

# A Debottlenecking Study of an Industrial Pharmaceutical Batch Plant

Baehner, Franz D.; Huusom, Jakob K.

Published in: Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research

Link to article, DOI: 10.1021/acs.iecr.9b03134

*Publication date:* 2019

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Link back to DTU Orbit

*Citation (APA):* Baehner, F. D., & Huusom, J. K. (2019). A Debottlenecking Study of an Industrial Pharmaceutical Batch Plant. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 58*(43), 20003-20013. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.9b03134

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





Subscriber access provided by DTU Library

# Process Systems Engineering

# A Debottlenecking Study of an Industrial Pharmaceutical Batch Plant

Franz David Baehner, and Jakob Kjøbsted Huusom

Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., Just Accepted Manuscript • DOI: 10.1021/acs.iecr.9b03134 • Publication Date (Web): 07 Oct 2019

Downloaded from pubs.acs.org on October 14, 2019

#### **Just Accepted**

"Just Accepted" manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides "Just Accepted" as a service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. "Just Accepted" manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. "Just Accepted" manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). "Just Accepted" is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the "Just Accepted" Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the "Just Accepted" Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these "Just Accepted" manuscripts.

is published by the American Chemical Society. 1155 Sixteenth Street N.W., Washington, DC 20036

Published by American Chemical Society. Copyright © American Chemical Society. However, no copyright claim is made to original U.S. Government works, or works produced by employees of any Commonwealth realm Crown government in the course of their duties.

# A Debottlenecking Study of an Industrial Pharmaceutical Batch Plant

Franz D. Bähner and Jakob K. Huusom\*

Process and Systems Engineering Center (PROSYS), Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, 2800 Lyngby, Denmark

E-mail: jkh@kt.dtu.dk

#### Abstract

Operational complexity in batch-operated plants is large and companies struggle to produce at high equipment utilisation. Due to high fixed costs, capacity utilisation is an important operational directive. Many current plants are not in a state that allows the application of rigorous process systems engineering tools due to modelling challenges. This work proposes identifying the right engineering projects based on statistic evidence. In the case of incomplete process monitoring strategies in semiautomated facilities, these analyses are specifically challenging. The power of modern data processing tools in this context is shown at hand of a case study in an industrial pharmaceutical production. This includes the development of a recursive monitoring algorithm as well as plant performance evaluation based on established heuristics.

# 13 1 Introduction

The operational paradigm of batch process plants producing high-value products at comparably low volumes differs from that of bulk chemical processes. Such batch plants are frequently encountered in speciality chemical-, pharmaceutical-, and bio-based industries.

Due to operational complexity especially in multi-product scenarios, it is difficult to operate these plants at maximum throughput. Therefore, incremental debottlenecking is generally among the primary production objectives. If high fixed costs arise from quality control and quality assurance in the context of good manufacturing practice (GMP) compliance,<sup>1,2</sup> the importance of high capacity utilisation is increased even more. Furthermore, reductions in public healthcare spending by means of price caps or endorsed production of generic (non-branded) drugs is expected.<sup>3</sup> This forces pharmaceutical enterprises to streamline existing production facilities and supply chains.<sup>4</sup> The situation is complicated further for research-driven pharmaceutical enterprises due to the complex interrelations between capacity plan-ning, risk management (i.e. from failed new drug development processes), and operational issues.<sup>5</sup> 

Incremental debottlenecking of continuous plants by installing additional recycles or by other means of deflecting workload from the bottleneck to less pressed units is generally possible.<sup>6</sup> Yet, flexibility in such plants is limited compared to designs with parallelised, intensified units<sup>7</sup> (scale-out vs. scale-up). Accordingly, systems of parallel standard units facilitate organic growth, enabling plants to track markets more flexibly. This requires continual (ex-pensive) engineering expertise and therefore effective project execution. Not least, parallel standard units facilitate performance monitoring and predictive maintenance as trends from equipment wear & tear are more easily distinguishable from trends induced by fluid proper-ties. 

Several frameworks exist for retrofit debottlenecking of batch process systems, the most recent by Amaran et al., and a large base of works has been presented by and around Petrides et al.. All of these frameworks advocate the use of computational tools, which fits well the desire to more consciously apply process systems engineering methods in the bio-based and i.e. pharmaceutical industries.<sup>10</sup> In an industrial context it is however not so that model-based work is apt for all projects. Particular challenges arise in bio-based production, and model-building as well as verification are likely to be expensive or even impossible

due to unmeasured, uncertain, and unknown variables. This can stem from the complexity of solid-liquid suspension properties,<sup>11</sup> large natural process variability,<sup>12</sup> but also due to non-deterministic manual control and incomplete process monitoring systems. This work discusses these and other challenges, and proposes a solution approach. To this end, firstly the general notion of batch processing, economical considerations, and arising operational challenges are introduced in section 2. Regard is paid to the special case of bio-based pro-cesses. Identification and handling of bottlenecks are discussed in section 3. Important heuristics are extracted from batch process plant debottlenecking frameworks. An algorithm for the reconstruction of machine states based on time-series values of commonly measured variables is introduced in section 4. This is necessary to identify scheduling bottlenecks in process plants without conclusive monitoring schemes, as is also the case in the regarded production plant. This industrial case study is described in section 5, functionality of the algorithm shown, and debottlenecking candidate projects derived accordingly. Operational challenges and generalisations are discussed in section 6, hereafter the work is concluded. 

# <sup>58</sup> 2 Background

This section discusses batch processes at a high level of abstraction as well as disadvantages and challenges immanent in them. This is embedded in the context of bio-based processes before introducing retrofit process re-designs aimed at debottlenecking.

# 62 2.1 Economics of Batch Process Plants

In a single-product scenario, continuous plants outperform batch processes. An estimate for possible savings is given for instance by Calabrese and Pissavini. Bauer and Craig state that there are less batch processes than continuous in chemical, petrochemical, and refining industries. This prevalence of continuous processes over batch production in large sectors of the chemical industry is a good indicator for their economic superiority, as batch operation constituted the first paradigm.<sup>15</sup> One explanation for this lies in lower equipment efficiencies,<sup>16</sup> which may be as low as 30% in pharmaceutical plants.<sup>17</sup>

Furthermore, reductions in equipment scale and consequently also temperature/concentration gradients due to better heat and mass transfer are expected for continuous reactors.<sup>18</sup> Co-standy et al. offer an optimisation-based framework for the comparison of batch- and contin-uous reactors based on first-principles. A more practical approach to evaluating the benefits of continuous processing including downstream lines is presented by Teoh et al.. Continuous processes can also be preferable for safety reasons due to reductions of hazardous material hold-ups.<sup>21</sup> and have been classified as more easily automatable.<sup>19</sup> Finally, a batch sched-ule impedes process integration as the points in time of heating and cooling may change relative to one-another.<sup>22</sup> This requires either advanced scheduling, which is expectedly con-nected with some cost, or extra equipment in the form of an intermediate thermal storage to decouple the integration events in time. 

