

Work and Heat Integration

– a New Field in Process Synthesis and PSE

Haoshui Yu^(a), Chao Fu^(b*), Matias Vikse^(a), Truls Gundersen^(a)

^(a): Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Kolbjoern Hejes vei 1.B, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway.

^(b): SINTEF Energy Research, Kolbjoern Hejes vei 1.B, NO-7491 Trondheim, Norway.

^(*): fuchao83@hotmail.com

Abstract

The extension from Heat Integration and design of Heat Exchanger Networks (HENs) to including heating, cooling and power effects from pressure changing equipment has been referred to as Work and Heat Integration and design of Work and Heat Exchange Networks (WHENs). This is an emerging research area in Process Synthesis and PSE, and WHENs represent a considerably more complex design task than HENs. A key challenge is the fact that temperature changes and pressure changes of process streams are interacting. Changes in inlet temperature to compressors and expanders resulting from heat integration will influence work consumption and production. Likewise, pressure changes by compression and expansion will change the temperatures of process streams, thus affecting heat integration. The state-of-the-art of this new research area including insight, methodologies, tools, opportunities, challenges and literature is presented. Key aspects are illustrated by simple examples while smaller case studies indicate potentials for industrial applications.

Key Words: Process Integration; Heat Integration; Work Integration; Expansion; Compression; WHENs

Background

Improved energy efficiency is regarded by the International Energy Agency (IEA) as well as the European Union (EU) to be in the front line of mitigating carbon emission from fossil fuels and thereby contribute towards more sustainable industrial processes and energy plants. A number of resource efficiencies represent important production goals and have therefore been used as key performance indicators (KPIs) for industrial processes. These KPIs relate to (i) raw materials, (ii) energy, and (iii) equipment, thus affecting both economic and environmental aspects of processing.

The field of designing such efficient processes in a systematic way has been referred to as Process Synthesis¹ (Rudd et al., 1973). Process Systems Engineering (PSE) considers modeling, simulation, optimization, control and operation of production facilities, where the word system clearly indicates a holistic approach. More specifically related to efficiency, the field of Process Integration emerged during the 1980s. The word integration refers to the synergies obtained by matching needs of opposite kinds, such as heating/cooling and expansion/compression. Yet another example is byproducts from one process being used as raw materials in other processes. These efforts are referred to as heat integration, power integration and chemical integration (industrial symbiosis), respectively. The key idea is to match sources with sinks. As an introduction to the topics in this paper, Figure 1 attempts to put the different terms that are used into perspective. Only energy related fields will be discussed, while material related topics will only be briefly mentioned.

Heat Integration and Pinch Analysis

This paper is focusing on energy, and the field of Heat Integration represents a mature field that has been subject to large research efforts and extensive industrial applications during the last 35-40 years. Methodologies and tools developed have been based on thermodynamics, heuristics and optimization, and they have had a nature of being manual or automatic. Of

course, there has also been hybrid approaches. More specifically, Pinch Analysis (combining thermodynamics and heuristics), Mathematical Programming (deterministic optimization) and Meta-Heuristics (stochastic search) are established methodologies for Heat Integration.




Fig. 1 The perspective and hierarchy of energy related terms used in this paper

The concept of a heat recovery Pinch and graphical diagrams such as Composite and Grand Composite Curves form the core of the field of Heat Integration with early contributions from Hohmann² (1971), Huang and Elshout³ (1976), Umeda et al.⁴ (1978) and Linnhoff and Flower⁵ (1978). Perhaps the single most important insight based on the Pinch concept is the decomposition of processes into a heat deficit region above Pinch and a heat surplus region below Pinch⁶ (Linnhoff et al., 1979). This decomposition then provided guidelines for design of Heat Exchanger Networks (HENs) through the Pinch Design Method⁷ (Linnhoff and Hindmarsh, 1983), integration of distillation columns⁸ (Linnhoff et al., 1983) and evaporators⁹ (Smith and Jones, 1990), as well as appropriate placement of heat pumps and heat engines¹⁰

(Townsend and Linnhoff, 1983). Glavič et al.¹¹ (1988) discussed the integration of chemical reactors, however, these are often operated at high temperatures for kinetic reasons, thus endothermic reactors (heat sinks) can normally not utilize available heat below Pinch. Exothermic reactors (heat sources) can provide heat above Pinch, but this is most commonly done in an indirect way using steam as the energy carrier.

