PHASE EQUILIBRIA

IN THE

PROPANE-BUTANE SYSTEM

Thesis by

C. W. Nysewander

 \sim

 \sim

In Partial Fulfillment

of the

Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California 1938

 $\label{eq:1.1} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} + \math$

TABLE OF CONTENTS

 \sim

PHASE EQUILIBRIA IN THE PROPANE-BUTANE SYSTEM

Introduction

A very important factor in the design of equipment used in transforming, separating, or otherwise handling of hydrocarbons is an exact knowledge of the physical properties of the hydrocarbon mixtures themselves under various temperatures and pressures. A large store of information concerning the physical properties of pure hydrocarbons and mixtures of these hydrocarbons has been amassed during the past few years but even so, there remains much to be done before the volumetric and phase behavior of uninvestigated mixtures can be quantitatively predicted from the properties of their components. Among the physical properties of interest are the P-V-T-N relations. These relations are of much value not only in themselves but also in the fact that many other physical properties may be calculated from such data through the use of thermodynamic principles.

At pressures in the neighborhood of 1-5 atmospheres, Raoult's Law and Dalton's Law may be used with fair accuracy to determine phase equilibrium data for hydrocarbon mixtures. At higher pressures and at temperatures approaching the critical temperature, however, deviations become large and these laws must be supplanted with experimentally determined facts. Souders, Selheimer, and Brown (1), have used fugacity instead of vapor pressure in an attempt to predict more accurately the equilibrium conditions at the higher pressures where experimental data were lacking.

There have been developed at least two distinctly different types of apparatus for the determination of the P-V-T relations of hydrocarbon mixtures. One of these, described in detail by Sage, Schaafsma, and Lacey (2), consists of a thermostated steel cell in which the sample to be investigated is placed. Suitable auxilliary apparatus is set up in conjunction with the steel cell, so that the volume of the sample and the pressure may be changed by the addition to or removal of mercury from the cell. The mercury level inside the cell, and thus the volume occupied by the sample, is accurately measured by a movable electric contact.

A different type of appara tus has been used by Young (3), Bahlke and Kay (4) , and Cummings (5) , similiar to the apparatus that was used to obtain the data presented in this thesis. It has a small diameter thick walled glass tube in place of the steel cell for holding the sample. The upper end of the glass tube is sealed, while the lower end is fitted into the steel block which has connections for evacuating the tube, adding the sample, and also for adding or removing mercury to change the volume and pressure on the sample. In this case the volume can be measured by visually noting the height of the mercury level in the glass tube. Other details of construction and procedure will be found in the section devoted to the apparatus and experimental procedure.

Each type of apparatus has its advantages and limitations. The variable volume steel cell may be used at pressures up to several thousand pounds, while with the glass tube about one

-2-

thousand pounds per square inch appears to be the upper limit. The steel cell may be made large enough to hold a sample weighing 20-50 grams whereas the total sample for the glass tube used in these experiments was never over 0.1 gram. The large sample may or may not be an advantage. The larger sample increases the accuracy with which the weights of the different components of the sample can be determined but, at the same time, the larger sample requires a great deal more material. It is usually necessary to study several different compositions of a mixture. The amount of sample required may be quite important where the purification is a problem. All the results presented in this thesis required less than 1 gram of the finally purified propane and butane.

A further advantage of the glass $P-V-T$ apparatus is that the phase boundaries may be determined quite accurately by direct observation. The dew point and bubble points may be determined by observing the pressure, volume, and temperature when a very small amount of the liquid or gas respectively is in equilibrium with the remainder of the sample in the other phase. With the steel cell, the dew points and bubble points may be obtained only by taking a great many readings in the vicinity of these points and determining the discontinuities in the pressure-volume curve at constant temperature.

Another advantage of the glass apparatus is the rapidity with which the temperature may be changed. The steel cell in a liquid bath with a large heat capacity requires considerable time for changing temperature. The glass tube is thermostated by a condensing vapor from a liquid boiling under reduced pres-

-3-

sure. The temperature may be changed and the apparatus brought to equilibrium again in a few minutes merely by changing the pressure on the boiling liquid.

