Isobaric vapour–liquid equilibria for some halogencontaining ethanes in binary mixtures with HF

E. Santacesaria*, R. Tesser and M. Di Serio

Cattedra di Chimica Industriale, Dipartimento di Chimica, Via Mezzocannone 4, 80134 Napoli (Italy)

G. Basile Ausimont SpA, P. Donegani, Spinetta Marengo (Al) (Italy)

(Received March 5, 1992; accepted June 7, 1992)

Abstract

The vapour-liquid equilibria (VLE) of four binary mixtures of HF with CCl_2F-CF_2Cl , $CHCl_2-CF_3$, CH_2Cl-CF_3 and CH_2F-CF_3 , respectively, have been studied under isobaric conditions. Experimental results have been interpreted by the NRTL (Not Random Two Liquids Theory) method with three parameters. The non-ideality and association of the vapour phase has been described with the virial equation. Despite the strong association of the HF molecules, the NRTL method satisfactorily reproduces the vapour-liquid equilibria of the binary mixtures, especially their lack of miscibility.

Introduction

It is known that great efforts are being made to replace Cl with C2 chlorofluorocarbons (CFC) in different uses, with the aim of reducing ozone depletion effects due to chlorine compounds. The necessity of producing environmentally acceptable fluorocarbons has led to a growing interest in defining the physical properties of these new products [1-3]. Fluorinated compounds are produced by reacting chlorinated species with hydrogen fluoride in the presence of suitable catalysts. Hence, reaction mixtures which usually contain residual reagents and fluorinated products need to be separated in a distillation unit. In order to design the separation unit, it is useful to know the VLE of all the binaries occuring in the multicomponent mixtures.

While some papers have been published concerning the VLE of CFC binary mixtures, none has been published on mixtures of CFC with hydrogen fluoride because of the difficulties in handling HF and collecting reliable data in the presence of this substance.

In this work, we have studied the isobaric VLE of four binary mixtures of HF with CCl_2F-CF_2Cl , $CHCl_2-CF_3$, CH_2Cl-CF_3 and CH_2F-CF_3 . In some cases, we have observed wide miscibility gaps and, in all cases, strong

^{*}To whom all correspondence should be addressed.

deviations from ideality. The experimental results have been interpreted by applying the three-parameter NRTL (Not Random Two Liquids Theory) model for the liquid phase [4] and the virial equation for the vapour in equilibrium. NRTL theory is well described by Renon and Prausnitz [4].

Despite the strong association of HF molecules [5], we have observed that it is possible to describe the vapour-liquid equilibria of the mixtures, at difference pressures, by using NRTL parameters. The second virial coefficients have been calculated as suggested by Hayden and O'Connell [6].

Experimental

Apparatus, procedure and chemicals

The apparatus employed for the equilibrium runs is shown schematically in Fig. 1. Two reservoirs were separately filled with the two components of the binary mixture to be tested. The equilibrium cell of stainless steel had a volume of 3 l and was completely bathed in a thermostatting fluid. The temperature was kept constant (± 0.1 °C) by heating with an electrical resistance and cooling with a refrigerating coil. The pressure of the system was measured through a pressure transducer with 0.02 atm precision. The temperature was measured with a thermocouple dipped in the liquid phase of the binary mixture. The liquid was stirred with a magnedrive stirrer connected to an electrical motor.

Samples were withdrawn, after interrupting the stirring, via the valves V5, V6, V7 (see Fig. 1) from the vapour phase V5 and from the head and the bottom of the liquid V6 and V7 respectively, in order to observe the presence or otherwise of two liquid phases. Samples taken from the vapour and liquid phases were separately fed to alkaline traps for HF measurement. These traps were thermostatted at temperatures higher than that of the



Fig. 1. Schematic representation of the apparatus employed for VLE equilibria measurements: F = equilibrium cell; D = thermostatting fluid; B = fluid bath stirrer; T = thermocouple; P = pressure transducer; V = valves; S = freezing coil; R = electrical resistance heater; C + A = magnetic stirrer; L = vapour sampling line; M, N = liquid sampling lines.

equilibrium cell in order to avoid condensation. For each isobaric run, the pressure, temperature and compositions of both the liquid and vapour phase in equilibrium were measured for nine different mixtures with different molar fractions of 0.1 to 0.9 of one component versus the other. Normally, 1 l of one component was charged into the equilibrium cell and increasing amounts of the other component were added until a molar fraction of c. 0.5 was reached; then the procedure was repeated with an inverted sequence. The time elapsed between two experimental measurements was c. 4 h, i.e. long enough to reach an equilibrium characterized by pressure constancy.

