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Nonlinear Model Predictive Control for Disturbance Rejection in Isoenergetic-isochoric Flash Processes
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Abstract: We present a nonlinear model predictive control (NMPC) algorithm for semi-explicit index-1 stochastic differential-algebraic equations. It is natural to model isoenergetic-isochoric (constant energy-constant volume) flash processes with such equations. The algorithm uses the continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter (EKF) for state estimation, and it uses a single-shooting method to solve the involved optimal control problems. It computes the gradients with an adjoint method. The isoenergetic-isochoric flash is also called the UV (or UVn) flash, and it is important to rigorous models of phase equilibrium processes because it is a mathematical statement of the second law of thermodynamics. NMPC algorithms for UV flash processes are therefore relevant to both safe and economical operation of phase equilibrium processes such as flash separation, distillation, two-phase flow in pipes, and oil production. We design the NMPC algorithm for disturbance rejection, and we therefore augment the state vector with the unknown disturbance variables in the continuous-discrete EKF. We present a numerical example of economical NMPC of a UV flash separation process. It involves output constraints and the estimation of an unknown and unmeasured disturbance. The computation time of the NMPC algorithm does not exceed 3.14 s in any of the 5 min control intervals. This indicates that real-time NMPC of UV flash separation processes is computationally feasible.

© 2019, IFAC (International Federation of Automatic Control) Hosting by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Nonlinear model predictive control, The extended Kalman filter, Single-shooting, Disturbance rejection, Vapor-liquid equilibrium, Differential-algebraic equations

1. INTRODUCTION

Nonlinear model predictive control (NMPC) algorithms compute a closed-loop feedback control strategy using the moving horizon optimization principle, i.e. by solving a sequence of open-loop optimal control problems (OCPs) (Binder et al., 2001). The objective of NMPC algorithms is either to optimize the economics of the process or to minimize the distance to predefined setpoints. NMPC algorithms are used to control a variety of chemical processes including stirred tank reactors, batch reactors, fermentors, distillation columns, and production from oil reservoirs.

Chemical processes often involve thermodynamic equilibrium between phases. The phase equilibrium conditions are derived from the second law of thermodynamics, i.e. the entropy of a closed system in equilibrium is maximal. The isoenergetic-isochoric (constant energy-constant volume) flash is a mathematical statement of the second law of thermodynamics and is therefore key to rigorous modeling of phase equilibrium processes. The isoenergetic-isochoric flash is also called the UV (or UVn) flash because it involves constraints on the internal energy, \( U \), the volume, \( V \), and the total mixture composition (in moles), \( n \). The solution to the UV flash is the equilibrium temperature, pressure, and phase compositions which maximize the entropy subject to these constraints. Therefore, the UV flash can be formulated as an equality-constrained optimization problem (Michelsen, 1999). The phase equilibrium conditions are the corresponding first-order optimality conditions which are a set of algebraic equations. Consequently, it is natural to model dynamic UV flash processes with differential-algebraic equations (DAEs). The UV flash has been used in models of flash separation (Castier, 2010; Arendsen and Versteeg, 2009; Lima et al., 2008), distillation (Flatby et al., 1994), and computational fluid dynamical processes (Hammer and Morin, 2014; Qiu et al., 2014). Furthermore, algorithms for dynamic optimization and state estimation of UV flash processes have been considered recently (Ritschel and Jørgensen, 2018; Ritschel et al., 2018). However, NMPC of UV flash processes has not yet been addressed.

NMPC algorithms combine state estimation algorithms with dynamic optimization algorithms. The extended Kalman filter (EKF) is commonly used for state estimation of nonlinear processes (Mobed et al., 2017; Jørgensen et al., 2007). Alternatives include the unscented Kalman filter and particle filters (Simon, 2006) as well as the ensemble Kalman filter (Evensen, 2009a,b), moving-horizon estimation (Alessandri et al., 2010), and neural network-based algorithms (Talebi et al., 2010). OCPs are often solved with direct methods (Binder et al., 2001), i.e. single-shooting, multiple-shooting, or simultaneous collocation.
Computationally efficient implementation of such methods requires the evaluation of gradients. The gradients can be computed with an adjoint method (Jørgensen, 2007) or with a forward method (Kristensen et al., 2004) in the single- and multiple-shooting approaches. NMPC algorithms for disturbance rejection either 1) estimate the disturbance variables (Vatankhah and Farrokhi, 2017; Morari and Maeder, 2012; Huang et al., 2010) or 2) represent the uncertainty in the disturbance variables with a scenario-tree (Subramanian et al., 2015).