Apparatus

The apparatus used and the procedure followed will be described in detail with reference to Figure 1, which shows a schematic diagram of the assembly, and Figure 2, which shows the pressure tube and jacket in detail. The glass pressure tube, A, was made of pyrex glass capillary tubing with 1.88 mm. average inside diameter and a wall thickness of 3.1mm. The upper end was sealed carefully, keeping the thickness of glass over the end about the same as that of the walls. In the preliminary runs, the end was sealed in such a way that the inside of the tip was flat and a large amount of glass was accumulated at the top. This seal satisfactorily withstood the pressure, after annealing, until it was cooled to liquid air temperature. Apparently the cooling to liquid air temperature caused strains in the glass for it invariably fractured in a plane across the flat surface at a lower pressure than that at which it had been tested before cooling. By keeping the inner surface of the sealed end rounded and the wall thickness over the sealed end uniform, the pressure tube could be cooled repeatedly with liquid air, without fracturing, when pressure was again applied.

To the lower end of the pressure tube, A, Figure 2, was sealed a 1.5 inch length of 1.2 inch diameter pyrex tubing in the shape of a thistle tube. This glass assembly was then fitted into the upper removable part of the steel block, B, with a rubber gasket, C, held in place by the gland nut, D ,

 $-4-$

 $-5-$

FIG.I.

 $-5-$

 $\bar{\bar{z}}$

 $-6-$

When the steel parts were fitted together the lower end of the thistle tube and the lower protective shield of steel slipped into the annular channel below the level of the outlet from this enclosed space. After these parts had been assembled, the procedure was to evacuate the tube through valve 1, down to about .001 mm. of mercury vacuum. Then by opening valve 3, shown in Figure 1, mercury flowed into the annular channel, effectively sealing the inside of the pressure tube and the thistle tube from the annular space between the thistle tube and the steel block .

Built into the lower part of the steel block were two needle valves, 1, in the vacuum line and 2, in the line to the sampling hook-up. Below this block was an electrical contact, E, with which the level of mercury could be kept in the approximate vicinity while adding the sample. Extra heavy steel pipe connected the contact assembly with the mercury reservoirs, F and G, and the manometer, H. Reservoir G, was simply a junction between the mercury in the system and the oil in the pipe to the fluid pressure balance. An electrical contact inside this reservoir made it possible to keep the mercury level at a fixed point while taking pressure readings. The reservoir, F, was connected by a manifold with a source of air pressure, a vacuum, and a vent. The air pressure was used to force mercury into the pressure tube and thus change the volume and pressure on the sample as desired. The vent allowed the release of pressure when desired. The vacuum was used to pull the mercury down out of the tube when the pressure in the tube was less than one atmosphere .

 $-7-$

The manometer, H, was useful in checking the amount of sample added, in the calculation of the pressure correction. and in indicating directly the pressures on the samples when they were in the range of the manometer. The first two uses will be described in detail later.

Temperature Control

A vacuum jacket, I, surrounded the pressure tube in the section between the boiler, J, and the condenser at the top. This vacuum jacket was silvered except for narrow vertical apertures, in front and back, for observing the phenomena inside the tube. The length of the vacuum jacketed portion was 27.5 inches, the inside diameter, 1.1 inches, and the outside diameter 1.5 inches. The liquid providing the vapor was pulled by suction into the annular space around the pressure tube and up into the boiler space, below the vacuum jacket, through the projecting glass tube, K. A rubber tubing connection prevented liquid from escaping between the lower end of the jacket and pressure tube. To prevent deterioration of this rubber connection by the organic liquids used, a small amount of mercury was run into the lower end of the jacket up to the level of the projecting glass tube. Glass beads were placed in the boiler section to prevent bumping. To prevent the beads from wedging around the pressure tube, the glass tubing through the small water condenser was extended up several inches into the boiler section. A small hole, L, in the wall of this tube, just above the point where it was sealed into the outer jacket, permitted the liquid to be drained out when desired. Above the vacuum jacketed section a water condenser was placed to condense the

 $-8-$

The junction of the thermocouple was located slightly above the middle of the length of the pressure tube, used in the measurements, and just to one side. Error due to radiation was considered negligible since the double walls of the jacket were silvered except for the narrow apertures for observation. The copper constantan thermocouple was calibrated throughout the entire temperature range required in a thermostated oilbath or lead bath against a set of Bureau Standards thermometers which could be read with an accuracy of 0.03° F.