The field of Heat Integration only considers heat and temperature, except for the work produced and consumed in heat engines and heat pumps. In the process industries, however, both pressure and temperature of process streams need to be considered and both heat and work are important energy forms. This is the main motivation for developing new methodologies that encapsulate these aspects of industrial processing. The result is a new emerging field of Process Synthesis and PSE referred to as Work and Heat Exchange Networks (WHENs).

Analogies to the Heat Pinch

Before introducing and defining WHENs, it is worth mentioning that a number of tools and methodologies have been developed by using analogies from Heat Integration and HENs. Concepts, representations and graphical diagrams from HENs can be re-used as important design tools in other areas. El-Halwagi and Manousiouthakis¹² (1989) discussed Mass Exchanger Networks (MENs), while Wang and Smith¹³ (1994) used similar ideas for Wastewater Minimization as a start of a new design field referred to as Water Networks. In addition to Heat Pinch, Mass Pinch and Water Pinch, methodologies for Hydrogen Pinch¹⁴ (Alves and Towler, 2002), Oxygen Pinch¹⁵ (Zhelev and Ntlhakana, 1999) and Carbon Emission Pinch¹⁶ (Tan and Foo, 2007) have been developed.

Work Exchange Networks - WENs

In parallel, there has also been some efforts to develop systematic approaches to handle pressure and work in so-called Work Exchange Networks (WENs). Work (or mechanical energy) typically comes in two forms; flow work and shaft work. While flow work can be

recovered (or exchanged) directly, shaft work is recovered directly (expansion and compression on a single shaft) or indirectly (using electricity generator and motor). Cheng et al.¹⁷ (1967) introduced the flow work exchanger and Huang and Fan¹⁸ (1996) later defined the WENs problem as an analogy to HENs. While the flow work exchanger is an interesting concept, pressure changing equipment in the process industries are more typically compressors, pumps, fans, expanders (turbines) and valves. Expanders can be used to run compressors and pumps, either directly by single shaft solutions or indirectly by generators and motors, as mentioned above.




Fig. 2 Source and sink profiles in HENs (a) and WENs (b)

The analogy between HENs and WENs is, however, not very strong. One example is temperature driving forces that are fundamental in HENs (see Figure 2.a), while there are no driving force limitations related to pressure in WENs. In fact, the pressure profiles in a flow work exchanger show crossover as a necessary means to operate the unit (see Figure 2.b). This lack of driving force requirements also applies to shaft work exchange, where for example an expander operating between 4 and 1 bar can be used to drive a compressor operating between 6 and 15 bar. This is the case both for direct (i.e. Single-Shaft-Turbine-Compressor – SSTC) and indirect (i.e. generator and motor) shaft work exchange. In conclusion, for WENs there are no driving force requirements ($\Delta p \geq \Delta p_{\min}$), and thus no work recovery Pinch. The obvious

reason is that pressure based energy is converted into mechanical energy (or power), which is then subsequently used to pressurize another process stream. Since the main focus of this review paper is on WHENs dealing with pressure, temperature, work and heat, methodologies for WENs without considering heat and temperature will only be briefly discussed here, with a few selected references that indicate the different schools of methods.

Brief literature review of Work Exchange Networks

As mentioned above, the WENs field was pioneered by Huang and Fan¹⁸ (1996) who proposed necessary and sufficient conditions for stream matching in networks of flow work exchangers. The outlet pressure of the work source should be lower than the inlet pressure of the work sink, while the inlet pressure of the work source must be higher than the outlet pressure of the work sink, as shown in Figure 2.b. Both thermodynamic and optimization based approaches have been proposed.

Zhou et al.¹⁹ (2011) extended Pinch Analysis to WENs based on flow work exchangers by using the problem table algorithm to determine minimum work utility requirements. Chen and Feng²⁰ (2012) proposed a novel graphical method for constructing Composite Curves in a pressure-work diagram in order to determine the theoretical work target. Liu et al.²¹ (2014) further developed this graphical integration method, where Composite Curves for work sources and sinks are drawn in an $\ln p$ vs. W diagram. They also proposed five rules for optimally matching work sources and sinks. Yet another upgraded graphical method for the synthesis of direct WENs was proposed by Zhuang et al.²² (2017). Finally, Amini-Rankouhi and Huang²³ (2017) proposed a thermodynamic modeling and analysis method for direct work exchange networks to identify the maximum amount of recoverable work by using a matrix of pressure intervals.