The fluorinated chemical products used were all produced and supplied by Ausimont SpA, in particular the products Algofrene 113, Meforex 123, HCFC 133a (a laboratory sample) and Meforex 134a were all of 99.9% purity.

Results and discussion

The vapour-liquid equilibrium runs under isobaric conditions were performed on the binary mixtures of HF with the following compounds: CCl_2F-CF_2Cl (CFC113), $CHCl_2-CF_3$ (HCFC123), CH_2Cl-CF_3 (HCFC133a) and CH_2F-CF_3 (HCFC134a). Experimental VLE data for these mixtures are reported in Tables 1–4, respectively. As mentioned above, the data collected have been interpreted with the three-parameters NRTL model [4].

Table 5 reports the thermodynamic data related to the pure components employed for the calculations. Some data listed in the table were estimated by calculation using the methods suggested by Reid, Prausnitz and Sherwood

TABLE 1

Experimental VLE data for the binary system $CCl_2F-CClF_2$ (1) versus HF (2)

P = 1.75 atm			P = 1.98 atm			
Temp. (°C)	x_1	y_1	Temp. (°C)	x_1	y_1	
34.0	0.000	0.000	37.8	0.000	0.000	
26.9	0.030	0.248	31.2	0.030	0.242	
26.8	0.060	0.265	30.9	0.050	0.264	
27.1	0.200	0.247	30.8	0.150	0.248	
26.9	0.300	0.220	30.4	0.250	0.250	
26.0	0.400	0.225	29.2	0.390	0.258	
25.0	0.500	0.244	29.2	0.500	0.252	
25.4	0.600	0.245	30.0	0.600	0.248	
25.6	0.700	0.247	29.5	0.700	0.236	
25.5	0.850	0.243	29.1	0.800	0.249	
24.6	0.960	0.268	29.3	0.900	0.245	
64.6	1.000	1.000	29.0	0.960	0.271	
			71.0	1.000	1.000	

P = 1.05 atm			P = 3.5 atm			
Temp. (°C)	x_1	y_1	Temp. (°C)	x_1	${m y}_1$	
20.1	0.000	0.000	57.5	0.000	0.000	
10.8	0.017	0.124	46.8	0.017	0.124	
8.5	0.036	0.209	43.7	0.033	0.206	
7.4	0.054	0.247	42.1	0.054	0.232	
7.4	0.057	0.248	41.8	0.057	0.231	
7.5	0.072	0.245	41.7	0.072	0.233	
7.5	0.102	0.243	41.8	0.102	0.234	
7.6	0.141	0.243	41.7	0.141	0.232	
7.4	0.185	0.242	41.6	0.185	0.229	
7.4	0.288	0.241	41.8	0.288	0.234	
7.5	0.385	0.244	41.6	0.385	0.235	
7.6	0.656	0.240	41.8	0.656	0.239	
7.5	0.771	0.250	42.0	0.799	0.243	
10.1	0.902	0.386	44.2	0.942	0.419	
27.8	1.000	1.000	66.0	1.000	1.000	

TABLE 2

Experimental VLE data for the binary system $CHCl_2-CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2)

TABLE 3

Experimental VLE data for the binary system CH_2Cl-CF_3 (1) versus HF (2)

P=3.5 atm					
Temp. (°C)	x_1	y_1			
57.5	0.00	0.000			
43.1	0.078	0.193			
40.1	0.103	0.231			
33.2	0.204	0.336			
31.2	0.290	0.430			
31.3	0.348	0.435			
31.0	0.397	0.433			
31.3	0.490	0.433			
32.1	0.659	0.565			
33.2	0.805	0.721			
34.1	0.905	0.845			
41.3	1.000	1.000			

[7] because they were not available from the literature. Vapour pressure data of pure HCFC 123, 133a and 134a were communicated by Basile [8].

