## Journal of Chemical Engineering and Material Science

Volume 8 Number 1 January 2017 ISSN 2141-6605



Academic Iournals

### **ABOUT JCEMS**

The Journal of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science (JCEMS) is published monthly (one volume per year) by Academic Journals.

Journal of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science (JCEMS) is an open access journal that provides rapid publication (monthly) of articles in all areas of the subject such as semiconductors, high-temperature alloys, Kinetic Processes in Materials, Magnetic Properties of Materials, optimization of mixed materials etc. The Journal welcomes the submission of manuscripts that meet the general criteria of significance and scientific excellence. Papers will be published shortly after acceptance. All articles published in JCEMS are peerreviewed.

Contact Us

Editorial Office:	jcems@academicjournals.org
Help Desk:	helpdesk@academicjournals.org
Website:	http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/JCEMS
Submit manuscript online	http://ms.academicjournals.me/

### **Editors**

### Dr. R. Jayakumar

Center for Nanosciences Amrita Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Centre Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham University Cochin-682 026 India

### **Prof. Lew P Christopher**

Center for Bioprocessing Research and Development(CBRD) South Dakota School of Mines and Technology(SDSM&T) 501 East Saint Joseph Street Rapid City 57701 SD USA

### Prof. Huisheng Peng

Laboratory of Advanced Materials Department of Macromolecular Science Fudan University Shanghai 200438 China

### Prof. Layioye Ola Oyekunle

Department of Chemical Engineering University of Lagos Akoka-Yaba Lagos Nigeria

### Dr. Srikanth Pilla

Structural Engineering and Geomechanics Program Dept of Civil and Environmental Engineering Stanford University Stanford CA 94305-4020 USA.

### Asst Prof. Narendra Nath Ghosh

Department of Chemistry, Zuarinagar, Goa-403726, India.

### Dr. Rishi Kumar Singhal

Department of Physics, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur 302055 India.

### Dr. Daoyun Song

West Virginia University Department of Chemical Engineering, P. O Box 6102, Morgantown, WV 26506, USA.

### **Editorial Board**

### Prof. Priyabrata Sarkar

Department of Polymer Science and Technology University of Calcutta 92 APC Road Kolkata India

### Dr. Mohamed Ahmed AbdelDayem

Department of Chemistry College of Science King Faisal University Al-Hasa Saudi Arabia

### Ayo Samuel Afolabi

School of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg Private Bag 3 Wits 2050 Johannesburg South Africa

### Dr. S. Bakamurugan

Institut für Anorganische und Analytische Chemie Universität Münster Corrensstrasse 30 D-48149 Münster Germany

### Prof. Esezobor David Ehigie

Department of Metallurgical and Materials Engineering Faculty of Engineering University of Lagos, Lagos

### Dr sunday ojolo

Mechanical Engineering Department University of Lagos Akoka Lagos, Nigeria

### Prof. Dr. Qingjie Guo

College of Chemical Engineering Qingdao University of Science and Technology Zhengzhou 53 Qingdao 266042 China

### Dr Ramli Mat

Head of Chemical Engineering Department Faculty of Chemical and Natural Resources Engineering Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

### Prof. Chandan Kumar Sarkar

*Electronics and Telecommunication Engineering Jadavpur University Kolkata India* 

### Dr.-Ing. Ulrich Teipel

Georg-Simon-Ohm Hochschule Nürnberg Mechanische Verfahrenstechnik/ Partikeltechnologie Wassertorstr. 10 90489 Nürnberg Germany

### Dr. Harsha Vardhan

Department of Mining Engineering National Institute of Technology Karnataka Surathkal P.O - Srinivasnagar - 575025 (D.K) Mangalore Karnataka State India

### Dr. Ta Yeong Wu

School of Engineering Monash University Jalan Lagoon Selatan Bandar Sunway 46150 Selangor Darul Ehsan Malaysia

### Dr. Yong Gao

DENTSPLY Tulsa Dental Specialties 5100 E. Skelly Dr. Suite 300 Tulsa Oklahoma USA

### Dr. Xinli Zhu

School of chemical Biological and materials engineering the University of Oklahoma 100 E Boyd St SEC T-335 Norman, OK 73019 USA

### Journal of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science

### ARTICLE

Addition of carbon tetrachloride as propulsion to the thermal cracking reactor based on the amount of coke formed in different coil outlet temperatures (COT) Afshin Davarpanah

1

### academic Journals

Vol. 8(1), pp. 1-9, January 2017 DOI: 10.5897/JCEMS2016.0274 Articles Number: 49F025162685 ISSN 2141-6605 Copyright ©2017 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article http://www.academicjournals.org/JCEMS

Journal of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science

Full Length Research Paper

### Addition of carbon tetrachloride as propulsion to the thermal cracking reactor based on the amount of coke formed in different coil outlet temperatures (COT)

### Afshin Davarpanah

Department of Petroleum Engineering, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran.