#### 81 2.1.1 Batch Production of Specialty Chemicals

To reap the benefits of economies of scale, suppliers of volume-limited markets need to operate flexible multi-purpose plants.<sup>23</sup> Due to changeover and shut-down as well as start-up costs, continuous multi-purpose plants can be unattractive. Furthermore, batch duration as an extra degree-of-freedom renders systems highly flexible. Fifteen years ago, Edgar claim that, in total, there were more batch operated plants than continuous plants in the United States. More recently, Kano and Ogawa or Amaran et al. mention the growing importance of specialised products and consequently batch processes. An alternative lies in the development of flexible multi-purpose continuous plants, which is however connected with substantial technological challenges.<sup>26</sup> 

In bio-based production, but especially in the case of pharmaceuticals, the plantwide production regime is traditionally batch, likely for three reasons:

- Fermentation was initially a batch process (and frequently still is), this operational regime is propagated through the downstream line.
- Recurrent cleaning and sterilisation of units is necessary to prevent cross-contamination between batches and accumulation of biological cell matter in general.

• Limited batch durations reduce the risk of mutation in the deployed organisms.

<sup>99</sup> The latter also implies that, aside from the complications in heat-integrating processes, ma-<sup>100</sup> terial recycles may be entirely forbidden due to cross-contamination risk policies calling for <sup>101</sup> rigorous cleaning-in-place (CIP) or sterilisation-in-place (SIP) barriers.

Due to the historical prevalence of batch processes, regulatory entities (U.S. Food and Drug Administration, European Medicines Agency, etc.) as well as industrial stakeholders have accumulated a lot of experience from frequent qualification of these processes. This is also mentioned by Wu et al., who acknowledge that batch processes are likely to have lower ef-ficiencies, but bear the convenience of the "three-batch process validation approach". This adds a lot of inertia in a transition to continuous process regimes, as especially in first-to-market scenarios commissioning delays are likely to outweigh suboptimally high operational costs - even if they persist for numerous years.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, there is a push for the pharma-ceutical industry to rely more on continuous and semi-continuous processing technology.<sup>28-30</sup> This is enabled by the fact that product batches which undergo final testing and are ulti-mately sold need not strictly stand in relation to a single upstream batch.<sup>31,32</sup> 

Beyond the process-oriented economic arguments, there are upstream processes that favour a continuous production regime due to biological properties.<sup>33</sup> Schaber et al. compared costs for continuous and batch processing for a large-scale pharmaceutical production and conclude significant cost savings in the case of continuous processing technology. While most big

players in pharmaceutical production engage in related research projects, the industry per-spective is not without restraint, especially concerning the replacement of existing (batch) infrastructure.<sup>35</sup> Croughan et al. point out that production scales of pharmaceuticals are in general not comparable to bulk chemical- and petrochemical industries. Therefore, they conclude "[...] should we close existing batch operations? The answer, at least for now is no, but the factory of the future embodied in new facility design is likely to evolve around integrated continuous bioprocessing". All in all, there is strong evidence that batch plants in today's chemical and especially biochemical industries are of economic relevance. 

# <sup>125</sup> 2.2 Operational Objectives in High-Value Bio-Based Production

In the above it has been mentioned that bio-based plants tend to operate in batch regimes. In these plants, operational complexity is substantial due to the additional scheduling tasks on unit operation layer. Low- and high-level automation may is complicated by the absence of reliable property models, presence of uncertainties and delays, and not lastly entirely unmeasurable states.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, the comparably small scale of the facilities and the indicated disproportion between cost of utilities and fixed costs (i.e. quality control) may complicate the business cases for automation projects. Finally, due to fault-tolerant processes and equipment breakdowns, flexible control systems are needed. This flexibility is added in most easily by including educated operators into the control structure, which implies operating mistakes due to human error.<sup>38</sup> All of the above may lead to suboptimal operation conditions including suboptimal capacity utilisation, which can easily go unnoticed in a complex environment. Therefore, if fixed costs (for quality control, quality assurance, GMP) facility depreciation, and labour) outweigh the cost of utilities, full capacity utilisation of installed equipment is likely to be the primary operational objective as long as the market is not saturated. 

#### 141 2.2.1 Retrofit Process Design

Most enterprises have to react to market evolution in a recurrent manner. This may be due to changes in demand, product line-up, raw material supply, energy prices, and emerging or disappearing competitors. In the operated plants this implies an ongoing sequence of engineering projects, which aligns well with the plantwide control task, also iterative.<sup>39</sup> Re-optimisations are especially important in newly-built plants after experience has been gathered, or after significant process or market changes. In these projects, economic plant performance should be evaluated based on accumulated sales, process, and product data, but also extraordinary sampling campaigns may be sensible. This usually requires manual processing as, unlike in the case of control system performance monitoring,<sup>40</sup> data sets are relatively heterogeneous and unstructured, and on top of that case-specific - making it difficult to apply a set of standard tools. It is important for an enterprise to enable efficient and robust execution of these projects; similarly process designs that allow incremental capacity increases may be a conscious choice. 

# <sup>155</sup> 3 Debottlenecking Methodology

Several frameworks and articles incorporating best practices specifically for or including de-bottlenecking of batch process plants have been presented.<sup>8,9,23,41-44</sup> Many of these include application examples, and further cases have been studied.<sup>45-50</sup> Most of these frameworks advocate the use of models to augment decision-making. Undoubtedly, the dynamic be-haviour of complex batch process systems is hard to conceptualise for the human mind, calling for computational support. However, not every production facility or enterprise is apt for model-based optimisation. This is discussed for instance by Guimarães et al. for the case of discrete-event models. Here, with a reference to  $5^{2}$  a basis for a maturity measure for an organisation's aptitude for process modelling is introduced. The latter depends both on the production process itself, which has to be structured and operate in stable routines, 

furthermore automatic data collection needs to be in place. Finally, the right skill-set needs to be available within the enterprise. These measures are subject to some ambiguity, not lastly stemming from a lack of documented industrial cases.

# <sup>170</sup> 3.1 Identification of Bottlenecks

Any unit not capable of handling a throughput increase is per definition a bottleneck.<sup>53</sup> In stable, continuous processes, personnel is usually able to pin-point this unit or these units with high precision. This information can also be concluded from statistical analysis of process data.<sup>54</sup> Alternatively, the plant can be tried in a maximum throughput trial. However, the shortness of a trial bears the risk of missing effects that would become relevant in the long-term. Secondly, it is usually so that operators are more attentive during out-of-the-ordinary temporary scenarios. Capacity estimates can also be basted on for instance model-based extrapolation of the current state - this may be necessary if capacity is elevated past several bottlenecking stages at once. However, if fluid properties change frequently and transient periods make up a substantial part of uptime, the task takes on a more complicated character. Here, a more advanced analysis including statistical elements is required. 

#### 182 3.1.1 Identification of Bottlenecks in Batch Plants

In a batch plant all of these complications can arise in the same way. Recalling section 2.1.2, complex scenarios are actually more probable, as batch plants are more likely to produce multiple products. Furthermore, operation may be less regular due to operators being actively in-the-loop. Also, one needs to refine the definition of a bottleneck in a batch processing context. According to Calandranis and Petrides, bottlenecks can be either *size* or *time* inflicted.