Table 6 shows the NRTL parameters obtained by regression on the experimental data for the different binary mixtures. These parameters must be considered as averaged over the temperature range of the isobar. The quantities Δy and ΔP are absolute mean deviations of y and P, respectively. The fittings obtained for the x/y plots of different binary mixtures by employing

P=3.0 atm			P = 10.0 atm			
Temp. (°C)	x_1	y_1	Temp. (°C)	x_1	y_1	
53.0	0.000	0.000	98.0	0.000	0.000	
11.5	0.100	0.777	58.1	0.100	0.691	
1.8	0.200	0.850	44.4	0.200	0.798	
0.8	0.300	0.862	42.0	0.300	0.827	
0.4	0.400	0.861	40.5	0.400	0.836	
0.1	0.500	0.857	39.4	0.500	0.838	
-0.1	0.600	0.852	38.6	0.600	0.840	
-0.2	0.700	0.852	38.2	0.700	0.847	
-0.2	0.800	0.864	37.8	0.800	0.866	
-0.1	0.900	0.902	37.6	0.900	0.908	
0.1	0.950	0.940	37.6	0.950	0.945	
0.9	1.000	1.000	39.0	1.000	1.000	

TABLE 4										
Experimental	VLE	data	for	the	binary	system	CH ₂ F-CF ₃	(1)	versus H	IF (2)

TABLE 5

Pure component data used in the VLE calculation

ln	$P_i^0 = A +$	$\frac{B}{T+C}$	$[P_i^0]$	(bar);	Т	(K)]	
----	---------------	-----------------	-----------	--------	---	------	--

	HF	CCl_2F-CF_2Cl	CHCl2-CF3	CH_2Cl-CF_3	$\mathrm{CH}_{2}\mathrm{F}\!-\!\mathrm{CF}_{3}$
M_w (g mol ⁻¹)	20.006	187.37	152.92	118.49	102.04
$T_{\rm c}$ (K)	461.15	487.25	457.50	429.80	374.20
P_{c} (bar)	64.79	34.15	36.09	38.40	40.56
$Z_{\rm Ra}$	0.1468	0.2723	0.2650	0.2553	0.2458
R_{d} (Å)	0.2006	3.659	3.273	2.8404	2.4799
$D_{\rm m}$ (Debye)	1.83	1.8	2.0	2.3	1.82
A	12.5361	9.4025	8.7457	8.7866	9.6385
В	-4389.13	-2657.6	-2116.95	-2012.27	-2008.89
C	57.8280	-38.085	-58.098	-46.674	-37.5538

NRTL with the parameters listed in Table 6 are reported as examples in Figs. 2–5. The dots are the experimental values while the lines are calculated. The fitting obtained for a plot of temperature versus x/y is reported in Fig. 6.

With the exception of HF/CH_2F-CF_3 , all the binaries studied show a wide miscibility gap whose extent has been demonstrated experimentally in the manner already described. The conditions for instability can be described via the following relation [4]:

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 \Delta g^{\rm M}}{\partial x^2}\right)_{T,P} = 0$$

TABLE (6
---------	---

NRTL	parameters	determined	by	regression	analysis
------	------------	------------	----	------------	----------