Pressure Measurement

A fluid pressure balance with an accuracy of 0.1 pound per square inch was used to measure the pressures below 300 pounds per square inch and a pressure balance with accuracy of 1 pound per square inch was used to measure the higher pressures. A number of correction factors were considered in determining the final pressure on the sample. These corrections included the barometer corrections, changes in the height and density of the mercury in the pressure tube, and the correction due to the difference in level of the pressure balance and the apparatus.

 $-10-$

Correction due to the capillary depression of the mercury was automatically made in the constant for the apparatus. This constant was obtained by reading several pressures both on the pressure balance and on the manometer, H. After correcting these pressures for the density of the mercury and the height in the pressure tube, the average difference between the pressure balance reading and the manometer reading was taken as the constant. In a series of three different pressure readings the constants found were: -20.03, -19.94, and -19.88, and the average value of -19.90, was used. The correction due to vapor pressure of mercury was so small as to be considered negligible in the temperature range of these experiments. The equation for correcting the pressures is as follows:

 $P(\text{corrected}) = SP + A + K (R_0 - R) + B$ A is the constant for the apparatus when $R = R_0$ and the density of the mercury in the pressure tube is corrected to 32° F. K is a factor converting a column $(R_0 - R)$ of mercury at the temperature of the experiment to pounds per square inch. R is the reference point at the uppermost point in the inside of the tube. R is the actual height of mercury in the pressure tube. B is the barometer reading in pounds per square inch.

Volume Measurement

The volume of the pressure tube as a function of the distance from the sealed end, was calibrated by measuring the length of a weighed amount of mercury as it was moved, in a single mass, up and down inside the tube. All the measurements

 $-11-$

of length or height of mercury column or liquid level were made with a cathetometer which was accurate to . Ol cm. Knowing the weight of the mercury and the temperature, its volume could be obtained. Then applying the meniscus corrections to both ends, an average volume per cm. of tube length was obtained. By making a series of such readings over the portion of the tube used in the experiments a value for the volume of each cm. of the tube was obtained. These values could have been integrated on a plot of volume versus distance, but to obtain greater accuracy a method of plotting residual volumes was used. A nominal or base volume equal to .02785 cc. per cm. of tube length was decided upon and this amount was subtracted from the actual volume of each cm. of tube length. Then these residuals were plotted against tube length both as actual residual for each cm. of length and also as total cc. of residual from the sealed tip (ref. point) to each cm. distance from the sealed tip. These curves are shown in Figure 5 . Thus the actual volume at any distance $(R_0 - R)$ from the reference point, R_0 , equaled .02785 $(R_0 - R)$ plus residual corresponding to that distance. The volumes were also corrected for the meniscuses of both the liquid and the mercury and also for the volume of the small steel agitator used. The specific volume of the material above the mercury level,

 $V = \begin{bmatrix} .02785 & (R_0 - R) + Residual & -.01331 & .01602 \\ .02785 & (R_0 - R) + Residual & -.01331 & .01602 \\ .02785 & .02785 & .02785 & .02785 \end{bmatrix}$

 $(R_{\textrm{o}}-R)$ is the distance between the reference point and the mercury level. Then .02785 $(R_0 - R)$ is the base volume above R. Residual is the correction between the base volume and the actual volume and is taken from Figure 3. The figure, .01331, in-

 $-12-$

Fig. 3. Residual Volume Corrections for the Pressure Tube.

 $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$

cludes the volume of the steel agitator and the mercury meniscus correction. These volumes are in cubic centimeters. To convert the total volume in cubic centimeters into cubic feet per pound, the conversion factor, $(.01602 \div \text{weight of sample})$, is applied.