In this work, we present an NMPC algorithm for disturbance rejection in UV flash processes. The algorithm combines the continuous-discrete EKF with single-shooting and an adjoint method for computing gradients. We model the UV flash processes with semi-explicit index-1 stochastic DAEs. We augment the states with the disturbance variables and exploit the structure of the augmented DAE system to improve computational performance. We use the open-source thermodynamic software ThermoLib (Ritschel et al., 2017, 2016) to evaluate thermodynamic functions. It is tailored for computation of first and second order derivatives which are needed for efficient implementation of the single-shooting method and in the adjoint method. We present a numerical example of output-constrained economical NMPC of a UV flash separation process that involves an unknown and unmeasured disturbance.

This paper is structured as follows. We describe the semi-explicit index-1 stochastic DAE system in Section 2, and we discuss the numerical simulation of such systems in Section 3. In Section 4, we discuss the estimation of the states and disturbance variables with the continuous-discrete EKF. We describe the open-loop OCP and the single-shooting method in Section 5. We describe the flash separation process in Section 6, and we present the numerical example in Section 7. Conclusions are given in Section 8.

2. SEMI-EXPLICIT INDEX-1 STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL-ALGEBRAIC EQUATIONS

We consider stochastic DAEs that are in the form

\[ G(x(t), y(t), z(t)) = 0, \]
\[ dx(t) = F(y(t), u(t), d(t))dt + \sigma(y(t), u(t), d(t))dw(t). \]

The measurements, \( y^m(t_k) \), of the outputs, \( z^m(t_k) \), are obtained at discrete times, \( t_k \):

\[ z^m(t_k) = H(y(t_k)), \]
\[ y^m(t_k) = z^m(t_k) + v(t_k). \]

\( v_k \) is the measurement noise. It is normally distributed, i.e. \( v_k \sim N(0, T_k) \).

3. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

We discretize the stochastic DAE (1) with a semi-implicit scheme, i.e. we discretize the drift and the diffusion terms in (1b) with Euler’s implicit and explicit method, respectively. Between measurement \( k \) and \( k + 1 \), we compute \( N_k \) time steps. In each time step, we solve

\[ w_{k,n+1} = [x_{k,n+1}; y_{k,n+1}; z_{k,n+1}] \]
\[ R_{k,n+1} = R_{k,n+1}\left( w_{k,n+1}; x_{k,n}, y_{k,n}, z_{k,n} \right) = D_{k,n+1} \left( x_{k,n+1}, y_{k,n+1}, z_{k,n+1}; x_{k,n}, y_{k,n}, u_k, d_k \right) = \frac{1}{G\left( x_{k,n+1}, y_{k,n+1}, z_{k,n+1} \right)} \]

The discretized stochastic differential equations are

\[ D_{k,n+1} = D_{k,n+1}\left( x_{k,n+1}, y_{k,n+1}, z_{k,n+1}; x_{k,n}, y_{k,n}, u_k, d_k \right) = x_{k,n+1} - F\left( y_{k,n+1}, u_k, d_k \right) \Delta t_{k,n} - \sigma\left( y_{k,n+1}, u_k, d_k \right) \Delta \omega_{k,n} - x_{k,n}. \]

We sample the increments, \( \Delta \omega_{k,n} \), from \( N(0, I \Delta t_{k,n}) \). We solve \( R_{k,n+1} = 0 \) with an inexact Newton method:

\[ w^{t+1}_{k,n+1} = w_{k,n+1} + \Delta w_{k,n+1}. \]