CCl ₂ F>CClF ₂ (1) versus HF	(2) system	
	P = 1.75 atm	P = 1.98 atm
Δg_{12}	1855.13 ± 70.51	1828.92 ± 71.71
Δg_{21}	1827.25 ± 101.5	1797.63 ± 99.87
α_{12}	0.41 ± 0.003	0.42 ± 0.004
η_{11}	0.80	0.80
η_{12}	0.50	0.50
η_{22}	1.65	1.65
ΔY	0.0262	0.0249
ΔP (mmHg)	36.60	39.08
$CHCl_2CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2)	system	
	P = 1.05 atm	P=3.5 atm
Δg_{12}	1398.40 ± 64.52	1721.58 ± 46.01
Δg_{21}	1550.95 ± 32.79	1581.27 ± 63.70
α_{12}	0.45 ± 0.002	0.46 ± 0.01
η_{11}	0.80	0.80
η_{12}	0.50	0.50
η_{22}	1.95	2.00
ΔY	0.0273	0.0427
ΔP (mmHg)	16.64	53.65
$CH_2Cl_2CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2)) system	
$CH_2Cl_2CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2)) system P=3.5 atm	
$CH_2Cl_2CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12}) system P=3.5 atm 990.01±81.50	
CH_2CUCF_3 (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21}) system P=3.5 atm 990.01±81.50 598.35±96.60	
$CH_2C\cup CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12}) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09	
$CH_2C\cup CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11}) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09 0.90	
$CH_2C\cup CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12}) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09 0.90 0.50	
$CH_2C\cup CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22}) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09 0.90 0.50 2.00	
$CH_2C\cup CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09 0.90 0.50 2.00 0.0506	
CH_2CUCF_3 (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg)) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09 0.90 0.50 2.00 0.0506 41.31	
$CH_2C\cup CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_2F \cdot CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2)) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09 0.90 0.50 2.00 0.0506 41.31 system	
$CH_{2}CUCF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_{2}F_{3}CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2)) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09 0.90 0.50 2.00 0.0506 41.31 system P = 3.0 atm	P = 10.0 atm
$CH_{2}C\cup CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_{2}F > CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12}) system P = 3.5 atm 990.01 ± 81.50 598.35 ± 96.60 0.33 ± 0.09 0.90 0.50 2.00 0.0506 41.31 system P = 3.0 atm 1145.04 ± 20.43	P=10.0 atm 1170.97 + 33.33
$CH_{2}C\cup CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_{2}F > CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21}	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{ystem} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.5 \ atm \\ \textbf{990.01} \pm 81.50 \\ 598.35 \pm 96.60 \\ 0.33 \pm 0.09 \\ 0.90 \\ 0.50 \\ 2.00 \\ 0.0506 \\ 41.31 \\ \textbf{system} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.0 \ atm \\ 1145.04 \pm 20.43 \\ 1059.10 \pm 22.73 \end{array}$	P=10.0 atm 1170.97±33.33 1148.50±37.77
$CH_{2}C\cup CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_{2}F > CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12}	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{ystem} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.5 \ atm \\ \textbf{990.01 \pm 81.50} \\ 598.35 \pm 96.60 \\ \textbf{0.33 \pm 0.09} \\ \textbf{0.90} \\ \textbf{0.50} \\ \textbf{2.00} \\ \textbf{0.0506} \\ \textbf{41.31} \\ \textbf{system} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.0 \ atm \\ \textbf{1145.04 \pm 20.43} \\ \textbf{1059.10 \pm 22.73} \\ \textbf{0.43 \pm 0.002} \end{array}$	$P = 10.0 \ atm$ 1170.97 ± 33.33 1148.50 ± 37.77 0.44 ± 0.01
CH_2CUCF_3 (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_2F>CF_3$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11}	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{ysytem} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.5 \ atm \\ \textbf{990.01} \pm 81.50 \\ 598.35 \pm 96.60 \\ 0.33 \pm 0.09 \\ 0.90 \\ 0.50 \\ 2.00 \\ 0.0506 \\ 41.31 \\ \textbf{system} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.0 \ atm \\ 1145.04 \pm 20.43 \\ 1059.10 \pm 22.73 \\ 0.43 \pm 0.002 \\ 1.40 \end{array}$	$P = 10.0 \ atm$ 1170.97 ± 33.33 1148.50 ± 37.77 0.44 ± 0.01 1.40
$CH_{2}C\cup CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_{2}F > CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12}	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{ysytem} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.5 \ atm \\ \textbf{990.01} \pm 81.50 \\ 598.35 \pm 96.60 \\ 0.33 \pm 0.09 \\ 0.90 \\ 0.50 \\ 2.00 \\ 0.0506 \\ 41.31 \\ \textbf{system} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.0 \ atm \\ 1145.04 \pm 20.43 \\ 1059.10 \pm 22.73 \\ 0.43 \pm 0.002 \\ 1.40 \\ 0.50 \end{array}$	$P = 10.0 atm$ 1170.97 ± 33.33 1148.50 ± 37.77 0.44 ± 0.01 1.40 0.50
$CH_{2}C\cup CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_{2}F > CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22}	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{ysytem} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.5 \ atm \\ \textbf{990.01 \pm 81.50} \\ 598.35 \pm 96.60 \\ \textbf{0.33 \pm 0.09} \\ \textbf{0.90} \\ \textbf{0.50} \\ \textbf{2.00} \\ \textbf{0.0506} \\ \textbf{41.31} \\ \textbf{system} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.0 \ atm \\ \textbf{1145.04 \pm 20.43} \\ \textbf{1059.10 \pm 22.73} \\ \textbf{0.43 \pm 0.002} \\ \textbf{1.40} \\ \textbf{0.50} \\ \textbf{1.80} \end{array}$	$P = 10.0 atm$ 1170.97 ± 33.33 1148.50 ± 37.77 0.44 ± 0.01 1.40 0.50 1.80
$CH_{2}C\cup CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY ΔP (mmHg) $CH_{2}F > CF_{3}$ (1) versus HF (2) Δg_{12} Δg_{21} α_{12} η_{11} η_{12} η_{22} ΔY	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{ysytem} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.5 \ atm \\ \textbf{990.01 \pm 81.50} \\ 598.35 \pm 96.60 \\ \textbf{0.33 \pm 0.09} \\ \textbf{0.90} \\ \textbf{0.50} \\ \textbf{2.00} \\ \textbf{0.0506} \\ \textbf{41.31} \\ \textbf{system} \\ \textbf{P} = 3.0 \ atm \\ \textbf{1145.04 \pm 20.43} \\ \textbf{1059.10 \pm 22.73} \\ \textbf{0.43 \pm 0.002} \\ \textbf{1.40} \\ \textbf{0.50} \\ \textbf{1.80} \\ \textbf{0.0305} \end{array}$	$P = 10.0 atm$ 1170.97 ± 33.33 1148.50 ± 37.77 0.44 ± 0.01 1.40 0.50 1.80 0.0274