### Received 4 November, 2016; Accepted 29 December, 2016

Nowadays, polyvinyl chloride (PVC) is the most usual plastic. Therefore, to make PVC, its monomer called vinyl chloride (VCM) must be produced first. It is a severely endothermic reaction that is done in an ethylene dichloride thermal cracking reactor within a temperature range of 680 to 758°K and pressure range of 2500000 Pascal. Thus, this cracking reaction changes into hydrochloric acid and VCM. In production unit, monomeric chloride has the main and principal role as the core of the process of thermal cracking that occurs in the furnace. Increased wall temperature causes boil gas mixture and pyrolysis reactions. Regarding simulation, the results showed that the number of pyrolysis produced composition with maximum concentration in the length of the reactor. This illustrated that these compositions participated in secondary reactions. Furthermore, by increasing the amount of coil outlet temperatures, the amount of formed coke will increase. If carbon tetrachloride is considered as the chlorine radicals, it has an important role as the motivator in the cracking procedures, radicals causing an enhancement in VCM production.

Key words: Carbon tetrachloride, conversion factor, coke, coil outlet temperatures, thermal cracking.

### INTRODUCTION

Designing and simulation of thermal cracking reactor of the chemical reactions in the processes and heat transfer in the furnace are very complex. Therefore, this process from the chemical reactions engineering perspective and from the perspective of transfer phenomena is highly regarded. Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) tools help us to investigate the development of detailed models of these reactors, and by understanding the basic principles, the optimized design of reactor, saving of cost and time performance of this equipment in a virtual laboratory can be done. In this research, the author investigates the proposed model of 1,2-dichloroethane (EDC) cracking process in an industrial furnace and by operational data from a petrochemical unit, qualifies the model and removes its reductions. To begin, previous research done on this specific subject was studied. Moreover, the reactor mathematical models were provided and solved by numerical software. Thereby, the operation of the reactor at different operating conditions was investigated as well as sensitivity analysis of

E-mail: Afshindpe@gmail.com.

Author(s) agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the <u>Creative Commons Attribution</u> <u>License 4.0 International License</u>



Figure 1. Placement of coil in the furnace.

effective parameters. As a result, new reactors or increasing the optimization capacity of existing reactors can be designed.

### **Molecular cracking**

Molecular cracking is a process that is used in the petrochemical industry and is used to reduce their hydrocarbons molecular weight by breaking their bonds. This process is the main principal of converting crude oil to useful fuels such as gasoline, diesel, jet fuel and kerosene. Thermal cracking, catalyst cracking, hydrocracking and cracking by water vapour are the most useful cracking processes in the industry. This process is either done with high temperature and pressure without a catalyzer or with low temperature and pressure with a catalyzer.

### Geometry of thermal cracking reactor

In EDC thermal cracking process, coils containing process fluid in a box called furnace, are positioned horizontally. Coils placed inside the furnace are shown in Figure 1 (Kaggerud, 2007). They are positioned on both sides of the furnace wall. By burning the gases of these furnaces heat is produced and then transferred to the coils by convection or radiation. The number of intended coils to simulate 11 rows of pipes (Inconel 600) with overall length of 95 m and length of each row tube is 13.5 m. The inner diameter of coils is 0.134 m and the distance between the centers of the two tubes is 0.32 m.

Schematic of one row of the coil in the software is in Figure 2. Furthermore, prospective a row of coil was shown in Figure 3.

Mass balance equation in the software is proposed in form of Equation.1

$$\frac{\partial(\rho y_i)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(\rho u_i y_i)}{\partial x_i} = -\frac{\partial J_i}{\partial x_i} + R_i + S_i \tag{1}$$

 $\rho$  is the density, t is the time,  $u_i$  is the potential energy,  $J_i$  is the diffusion term,  $s_i$  is the heat at point I,  $R_i$  is the input heat to the reactor.