In each Newton iteration, we solve

\[ M \Delta w_{k,n+1} = -R_{k,n+1}(w^{t+1}_{k,n+1}), \]

for the Newton step. The iteration matrix, \( M \), is

\[ M \approx \frac{\partial R_{k,n+1}}{\partial w_{k,n+1}} = \begin{bmatrix} I & -\frac{\partial F}{\partial y} & 0 \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial G}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial G}{\partial z} \end{bmatrix}. \]

4. STATE AND DISTURBANCE ESTIMATION

In order to estimate the disturbances, we augment the stochastic DAE system (1) with a stochastic differential equation for the disturbance variables:

\[ G(x(t), y(t), z(t)) = 0, \]
\[ dx(t) = F(y(t), u(t), d(t))dt + \sigma(y(t), u(t), d(t))dw(t), \]
\[ dd(t) = \sigma_d dw_d(t). \]

The measurement equations (2) remain unchanged. We use \( \sigma_d \) to tune the filter. We initialize the continuous-discrete EKF with \( x_0|0 = x_0, \sigma_0|0 = \sigma_0, P^z_0|0 = P^z_0, P^{xz}|0|0 = 0, \) and \( P^{zd}|0|0 = P^{zd}, d_0 \) is an initial estimate of the disturbance variables. We use \( P^{zd} \) for tuning of the filter.

4.1 Measurement-update

The on-step ahead prediction of the measurements, \( \hat{y}_{k|k-1} \), and its approximate covariance, \( T_{k|k-1} \), are

\[ \hat{y}^m_{k|k-1} = H(\hat{y}_{k|k-1}), \]
\[ T_{k|k-1} = C_k P^z_{k|k-1} C^*_k + T_k, \]

