GHENT UNIVERSITY









The von Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics











LABORATORY FOR CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY

Technologiepark 125, 9052 Ghent, Belgium

- E info.lct@ugent.be
- T 003293311757

https://www.lct.ugent.be