Analysis and design of WENs have also been subject to the use of optimization. Razib et al.²⁴ (2012) developed a superstructure for WENs with a corresponding Mixed Integer Non-Linear

Programming (MINLP) model that minimizes total annualized cost. This model can synthesize WENs while considering operational issues such as surging, choking and shaft speed. Du et al.²⁵ (2015) developed an optimization model where compression and expansion ratios are regarded as variables. Their transshipment based model is easy to solve since it is linear. Zhuang et al.²⁶ (2015) used a transshipment model to target minimum utility (work) consumption, while WEN synthesis was approached using a linear programming model assuming isothermal compression and expansion. Later, Zhuang et al.²⁷ (2017) used a stage-wise superstructure with and without stream splits to synthesize direct work exchanger networks with minimum total annualized cost.

Introducing Work and Heat Exchange Networks - WHENs

After introducing Heat Exchanger Networks (HENs) and Work Exchange Networks (WENs), the combined case of Work and Heat Exchange Networks (WHENs) will be thoroughly introduced, defined and reviewed. It is important to realize that HENs and WENs should not be solved independently, since temperature changes and pressure changes of process streams are interacting. The inclusion of heating from compression and cooling from expansion in the heat recovery system is the key element that distinguishes WHENs from HENs and WENs. It also distinguishes WHENs from previous synthesis studies on Heat and Power systems, such as Townsend and Linnhoff¹⁰ (1983) who presented criteria for appropriate placement of heat engines and heat pumps, Colmenares and Seider²⁸ (1987) who developed a Non-Linear Programming (NLP) model for heat and power integration, Yoon²⁹ (1990) who developed models for simultaneous synthesis of utility systems and HENs, Linnhoff and Dhole³⁰ (1992) who presented shaftwork targets for heat and power integration, and Holiastos and Manousiouthakis³¹ (2002) who developed models for minimizing hot, cold and electric utility cost for the design of HENs including heat pumps and heat engines. In all these references to

heat and power integration, it is only the working fluids of the thermodynamic cycles that change pressure.

Problem definition for WHENs

Since WHENs include energy forms with different quality (heat and work), exergy has been used as a common measure. Correspondingly, exergy efficiency is an adequate KPI for energy efficiency. Unfortunately, several exergy efficiencies have been proposed in the literature with varying ability to properly capture the essential features of the energy and exergy transfer processes in a plant³² (Marmolejo-Correa and Gundersen, 2012).

The WHEN synthesis problem can be defined in the general situation as follows: *Given a set of process streams with supply and target states (temperature and pressure), as well as utilities for power, heating and cooling; design a work and heat exchange network of heat transfer equipment such as heat exchangers, evaporators and condensers, as well as pressure changing equipment such as compressors, expanders, pumps and valves.* As a first step, with a focus on energy targeting while handling energy forms with different quality, minimum exergy consumption has been used as the objective function. Of course, the ultimate goal is to identify WHENs with minimum Total Annualized Cost (TAC). The fact that compressors and turbines (expanders) are significantly more expensive pieces of equipment than heat exchangers makes it even more important to move from energy/exergy to economy (cost).

Appropriate Placement of Compressors and Expanders

In WHENs, the interaction between heat and temperature on one hand and work and pressure on the other hand can be described as follows: Changes in inlet temperature to compressors and expanders resulting from heat integration will influence work consumption and production. Likewise, pressure changes by compression and expansion will change the temperatures of process streams, thus affecting heat integration. This is why identifying optimal inlet temperatures to compressors and expanders, also referred to as Appropriate Placement (or

correct integration) of these units, is a key issue in WHENs. While Appropriate Placement is straightforward for equipment such as chemical reactors, distillation columns, evaporators, heat pumps and heat engines, it is considerably more complex for pressure changing equipment such as compressors and expanders. The Appropriate Placement concept is based on Pinch decomposition, however, pressure changes result in temperature changes, especially for gas phase streams. Changes in stream temperatures result in changes in the shape of the Composite and Grand Composite Curves, and thus possibly changes in Pinch location as well as thermal utility requirements. This is the main complicating factor for WHENs that makes it much more challenging to solve as a design problem than HENs.

Developing Insight based on Thermodynamics

Insight related to Appropriate Placement of compressors and expanders has developed gradually. Aspelund et al.³³ (2007) realized that compressors provide heat and should thus be placed (operated) above Pinch in the heat deficit region. Likewise, expanders provide cooling and should be placed below Pinch in the heat surplus region. It should be noticed that these guidelines are in conflict with current industrial practice. This new insight was stated more firmly by Gundersen et al.³⁴ (2009), who suggested that compressors and expanders should be placed (i.e. have inlet temperatures) exactly at the Pinch. As mentioned above, however, pressure changes may result in changes in Pinch location, thus the Appropriate Placement concept becomes less obvious, and more insight was required.