where

\[ C_k = \frac{\partial H}{\partial y}(\hat{y}_{k|k-1}) \frac{\partial \hat{y}_{k|k-1}}{\partial x_{k|k-1}}. \]
The sensitivities $\frac{\partial g_{k+1}}{\partial x_{k+1}}$ and $\frac{\partial s_{k+1}}{\partial x_{k+1}}$, satisfy
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial G}{\partial y} \\
\frac{\partial G}{\partial z}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial y_{k+1}}{\partial x_{k+1}} \\
\frac{\partial z_{k+1}}{\partial x_{k+1}}
\end{bmatrix} = -\frac{\partial G}{\partial x}. \tag{11}
\]
The innovation error is
\[e_k = y_k - \hat{y}_k, \tag{12}\]
and the Kalman filter gain matrices are
\[
\begin{align*}
K_{f_x,k} &= P_{xx,k}^{-1}C_kT_{k-1}^{-1} 
\quad \text{and} \quad
K_{f_d,k} &= P_{xx,k}^{-1}C_kT_{k-1}^{-1}. \tag{13}\end{align*}
\]
The filtered estimates of the states and disturbance variables and their covariance matrices are
\[
\dot{x}_{k|k} = \hat{x}_{k|k-1} + K_{f_x,k}c_k,
\]
\[d_k = \hat{d}_{k|k-1} + K_{f_d,k}d_k. \tag{14}\]
The filtered matrices in (22) are therefore the ones that we solve (21)
\[
\begin{align*}
P_{xx,k} &= P_{xx,k}^{-1} - K_{f_x,k}T_{k-1}K_{f_x,k}', 
\quad \text{and} \quad
P_{xx,k} &= P_{xx,k}^{-1} - K_{f_d,k}T_{k-1}K_{f_d,k}'. \tag{14c}\end{align*}
\]
4.2 Time-update
We compute the one-step ahead predictions at time $t_{k+1}$ by solving
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\hat{x}}_k(t_k) &= \hat{x}_k(t_k), 
G(\hat{x}_k(t), \hat{y}_k(t), \hat{z}_k(t)) = 0, \quad t \in [t_k; t_{k+1}],
\dot{d}_k(t) &= f(\hat{y}_k(t), u(t), \hat{d}_k(t))dt, \quad t \in [t_k; t_{k+1}].
\end{align*} \tag{15}
\]
where $u(t) = u_{k|k}$ and $\dot{d}_k(t) = \dot{d}_{k|k}$.
\[
\Phi_{xx}(t, s) = \frac{\partial \hat{x}_k(t)}{\partial \hat{x}_k(s)};
\Phi_{yx}(t, s) = \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k(t)}{\partial \hat{x}_k(s)};
\Phi_{zd}(t, s) = \frac{\partial \hat{d}_k(t)}{\partial \hat{x}_k(s)},
\Phi_{yy}(t, s) = \frac{\partial \hat{y}_k(t)}{\partial \hat{y}_k(s)},
\Phi_{zz}(t, s) = \frac{\partial \hat{z}_k(t)}{\partial \hat{z}_k(s)},
\Phi_{dd}(t, s) = \frac{\partial \hat{d}_k(t)}{\partial \hat{d}_k(s)}.
\]
where $\Phi_{xx}(t, s) = 1$ and $\Phi_{yy}(t, s) = 0$. The covariance matrices are given by (Jorgensen et al., 2007)
\[
P_{xx,k} = \Phi_{xx,x}P_{xx,k}^{-1}\Phi_{xx,x}' + \Phi_{xx,d}P_{xx,k}^{-1}\Phi_{xx,d}' + \Phi_{xx}\int_{t_k}^{t} \Omega_{xx}(t, s)\delta_{xx}(t, s)ds,
\]
\[
P_{zx,k} = \Phi_{zx}P_{xx,k}^{-1}\Phi_{zx}' + \Phi_{zx}\int_{t_k}^{t} \Omega_{zx}(t, s)\delta_{zx}(t, s)ds,
\]
\[
P_{xx} = \Phi_{xx}\int_{t_k}^{t} \Omega_{xx}(t, s)\delta_{xx}(t, s)ds,
\]
where the sensitivity matrices are evaluated at $t$ and $t_k$
\[
\begin{align*}
\Omega_{xx}(t, s) &= \Phi_{xx}(t, s)\sigma(\hat{y}_k(s), u(s), \hat{d}_k(s)), 
\Omega_{xd}(t, s) &= \Phi_{xd}(t, s)\sigma_d, 
\Omega_{dd}(t, s) &= \Phi_{dd}(t, s)\sigma_d.
\end{align*} \tag{18}\]
4.3 Numerical solution of the time-update equations
We solve the time-update equations (15) with Euler’s implicit method, i.e., we solve the equations
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
D_{k,n+1}(\hat{x}_{k,n+1}, \hat{y}_{k,n+1}, \hat{z}_{k,n+1}) 
\quad \text{and} \quad
G(\hat{x}_{k,n+1}, \hat{y}_{k,n+1}, \hat{z}_{k,n+1})
\end{bmatrix} = 0, \tag{19}\]
where the discretized differential equations are
\[
\begin{align*}
D_{k,n+1} &= \hat{x}_{k,n+1} - F(\hat{y}_{k,n+1}, u_{k|k}, \hat{d}_k)\Delta t_{k,n} - \hat{x}_{k,n},
\end{align*} \tag{20}\]
where the sensitivity matrices are evaluated at $t_{k,n+1}$ and $t_{k,n}$, e.g., $\Phi_{xx} = \Phi_{xx}(t_{k,n+1}, t_{k,n})$.
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
P_{xx,k}^{-1} + \Phi_{xx}\int_{t_k}^{t} \Omega_{xx}(t, s)\delta_{xx}(t, s)ds
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 
\frac{\partial F}{\partial y} 
\frac{\partial F}{\partial z}
\frac{\partial F}{\partial d}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{21}\]
5. DYNAMIC OPTIMIZATION
We assume that there is one control interval between measurements. At sample time $t_k$, we solve the OCP
\[
\min_{[x(t); y(t); z(t)]_{t_k}^{t_{k+N_h}}} \phi \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+N_h}} \Phi(y(t), u(t), d(t)dt)\right)^{1+k+N_h}, \tag{23a}\]
subject to
\[
x(t_k) = \hat{x}_{k|k}, \tag{23b}\]
\[
G(x(t), y(t), z(t)) = 0, \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+N_h}], \tag{23c}\]
\[
\hat{x}(t) = F(y(t), u(t), d(t)), \quad t \in [t_{k}, t_{k+N_h}], \tag{23d}\]
\[
u(t) = u_{j|k}, \quad t \in [t_{j}, t_{j+1}], \quad j = k, \ldots, k+N_h-1, \tag{23e}\]
\[
d(t) = \hat{d}_{j|k}, \quad t \in [t_{j}, t_{j+1}], \quad j = k, \ldots, k+N_h-1, \tag{23f}\]
\[
\{u_{j|k}\}_{j=k}^{k+N_h-1} \in \mathcal{U}. \tag{23g}\]
where the objective function, $\phi$, is in Lagrange form:
\[
\phi \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+N_h}} \Phi(y(t), u(t), d(t))dt\right) = \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+N_h}} \Phi(y(t), u(t), d(t))dt. \tag{24}\]
We consider a control and prediction horizon of $N_h$ control intervals. $[x(t); y(t); z(t)]_{t_k}^{t_{k+N_h}}$ is a vector of dependent
optimization variables, and \( \{u_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k} \) are independent optimization variables. The DAE system (23c)-(23d) is deterministic, i.e., there is no process noise. (23e)-(23f) are zero-order-hold parametrizations of the manipulated inputs and the disturbance variables, and (23g) are constraints on the manipulated inputs. We assume that \( \hat{d}_{j,k} = \hat{d}_{j,k} \) for \( j = k + 1, \ldots, k + N_h - 1 \). The OCP (23) needs the current estimates of the states, \( \hat{x}_{j,k} \), and disturbance variables, \( \hat{d}_{j,k} \). They are computed by the continuous-discrete EKF.