<sup>189</sup> The size bottleneck limits the amount of coherent material ('a batch') passing through the <sup>190</sup> system. It is evidently so that the size bottleneck's volume should be utilised to the maxi-

mum in each batch. Note that there can be multiple size bottlenecks in processes where the product changes streams (for example elution processes) or processes with purge streams. Time bottlenecks are those with the largest stage cycle time, or those where it takes longest to process a batch until starting the next. Ideally, time bottlenecks operate at 100% equip-ment uptime, it is then also trivial to understand that throughput on these units cannot be increased further. However, due to operational complexity, it may not be possible to challenge a plant in a maximum throughput scenario, thus some form of extrapolation from nominal production rate may be of need. 

In general, batch plants ordinarily employ both 'native' batch and semi-batch units, but also semi-continuous units that only follow the batch regime of the incorporating plant. For a detailed overview of common nomenclature, the reader is referred to Barrera.

#### 202 3.1.2 Batch and Semi-Batch vs. Semi-Continuous Units

Batch processes are characterised by their size or volume, have specified filling, processing, draining steps, and no material may be added to or removed during the processing phase. In fermentations this requirement is usually relaxed as addition of acids/bases for pH control purposes is allowed.<sup>56</sup> There is always at least one transient variable and a constraint value for it. This variable can be cycle time, in which case the transient is reduced to a timer. A batch process is depicted schematically in figure 1 (left), where it can also be seen that for batch units with predominantly 'holding' operations (size bottlenecks), debottlenecking by means of volume maximisation is effective (for example fermentation). 

Native batch units are contrasted with continuous units operated under a batch operating regime. A 'semi-continuous' unit can be inactive due to planned downtime (as are all nonbottleneck units) or CIP / SIP / maintenance activities. However, start-up and shut-down procedures are generally negligible and the unit operates continuously during uptime. This is represented by figure 1 (right), and it is also intuitive to understand that scheduling bottlenecks are more likely to arise upon batch-size increases on 'flow' units (for example

<sup>217</sup> decantation).

The restriction of no addition or removal of material is removed in semi-batch steps. A deadend filtration process with uncertain cake properties is a semi-batch process with, depending
on the control strategy (flow rate or pressure controlled regime) an unknown duration or
even unknown flow rate and duration.<sup>57</sup> These processes lie somewhat between batch and
semi-continuous units in terms of how to identify and treat bottlenecks.



Figure 1: Native batch vs. semi-continuous units and the effect of throughput increases 'a' on cycle time 'b'.

#### 223 3.1.3 Engineering Projects

Implementation of debottlenecking strategies even in a continuous improvement cycle is usually project-based. Calandranis and Petrides list three primary debottlenecking strategies (increase number of cycles per batch for the limiting procedure, rearrange the equipment assignment, introduce new equipment). Amaran et al. suggest the following taxonomy of possible retrofit debottlenecking project turnouts which are applicable to a broader class of problems:

• "Type-1: operational improvements by removing slack and uncovering hidden capacity

with current infrastructure".

• "Type-2: upgrades to current equipment, planning and scheduling improvements and improvements in operating discipline".

• "Type-3: fundamental improvements in operating policies".

• "Type-4: investment in new pieces of equipment/trains".

The framework by Amaran et al. takes a process systems engineering approach and these projects are turnouts of model-based simulation studies with an optimisation sub-step. This allows balancing mathematical optimality and degree of subjectivity, and can therefore cap-italise flexibly on skills and experience of the process optimisation team. Amaran et al. propose to validate the discrete-event model by means of comparing simulated inter-batch start times, overall production times, queue lengths, and individual processing and wait times to sets of historical data that are most descriptive of future operations. The cycle times of individual unit operation steps in turn are assumed to be captured by the process monitoring system. With a reference to the fact that validation can be a very time-consuming step, one could find that comparably little attention is paid to it. Further, Amaran et al. remark that especially implementation of Type-3 projects may be difficult as also these require opera-tional discipline. The above classification are adapted in the following and projects will be defined in these terms. 

# <sup>249</sup> 4 Machine State Reconstruction Algorithm

The absence of control system state information due to manual operation makes it difficult to impossible to reliably identify scheduling bottlenecks, furthermore it is not possible to validate models merely at hand of the collected time-series data. Sequential control systems are characterised by a set of discrete states S; examples are given in table 1. These states

Type of unit	Common machine states (aside from idle)							
Batch Reactor (Fermentation)	Fill	Heat Treatment	Inoculate	Ferment	Stabilise (chemical, cooling)	Drain	CIP	
Holding Tank (Storage )	Fill (from)	Wait for resource	Drain (to)	CIP				
Tank (Flocculation,)	Fill (from)	Perform operation	Wait for resource	Drain (to)	CIP			
Flow Unit (Centrifugation, Filtration,)	Active	Reinitialise	CIP					

Table 1: Exemplary machine states in batch operation regime.

define the control system outputs  $\omega$ , and thereby finally the evolution of the set of continuous states X of the plant as a consequence of actuation. The continuous states furthermore experience significant process noise, for instance from slurry properties as a consequence of batch-to-batch variability in fermentations. The control system outputs in this sequential context are often binary or categorical (for instance open/closed valve position), but also continuous process data (flow, temperature, pH) are measured. Some of the continuous variables may be controlled, usually by means of proportional-integral control.

This knowledge needs to be harnessed into the state reconstruction algorithm. Further information available comes in the form of standard operating procedures, piping and instrumentation diagrams, and not lastly experience of operators and engineers. A non-deterministic recurrent state machine RSM is chosen as a modelling basis:

$$RSM = \langle M_1, ..., M_k \rangle \tag{1}$$

$$M_i = (S_i, s_{0_i}, \Sigma_{SFC_i}, \Sigma_{TS_i}, F_i)$$

$$\tag{2}$$

For each component state machine  $M_i$ ,  $S_i$  describes the set of discrete states and  $s_{0_i}$  the initial state (which for all machines is idle). The input alphabet  $\Sigma$  will be delineated in

#### Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research

greater detail in the following.  $F_i$  denotes the set of final states for the component machines. In the reconstruction algorithm, the outputs  $\omega$  of the sequential batch control system become inputs to the state machine reconstruction algorithm:

$$\Sigma_{SFC} = f(\omega, S) \tag{3}$$

This is intuitive, as every time a value  $(\in \omega)$  opens or closes, or a flow magnitude changes persistently, this must have been dictated by a state transition in S. Note that in this, operators are control system elements and therefore introduce non-determinism. They make mistakes and react delayed. In general there may be some leeway in the operating procedures that are not strictly product-safety critical. Further, operators may have to react flexibly to changing fluid properties: sometimes a routine will have to be called multiple times instead of once until the desired effect is achieved. Finally, units malfunction, which also leads to extraordinary state sequences. 