where Δg^{M} is the Gibbs molar free energy of mixing and x is the mole fraction of a component in the mixture. By applying this to the Δg^{M} relation of the NRTL model in the case of a binary system, we have [4]:

$$F(x_1) = -\frac{2\tau_{21}G_{21}^2}{(x_1 + x_2G_{21})^3} - \frac{2\tau_{12}G_{12}^2}{(x_2 + x_1G_{12})^3} + \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2}$$



Fig. 2. An x_1/y_1 plot for the system CCl_2F-CF_2Cl (1) versus HF (2) at 1.75 atm pressure. Fig. 3. An x_1/y_1 plot for the same system as in Fig. 2 at 1.98 atm pressure.



Fig. 4. An x_1/y_1 plot for the system CH_2F-CF_3 (1) versus HF (2) at 3 atm pressure. Fig. 5. An x_1/y_1 plot for the same system as in Fig. 4 at 10 atm pressure.

This relation, which represents the phase stability, can be plotted as a function of the composition, i.e. as a function of x_1 .

The results obtained in our case are reported, as examples, in Figs. 7 and 8. As can be seen, the miscibility gaps observed are hardly affected by temperature. In particular, the HF/CH_2F-CF_3 mixture does not show miscibility gaps at temperatures higher than 0 °C in agreement with the experimental observations.

To conclude, we have shown that it is possible to describe satisfactorily the VLE of HF binary mixtures by employing the NRTL model [4] and the virial equation [5] with parameters that seem to be virtually constant with pressure. The small differences in solvation and association parameters are explained by the change in temperature which is unavoidable in isobaric



Fig. 6. A temperature versus x/y plot for the system CH_2F-CF_3 (1) versus HF (2) at 3 atm pressure.

Fig. 7. Phase stability diagram for the system CCl_2F-CF_2Cl (1) versus HF (2) at 1.85 atm pressure.



Fig. 8. Phase stability diagram for the system CH_2F-CF_3 (1) versus HF (2) at 3 atm pressure.

runs. Hence, as already mentioned, these parameters must be considered averaged relative to temperature.

Acknowledgement

Thanks are due to Ausimont for financial support.

List of symbols

$C_1 - C_3$	Antoine constants of the vapour pressure
D_{m}	dipole moment (Debye)
g	Gibbs energy per mol
g_{ij},g_{ii}	energies of interaction between ii and ij pairs of molecules

$\Delta g^{ extsf{M}}$	Gibbs energy of mixing per mol
Δg_{ij}	$g_{ij} - g_{ii}$
G_{ji}	$\exp(-lpha_{ji} au_{ji})$
M_{w}	molecular weight
$P_{\rm c}$	critical pressure
R	gas constant
$R_{\rm d}$	gyration radius
T	absolute temperature
$T_{\rm c}$	critical temperature
x_i	mole fraction of substance i in liquid phase
y_i	mole fraction of substance i in vapour phase
Z_{Ra}	Rackett parameter

Greek letters

α_{ij}	non-randomness constant for binary <i>ij</i> interactions
$\eta_{ij}, \ \eta_{ii}$	solution and association parameters, respectively
$ au_{ji}$	$(g_{ij}-g_{ii})/\mathrm{R}T$

References

- 1 Y. Maezawa, H. Sato and K. Watanabe, Fluid Phase Equil., 61 (1991) 263.
- 2 A. Valtz, S. Laugier and D. Richon, J. Chem. Eng. Data, 32 (1987) 397.
- 3 C. C. Piao, H. Sato and K. Watanabe, ASHRAE Trans., (1989) 95.
- 4 H. Renon and J. M. Prausnitz, AIChE J., 14 (1968) 135.
- 5 R. L. Redington, J. Phys. Chem., 86 (1982) 552.
- 6 J. G. Hayden and J. P. O'Connell, Ind. Eng. Chem. Process Des. Dev., 14 (1975) 209.
- 7 R. C. Reid, J. M. Prausnitz and T. K. Sherwood, *The Properties of Gases and Liquids*, 3rd edn., McGraw-Hill, New York, 1977.
- 8 G. Basile, personal communication.