5.1 Single-shooting

We use the single-shooting algorithm described by Ritschel et al. (2018) to solve the OCP (23). We define the objective function, \( \psi \), as

\[
\psi = \psi(\{u_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k}; \hat{x}_{j,k}; \{\hat{d}_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k}) = \left\{ \phi : (23b)-(23f) \right\}.
\]

That is, \( \psi \) is the objective function \( \phi \) in (24) evaluated using the solution of the DAE system (23c)-(23d) with the initial condition (23b) and the zero-order-hold parametrizations of the manipulated inputs and the disturbance variables (23e)-(23f). In the single-shooting approach, we solve the finite dimensional nonlinear program

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{\{u_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k}} & \quad \psi(\{u_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k}; \hat{x}_{j,k}; \{\hat{d}_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k}), \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad \{u_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k} \in \mathcal{U}. 
\end{align*}
\]

We solve the DAE system (23c)-(23d) with Euler’s implicit method. For each time step, we solve the residual equations, \( R_{j,n+1} = 0 \), for \( w_{j,n+1} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
R_{j,n+1} &= R_{j,n+1}(w_{j,n+1}; x_{j,n}, u_{j,n}, \hat{d}_{j,n}) \\
&= R_{j,n+1}(x_{j,n+1}, y_{j,n+1}; x_{j,n}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n}) \\
&= \left[D_{j,n+1}(x_{j,n+1}, y_{j,n+1}; x_{j,n}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n}), \right. \\
&\left.\frac{\partial}{\partial w_{j,n}} \Phi(x_{j,n+1}, y_{j,n+1}, x_{j,n}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n}) \right].
\end{align*}
\]

and the discretized differential equations are

\[
\begin{align*}
D_{j,n+1} &= D_{j,n+1}(x_{j,n+1}, y_{j,n+1}; x_{j,n}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n}) \\
&= x_{j,n+1} - F(y_{j,n+1}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n}) \Delta t_{j,n} - x_{j,n}.
\end{align*}
\]