Phrase  $J_i$  reflects the term infiltration, which is not used in this simulation (ANSYS, 2011). The energy equation in the Fluent software is as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho E) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( u_i(\rho E + p) \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left( K_{eff} \frac{\partial T}{\partial x_i} - \sum_j h_j J_j + u_j(\tau_{ij})_{eff} \right) + S_h$$
(2)

 $\rho$  is the density, p is pressure, t is time, T is temperature,  $u_i$  is input potential energy,  $u_j$  is output potential energy,  $\tau_{ij}$  is torque,  $J_j$  is output diffusion term,  $s_i$  is input thermal of chemical reactions, and  $S_h$  is



Figure 2. Schematic of one row of the coil in the software.



Figure 3. Prospective a row of coil.

thermal of chemical reactions,  $K_{eff}$  is the effective conductivity, and E is the total energy.

 $K_t + K = K_{eff}$  is the effective conductivity,  $K_t$ turbulent thermal conductivity, according to the model used is the perturbation. The first three terms on the right side of the equation are an expression of directed energy transfer, distribution of components and dispersion of viscosity. The volume of EDC thermal cracking Energy reaction are being calculated in Table 1 (Chaochun et al., 2013).  $S_h$  is the thermal of chemical reactions (Berreni and Wang, 2011; Fogler, 1999; Bird et al., 2007). E is expressed as follows:

$$E = h - \frac{p}{\rho} + \frac{u_i^2}{2}$$
(3)

where  $u_i$  is the input potential energy, p is pressure,  $\rho$  is density, E is total energy,  $u_i$  is input potential energy, and h is the input heat.

Mass continuity equation in FLUENT software is in Equation 4:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho \, u_i}{\partial x_i} = 0 \tag{4}$$

The aforementioned equation is the general form of the mass balance equation for compressible and non-compressible flows.

$$\frac{\partial(\rho u_i)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(\rho u_i u_j)}{\partial x_i} = -\frac{\partial\rho}{x_i} + \frac{\partial\tau_{ij}}{\partial x_j} + \rho g_i + F_i$$
(5)

In the aforementioned equation, P is the static pressure,  $\tau_{ij}$  is the tensor stress,  $\rho g_i$  and  $F_i$  are physical forces of gravity and physical external factors in i direction. Tensor stress is as follows:

$$\tau_{ij} = \left[\mu\left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i}\right)\right] - \frac{2}{3}\mu\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial u_i}\delta_{ij} \tag{6}$$

where  $\mu$  is the molecular viscosity and the second semester is the influence of volumetric expansion (ANSYS, 2011).

#### Standard k-ɛ model

This is a comprehensive model that accounts for the simplest turbulence model. Two educational turbulent models enable solving of the two transfer equations that separately determine turbulent length and time scale. Standard k-E model is useful for powerful engineering calculations. The power of this equation, its economical and acceptable accuracy for a wide range of turbulent flow is as a result of its popularity in industrial flow and heat transfer simulation. This model is a semi-empirical model. Standard k-ɛ model is a model based on transfer equations for kinetic turbulent energy and dissipation rate (ε). In achieving the standard k-ε model it is assumed that the fully turbulent flow and molecular viscosity effects are ignored. Because of the strengths and weaknesses of the equation to improve its performance, k-ɛ realizable and k- $\epsilon$  RNG model were introduced. K and  $\epsilon$  are obtained by solving simultaneously the following two equations:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho K) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(\rho K v_i) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\left[(\mu + \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_k})\frac{\partial k}{\partial x_j}\right] + G_k + G_b - \rho \varepsilon - Y_M + S_K$$
(7)

Table 1. Energy of EDC thermal cracking reaction.