Thus, this input alphabet is not enough to reconstruct the machine states due to countless multiplicities: a valve opening / closing may result in different transitions depending on the current machine step - which may be unknown yet due to preceding multiplicities or irregular events. Therefore, characteristic points in the time-series data need to be translated into inputs

$$\Sigma_{TS} = f(X, S) , \qquad (4)$$

which is described in more detail in section 4.2. Secondly, it may be necessary to call a subset of unique component state machines which will be supplied with the subsequent input sequence (both  $\Sigma_{SFC}$  and  $\Sigma_{TS}$ ) to see which - if any - of the machines converges to a final state. Upon unequivocal convergence, the algorithm, recursive in its nature, will trigger a state transition at the point-in-time of initial execution of the subroutines. Otherwise it is concluded that an erroneous procedure must have occurred during processing of the active batch which is also logged.

# <sup>275</sup> 4.1 Identification of $\Sigma_{SFC}$

As indicated, opening and closing of values as well as switching motors on or off are trivial and usable indicators. However, in some cases and especially in the case of flow control, more scrutiny is of need. Changes in absolute values of rates (for example aeration) can allow pin-pointing specific steps. Secondly, in the case of strongly sequential operations (for example a sequence of five-fold elution or washing steps), a component state machine is needed that keeps track of the sequence on the one hand, and potentially duration of the steps on the other. These checks (range, spread, and timers) have proven to be powerful elements for sequential flowchart reconstruction. 

# <sup>284</sup> 4.2 Identification of $\Sigma_{TS}$

There are countless characteristic points in the time-series data and it is neither realistic nor necessary to delineate each one of them as they are highly case-specific. The most trivial characteristic points are a flow stopping persistently on a 'flow' unit, or a tank running dry for a 'holding' unit. The respective unit then must be in *Idle/Empty*. Note that for holding units, *Empty* is an unambiguous state, whereas *Full* may be more difficult to pin-point in the case of altering fill-levels. (Also for *Empty*, a tolerance may be of need due to sensor noise.) As the finalisation of a draining procedure on one tank normally means that a fill procedure on another tank has been finished, this information is of two-fold value. 

Beyond these simple indicators, more advanced routines can easily be included into the algorithm. Moving-horizon linear fits, smoothers, maximum norms, or variance estimators can be used efficiently to detect and classify changes in uncertain environments. Averaged threshold values can usually be inferred from observations. These vector operations are however computationally expensive and should only be applied when scalar criteria fail. Finally, the duration of a procedure can be estimated early on and gives a good indication about its nature (standard operation, CIP routine, irregular event), enabling an a-priori selection of component state machines that will be triggered subsequently. It should be noted 

that, at times, knowledge of future information may be needed in order to unambiguously
classify an event. In these, the algorithm cannot be used for on-line monitoring purposes.
However, the real-time requirements in production are rather soft as there is significant value
in having knowledge about the past 12-24 hours of production after a shift changeover even
if there is some delay.

#### <sup>306</sup> 4.3 Superstructure, Equipment Assignments

Due to the predominantly forward-oriented flow of product in batch plants without recycle, a separation into subroutines is possible, which allows step-wise implementation and validation. Therefore, generally a link between unit state machines only has to be drawn when material is transferred, which may require identification of a resource (flow unit) in the case of parallel units, and identification of a target holding unit. By tracking material accumulation / depletion and by estimating the flow rates into and out of the respective tanks, this link can then be established with high certainty.

### 314 4.4 Illustrative Example

At hand of a small excerpt of the case study plant (introduced in the next section), these principles will be demonstrated. The Gantt chart of the example plant in figure 2 is limited to a single fermenter FE03, from where material is transferred to holding tanks T11 and T12. At hand of the pseudo-code for algorithm 1 it is shown how machine states for the fermenters are identified from  $\Sigma_{SFC}$  and  $\Sigma_{TS}$ . Secondly, the posterior propagation of batch numbers to the holding tanks is indicated algorithm 2. On plant scale this is necessary to create batch traceability, and for complex transitions. Furthermore, sometimes it is not possible to identify all necessary  $\Sigma_{TS}$  &  $\Sigma_{SFC}$  based on time-series values from one unit operation, and steps on preceding / succeeding units need to be included. In these cases, the batch ID needs to be propagated simultaneously with the RSM calculations. (For instance, this is different for the special case of the recycle section (Tanks 31/32, Unit 3, Tanks 41/42

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 21
3 I 2 2
2∠ 22
22 24
25
36
30
38
30
40
40 41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

Algo	rithm 1 RSM Principle	
1: $T$	is vector of time-points	
2: $\omega$	is matrix of inputs (valves initially closed), $X$ is matrix of	continuous states
$3: S_1$	$_{FE03}$ is unknown fermenter machine state	
4: <b>p</b>	rocedure TRACKFERMSTATES $(X, \omega, T)$	
5:	$S_{FE03} = idle; t_k = T(1)$	
6:	while $t_k < T (end)$ do	
7:	if $S_{FE03}$ is <i>idle</i> then	
8:	CheckTransitionsFromIdle( $X.FE03.Level, \omega.FE$	$E03.ValveIn\left(t_{k} ight),T,t_{k} ight)$
9:	else if $S_{FE03}$ is filling then	
10:	$\operatorname{CheckTransitionsFromFilling}()$	
11:	else if $S_{FE03}$ is then	
12:	Check transitions from	
13:	end if	
14:	Increment $t_k$ in $T$	
15:	end while	
16: <b>er</b>	nd procedure	
17: <b>p</b>	rocedure CHECKTRANSITIONSFROMIDLE(Level, ValveIn)	$,T,t_k)$
18:	if ValveIn.opens then	
19:	$t_i = t_k;$	
20:	while $Level(t_i) > 0$ do	
21:	Increment $t_i$ in $T(t_k : end)$	
22:	end while	
23:	$\Delta T_{Ferm}$ and $L_{Ferm}$ are thresholds	
24:	Condition 1: $t_i - t_k > \Delta T_{Ferm}$ , Condition 2: $avg$ (Level)	$(t_k:t_i)) > L_{Ferm}$
25:	if Condition 1 and Condition 2 then	
26:	store (Ferm. nr. begins at $t_k$ )	
27:	store (Ferm. nr. ends at $t_i$ )	
28:	$S_{FE03} = filling$	$\triangleright$ (Transition)
29:	else	
<b>3</b> 0:	# Irregular event has occured	
31:	Store time-points	
32:	$t_k = t_i$	⊳ Jump period
33:	end if	
34:	end if	
35: <b>er</b>	nd procedure	
36: <b>p</b> 1	<b>rocedure</b> CHECKTRANSITIONSFROMFILLING $(ValveIn)$	
37:	if ValveIn.closes then	$\triangleright$ Simple $\Sigma_{SFC}$
38:	$S_{FE03} = waiting$	
39:	end if	
40: <b>er</b>	nd procedure	

