

Reply

Authors' reply to the comments of Song et al.

Vural Evren, Ahmet R. Özdural

Hacettepe University, Chemical Engineering Department, Beytepe, 06532 Ankara, Turkey

We thank Song et al. for their comments. They enabled us to make further explanations on the new technique which was introduced in our paper [1]. In their letter, Song et al. addressed two issues.

1. Selection of the following boundary condition for the calculation of  $\lambda^2$  was wrong:  $x=0 A^o=A^{o1}$

The well known Danckwerts [2] boundary condition is as follows:

At  $x=0$

$$(u_0 A^{o1} / \epsilon) = (u_0 A^o / \epsilon) - D_L (dA^{o1} / dx) \quad (1)$$

where  $u_0$  is the superficial velocity. When axial dispersion is insignificant, as stated in our paper [1], Eq. 1 reduces to:

$$A^o = A^{o1} \quad \text{at the entrance } (x=0)$$

This is the case of step input, and we simply used this boundary condition.

2.  $\lambda^2$  should be a constant whereas the authors found  $\lambda^2$  to be a function of  $t$ .

We also stated that  $\lambda^2$  is a constant after Eq. (11) of our paper [1] and as a logical consequence of this statement:  $d\lambda/dt=0$ .

Differentiating Eq. (16) of our paper [1] and making use of  $d\lambda/dt=0$  one obtains following criterion at which  $dA^{o1}/dt$  is the time difference of  $A^{o1}$  at the column inlet.

$$\frac{dA^{o1}}{dt} = \left( \frac{\alpha^2}{A^{o1} - \alpha} \right) \frac{1}{t} \ln \left( 1 - \frac{A^{o1}}{\alpha} \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha = (P_1/\text{He}) - \Phi(P_2 - P_1)/\text{He}$

Eq. 2 is unconditionally satisfied due to the inherent nature of  $\lambda^2$  that is used as a constant during the employment of separation of variables technique.

**Nomenclature**

Unless otherwise stated in the reply, the same as for [1].

**References**

- [1] V. Evren and A.R. Özdural, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 57 (1995) 67.
- [2] P.V. Danckwerts, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 2 (1953) 1.