Reactions	A [(cm <sup>3</sup> /mole)n <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> ]	n	E (kj/mole)
Radical reaction chain initialization			
$EDC \rightarrow R1 + R2$	5.9 × 101 <sup>5</sup>	1	342
$CCI_4 \rightarrow R1 + R8$	2.2 × 10 <sup>12</sup>	1	230
Radical reaction chain propagation			
FDC + R1 $\rightarrow$ HCl + R3	$1.3 \times 10^{13}$	2	7
$EDC + R5 \rightarrow VCM + R3$	$1.2 \times 10^{13}$	2	34
$FDC + R2 \rightarrow FC + R3$	$1.0 \times 10^{12}$	2	42
$FDC + R4 \rightarrow 11 + R3$	$5.0 \times 10^{11}$	2	45
$FDC + R6 \rightarrow 1.1.2 + R3$	$2.0 \times 10^{11}$	2	48
$FDC + R7 \rightarrow 1.1.1.2 + R3$	$1.0 \times 10^{11}$	2	56
$FDC + R8 \rightarrow CHCl_2 + R3$	$1.0 \times 10^{12}$	2	63
$VCM + R1 \rightarrow R4$	$9.1 \times 10^{10}$	2	0
VCM + R1 $\rightarrow$ HCl + R5	$1.2 \times 10^{14}$	2	56
VCM + R5 $\rightarrow$ CP + R1	$5.0 \times 10^{11}$	2	31
VCM + R4 $\rightarrow$ C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>6</sub> H <sub>2</sub> + R1	$2.0 \times 10^{10}$	2	30
VCM + R2 $\rightarrow$ EC + R5	$3.0 \times 10^{11}$	2	61
R3 ↔VCM + R1	$2.1 \times 10^{14}$	1	84
R5 ↔C₂H₂ + R1	$5.0 \times 10^{14}$	1	90
R6 ↔Di + R1	$2.0 \times 10^{13}$	1	70
R7 ⇔Tri + R1	2.5 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	1	70
$2C_2H_2 + R5 \rightarrow C_6H_6 + R1$	$1.0 \times 10^{14}$	2	20
$EC + R1 \rightarrow HCI + R2$	1.7 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	1	4
$1,1 + R1 \rightarrow HCI + R4$	1.2 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	1	6
$1,1,2 + R1 \rightarrow HCI + R6$	1.7 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	1	15
$1,1,1,2 + R1 \rightarrow HCI + R7$	1.7 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	2	17
$CHCI_3 + R1 \rightarrow HCI + R8$	1.6 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	2	14
$CCl_4 + R5 \rightarrow Di + R8$	$5.0 \times 10^{11}$	2	33
$CCI_4 + R4 \rightarrow 1,1,2 + R8$	1.0 × 10 <sup>12</sup>	2	33
$\text{CCl}_4 + \text{R5} \rightarrow 1,1,1,2 + \text{R8}$	$5.0 \times 10^{11}$	2	33
Radical reaction chain termination			
R2 + R1 $\rightarrow$ VCM + HCI	1.0 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	2	13
$R3 + R1 \rightarrow Di + HCI$	1.0 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	2	12
$R6 + R8 \rightarrow Di + CCI_4$	1.0 × 10 <sup>13</sup>	2	13
$C_2H_2 + 2R1 \rightarrow 2C + 2HCI$	1.6 × 10 <sup>14</sup>	2	70

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho\varepsilon) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}(\rho\varepsilon v_i) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left[ \left( \mu + \frac{\mu_t}{\sigma_\varepsilon} \right) \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial x_j} \right] + C_{1\varepsilon}G_k \frac{\varepsilon}{k} - C_{2\varepsilon}\rho \frac{\varepsilon^2}{k} + S_\varepsilon$$
(8)

 $G_k$  is the turbulent kinetic energy generated due to the gradient of speed,  $G_b$  is the turbulent kinetic energy generated due to the buoyancy forces,  $Y_M$  is the Share Swinging delay in the compressibility turbulence for a total loss of (j),  $C_{1\varepsilon}$  is the constant parameter of model = 1.44,  $C_{2\varepsilon}$  = 1.92,  $\sigma_k$  is the turbulent Prantel numbers for k = 1,  $\sigma_{\varepsilon}$  is the turbulent Prantel number for  $\varepsilon$  = 1.3,  $S_K$  is the term defined source for k,  $S_{\varepsilon}$  is the term defining

source for  $\varepsilon$ , and  $\mu_t$  is the turbulence viscosity that can be obtained from the following equation:

$$\mu_t = \rho C_\mu \frac{\kappa^2}{\varepsilon} \tag{9}$$

### RNG k-ɛ model

This model is based on statistical methods. This model is the same as the standard k- $\epsilon$  model, but with the following modifications:

(1) An additional term ( $\epsilon$ ) that significantly increases

 Table 2. Thermo-physical properties of coils.

