- $\sigma_{H}(X_{12})$  = standard deviation between theoretical and experimental molar excess enthalpies
  - v = standard error of estimate for representation of molar excess volume results by Equation 1
  - $\theta$  = site fraction

### Subscripts

- 1 = component of binary mixture with shorter hydrocarbon chain
- 2 = component of binary mixture with longer hydrocarbon chain

## Superscripts

- = characteristic values of p, v, and T
- $\tilde{}$  = reduced values of v and T

#### LITERATURE CITED

- (1) Abe, A., Flory, P.J., J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 87, 1838 (1965).
- (2) Benson, G.C., Singh, J., J. Phys. Chem. 72, 1345 (1968).
- (3) Flory, P.J., J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 87, 1833 (1965).

- (4) Flory, P.J., Abe, A., Ibid., 86, 3563 (1964).
- (5) Hutchinson, E., Bailey, L.G., Z. Phys. Chem. (Frankfurt) 21, 30 (1959).
- (6) "International Critical Tables," Vol. V, p. 108, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1928.
- (7) Orwoll, R.A., Flory, P.J., J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 89, 6822 (1967).
- (8) Pflug, H.D., Benson, G.C., Can. J. Chem. 46, 287 (1968).
- (9) Pflug, H.D., Pope, A.E., Benson, G.C., J. CHEM. ENG. DATA 13, 408 (1968).
- (10) Pope, A.E., Pflug, H.D., Dacre, B., Benson, G.C., Can. J. Chem. 45, 2665 (1967).
- (11) Schaaffs, W., in "Molecular Acoustics," Vol. 5 of "Landolt-Börnstein New Series Group II," K.-H. Hellwege and A. M. Hellwege, Eds., p. 41, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1967.
- (12) Timmermans, J., "Physico-Chemical Constants of Pure Organic Compounds," Vols. I and II, Elsevier, New York, 1950 and 1965.

RECEIVED for review November 17, 1969. Accepted February 11, 1970. Issued as NRCC No. 11416.

# Vapor-Liquid Equilibria of the Quinary System Hexane,

# Methylcyclopentane, Cyclohexane, Benzene, and Toluene

ROBERT M. WEATHERFORD<sup>1</sup> and MATTHEW VAN WINKLE

Department of Chemical Engineering, The University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 78712

Vapor-liquid equilibria were determined for the quinary system of hexane, methylcyclopentane, cyclohexane, benzene, and toluene at 760 mm of mercury. Ten data points were run for this system. Six additional points were taken on the five possible quaternaries. Nine of the required sets of binary equilibria were obtained from the literature, and the methylcyclopentane-cyclohexane data were experimentally determined by the authors. The Wilson equation was used to predict the experimental values; agreement was excellent.

**B**ATCH FRACTIONATION to separate benzene and cyclohexane azeotrope indicated that the presence of the other three components enhanced the separation. Recent investigations (6, 8, 16) wherein accurate multicomponent polar and hydrogen-bonding data have been experimentally determined, have given opportunity to compare the capability of various two-parameter equations to predict highly nonideal multicomponent vapor-liquid equilibria data from binary data. A modified form of the Wilson (17) equation assuming ideal vapor mixtures and requiring only binary equilibrium and pure component data served this purpose satisfactorily. Because multicomponent data for different types of systems are not abundant, this investigation was initiated to determine experimental quinary data for a mul-

<sup>1</sup>Present address, Humble Oil and Refining Co., Baytown, Tex. 77520

386 Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data, Vol. 15, No. 3, 1970

titype hydrocarbon mixture. In addition, it was desirable to learn the capability of the equation to predict equilibrium data for multicomponent hydrocarbon mixtures at atmospheric pressure from binary data.

#### EXPERIMENTAL

Materials. The hexane and methylcyclopentane were Phillips pure grade (99 mole % minimum). The cyclohexane was obtained from the Phillips Petroleum Co. as the 99.5 weight % minimum purity grade. The benzene was certified ACS reagent grade solvent from the Fisher Scientific Co., which had been further purified by distillation by Hudson (8). The toluene was obtained from the Monsanto Co. Analysis by a GC-2A gas chromatograph indicated that the toluene and benzene exceeded 99.9 mole % purity, and these components were not further purified. The hex-

methylcyclopentane, and cylcohexane contained ane. significant amounts of trace impurities, and were subjected to batch distillation at atmospheric pressure in a 30-plate Oldershaw column. Typically, 700 ml were charged to the still pot, and the column was operated at total reflux for 30 minutes, using a timed reflux of approximately 11 to 1. The overhead product was analyzed at various intervals by gas chromatography and the "heart" cut of the desired purity was taken for use in the equilibrium determinations. Composite sample analyses gave the following approximate purities: hexane, 99.74; methylcyclopentane, 99.86; cyclohexane, 99.98; benzene, 99.91; and toluene, 99.96 mole %. Table I compares the experimental and literature values for the boiling points and refractive indexes of the purified components.