1:	$T_{S,FE03}$ contains points in time of all fermenter state transitions from algorithm 1 as well
	as batch IDs
2:	$T_{S,T11}$ and $T_{S,T12}$ contain holding tank state transitions
3:	<b>procedure</b> PROPAGATEBATCHID $(T_{S,FE03},T_{S,T11},,T_{S,T12})$
4:	# Times of all tank filling events:
5:	$T_{Fill,T11} = T_{S,T11}.allBatches.periodOf(filling)$
6:	$T_{Fill,T12} = T_{S,T12}.allBatches.periodOf(filling)$
7:	for each $batchID$ in $T_{S,FE03}$ do
8:	$t_{drain} = batchID.periodOf(draining)$
9:	${f if} \ t_{drain} = { m any}(T_{Fill,T11}) \ {f then}$
10:	Propagate <i>batchID</i> to batch in $T_{S,T11}$
11:	$\mathbf{else \ if} \ t_{drain} = \mathrm{any}(T_{Fill,T12}) \ \mathbf{then}$
12:	Propagate <i>batchID</i> to batch in $T_{S,T12}$
13:	else
14:	Throw Exception $\triangleright$ Indicates error in algorithm as each batch must be
	processed
15:	end if
16:	end for
17:	end procedure

in figure 3) of the case study plant, which requires a more complex approach, namely one state machine model describing the simultaneous evolution on five units.)

# <sup>328</sup> 4.5 Logging of Important Time-Series Values

While this information is not crucial for the identification and quantification of scheduling bottlenecks, values beyond points-in-time can be of relevance to the analyst. Volumes as indicators for size bottlenecks are of evident interest. Still, refined feature engineering is easy once the overall frame has been implemented, and tracking for instance a relative average pH change between two steps is trivial. On the other hand, once the time-steps for machine state changes have been identified, post-hoc extraction of features is similarly easy and it is a matter of taste how to generate the specific data sets.



Figure 2: Gantt chart excerpt with propagation of the batch ID (color). Grey lines indicate level in the tanks. (Fermenter states: 0:idle, 1:filling substrate, 2:autoclaving & waiting for inoculation, 3:fermentation, 4:waiting for transfer, 5:emptying)

# <sup>336</sup> 5 Pharmaceutical Production Plant Case Study

At hand of an industrial production of fermentation-derived antibiotic, the challenges mentioned above are delineated. Furthermore, it is shown that in the case of a strongly capacityleveraged process, local improvements can be identified effectively using visual statistics and domain knowledge. The study is to be of descriptive value, outlining the challenges that are likely to exist in many semi-automatic production facilities currently in operation, while proposing some ways of how to handle them.

# 343 5.1 Process System Description

Figure 3 shows the process in terms of semi-continuous and batch units as well as those entailing strong elements of both. A more detailed description was not compliant with the intellectual property policy of the industrial partner, but this does not harm the analysis in the following. The CIP barrier running through a certain fraction of the downstream

section is also indicated. In the regarded plant, the batch number is logged exclusively for
fermentation units. For all other machines, only time-series data (i.e. flows, pressures, levels, pH) are available on the historian.



Figure 3: Indication of process flowsheet in terms of batch (predominantly holding: 'tank') and flow 'units'. Units 21 and 22 (light orange underlay) with strong aspects of both. Note the structured CIP that passes through a certain fraction of the downstream line sequentially.

#### 351 5.1.1 Application of State Reconstruction Algorithm

The proposed recursive state machine based algorithm is applied, which allows reconstruc-tion of the machine states for an entire production campaign of almost 70 batches with high certainty. This enables taking advantage of the advanced plotting capabilities available in open-source software (here Python). Figure 4 shows a Gantt chart of the production cam-paign with the units from the process flowsheet (figure 3) on the y-axis over date-time on the x-axis. The colour code allows facile visual tracking of a batch through the system, fur-thermore the scaled time-series variable that best characterises the respective process steps on the machines is displayed. The boxes on U1 have been omitted to show the discontinuous nature of this flow unit which may make reliable state identification difficult. As the infor-

mation about unit-activity is implicitly defined both by the level evolution of upstream and
downstream tanks, this induces no loss in informative value. Furthermore, a second indicator
(the level in the wastewater treatment plant) has been added as a dotted line to units T21
and T22. High material inventory in the water treatment plant can delay a step transition
on T21 and T22. However, as the water treatment plant as a resource is shared by several
plants, there is substantial noise and no unambiguous classification of delays was possible.
Visual analysis of some operational patterns with engineers and operators was found to be
insightful, but is not to be discussed in greater detail in this work.



Figure 4: Reconstructed Gantt chart of an entire production campaign with unique colourcode for batches and scaled time-series data (usually flows or volumes) as indicator of process step. Cleaning-in-Place with black underlay for units T31/T32/U3. Last batch of campaign has been excluded.

# 369 5.2 Bottleneck Identification

By mere visual assessment of figure 4, the density of the colour-bars on units T21/T22 and U21/U22 indicates a bottleneck. Especially downstream of these units, long idle periods indicate free capacities. Upstream, the fermenters may exhibit long cycle times. However, this front-end process is easily plannable and long cycle times occur as material is prepared in advance to be ready for downstream processing. In the end this is possible due to overcapacity also on the fermenters.

#### <sup>376</sup> 5.2.1 Bottleneck Identification (Frequentist Statistics)

There are multiple ways to assess capacity at current planning and operating skill. Firstly, it is possible to draw an average over the entire campaign (76.5 days) in which 69 batches have passed through the largest part of the downstream line which gives a capacity of 0.9 batches per day.

Bar-plots showing the effective (normalised w.r.t. number of units) cycle times are a common visual tool for comparing equipment capacities. Figure 5 indicates a strongly leveraged process with a bottleneck around  $T_{21}/T_{22}$  and  $U_{21}/U_{22}$ . Note that here waiting time between batches is not counted, and exclusively processing or waiting with material-in-the-loop is tracked. An equivalent visualisation is shown in figure 6, however expressed in batches per day which was preferred by the industry stakeholders due to its more expressive nature. The average stage cycle time (including the time units wait for material from upstream) amounts to 53.3 hours. Converting to the effective average stage cycle time, a capacity estimate based on the bottleneck can be made and adds up to 

$$C = (24h/d)/(53.3h/2b) = 0.9b/d \quad , \tag{5}$$

<sup>390</sup> b denoting batches. This is a good indication that the Frequentist analysis is meaningful.
<sup>391</sup> A reduction of waiting for upstream material on the bottlenecking units would increase this



Figure 5: Effective cycle times (normalised by number of installed machines), excluding periods of waiting for material-transfer from upstream.



to 1 batch per day. However, this requires substantial operating discipline and is thus both a difficult and risky project. Again, it is not possible to differentiate waiting periods further as there are many process steps with naturally varying durations due to changing slurry/fluid properties, and the re-constructed machine steps do not contain enough information to un-ambiguously characterise the waiting periods. It is known that CIP-procedures throw the downstream-line off of the planned fermentation schedule on a regular basis. Careful exami-nation of the Gantt chart reveals that CIPs of units T31/T32 as well as U3 prohibit passing material on from U21/U22. This delays the already long processing step and furthermore propagates upstream to units T21/T22, which have previously also been identified to have naturally long cycle times. Figure 7 shows the results of an algorithm that classifies cycles on units U21/U22 into CIP-affected and non-CIP-affected (and post-CIP) populations. Despite of large variability, CIP-affected cycles can be clearly distinguished and are substantially delayed, the cycle immediately after a CIP is already unaffected by this.