Temperature (°K)	Transfer coefficient (W/m.K)
373	15.9
573	21.2
753	25.7
973	25.7
Density (kg/m <sup>3</sup> )	8470
Heat capacity (j/kg.k)	444

accuracy for flow to layer velocity.

(2) The effect of the rotational movement (vortex motion) included turbulences and increases accuracy for rotary flow.

(3) An analytical formula for turbulent Prantel numbers is provided, as standard k- $\epsilon$  model is considered a fixed amount

(4) While the standard k- $\epsilon$  model is the model for high Reynolds numbers, the theory of RNG for analysis of a differential equation for the turbulent viscosity can be provided considering the effects of low Reynolds. Effective use of this feature depends on proper behavior of the region near the wall of the furnace.

### K-ɛ realizable model

This model has limitations on Reynolds stresses that match with the physics of turbulent flows. This is possibly not in the standard k- $\epsilon$  model and not in the k- $\epsilon$  RNG model; but in places with a large curvature in flow lines, vortex and rotation of the screw. K- $\epsilon$  RNG and k- $\epsilon$  realizable models have significant progress towards standard k- $\epsilon$  model. Preliminary studies show that the k- $\epsilon$  realizable model between k- $\epsilon$  models has best performance for confirmation numbers of complex flows and segregated flows. In all of these cases, the performance of this model is better than the standard k- $\epsilon$  model. As it was observed that in the standard k- $\epsilon$  model, turbulent viscosity achieved the following equation:

$$\mu_t = \rho C_\mu \frac{K^2}{\varepsilon} \tag{10}$$

That  $C_{\mu}$  is constant, but in the k- $\epsilon$  realizable  $C_{\mu}$  is achieved by the following equation:

$$C_{\mu} = \frac{1}{A_o + A_s \frac{KU^*}{\varepsilon}}$$
(11)

$$U^* \equiv \sqrt{S_j S_j + \widetilde{\Omega_j} \widetilde{\Omega_j}} \tag{12}$$

$$\widehat{\Omega_j} = \Omega_j - 2\varepsilon_{jk}\omega_k \tag{13}$$

$$\Omega_j = \Omega_j - \varepsilon_{jk} \omega_k \tag{14}$$

 $\Omega_j$  Average rate of tensor with rotational speed is  $\omega_k$ ; constants are defined as follows:

 $A_{o} = 4/04, A_{s} = \sqrt{6}\cos{0}$ 

$$\emptyset = \frac{1}{3} \cos^{-1} \left( \sqrt{6} \frac{S_j S_{jk} S_{ki}}{\left(S_j S_j\right)^{3/2}} \right)$$
(15)

$$S_j = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j} \right)$$
(16)

As seen,  $C_{\mu}$  placed a function of the average strain, rotational speeds, the angle speed of rotation systems, and turbulent fields which are k and  $\epsilon$ .

Thermo-physical properties of coils are being illustrated in Table 2.

### Wall of furnace

The profile of heat is applied in the walls. A total of eleven walls were located and each row of coil has a heat profile of its own. The thermal flux resulting from furnaces applied on the coils level used for proposed profiles was provided by Kegard (2007). The length of each row of coils can be categorized as profile provided by the amount of heat to be entered in the software (figure 4).

### METHODOLOGY OF THE WORK (SIMULATION)

Boundary conditions of cracking reactor

#### Inlet flow

Input for fluid flow based on mass flow rate and percentage of each of the compounds at the entrance of the inlet is used for the mass

Table 3. Input fluid conditions

Feed mass flow rate	6.086 kg/s
Mass percentage of input EDC	0.9707
Mass percentage of input VCM	0.0184
Mass percentage of HCL input	0.0109

Table 4. Applied boundary conditions in the software.

Location	Type of boundary condition
Walls	Heat flux
Input gas	Input mass rate
Output flow rate	Output pressure



Figure 4. Thermal profiles calculated by Kegard.

flow condition that accounts for the boundary condition (Table 3).