Purification of Materials

The propane and butane were obtained from the Philgas Company. According to the specifica tions, the ori ginal propane contained less than 0.1% impurities. It was further purified by fractional distillation in a glass-ring packed column (6), four feet long and 0.5 inches inside diameter, equipped with vacuum jacket and with adequate facilities for maintaining very constant $reflux.$ The middle fraction, amounting to about three-fourths of the charge, was collected in a liquid air cooled receiver connected with a high vacuum degassing apparatus. The material was then distilled under vacuum back into the boiler of the fractionating tower and refractionated. This time about 90% of the charge was collected in the liquid air cooled trap as before and laterstransferred to a steel storage bomb. An isotherm on this material through the two phase region indicated that its purity was satisfactory.

The original butane contained 0.3% isobutane. This material was purified by the same general procedure as described above for the propane.

 $-14-$

Method of Adding Sample

Samples were added to the apparatus in the following manner: samples of purified propane and n-butane were kept in small steel weighing bombs. Before attaching one of these bombs to the line leading to valve 2, the bomb was washed in acetone, dried in a vacuum desicator, and carefully weighed. The mercury was pulled out of the pressure tube, lower chamber, and manometer, H, down to the level of the electrical contact, E, and valve 8, closed. With the bomb valve closed, valve 2, was opened and the pressure tube and connecting lines evacuated through valve, 1. The top of manometer, H, was connected to the same vacuum system. The vacuum was produced by a mercury vapor pump backed up by a Hi-Vac pump. When a vacuum of .001 mm. was produced as measured by a McLeod gage, valve, 1, was closed and the bomb valve carefully opened, allowing the hydrocarbon sample to enter the pressure tube. This gas caused the manometer to raise and the mercury at the electrical contact to fall, but by adding mercury through valve 8 , the mercury level was kept at the contact. When the desired amount of gas had been added as indicated by the height of the manometer level, valve, 2, was closed. Then the bomb was cooled in liquid air to reduce the amount of gas in the connecting lines to the vapor pressure of the hydrocarbon at liquid air temperature. The bomb valve was closed, the bomb warmed to room temperature, washed in acetone, dried, and reweighed. The sample of the other hydrocarbon was added in the same manner.

It is admitted that the accuracy of this gravimetric method

-15-

of determining the amount of sample may not appear to be as accurate as some volumetric methods which have been used. When the straight forwardness of the method and the absence of any assumptions as to gas volumes, etc., are considered, the overall accuracy was felt to be as good. In only one run, No. 9, was the composition questionable, and this run was made with a very small sample to obtain additional dew points at lower temperatures.

However in this run, several bubble points and dew points were taken at the higher temperatures where the phase boundaries as functions of pressure and composition, and temperature and composition had been definitely determined by previous runs on larger samples. Thus it was considered justifiable, in this case, to change the composition from that determined gravimetrically, to one which would permit the dew points and bubble points at the higher temperatures to fall upon the definitely established curves. This involved a shift of the mol percent of propane from 68.2% to 65.0%.

Although the simplified diagram shows the valves, 1 and 2 , some distance to either side of the vertical center hole, the valves were actually placed so that no gas could be trapped when the mercury level was raised above that point. When the mercury level was raised, compressing the sample into the portion of the tube where the measurements were made, frequently at room temperature, the sample would begin to liquify below the boiler. It was found that an appreciable amount of the liquid adhered to the glass walls. To prevent this, the sample

 $-16-$

was condensed with liquid air into the upper tip of the tube while the mercury level was raised up above the boiler. The liquid air trap, S, was slipped inside the vacuum jacket down around the tip of the pressure tube. After the mercury level was gotten above the boiler, it was kept there until the measurements on the sample were completed.

Experimental

The single phase measurements of the isotherms were simple to make, consisting merely of taking readings of the pressure and the corresponding volumes over the range desired. Since the investigation was largely concerned only with the phase boundaries, the single phase measurements were limited to those in the neighborhood of the dew and bubble points.