Apparatus and Procedure. The pure component boiling points reported here were obtained by use of a modified Colburn still used by Willock (16). A similar still, but with slightly different heating coil arrangement and double capacity, was used in the determination of the vapor-liquid equilibrium data. This was the still described by Matocha (9) and Garrett (3, 4). Better flow control was obtained, which allowed more rapid attainment of equilibrium.

The experimental procedure consisted of weighing amounts of each component into a flask to give approximately the desired concentration. The total sample charged to the still amounted to 34 to 36 ml for each determination. After charging, the pressure was adjusted to 760 mm of mercury and the vaporizer chamber was heated to start the sample boiling. The other heaters were then slowly adjusted until the levels in the condensate receiver remained constant and steady-state conditions were reached. A few drops of liquid were maintained in the vaporizer tube and only vapor was introduced into the liquid in the residue chamber. When temperature, pressure, and constant flow rate were reached, the still was operated for 45 minutes to 1 hour before shutdown and sampling. The first few milliliters of both condensed vapor and liquid samples were discarded to prevent contamination with nonequilibrium material.

The samples were analyzed with a Beckman GC 2A gas chromatograph equipped with a 6-foot, general-purpose silicone column, a 1-mv Sargent SR recorder, and a Disc integrator.

The calibration technique described by Hudson (7) was followed in sample analyses, and his computer program for calculation of equilibrium values from chromatographic peak areas was used. The wide variation in composition of equilibrium samples required changes in attenuation and introduced some uncertainty in reproducibility. For this reason, both the equilibrium samples and their corresponding known samples were analyzed in duplicate. If any peak area did not reproduce within 2%, the sample was analyzed again. The mean of the two or three replicates was then used in calculating equilibrium values.

The detailed procedure used was designed to limit experimental error. In addition to error produced by un-

Table I. Comparison of Pure Component Properties								
	Norm Po	nal Boiling ints, ° C	Refractive Index (25° C)					
	Exptl.	Lit.	Exptl.	Lit.				
Hexane	68.76	68.740 (2)	1.37238	1.37226 (2)				
Methylcyclo- pentane	71.82	71.812 (1)	1.40700	1.40700 (1)				
Cyclohexane	80.76	80.738 (1)	1.42355	1.42354(1)				
Benzene	80.06	80.100 (1)	1.4978	1.49792 (1)				
Toluene	110.56	110.625 (1)	1.4941	1.49414 (1)				

intentional deviation from this procedure, the estimated limits of error are:

Temperature.	$\pm 0.1^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$
Pressure.	$\pm 0.2$ mm of mercury
Composition.	$\pm 0.005$ mole fraction

#### DISCUSSION AND CORRELATION OF EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Basically, the Wilson equation is a two-parameter model for predicting liquid phase activity coefficients. The general expression is

$$\ln \gamma_m = 1 - \ln \left[ \sum_{j=1}^k x_j \Lambda_{mj} \right] - \sum_{i=1}^k \left[ \frac{x_i \Lambda_{im}}{\sum_{j=1}^k x_j \Lambda_{ij}} \right]$$
(1)

where the  $\Lambda$ 's are defined by

$$\Lambda_{ij} = \frac{v_j}{v_i} \exp\left[\frac{-(\lambda_{ij} - \lambda_{ii})}{RT}\right]$$
(2)

With the assumption of ideality in the gas phase, vapor and liquid equilibrium compositions may be calculated by

$$y_i = \frac{\gamma_i x_i P_i}{P_T} \tag{3}$$

Multicomponent data in this study were predicted by use of a computer program, originally published by Prausnitz (13) and modified by Holmes (6) and Hudson (7). Gas phase ideality was assumed in these calculations.

**Binary Data**. The binary parameters expressed in Equation 2 were obtained from binary vapor-liquid equilibrium data using the computer method described by Holmes (6). The sources of the binary data and the resulting parameters are presented in Table II.