Furthermore, \( w_{j+1,0} = w_{j,N_j} \). We substitute the discretized DAEs (27) into (25) and approximate the integral in (24) with a right rectangle quadrature rule:

\[
\psi(\{u_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k}; \hat{x}_{j,k}; \{\hat{d}_{j,k}\}^{k+N_h-1}_{j=k}) = \left\{ \phi \sum_{j=k}^{k+N_h-1-N_h} \Phi(x_{j,n}, y_{j,n+1}, u_{j,k}, \hat{d}_{j,k}) : \right. \\
\left. x_{k,0} = \hat{x}_{k,k}, \\
R_{j,n+1}(w_{j,n+1}; x_{j,n}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n}) = 0 \right\}.
\]

Proposition 1. Consider the function, \( \psi \), defined in (29).

\[
\nabla_{u_{j,k}} \psi = \sum_{n=0}^{N_j-1} \left( \nabla_{u_{j,k}} \Phi(x_{j,n}, y_{j+1,n}, u_{j,k}, \hat{d}_{j,k}) + \left( \frac{\partial R_{j,n+1}}{\partial w_{j,n}} \right) \Delta t_{j,n} \right).
\]

\[
(\partial R_{j,n+1})' \lambda_{j,n} = -\nabla_{w_{j,n}} \Phi(x_{j,n}, y_{j,n+1}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n}) \left( \lambda_{j,n+1} - \nabla_{\Phi(x_{j,n}, y_{j,n+1}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n})} \lambda_{j,n+1} \right),
\]

for \( j = k + N_h - 1 \),

\[
(\partial R_{j,n+1})' \lambda_{j,n+1} = -\nabla_{w_{j,n+1}} \Phi(x_{j,n+1}, y_{j,n+1}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n+1}) \left( \lambda_{j+1,n+1} - \nabla_{\Phi(x_{j,n+1}, y_{j,n+1}, u_{j,n+1}, \hat{d}_{j,n+1})} \lambda_{j+1,n+1} \right),
\]

for \( j = k + N_h - 2, \ldots, k \).

6. DYNAMIC UV FLASH SEPARATION

We consider the flash separation of a mixture of \( N_C \) components into a vapor phase (\( v \)) and a liquid phase (\( l \)). The two phases are in thermodynamic equilibrium. The vapor and liquid phases exit the separator from two separate streams. The separator is supplied with a vapor-liquid mixture through a feed stream. The separator is cooled, \( Q(t) \leq 0 \). The internal energy, \( U \), and the total amount of moles of each component, \( n \), are described by the conservation equations

\[
U(t) = H_F(t) + H_L(t) - H_V(t) - H_L(t) + Q(t),
\]

\[
\eta_i(t) = f^{\nu}(t) + f^{l}(t) - u_i(t) - l_i(t), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N_C.
\]

\( H_F \) and \( H_L \) are the vapor-liquid enthalpies of the feed stream, and \( H_V \) and \( H_L \) are the enthalpies of the vapor and liquid streams. \( Q \) is the heat flux from the external cooling. \( f^{\nu} \) and \( f^{l} \) are vectors of the molar flow rates of the feed stream, and \( v \) and \( l \) are vectors of the molar flow rates of the vapor and liquid streams. The volume, \( V \), of the separator is fixed. The equilibrium temperature, \( T \), pressure, \( P \), and vapor-liquid compositions, \( n^v \) and \( n^l \), are the solution to the UV flash optimization problem:

\[
\max_{T, P, n^v, n^l} \quad S = S^v(T, P, n^v) + S^l(T, P, n^l),
\]

s.t. \( U(t, P, n^v) + U(t, P, n^l) = U \)

\( V^v(T, P, n^v) + V^l(T, P, n^l) = V \)

\( n_i^v + n_i^l = n_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N_C. \)

The UV flash optimization problem (36) is a mathematical statement of the second law of thermodynamics, i.e. the entropy of a closed system in equilibrium is maximal. That condition can be adapted to isothermal-isobaric (constant temperature-constant pressure) systems in which case it states that Gibbs energy, \( G \), is minimal. That is the condition that determines the molar flow rates of the feed stream, \( f^{\nu} \) and \( f^{l} \), based on the feed temperature, \( T_F \), pressure, \( P_F \), and total molar flow rates, \( f_F \):
We consider the flash separation of a hydrocarbon mixture in a 1 m³ separator. The feed mixture contains 60% C₁, 10% C₂, 5% C₃, 23% n-C₇, and 2% H₂S. There are 6 states, 12 algebraic variables, and 7 adjoint algebraic variables. We control the separation process over a time period of 8 h. The prediction and control horizon in the NMPC algorithm is 6 h. The manipulated inputs are the heat flux, Q, and the total flow rates of the vapor and liquid streams, Fᵥ and Fₗ. The total feed flow rate is Fₚ = 12 kmol/h.