The measurements in the two phase region were more difficult due to the difficulty with which equilibrium was attained between the phases. The sample was thoroughly agitated by means of a small iron stirrer which was moved up and down the inside of the tube with a magnet around the outside of the jacket. All measurements were taken with valves, 3 and 8, open. This allowed the equilibrium to be reached before each reading by an isobaric process. The pressure having been set at the desired point by adding to or removing air from the chamber, F, the sample would be agitated, at the constant pressure, until the total volume, occupied by both phases ceased to change with further agitation. This gave a simple way of determining when equilibrium had been reached.

-17-

The bubble points were determined in the following manner: with the sample in the liquid phase at a pressure slightly above the bubble point, the pressure was reduced very slowly by venting air while the liquid was continually and vi gorously agitated. At the first sign of a bubble forming, the air release valve was closed. If on further agitation the bubble did not become larger than being barely visible, this was considered to be the bubble point and the pressure and volume were recorded as such. If the bubble did become appreciably larger on further agitation the pressure was raised a few pounds and the process repeated. These points could be checked by approaching from the two phase region but this method was much more difficult since it involved equilibrium in two phases instead of one just before the bubble point was reached.

The most difficult measurements of all were those of the dew points. The technique finally developed was similar to that for bubble points. With all the sample in the gas phase, the pressure was very slowly raised while the gas was being thoroughly agitated. At the first sign of liquid forming, the pressure valve was closed. If on further agitating no more liquid was formed this was considered dew point. Al though these points could be checked from the opposite side, that is, from the two phase side, it was an almost endless task. It meant setting the pressure and agitating thoroughly; if liquid remained, the pressure was reset, lower, and the process repeated. If one was fortunate, after a few trials the exact pressure was found at which, after thorough agitation, only

-18-

a very small amount of liquid remained.

Since pressure and volume measurements were taken on both sides of each of the phase boundaries for each isotherm, the exact positions of the boundaries were checked by locating the discontinuities in the curves of pressure versus volume at constant temperature. In nearly all the determinations, the dew point and bubble point pressures as determined by observation checked within .5% of these pressures as indicated by the breaks in the isotherms.

Figure 4, shows the isotherms obtained from run No. 5, on the system containing 69.8 mol percent of propane and 30.2 mol per cent butane. It was impossible to obtain dew points over the entire temperature range unless very small samples were used, due to the small volume of the pressure tube. It was found advisable to make runs with large samples primarily for bubble points over the entire temperature range and dew points at the higher temperatures and then subsequently to fill in the dew point data with runs on smaller samples.

-19-

Fig. 4. Isotherms of System Containing 69.8 Mol Percent Propane and 30.2 Mol Percent Butane

Results

The experimental determinations included the measurements of the volumes of the phases under the different conditions of temperature and pressure, but these volumetric data have not been used in the preparation of this thesis other than to check, or in some cases to establish, the dew points and bubble points by the discontinuities in the re- lation, $\left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial P}\right)_T$. A number of these isotherms for the system of composition, 69.8 mol percent propane and 30.2 mol percent butane are shown in Figure 4. Measurements were made upon nine different compositions in all, but the results of only the last five have been used. The measurements on the first two compositions were of a preliminary nature during which time a technique was being developed and certain improvements were being made in the apparatus. The results of the next two compositions studied were so fragmentary, due to the breaking of the pressure tube, that they were of no value. The compositions of the five remaining runs are given in Table I, along with the pressures and temperatures at the critical point, the point of maximum pressure, and the point of maximum temperature for each composition.

Figure 5, shows the phase boundaries of the five mixtures on a pressure-temperature diagram, each loop representing a different mixture. From left to right, these mixtures are No. 7, No. 5, No. 8, and No. 6, as numbered in Table I. The sample of mixture, No. 9, was too small to be studied satisfactorily in the critical region. The broken line, tangent to

-21-

Fig. 5. Pressure-Temperature Diagrams at Constant Compositions

224.2 630

280.3 609

 223.2

279.6

TABLE I. Some Characteristics of the Mixtures Studied.