Data were available in the literature for all ten possible binaries. When data were reported on one system by more than one author, the data utilized in evaluating the parameters were selected, when possible, from the author who had reported data on other of the ten binary systems.

Table II. Binary Wilson Parameters

	Binary Data	Wilson Parameters		
Binary	Reference	$\lambda_{12} - \lambda_{11}$	$\lambda_{12} - \lambda_{22}$	
Hexane-methylcyclopentane	(12)	348.43	-219.53	
Hexane-cyclohexane	(12)	496.96	-230.57	
Hexane-benzene	(10)	279.52	134.35	
Hexane-toluene	(10)	-121.00	383.89	
Methylcyclopentane- cyclohexane	This study	327.06	-247.40	
Methylcyclopentane-benzene	(11)	94.01	162.93	
Methylcyclopentane-toluene	(11)	-465.89	1004.73	
Cyclohexane-benzene	(14)	151.22	107.28	
Cyclohexane-toluene	(11)	-446.10	981.96	
Benzene-toluene	(5)	75.54	-88.83	
	·····			

Table III. Methylcyclopentane <sup>4</sup> -Cyclohexane Binary System								
$\boldsymbol{x}_1$	$\mathcal{Y}_1$	$\gamma_1$	<b>γ</b> 2	P, Mm Hg	<i>T</i> , ° C			
$\begin{array}{c} 0.102 \\ 0.477 \\ 0.771 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.131 \\ 0.541 \\ 0.814 \end{array}$	$1.015 \\ 0.994 \\ 0.998$	$0.999 \\ 1.009 \\ 1.010$	760 760 760	$79.68 \\ 76.17 \\ 73.65$			
<sup>a</sup> Component 1.								

Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data, Vol. 15, No. 3, 1970 387

The data, with the exception of the cyclohexane-benzene binary at 759.9 mm of mercury, were reported at 760 mm of mercury. Parameters were calculated at both 759.9 and 760 mm of mercury for this binary; while the values of the parameters changed slightly, no difference resulted when both sets of parameters were used to predict a trial quinary point.

The data on the reported methylcyclopentane-cyclohexane binary system (15) appeared to be inconsistent and



/14 - 5 - 6 - 6 - 6 - 6

three points were experimentally determined in this laboratory (Table III). The reported data and experimental points were plotted (Figure 1). The equilibrium concentrations were plotted on the same curves, but our data showed a more consistent trend in activity coefficients. Therefore, they were used in determining the methylcyclopentanecyclohexane parameters. Since the Wilson equation is consistent with the Gibbs-

Since the Wilson equation is consistent with the Gibbs-Duhem relationship, the agreement between experimental vapor compositions and those predicted through the use of the equation should indicate the consistency of the data. Using this criterion, the data used in determining binary parameters appear to be good and no other consistency tests were performed.

Quaternary Data. Since an extremely large number of data points would be necessary to describe a quinary system completely, selected points were chosen that were significant in describing the system and were capable of accurate analysis. One point for each of the five possible quaternary systems was determined and then a quantity of the fifth component was added to determine its effect on experimental and predicted vapor-liquid equilibrium values. The quaternary data are presented in Table IV. With the exception of one point, QUAT 3, disagreement between predicted and experimental equilibrium values was not significantly greater than the estimated cumulative limits of experimental error of 0.010 mole fraction. Since the reproducibility in previous analyses had been excellent, the usual procedure of analyzing duplicates was not used for this point. As the agreement between predicted and experimental values was significantly less for QUAT 3 than for any of the other quaternaries, another point, QUAT 6, was run with approximately the same charge composition as the deviant. The usual duplicate analyses procedure was used, and the