#### **Output flow**

The output flow is used for pressure boundary condition. The boundary conditions are summarized in Table 4. The conversion factor and amount of coke formed are based on different COTs. In this part of the research, the different COTs EDC conversion

factor and the amount of formed coke are investigated. The amounts of COT based on recent issues in review of EDC cracking processes with values of 760, 770, 780 and 790 are selected. To achieve this profile, it is first calculated  $\frac{COT_{desired}}{COT_{base}}$  and by using

the proportion, a variable factor is described. As a result, the new temperature profile in a particular COT from the new data was achieved. In this method, input temperature of the coil does not change and base COT temperature multiplies in the  $\frac{COT_{desired}}{cOT_{base}}$ ; the

other base profile in Equations 17 and 18 multiplies in a constant parameter to obtain new profile points.

$$Weight factor(x) = \frac{Temperature(x) - Temperature(l = 0)}{Temperature(l = 150) - Temperature(l = 0)}$$
(17)

$$T(x) = Weight factor(x) \times \frac{T(l=150)_{desired}}{774.1} \times T_{base}$$
(18)

The results of these calculations can be seen in Figure 5. COT



Figure 5. Process fluid temperature profile along the reactor.



Figure 6. Process fluid temperature profile along the reactor.



Figure 7. Process fluid temperature profile along the reactor.

different temperature profiles were obtained. Figure 6 indicates the EDC conversion factor in different COTs; higher conversion factor will be higher in the COTs. In Figure 7, if the amount of COT is higher, the amount of formed coke also will be higher. So by regarding the simulation results, it can be said that for optimum economic performance of furnace, the temperature profile of the fluid is very important.

### INVESTIGATING ADDING CARBON TETRACHLORIDE AS PROPULSION

By adding this compound to the feed in addition to increased conversion factor, it has other effects on the process. Due to increasing number of chlorine radicals in



Figure 8. Conversion percentage change Ay.dy.sy in different concentrations of carbon tetrachloride.



Figure 9. Change the concentration of coke in different concentrations of carbon tetrachloride.

the process, the number of unwanted compounds and acetylene production, coke production increased. Creating unwanted compounds in the next stages, in addition to VCM treating problem leads to an important loss. As shown in Figure 8, conversion factor increases with increasing carbon tetrachloride; on the other hand, in Figure 9, coke is formed with increase in carbon tetrachloride. Regarding simulation results, it can be said that for optimum economic performance of furnace, the temperature profile of the fluid is very important. Therefore, by optimizing the amount of carbon tetrachloride added to the feed for economic performance of thermal cracking unit is very important. In this amount of propulsion conversion factor increases as an allowable limit and reactor performance for forming coke and unwanted compounds are economical (Figure 5).

### Conclusion

K-ε realizable model is the most appropriate model for calculation because of the following reasons (Berreni and Wang, 2011):

(1) This version contains a new formula for turbulence viscosity.

(2) A modified transferring equation for scattering rate,  $\varepsilon$ , can be considered. Therefore, this model is an exact equation for fluctuations transfer.

In this research, the effect of adding carbon tetrachloride as a propulsion has been investigated. According to the result of this research and other issues, if the amount of this compound is not more than 100 ppm, conversion factor will be increased; if this amount is more than 100 ppm, it is not suggested economically.

### **Conflict of Interests**

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

#### REFERENCES

- Kaggerud TH (2007). Modeling an EDC Cracker using Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD), Norwegian University of Science and Technology. P 70.
- Li C, Hu G, Zhong W, He W, Du W, Qian F (2013). Coke Deposition Influence Based on a Run Length Simulation of a 1,2-Dichloroethane Cracker". Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 49:17501-17516.
- ANSYS I (2011). ANSYS FLUENT User's Guide.
- Berreni M, Wang M (2011). Modelling and dynamic optimisation for optimal operation of industrial tubular reactor for propane cracking in Computer Aided Chemical Engineering. 29 Pistikopoulos MCGEN, Kokossis AC, Eds., ed: Elsevier. pp. 955-959.
- Fogler S (1999). Element of chemical reaction engineering.
- Bird RB, Stewart WE, Lightfoot EN. Transport Phenomena: Wiley, 2007. Berreni M, Wang M (2011). Modelling and dynamic optimization of thermal cracking of propane for ethylene manufacturing", Comput. Chem. Eng. 12:2876-2885.

# Journal of Chemical Engineering and Material Science

**Related Journals Published by Academic Journals** 

- Journal of Engineering and Technology Research
   International Journal of Water Resources and Environmental Engineering
- Journal of Civil Engineering and Construction Technology
   International Journal of Computer Engineering Research
- Journal of Electrical and Electronics Engineering Research
- Journal of Engineering and Computer Innovations
- Journal of Mechanical Engineering Research
- Journal of Petroleum and Gas Engineering

## academiclournals