Figure 7: Effect of Cleaning-in-Place on cycle durations. Indirectly affected denotes the cycle after the CIP-affected cycle has been completed.

#### 405 5.2.2 Bottlenecks in a Transient Scenario

Due to the inability to differentiate inter-unit waiting and include this into the bar plot
(figures 5 and 6), the scenario needs to be assessed in the transient regime. The timeevolutions of the machine capacities are overlaid in figure 8. (Here fermentation has been
omitted as it is known that ample capacity is available.) Units T21/T22 and U21/U22 exhibit
the lowest capacities over the entire campaign. It is known that they are strongly correlated,
furthermore it appears that both can be rate-limiting at different times. Therefore, in the
following a selection of possible debottlenecking projects is identified from process knowledge substantiated with the statistical analysis.



Figure 8: Effective capacities over time for all units but fermentation. Proximity in the process and similar capacities indicate a shared bottleneck on units T21/T22 and U21/U22; all other cycle times lie far below these two throughout the campaign.

# 414 5.3 Retrofit Engineering Projects

It is not a possibility to increase batch size further (avert 'size bottlenecks'). Fermenter volume has been enhanced previously by increasing the height of the tanks, but another increase at this point is not realistic. However, a project aimed at substantially increasing the product concentration in the slurry by adjusting feed composition as well as feeding strategy is ongoing. This constitutes debottlenecking on the biochemical level, which suggests an extension of the classification size/scheduling bottleneck by a quality bottleneck, as it not evident that all downstream unit operations can handle this increase (thinking for instance
about resin capacity in chromatographic units<sup>44</sup>).

Having identified the scheduling bottleneck consisting of an interlinkage of units T21/T22
and U21/U22, it is time to capitalise on the process knowledge of the experienced engineers
for the identification of possible engineering projects.

<sup>426</sup> Firstly, it is desirable to reduce the effect of downstream CIPs. These not only delay the
<sup>427</sup> bottleneck, but also induce substantial operational complexity due to the irregularity arising
<sup>428</sup> in the schedule. Currently, CIPs of U3 block both tanks T31/T32 (figure 9) and therefore also the transmission of material from bottleneck U21/U22 for ca. 12 hours. A reconfiguration of



Figure 9: Strongly delayed material transfer from bottleneck (U21, olive-green batch) due to T31/T32 blockage by U3 CIP.

the CIP piping allows running a CIP on unit U3 with only one of the tanks (there will still be two shorter tank CIPs). This implies that the other tank is free to receive the upstream material-in-waiting, freeing up roughly 12 hours of bottleneck operation once every 6-8 days as dictated by the CIP schedule. This is expected to yield a capacity increase of 0.5 batches
per week for a comparably simple Type-2 project (3.1.3). Again, it must be pointed out that
this reduction in delay is likely to reduce the propagation of delays into the upstream process,
reducing operational complexity for operators due to increased regularity, facilitating future
optimisation projects.

Secondly, aside from these irregular delays, it is desirable to elevate the baseline capacity on the bottlenecking units. Figure 10 shows some refined machine step statistics (anonymized). Steps 4-6 denote the transfer of material from T21/T22 to U21/U22 and therefore take up an equally long amount of processing time on both units. The distinction is drawn as step 4 is largely automatic, whereas step 5 requires substantial manual operation. Delays here arise especially due to challenging fluid properties as a result of variability in the fermentations. In the case of highly viscous slurries, the transfer of material requires a lot of manual re-tuning of set points. This can lead to delays if the operator is not disposable and can create problems in other parts of the process as the operator needs to keep an eye on the procedure. Installation of a new pumping system with a higher degree of automation as a Type-4 project is likely to shorten this step significantly. Furthermore, variability of the step duration will be reduced and the operator be given more capacities to engage in other parts of the process. Roughly, each 5 hours of shortening the procedure will increase capacity by 0.7 batches per week. It is not clear exactly how much time will be saved, but as indicated by figure 11 there is high potential due to extreme delays. (The large tails in steps 2-4 in figure 10 are i.e. due to CIPs.) 

# 454 6 Discussion

Firstly, the case study has confirmed that it is not always possible or justifiable to apply a formal model-based systems engineering approach to optimisation of industrial processes. Limitations in model-building and verification, as well as uncertainty regarding implementability



Figure 10: Granularity of the sub-steps with kernel-smoothed density estimates to facilitate



Figure 11: Distribution of cumulative transfer times (steps 4-6).

especially of projects that require operational discipline are main inhibitors in this. On the other hand it is shown that modern data processing environments can be a viable tool in the incremental optimisation of bio-based processes, especially if the increments have only moderate impact on operations. Statistical means create a more explicit evidence-base than mental models. Furthermore, it has been shown that it is possible to reconstruct necessary cycle time information even in plants without a rigorous monitoring system, as is the case in many semi-automated facilities due to the difficulties that arise in monitoring manual pro-cess steps. The proposed algorithm is closely linked to process and plant structures, which renders it intuitive and easy to maintain. Furthermore, it allows identifying batches that did not follow a standard pattern with high certainty. 

In the regarded scenario, the recursive state machine functioned effectively despite of the uncertain process regime as many input sequences themselves were very reproducible (due to being automated or standardised operating procedures). Augmented by the time-series data from common sensors and domain knowledge, this enabled precise reconstruction of the schedule - it was however connected with a substantial programming effort. Accelerating this

development process should greatly contribute to usability of the proposed methodology. The same applies to an extension of the method which better accommodates or even automat-ically handles irregular sequences or time-series profiles. Bayesian changepoint detection<sup>58</sup> seems to offer a theoretic foundation which can help with both ambitions. Here, thought should be given to balancing programming effort with the workload which may arise in pos-terior validation of the algorithm, which expectedly grows with its flexibility/independence. Utilising a flexible algorithm for detailed analyses within the superstates (which can be re-liably generated by a robust embedding algorithm such as the one presented in this work) might constitute a good trade-off. 

In terms of process optimisation, Amaran et al.'s model-based approach is justified by setting an ambitious future production target. Due to the implied complexity, for instance de-bottlenecking of multiple stages at once calls for a notable level of formality. Still, small projects along the way must not be neglected, especially if they pave the way for these large projects by facilitating or enabling modelling, validation and implementation.

In these small projects, a model-based approach may not always be the correct choice. Again,
besides unknowns on the physiochemical level, modelling may be difficult in the bio-based
industries as

- Machine steps are not tracked in semi-automated facilities (incomplete process monitoring)
  - Production processes are unsteady/irregular which makes validation of the models complicated and costly or even impossible
- Model-uncertainties and complex manual operations can create substantial uncertainty about the goodness of the results after implementation

<sup>496</sup> On the other hand, the amount of products and number of parallel trains are usually quite <sup>497</sup> manageable.