		Experimental Values				$\mathbf{W}$ ils	Wilson Eq. Predictions		
Component	Run No.	<i>T</i> , °C	x	у	γ	<i>T</i> , ° C	У	γ	
Hex	QUAT 1	80.88	0.181	0.273	1.047	80.32	0.281	1.096	
Mcp	•		0.223	0.297	1.015		0.301	1.047	
Ch			0.263	0.278	1.055		0.277	1.065	
Tol			0.333	0.152	1.153		0.141	1.093	
Hex	QUAT 2	81.65	0.134	0.235	1.183	81.90	0.246	1.235	
Mcp	•		0.196	0.290	1,106		0.290	1.096	
Bz			0.278	0.307	1.052		0.303	1.031	
Tol			0.392	0.169	1.062		0.161	1.006	
Hex	QUAT 3	83.24	0.115	0.207	1.168	83.54	0.227	1.270	
Ch	·		0.208	0.271	1.210		0.250	1.106	
Bz			0.325	0.382	1.066		0.371	1.029	
Tol			0.352	0.140	0.931		0.152	0.995	
Hex	QUAT 4	73.60	0.152	0.191	1.080	73.71	0.195	1.098	
Mcp			0.208	0.227	1.034		0.233	1.055	
Ch			0.267	0.228	1.061		0.220	1.024	
Bz			0.373	0.355	1.167		0.353	1.156	
Mcp	QUAT 5	84.15	0.142	0.234	1.141	85.00	0.234	1.116	
Ch			0.196	0.244	1.125		0.247	1.110	
Bz			0.303	0.356	1.040		0.357	1.016	
$\operatorname{Tol}$			0.359	0.166	1.047		0.162	0.994	
Hex	QUAT 6	82.61	0.123	0.228	1.222	83.25	0.240	1.264	
Ch			0.208	0.252	1.142		0.248	1.105	
Bz			0.320	0.365	1.056		0.364	1.032	
$\mathrm{Tol}$			0.348	0.155	1.063		0.149	0.998	
		$\Delta y_H \text{ av. dev.} = 0.011 \qquad \qquad \Delta y_H \text{ max. dev.} = 0$ $\Delta y_M \text{ av. dev.} = 0.003 \qquad \qquad \Delta y_M \text{ max. dev.} = 0$			$_{H}$ max. dev. = 0	0.020			
					0.006				
		$\Delta y_c \ \mathbf{av}.$	dev. = 0.007	$\Delta y$	$c \max. \operatorname{dev.} = 0$	.021			
		$\Delta y_B$ av.	dev. = 0.005	$\Delta y$	$_{B}$ max. dev. = 0	.009			
		$\Delta y_T$ av.	dev. = 0.008	$\Delta y$	T max. dev. = 0	.012			
		$\Delta T$ av.	dev. = 0.47° C	$\Delta T$	$T \max. \text{dev.} = 0$	.85° C			

....

difference between experimental and predicted values was no greater than that of the other quaternaries. In all points other than QUAT 3, duplicate analyses were made.

Quinary Data. Information derived from the quinary data and a summary of the deviations between experimental and predicted vapor composition for these data are given in Table V. Agreement was within the estimated limits of experimental error. As in the quaternary data, the predicted equilibrium temperature was consistently higher than that observed. The average temperature difference was approximately 0.5°C.

Points QUIN 1 through QUIN 5 were determined to obtain the effect of the fifth component on the quaternaries. These points indicate that no loss in the accuracy of the predictive equation resulted from expansion to the quinary system.

QUIN 7 contained approximately the relative amounts of methylcyclopentane and benzene reported in the binary