In a series of papers, Fu and Gundersen³⁵⁻³⁸ (2015) proposed Theorems that were based on thermodynamics and proven mathematically for integration of compressors and expanders above and below ambient temperature. The simplified case with only one hot and one cold constant temperature utility was considered, and the chosen objective function was minimum exergy consumption (or maximum exergy production) in order to properly account for the difference in energy quality between heat and work. The main result from these studies is that

only a few inlet temperatures to these units are potential candidates for optimal integration. These are the hot and cold utility temperatures (T_{HU} and T_{CU}), Pinch temperature(s) (T_{PI}) and ambient temperature (T_0), depending on whether the case is compression or expansion and whether the process is above or below ambient temperature.




Fig. 3 Maximum Pinch expansion determined by the Grand Composite Curve³⁶ (Fu and Gundersen, 2015)

This important insight will be illustrated by a simple example where a stream is to be expanded above ambient temperature, i.e. the situation discussed by Fu and Gundersen³⁶ (2015). There are two important variables that determine the optimal inlet temperature for the expander; the cooling duty resulting from expansion if the stream in question is expanded at Pinch temperature, $Q_{exp,PI}$, and the outlet temperature if expansion starts at hot utility temperature, $T_{exp,HU}$. Four cases are possible depending on the values of these two variables, and the minimum cooling requirement, $Q_{C,min}$ (the lumped variable mCp is the product of mass flowrate and specific heat capacity):

1. The simplest case is the rare situation when $T_{\text{exp,HU}} \leq T_0$. Then expansion at hot utility temperature provides an amount of cooling below Pinch, $mCp \cdot (T_{\text{PI}} - T_0)$, that is equal to or greater than any other expansions, while producing a maximum amount of work (*Theorem 4*).
2. A very common situation is when $T_{\text{exp,HU}} > T_0$ and $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} \leq Q_{\text{C,min}}$. Then only Pinch expansion should be used (*Theorem 1*).
3. If $T_{\text{exp,HU}} \geq T_{\text{PI}}$ and $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} > Q_{\text{C,min}}$, then Pinch expansion should be used until external cooling requirements are satisfied. The remaining expansion could be done at T_{HU} or T_0 . These alternatives are equal from an exergy point of view (*Theorem 2*).
4. The most complicated case is when $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} > Q_{\text{C,min}}$ and $T_0 < T_{\text{exp,HU}} < T_{\text{PI}}$. Expansion at hot utility temperature then becomes a strong competitor to Pinch expansion, since it provides some cooling below Pinch while producing more work than Pinch expansion due to a higher inlet temperature to the expander. An iterative procedure is required where Pinch expansion is reduced and expansion at hot utility temperature is increased (*Theorem 3*).

Cases 2 and 3 are, however, more complicated than indicated above. There are cases where expanding a part of the stream (Case 3) or the entire stream (Case 2) at Pinch temperature will create a new Pinch at a lower temperature. Then the stream must be split and a fraction of the stream should be expanded at this new Pinch. Obviously, this situation may have to be repeated several times. The tool to identify the maximum cooling that can be utilized below Pinch from expansion at Pinch is the Grand Composite Curve (GCC), see Figure 3. A number of potential new Pinch candidates exist; however, the new Pinch can be identified as the point on the line from the Pinch point with the steepest slope while touching but not intersecting with the GCC, i.e. point *c* in Figure 3. By extending this line to the outlet temperature from Pinch expansion, $T_{\text{exp,PI}}$, the maximum amount of cooling that can be utilized by Pinch Expansion, $Q_{\text{exp,max}}$, is

identified. The corresponding maximum mCp that can be subject to Pinch expansion is then found by the simple equation $mCp_{\max} = Q_{\text{exp,max}} / (T'_{\text{PI}} - T'_{\text{exp,PI}})$. Here, T' indicates modified temperature that is used in the GCC to be able to represent hot and cold streams in the same diagram while satisfying ΔT_{\min} requirements. The remaining mCp of the stream to be expanded is then routed to an expander operating at the new Pinch temperature, and the procedure is repeated.