TABLE II. Equilibrium Ratios for Propane and Butane

626

605

 $\overline{7}$

 $\mathbf 8$

these curves and which ends at the critical points of propane and butane, is the loci of the critical points of all possible mixtures of propane and butane. It is evident from the flatness of this curve, especially as it approaches the critical point of propane, that there is not much difference between the maximum pressures and the pressures at the critical points of the different mixtures. As shown in Table I, for mixtures, No. 5, and No. 7, the differences in these pressures are negligible, while for mixtures, No. 6, and No. 8, the differences are barely more than limits of the experimental error of the pressure measurements. That it was found very difficult to study experimentally the region of retrograde condensation. may be partially explained by the facts that the differences between the maximum pressures and the critical pressures were so small and that the differences between the maximum temperatures and the critical temperatures were also quite small, the maximum being 1.6° F., with mixture No. 5, Table I. It is within these narrow limits that the phenomena of retrograde condensation occurs.

Figure 6 includes a number of pressure-composition diagrams at constant temperatures ranging from 100° F. to 280[°] F. This set of diagrams was made up by following constant temperature lines on Figure No. 5, and reading the pressures at the phase boundaries of the different compositions. These pressures were then plotted upon the pressure-composition coordinates and smooth curves drawn through the points for each phase boundary at each temperature. Each pair of constant temperature phase boundary curves terminates in common

-24-

Fig. 6. Pressure-Composition Diagrams at Constant Temperature.

points at the vapor pressures of pure butane and propane at that temperature. Consider, for example, the curves at the constant temperature of 190° F. These curves terminate at the right hand ordinate (100% propane) at the vapor pressure of pure propane at 190° F. and terminate at the left hand ordinate (100% butane) at the vapor pressure of pure butane. The region enclosed by this pair of curves is the only region in which two phases may exist in equilibrium at 190° F. At all pressures above the upper curve, the loci of bubble points at 190° F. for all mixtures of propane and butane, only the liquid phase may exist. At all pressures below the lower curve, the loci of dew points at 190° F. for all mixtures, only the gas phase may exist. If now a constant pressure is taken, for example 300 pounds per square inch, it is possible to determine the composition of the coexisting phases at 190° F. by merely reading the composition of the liquid phase on the bubble point curve and the composition of the gas phase on the dew point curve, both at 190° F. and 300 pounds per square inch pressure.

The curvature of the bubble point curves on this diagram is a measure of the degree with which mixtures of butane and propane agree with Raoult's Law and Dalton's Law. Straight lines would indicate that the total vapor pressure of the liquid of any mixture at any definite temperature is equal to the sum of the mol fraction of butane times its vapor pressure in the pure state, at the temperature in question, and the mol fraction of propane times its vapor pressure at the

-26-

same temperature. Since the bubble point curves are not entirely straight, it is evident that mixtures of these hydrocarbons do not follow these laws, although the deviations are not as large as is found with some pairs of other hydrocarbons with more widely varying physical properties.

Figure 7, a temperature-composition diagram at constant pressures, was prepared similarly to Figure 6, except that, in this case, constant pressure lines were followed on Figure 5, and the tempera tures of the phase boundaries of the different mixtures plotted on the temperature-composition coordinates. On Figure 7, at the constant pressure of 300 pounds per square inch, as an example, the phase boundary curves terminate at common points, the point on the right being the temperature at which pure propane has a vapor pressure of 300 pounds per square inch, and the point on the left being the temperature at which pure butane has a vapor pressure of 300 pounds per square inch. These two curves inclose the two phase region at 300 pounds per square inch for all mixtures of propane and butane. The upper curve is the loci of dew point temperatures for all mixtures at this pressure and the lower curve is the loci of all bubble point temperatures at the same pressure. For any mixture at 300 pounds per square inch pressure, only the gas phase will exist above the dew point curve and only liquid phase will exist below the bubble point curve. If on this diagram, a constant temperature line, for example 190⁰ F., is followed, it is possible to determine the composition of the coexisting phases at 300 pounds per

-27-

Fig. 7. Temperature-Composition Diagrams at Constant Pressure

square inch pressure by reading, as before, the composition of the gas phase on the dew point curve and composition of the liquid phase on the bubble point curve. Since, on both diagrams, the same pressure and temperature have been used. namely, 190° **F.** and 300 pounds per square inch, the composition of the coexisting phases as determined in both cases will be the same.