			Experiment	al Values	Wilson Eq. Predictions			
omponent	Run No.	$T, \circ C$	x	У	$\gamma$	$\overline{T, \circ C}$	У	γ
Hex	QUIN 1	78.27	0.186	0.274	1.105	78.53	0.284	1.13
Мср	·		0.257	0.328	1.049		0.333	1.05
Ch			0.118	0.118	1.081		0.118	1.06
Bz			0.153	0.167	1.153		0.156	1.06
$\operatorname{Tol}$			0.286	0.113	1.094		0.110	1.05
Hex	QUIN 2	84.41	0.129	0.243	1.183	84.64	0.249	1.20
Mcp	40110 -	0	0.159	0.224	0.972		0.252	1.08
Ch			0.132	0.168	1.138		0.162	1.09
Bz			0.100	0.128	1.124		0.116	1.0
Tol			0.480	0.237	1.107		0.221	1.0
Hex	QUIN 3	80.45	0.132	0.219	1.164	81.09	0.232	1.20
Мср	•		0.095	0.134	1.093		0.135	$1.0^{\circ}$
Ch			0.218	0.241	1.115		0.239	1.0
Bz			0.253	0.284	1.110		0.273	1.0
Tol			0.302	0.122	1.039		0.122	1.0
Hex	QUIN 4	80.50	0.069	0.112	1.133	81.32	0.124	1.2
Mcp	•		0.166	0.238	1.104		0.239	1.0
Ch			0.215	0.241	1.128		0.238	1.0
$\mathbf{Bz}$			0.261	0.290	1.097		0.282	1.0
Tol			0.288	0.119	1.062		0.116	1.0
Hex	QUIN 5	76.58	0.132	0.192	1.146	77.28	0.202	1.1
Мср			0.155	0.202	1.123		0.194	1.(
Ch			0.228	0.213	1.061		0.220	1.0
Bz			0.333	0.336	1.129		0.331	1.(
Tol			0.152	0.057	1.096		0.053	0.9
Hex	QUIN 6	77.98	0.067	0.105	1.180	78.68	0.111	1.2
Mcp			0.081	0.106	1.087		0.106	1.(
Ch			0.360	0.362	1.092		0.365	1.0
Bz			0.359	0.374	1.111		0.371	1.0
Tol			0.132	0.053	1.121		0.047	0.9
Hex	QUIN 7	75.71	0.066	0.087	1.070	75.93	0.089	1.0
Mcp			0.583	0.676	1.030		0.689	1.0
Ch			0.077	0.070	1.064		0.069	1.0
Bz			0.089	0.095	1.225		0.085	1.0
$\operatorname{Tol}$			0.186	0.072	1.174		0.069	1.
Hex	QUIN 8	78.83	0.098	0.153	1.145	79.45	0.162	1.
Mcp			0.149	0.206	1.115		0.200	1.
Ch			0.269	0.272	1.072		0.278	1.0
Bz			0.265	0.282	1.104		0.277	1.0
Tol			0.219	0.088	1.100		0.083	1.
Hex	QUIN 9	78.54	0.186	0.273	1.088	78.96	0.273	1.
Мср			0.255	0.339	1.084		0.335	1.0
Ch			0.127	0.126	1.060		0.128	1.0
Bz			0.128	0.137	1.125		0.131	1.0
Tol			0.304	0.125	1.131		0.119	1.0
Hex	QUIN 10	76.02	0.130	0.178	1.092	76.61	0.182	1.
Mcp			0.471	0.563	1.052		0.572	1.0
Ch			0.060	0.055	1.052		0.055	1.0
Bz Tol			0.109	0.115	1.197		0.105	1.0
1.01			0.200	0.000	1.100	010	0.000	1.1
		$\Delta y_H$ av. d	ev. = 0.007 ev. = 0.006	$\Delta y$	$H_H$ max. dev. = 0	0.013		
		Jva av. u	$ev_{1} = 0.003$	<u>Δ</u> y	$a \max dev = 0$	007		
		Avrav d	$ev_{1} = 0.000$	<u>لط</u> ۸۱	$a_{\rm max} dev. = 0$	012		
		Avrav d	$ev_{1} = 0.005$	<u>д</u> у Ал	max dev. = 0	016		
		AT av. d	-0.500	 ^	T more dore = 0	0000		

- . .  $(\mathbf{D}) = \mathbf{I}$ . 

azeotrope (0.125 mole fraction benzene). A mixture of methylcyclopentane and benzene of the azeotropic composition was made and a still charge composed of 71% by volume of this mixture and 29% of the other three components was then run. The resulting normalized (based on the sum of the azeotropic components' compositions) liquid and vapor benzene compositions were 0.132 and 0.123 mole fraction, respectively. These relative concentrations are not significantly different from those of the azeotrope when the estimated errors are considered.

Three points-QUIN 6, QUIN 8, and QUIN 9-were run in a similar manner to examine the cyclohexane-benzene azeotrope. These points contained total azeotrope charges of 71, 50, and 22 volume %, respectively. For QUIN 6, the resulting normalized liquid and vapor compositions were 0.499 and 0.508 mole fraction as compared to the azeotropic benzene concentration of 0.498 mole fraction. The corresponding liquid and vapor values were 0.496 and 0.509 mole fraction for QUIN 8. In QUIN 9, the resulting benzene liquid concentration was 0.502 mole fraction, the vapor being 0.521 mole fraction. These values represent a relative volatility of the benzene and cyclohexane of 1.04 for QUIN 6, 1.05 for QUIN 8, and 1.08 for QUIN 9. These points also indicate that the charge compositions were slightly different from those exhibited by the azeotrope. When this difference is considered with the possibility of experimental error, it is again difficult to evaluate the significance of the effect of the addition of the other system components on the separability of this azeotrope.