The objective of the NMPC algorithm is to minimize the amount of energy spent on cooling, i.e., to maximize \( f_{\text{oh}} \) over a h (which is negative). There are upper bounds on the H₂S vapor mole fraction, \( y_{\text{H₂S}} \), and the pressure, \( P \leq 7.5 \) MPa. We incorporate those bounds into the objective function with logarithmic barrier functions. We incorporate bounds on the vapor fraction, \( \beta \in [0\%, 100\%] \), in a similar manner. The feed temperature, \( T_F \), is an unknown disturbance variable that we estimate. The initial estimate of \( T_F \) is equal to its true value. However, \( T_F \) increases with 5 K after 2 h. This increase is not known by the NMPC algorithm. We use \( \sigma_\beta = 0.5 \) K and \( P_{\text{dd}}^0 = 0.25^2 \) K² in the EKF. We measure the temperature and pressure every 5 min. This is also the length of the control intervals. The standard deviations of the temperature and pressure measurement noises are 2.5 K and 0.05 MPa. The diffusion coefficient is constant, i.e., \( \sigma(y(t), u(t), d(t)) = \sigma = \text{diag}([\sigma_U; \sigma_{C_1}; \sigma_{C_2}; \sigma_{C_3}; \sigma_{n-C_7}; \sigma_{H_2S}]) \) where \( \sigma_U = 0.2 \) MJ, \( \sigma_{C_1} = \sigma_{C_2} = \sigma_{C_3} = 2 \) mol, and \( \sigma_{n-C_7} = \sigma_{H_2S} = 0.2 \) mol.

Fig. 1 shows a closed-loop simulation of NMPC of the flash separation process. The upper bounds on \( y_{\text{H₂S}} \) and \( P \) are satisfied throughout the entire simulation. Fig. 2 shows the estimated disturbance variable, \( T_F \), together with the manipulated inputs, \( Q \), \( F_V \), and \( F_L \). The EKF is able to track the increase in \( T_F \), and the NMPC algorithm is able to reduce the cooling and thereby lower the energy consumption. The computation time of the NMPC algorithm is between 0.21 s and 3.14 s in each of the control intervals, and the average computation time is 0.64 s.

8. CONCLUSIONS

We present an NMPC algorithm for disturbance rejection in isenergetic-isochoric flash processes (also called UV flash processes). It estimates the states and the unknown disturbance variables with the continuous-discrete EKF and solves the involved OCPs with a single-shooting method. The gradients are computed with an adjoint method. It is natural for models of UV flash processes to be in a semi-explicit index-1 stochastic DAE form. We describe a model of a UV flash separation process in such a form. We present a numerical example of economical NMPC of the UV flash separation process. The example involves constraints on the H₂S vapor mole fraction and the pressure, and the estimation is based on temperature and pressure measurements. The NMPC algorithm is able to estimate an unknown increase in the unmeasured feed temperature while satisfying the constraints. The computation time is 3.14 s or less in all of the 5 min control intervals which indicates that real-time NMPC of UV flash processes is computationally feasible.
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Fig. 1. Closed-loop simulation of the flash separation process. Top row: Energy consumption and H$_2$S vapor mole fraction as well as actual and measured temperature and pressure. Bottom row: Vapor fraction and vapor-liquid mole fractions of the mixture in the separator and total mole fractions of the feed.

Fig. 2. The estimated disturbance variable, $T_F$, and the manipulated inputs, $Q$, $F_V$, and $F_L$.