The ratio of the mol fraction of propane in the gas phase to the mol fraction of propane in the liquid phase is called the equilibrium ratio for propane. This quantity, K, is frequently called the equilibrium constant although it varies with temperature and pressure as well as the character and amounts of the other components present in the mixture. If at equilibrium, X_p is the mol fraction of propane in the liquid phase, and Y_p is the mol fraction in the coexisting gas phase, then K_P = $\frac{Y_P}{X_P}$ In a like manner, the equilibrium ratio for butane, $K_B = \frac{V_B}{X_B}$ or in this binary system, $K_B = \frac{1 - Y_P}{1 - X_P}$ These values of K may be determined from the temperature-composition of the pressure composition diagram as explained previously.

Equilibrium ratios taken at different pressures from Figure 6, at each of the constant temperatures indicated there, were multiplied by the pressures at which they were taken and then plotted against these pressures in Figure 8. The curves below the diagonal line represent constant temperature equilibrium ratios for butane as functions of pressure. The curves above the diagonal line represent constant temperature equilibrium ratios for propane as functions of pressure. If the equilibrium ratio for propane. is desired, for example, at 190⁰ F.

-29-

and 400 pounds per square inch pressure, it may be determined by dividing PK by P or, in this case, K = $500/400 = 1.25.$ Of course, for the sole purpose of obtaining equilibrium ratios, a plot of equilibrium ratios as functions of temperature or pressure would be more convenient. This diagram, Figure 8 , was prepared to show more satisfactorily the behavior of these ratios in the critical region. A number of equilibrium ratios taken from this diagram are tabulated in Table II for both propane and butane.

The diagonal line, Figure 8, is the loci of points where the equilibrium ratios are equal to unity, that is, where $PK = P$. The equilibrium ratios for either component approaches unity as the total pressure on the system approaches the vapor pressure of that component at the temperature of the system. Where the temperature is above the critical point of one of the components, both equilibrium ratios approach unity as the pressure approaches the critical pressure corresponding to the temperature of the system, which temperature becomes the critical temperature of the system. These critical values, of course, correspond to definite compositions. This is illustrated by the constant temperature curves at 220° F., 250°F., and 280° F., and the corresponding mixtures are 88.8 mol percent propane, 64.6 mol percent propane, and 34.2 mol percent propane, respectively, as may be ascertained by noting the points, on Figure 6, where the phase boundary curves at these temperatures touch the loci of critical pressures. Thus at temperatures above the critical point of propane but below the critical point for butane, the butane equilibrium ratios start at unity at the vapor pressure

-30-

Fig. 8. Pressure Times Equilibrium Ratios at Constant Temperature versus Pressure.

of butane and then return to unity at the critical pressure corresponding to the temperature on the system, which becomes the critical temperature.

At temperatures below the critical points of either component, the equilibrium ratios of either component become indeterminate as the pressure on the system becomes equal to the vapor pressure of the other component at the temperature of the system. The broken envelope curves, starting at the origin, are the loci of points at which the pressure on the system becomes equal to the vapor pressure of the other component at the temperature of the system. For example, the upper broken envelope line is the loci of points at which the equilibrium ratios for propane becomes indeterminate, that is, the points at which at the constant temperatures shown, the pressures become equal to the vapor pressure of butane. The vertical broken lines indicate the critical pressures of the pure components, the upper one for butane and the lower one for propane.

Figure 9, shows a comparison of the experimentally determined equilibrium ratios for butane and those calculated by Raoult's Law. It is evident that the deviation from Raoult's Law is not large at 150 pounds per square inch pressure and increases only slightly up to 300 pounds pressure. However, at 400 pounds per square inch pressure the deviation becomes relatively large as would be expected when the pressure approaches the critical pressure.

Where the necessary data have been lacking, values for equilibrium ratios have been calculated for engineering design, not only through the use of Raoult's Law and Dalton's Law, but also through the use of certain concepts of ideal solutions.