Batch Distillation of Quinary System. Since the three quinary equilibrium points did not significantly demonstrate the effect of the other components on the separability of the cyclohexane-benzene binary azeotrope by distillation, an atmospheric batch distillation was performed with a 30-plate Oldershaw column with the charge containing the approximate relative azeotropic concentrations of benzene and cyclohexane. The charge consisted of 100 ml each of hexane, methylcyclopentane, and benzene; 121 ml of cyclohexane; and 200 ml of toluene. After a 15-minute period of total reflux, fractions containing volumes equivalent to the charge quantities of the four lightest components were taken. Cuts of 40, 30, 20, and 10 ml were taken, using an operating reflux ratio of 10 to 1 based on an internal timer, and were combined to make the first three fractions. For the fourth fraction, the corresponding cuts contained 50, 40, 20, and 11 ml. Ten-minute intermediate periods of total reflux operation were provided between each cut. The four fractions were then analyzed by gas chromatograph (Table VI). On Figure 2, the compositions of benzene and cyclohexane in the fractions are presented. While these results are probably less accurate than the equilibrium data, because only single analyses were made, it is apparent that the benzene-cyclohexane separation by batch fractionation is greatly enhanced by the addition of the other quinary components.

### CONCLUSIONS

The Wilson equation accurately predicts multicomponent vapor-liquid equilibria at atmospheric pressure in the five possible quaternaries and the quinary system of hexane,

Table VI. Batch Distillation Data of Quinary System

Volume Collected Overhead.	Mole Fraction					
Ml	Hexane	Mcp	Benzene	Ch	Toluene	
100	0.631	0.241	0.126	0.002	0.000	
200	0.216	0.547	0.205	0.032	0.000	
300	0.004	0.145	0.474	0.377	0.000	
420	0.002	0.003	0.253	0.525	0.218	





Benzene

methylcyclopentane, cyclohexane, benzene, and toluene in the concentration ranges examined.

In the relatively ideal hydrocarbon quinary system of this study, the temperatures predicted by the Wilson equation were consistently high by approximately 0.5°C. The addition of hexane, methylcyclopentane, and toluene significantly enhances the separation of the cyclohexanebenzene azeotrope by fractional distillation.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors express appreciation for the financial support contributed by the Engineering Foundation at the University of Texas at Austin and to the Monsanto Co. for materials.

#### NOMENCLATURE

- k = number of components in system
- general component specification т =
- $\mathbf{P}_{i}$ vapor pressure of component *i*, mm of mercury
- $P_{T}$ system pressure, mm of mercury =
- R = gas constant
- Τ = absolute temperature, ° K
- molar volume of component i, cc/gram-mole  $v_i =$
- = mole fraction of i in liquid  $\boldsymbol{x}_i$
- $Y_i$ = mole fraction of i in vapor
- liquid phase activity coefficient of i=
- $\frac{\gamma_i}{\lambda}$ = Wilson equation interaction parameter

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Dreisbach, R.R., Advan. Chem. Ser. No. 15 (1955). (1)
- Ibid., No. 22 (1959). (2)
- Garrett, G.R., M.S. thesis, University of Texas, Austin, 1968. (3)
- Garrett, G.R., Van Winkle, M., J. CHEM. ENG. DATA 14, (4)302 (1969).
- Heertjies, P.M., Chem. Proc. Eng. 41, 385 (1960). (5)
- Holmes, M.J., Van Winkle, M., Ind. Eng. Chem. 62, 21 (1970). (6)
- Hudson, J.W., Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, (7)
- 1969. Hudson, J.W., Van Winkle, M., J. CHEM. ENG. DATA 14, (8)310 (1969)
- Matocha, I.R., unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Texas, (9)Austin, 1969.
- Myers, H.S., Ind. Eng. Chem. 47, 2215 (1955). (10)
- Ibid., 48, 1104 (1956). (11)
- (12)Myers, H.S., Petrol. Refiner 36, No. 3, 175 (1957).
- Prausnitz, J.M., Eckert, C.A., Orye, R.V., O'Connell, J.P. (13)"Computer Calculations of Multicomponent Vapor-Liquid Equilibria," Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1967.
- Richards, A.R., Hargreaves, E., Ind. Eng. Chem. 36, 805 (14)(1944).
- (15)Susarev, M.P., Lyzlova, R.V., Zh. Fiz. Khim. 36, 437 (1962).
  - Willock, J.M., M.S. thesis, University of Texas, Austin, 1969. (16)
  - Wilson, G.M., J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 86, 127 (1964). (17)

RECEIVED for review January 7, 1970. Accepted April 27, 1970.

390 Journal of Chemical and Engineering Data, Vol. 15, No. 3, 1970