<sup>498</sup> It could be argued that Amaran et al. presuppose that this type of statistical analysis is a

standard operation, but especially in smaller-scale and semi-automated facilities this is likely not so. Furthermore, in industry especially Type-1 and Type-2 problems will often not jus-tify the dedicated development and validation of models, as it may be both too expensive and too time-consuming, calling for simpler approaches. The situation may be different if a digital twin of the plant is available and rigorously maintained. On the other hand, this is still an emerging technology and the economics behind it are in need of further illumination. In general, the value of creating a database as an enabler of rigorous process systems engi-neering should be acknowledge by industrial stakeholders. This calls for investments in new data acquisition and better data contextualisation, but also in integrated manufacturing ex-ecution & control systems, which facilitate the often cumbersome data-collection process.<sup>59</sup> In the above analysis, no performance indicators beyond current practices<sup>8,23,41</sup> are intro-duced. However, a statistical analysis should have its place in a framework directed at especially bio-based batch plant debottlenecking. Modern data processing environments such as Python or R are attractive (cheap, fast, advanced, flexible) as they enable highly ef-ficient analyses as well as visualisations. Thus, the case study should hopefully be of notable practical interest to industrial readers. 

# 515 7 Conclusion

Batch processing is a relevant production paradigm especially in the bio-based industries, and a number of generalisable operational challenges have been shown at hand of an indus-trial case study. While several methodologies for debottlenecking of batch process plants exist in literature, it is likely that applicability in large parts of the bio-based industries is limited. The reasons for that lie in the irregularities that arise as a cause of manual process control, but also from missing monitoring systems (both of biochemical properties as well as machine states). An algorithm has been introduced that is capable of reconstructing the machine states necessary to identify and avert scheduling bottlenecks. Based on visual 

statistical and heuristics, a powerful combination that maybe deserves a mentioning in a flexible framework, promising candidate debottlenecking projects have been identified in the case study plant. The chosen projects are robust and have a positive effect on reproducibility (process stability), and thus bring the plant closer to a state that allows rigorous model-based optimisation. Transforming industrial process plants into predictable entities should be a general ambition both for academic and industrial stakeholders in order to reap the benefits of modern systems engineering tools. While it is a shared endeavour, it seems likely that the academy has to play an orchestrating role in this. 

# **Acknowledgements**

<sup>533</sup> The project received financial support from Innovation Fund Denmark.

# 534 References

<sup>535</sup> (1) FDA, Facts About the Current Good Manufacturing Practices (CGMPs). 2015.

(2) Meyer, H. P.; Minas, W.; Schmidhalter, D. In Industrial Biotechnology: Products and
 Processes; Wittman, C., Liao, J. C., Eds.; Wiley-VCH, 2016.

(3) Birg, L. Pharmaceutical Regulation, Mandatory Substitution, and Generic Competi tion. SSRN Electronic Journal 2015, 241.

(4) Gernaey, K. V.; Cervera-padrell, A. E.; Woodley, J. M. A perspective on PSE in pharmaceutical process development and innovation. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* 2012, 42, 15–29.

(5) Marques, C. M.; Moniz, S.; de Sousa, J. P. Strategic decision-making in the phar maceutical industry: A unified decision-making framework. *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 2018, 119, 171–189.

(6) Litzen, D. B.; Bravo, J. L. Uncover Low-Cost Debottlenecking Opportunities. *Chemical* Engineering Progress 1999, March Ed. (7) Baldea, M. From process integration to process intensification. Computers and Chemical Engineering **2015**, *81*, 104–114. (8) Amaran, S. .; Sharda, B.; Bury, S. J. Targeted Incremental Debottlenecking of Batch Process Plants. Proceedings of the 2016 Winter Simulation Conference. 2016; pp 2924-2934.(9) Petrides, D.; Carmichael, D.; Siletti, C.; Koulouris, A. Biopharmaceutical Process Op-timization with Simulation and Scheduling Tools. *Bioengineering* **2014**, 1, 154–187. (10) Wu, H.; Khan, M.; Hussain, A. Process control perspective for process analytical tech-nology: Integration of chemical engineering practice into semiconductor and pharma-ceutical industries. Chemical Engineering Communications 2007, 194, 760–779. (11) Klatt, K. U.; Marquardt, W. Perspectives for process systems engineering-Personal views from academia and industry. Computers and Chemical Engineering 2009, 33, 536 - 550.(12) Alford, J. S. Bioprocess control: Advances and challenges. *Computers and Chemical* Engineering 2006, 30, 1464–1475. (13) Calabrese, G. S.; Pissavini, S. From Batch to Continuous Flow Processing in Chemicals Manufacturing. AIChE Journal 2011, 57. (14) Bauer, M.; Craig, I. K. Economic assessment of advanced process control - A survey and framework. Journal of Process Control 2008, 18, 2–18. (15) Williams, T. J. In Springer Handbook of Automation; Nof, S. Y., Ed.; Springer Berlin Heidelberg: Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009; pp 5–11. 

(16) Lee, C. K.; Khoo, H. H.; Tan, R. B. Life Cyle Assessment Based Environmental Performance Comparison of Batch and Continuous Processing: A Case of 4-D-Erythronolactone Synthesis. Organic Process Research and Development 2016, 20, 1937–1948.

# <sup>573</sup> (17) Vervaet, C.; Remon, J. P. Continuous granulation in the pharmaceutical industry. <sup>574</sup> Chemical Engineering Science 2005, 60, 3949–3957.

(18) Gutmann, B.; Cantillo, D.; Kappe, C. O. Continuous-flow technology - A tool for
the safe manufacturing of active pharmaceutical ingredients. Angewandte Chemie -*International Edition* 2015, 54, 6688–6728.

(19) Costandy, J. G.; Edgar, T. F.; Baldea, M. Switching from Batch to Continuous Reactors
Is a Trajectory Optimization Problem. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*2019, 58, 13718–13736.

# (20) Teoh, S. K.; Rathi, C.; Sharratt, P. Practical Assessment Methodology for Converting Fine Chemicals Processes from Batch to Continuous. Organic Process Research and Development 2016, 20, 414–431.

<sup>584</sup> (21) Chen, S.; Koirala, Y.; Mannan, M. S. Comparison of batch versus continuous process
<sup>585</sup> in pharmaceutical industry based on safety consideration. 32nd Center for Chemical
<sup>586</sup> Process Safety International Conference 2017, CCPS 2017 - Topical Conference at the
<sup>587</sup> 2017 AIChE Spring Meeting and 13th Global Congress on Process Safety. 2017.

(22) Fernández, I.; Renedo, C. J.; Pérez, S. F.; Ortiz, A.; Mañana, M. A review: Energy recovery in batch processes. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 2012, 16, 2260–2277.

(23) Simon, L. L.; Osterwalder, N.; Fischer, U.; Hungerbühler, K. Systematic retrofit method
 for chemical batch processes using indicators, heuristics, and process models. *Industrial* and Engineering Chemistry Research 2008, 47, 66–80.