-32-

Fig. 9. Equilibrium Ratios for Butane, Experimental and Calculated.

As defined by Lewis and Randall (8), "The ideal solution is one in which the fugacity of each component is proportional to the mol fraction of that component at every temperature and pressure." In ideal solutions, the fugacity of each component in a phase is equal to the fugacity of each component in the same phase in the pure state, at the same temperature, times its mol fraction in the ideal solution. If the propane-butane system was an ideal solution, the following equations would be true: f'_{pk} = f_{pk} X_{p} ; f'_{pe} = f_{pe} Y_{p} ; f'_{bk} = f_{bk} X_{B} ; f_{BE} = f_{BE} Y_{B} (f' refers to the fugacity of the component in the system and f to the fugacity of the pure component. The subscript k , refers to the liquid; β , to the gas; P , to propane; and B , to butane. As used formerly, X is the mol fraction of the component in the liquid phase and Y, the mol fraction in the gas phase). From these equations it is possible to determine the compositions of the phases in terms of fugacities. Then, since the fugacity of each pure component is a function only of the temperature and pressure of the system, the compositions of the coexisting phases at any temperature and pressure may be determined with only the knowledge of the fugacities of the pure components at the desired temperature and pressure. Considering the above equations for propane, the following relation is obtained, $\frac{\gamma_{p}f_{p_{\beta}}}{\gamma_{p}} = \frac{f_{p_{\beta}}}{f_{p_{\alpha}}}$. Since at equilibrium, the fugacity of the $\gamma_{p_{\beta}}$ component in the liquid is equal to the fugacity of the component in the gas $\frac{\gamma_p f_{\rho g}}{\chi_p f_{\rho h}}$. It was through the use of this relation that the curve, No. 4, of Figure 10, was obtained for propane at 190° F.

 $-34-$

Fig. 10. Experimental and Calculated Equilibrium Curves for Propane at 190° F.

Frequently there are insufficient P-V-T data to permit the use of the laws of ideal solutions since these laws take into account the volume of the liquid phase and also the deviation of the gas phase from perfect gas behavior. Where no P-V-T data is available, other than the vapor pressure data of the pure components, Raoult's and Dalton's Laws may be used. Curve No. 1, of Figure 10, was obtained by use of these laws. If only the fugacities of the pure components are known, the volumes of the liquid phase may be neglected. Following this method, the curve, No. 3, of Figure 10, was obtained. For mixtures of propane and butane at 190° F., this adaption of the laws of ideal solutions appears to give phase equilibrium data nearer the experimental results, Curve 2, Figure 10. The experimental curve is nearer the Raoult's Law curve at higher concentrations of propane, while for the higher concentrations of butane, it is about equidistant between the Raoult's Law curve and the curve prepared by the laws of ideal solutions, neglecting the volume of the liquid phase. It is probable that at higher pressures. the laws of ideal solutions would more nearly fit the experimental results since the curves on Figure 9, indicate that, at the higher pressures, the deviation from Raoult's Law becomes greater.

 $-36-$

REFERENCES

- (1) Souders, Selheimer, and Brown, Ind. Eng. Chem., 24, 517 (1932)
- (2) Sage, Schaafsma, and Lacey, Ind. Eng. Chem., 2 26, 1218 (1934)
- (3) Young, Sydney, J. Chem. Soc., 47, 640 (1885)
- (4) Bahlke and Kay, Ind. Eng. Chem., 24, 291 (1932)
- (5) Cummings, Stones, Volante, Ind. Eng. Chem., 25, 728 (1933)
- (6) Young and Jasaitis., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 58, 377 (1936)
- (7) Beattie, Poffenberger, and Hadlock, J. Chem. Phys., 3, Feb., 1935
- (8) Lewis and Randall, "Thermodynamics", Pg. 223 McGraw-Hill, 1923

Acknowled gement

It is my pleasant duty to express my appreciation to Dr. B. H. Sage and Dr. W. N. Lacey for their advice, cooperation, and kindly consideration throughout this research.