(24) Edgar, T. F. Control and operations: When does controllability equal profitability? Computers and Chemical Engineering 2004, 29, 41–49. (25) Kano, M.; Ogawa, M. The state of the art in chemical process control in Japan: Good practice and questionnaire survey. Journal of Process Control 2010, 20, 969–982. (26) Roberge, D. M.; Ducry, L.; Bieler, N.; Cretton, P.; Zimmermann, B. Microreactor technology: A revolution for the fine chemical and pharmaceutical industries? Chemical Engineering and Technology 2005, 28, 318–323. (27) Hollis, A. The importance of being first: Evidence from Canadian generic pharmaceu-ticals. *Health Economics* **2002**, *11*, 723–34. (28) Zydney, A. L. Continuous downstream processing for high value biological products: A Review. Biotechnology and Bioengineering **2016**, 113, 465–475. (29) Lee, S. L.; O'Connor, T. F.; Yang, X.; Cruz, C. N.; Chatterjee, S.; Madurawe, R. D.; Moore, C. M.; Yu, L. X.; Woodcock, J. Modernizing Pharmaceutical Manufacturing: from Batch to Continuous Production. Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation 2015, 10, 191–199. (30) Jungbauer, A. Continuous downstream processing of biopharmaceuticals. Trends in Biotechnology **2013**, 31, 479–492. (31) Chatterjee, S. FDA Perspective on Continuous Manufacturing. IFPAC Annual Meeting. Baltimore, MD, 2012. (32) FDA, Code of Federal Regulations Title 21. 2017; https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/ scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfcfr/CFRSearch.cfm?CFRPart=211. 

(33) Doran, P. M. Bioprocess Development. *Bioprocess Engineering Principles* **2013**, 3–11.

(34) Schaber, S. D.; Gerogiorgis, D. I.; Ramachandran, R.; Evans, J. M.; Barton, P. I.;
Trout, B. L. Economic analysis of integrated continuous and batch pharmaceutical

619

60

manufacturing:	А	case	study.	Industrial	and	Engineering	Chemistry	Research	2011
50, 10083-10092	2.								

(35) Poechlauer, P.; Manley, J.; Broxterman, R.; Gregertsen, B.; Ridemark, M. Continuous
processing in the manufacture of active pharmaceutical ingredients and finished dosage
forms: An industry perspective. Organic Process Research and Development 2012, 16,
1586–1590.

(36) Croughan, M. S.; Konstantinov, K. B.; Cooney, C. The future of industrial bioprocessing: Batch or continuous? *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 2015, 112, 648–651.

(37) Mandenius, C.-F. Recent developments in the monitoring, modeling and control of
 biological production systems. *Bioprocess and biosystems engineering* 2004, 26, 347–
 351.

(38) Mannan, S. Lees' Loss Prevention in the Process Industries: Hazard Identification,
Assessment and Control: Fourth Edition; 2012.

(39) Downs, J. J. In *Plantwide Control: Recent Developments and Applications*; Rangaiah, G. P., Ed.; 2012.

(40) Bauer, M.; Horch, A.; Xie, L.; Jelali, M.; Thornhill, N. The current state of control
loop performance monitoring - A survey of application in industry. *Journal of Process Control* 2016, 38, 1–10.

(41) Calandranis, J.; Petrides, D. P. Analysis and debottlenecking chemical processes of
integrated batch. Computers & Chemical Engineering 2000, 24, 1387 - 1394.

(42) Petrides, D.; Koulouris, A.; Siletti, C. Throughput analysis and debottlenecking of
biomanufacturing facilities. *Chimica oggi* 2002, 5, 22–28.

2
ר ∧
4 5
5
7
/ Q
0
9 10
10
17
12
17
15
16
17
18
10
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(43) Jully, T.; Foo, D.; Yee, C.; Kumaresan, S.; Aziz, R. A. Computer-aided process Design Tools for Debottlenecking a Batch Pharmaceutical Production. *The Institution of Engineers* 2007, 68, 30–37.

(44) Yang, Y.; Farid, S. S.; Thornhill, N. F. Data mining for rapid prediction of facility
fit and debottlenecking of biomanufacturing facilities. *Journal of Biotechnology* 2014, *179*, 17–25.

(45) Tan, J.; Foo, D. C. Y.; Kumaresan, S.; Aziz, R. A. Debottlenecking of a batch pharmaceutical cream production. *Pharmaceutical Engineering* 2006, 26.

(46) Sharda, B.; Bury, S. J. Bottleneck analysis of a chemical plant using discrete event
 simulation. Proceedings - Winter Simulation Conference. 2010.

(47) Monroy, D. F. Z.; Vallejo, C. C. R. Use Cases of Discrete Event Simulation: Appliance
 and Research; 2013.

(48) Schmidtke, D. C. Value Stream Mapping and Discrete Event Simulation for Optimization of Chemical Production Processes. Ph.D. thesis, Fakultät für Chemie der Technischen Universität München, 2015.

(49) Alshekhli, O.; Foo, D. C.; Hii, C. L.; Law, C. L. Process simulation and debottlenecking
for an industrial cocoa manufacturing process. *Food and Bioproducts Processing* 2010, *89*, 528–536.

(50) Tan, M. M.; Andiappan, V.; Wan, Y. Process Debottlenecking and Retrofit of Palm Oil
Milling Process via Inoperability Input-Output Modelling. *MATEC Web of Conferences* **2018**, 152.

(51) Guimarães, A. M. C.; Leal, J. E.; Mendes, P. Discrete-event simulation software se lection for manufacturing based on the maturity model. *Computers in Industry* 2018,
 103, 14–27.

- (52) Pennsylvania, P. M. I. N. S. Organizational Project Management Maturity Model
  (OPM3) : Knowledge Foundation. 2003.
  (53) Goldratt, E. M.; Cox, J. *The Goal: A Process of Ongoing Improvement*; 2004.
  (54) Pegels, C. C.; Watrous, C. Application of the theory of constraints to a bottleneck
- operation in a manufacturing plant. Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management
   2005, 16, 302–11.
- 670 (55) Barrera, M. D. Optimal design and operation of batch processes. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1989.
- (56) Spann, R.; Eliasson Lantz, A.; Gernaey, K. V.; Sin, G. Reference Module in Chemistry,
   Molecular Sciences and Chemical Engineering; Elsevier Inc., 2018; pp 1–17.
- <sup>674</sup> (57) Bähner, F. D.; Santacoloma, P. A.; Huusom, J. K. Optimal operation of parallel dead<sup>675</sup> end filters in a continuous bio-based process. *Food and Bioproducts Processing* 2019,
  <sup>676</sup> 114, 267-75.
- 677 (58) Adams, R. P.; MacKay, D. J. C. Bayesian Online Changepoint Detection. 2007; http:
  678 //arxiv.org/abs/0710.3742.
- (59) De Carlo, F.; Arleo, M. A.; Tucci, M. OEE evaluation of a paced assembly line through
  different calculation and simulation methods: A case study in the pharmaceutical environment. International Journal of Engineering Business Management 2014, 6, 1–11.

# 682 Graphical TOC Entry