Table 1 Integrating compressors and expanders into HENs above and below ambient

Theorem	Expansion Above T_0	Compression Above T_0	Expansion Below T_0	Compression Below T_0
1	If $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} \leq Q_{C,\min}$ $T_{\text{exp,HU}} > T_0$ then use Pinch expansion	If $Q_{\text{comp,PI}} \leq Q_{H,\min}$ $T_{\text{comp,0}} < T_{\text{HU}}$ then use Pinch compression	If $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} \leq Q_{C,\min}$ $T_{\text{exp,0}} > T_{\text{CU}}$ then use Pinch expansion	If $Q_{\text{comp,PI}} \leq Q_{H,\min}$ $T_{\text{comp,CU}} < T_0$ then use Pinch compression
2	If $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} > Q_{C,\min}$ $T_{\text{exp,HU}} \geq T_{\text{PI}}$ then Split and maximize Pinch expansion, remaining expansion at T_{HU} or T_0	If $Q_{\text{comp,PI}} > Q_{H,\min}$ $T_{\text{comp,0}} \leq T_{\text{PI}}$ then Split and maximize Pinch compression, remaining compression at T_0	If $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} > Q_{C,\min}$ $T_{\text{exp,0}} \geq T_{\text{PI}}$ then Split and maximize Pinch expansion, remaining expansion at T_0	If $Q_{\text{comp,PI}} > Q_{H,\min}$ $T_{\text{comp,CU}} \leq T_{\text{PI}}$ then Split and maximize Pinch compression, remaining compression at T_{CU} or T_0
3	If $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} > Q_{C,\min}$ $T_0 < T_{\text{exp,HU}} < T_{\text{PI}}$ then increase HU expansion & reduce Pinch expansion	If $Q_{\text{comp,PI}} > Q_{H,\min}$ $T_{\text{PI}} < T_{\text{comp,0}} < T_{\text{HU}}$ then increase ambient compression & reduce Pinch compression	If $Q_{\text{exp,PI}} > Q_{C,\min}$ $T_{\text{CU}} < T_{\text{exp,0}} < T_{\text{PI}}$ then increase ambient expansion & reduce Pinch expansion	If $Q_{\text{comp,PI}} > Q_{H,\min}$ $T_{\text{PI}} < T_{\text{comp,CU}} < T_0$ then increase CU compression & reduce Pinch compression
4	If $T_{\text{exp,HU}} \leq T_0$ then use HU expansion	If $T_{\text{comp,0}} \geq T_{\text{HU}}$ then use ambient compression	If $T_{\text{exp,0}} \leq T_{\text{CU}}$ then use ambient expansion	If $T_{\text{comp,CU}} \geq T_0$ then use CU compression

Interestingly, expansion below ambient as well as compression above and below ambient have the same four cases as mentioned above with considerable symmetry between the four situations of compression/expansion above/below ambient temperature. The essence of the 16 cases (4 Theorems for each of the 4 situations) is described in Table 1. A manual and iterative procedure has been developed for the 4 cases discussed above (expansion or compression above or below ambient temperature). As mentioned, the GCC is used to determine maximum expansion or compression as well as the identification of new Pinch points that may occur as a result of Pinch expansion or compression. Fu and Gundersen^{39,40} (2016) also discussed the simultaneous use of compression and expansion below and above ambient temperature.

Appropriate Placement of Compressors and Expanders – An illustrative Example

Consider the simple example represented by the stream data provided in Table 2. Two streams are subject to pressure change. Hot stream H1 should be expanded from 3 to 1 bar, while cold stream C1 needs to be compressed from 1 to 2 bar. Ambient temperature and the reference temperature for exergy is assumed to be 288 K. Hot utility is assumed to be available at ambient temperature, thus its exergy value is zero. Polytropic efficiency for compression and expansion is assumed to be 1.0, while the minimum approach temperature (ΔT_{min}) for heat exchange is assumed to be 4 K. Ideal gas is assumed with constant heat capacity ratio $\kappa = c_p / c_v = 1.4$. The objective function is minimum exergy consumption.

Table 2 Stream data for a small illustrative example³⁹ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016)

Stream	T_s (K)	T_t (K)	mC_p (kW/K)	ΔH (kW)	P_s (bar)	P_t (bar)
H1	288	124	2	328	3	1
H2	252	168	4	336	–	–
C1	138	284	3	438	1	2
C2	198	235	7	259	–	–
Hot utility	288	288	–	–	–	–
Cold utility	120	120	–	–	–	–

Before considering pressure change in streams H1 and C1 (referred to as Case 0), minimum hot and cold utility requirements for the specified ΔT_{min} are $Q_{H,min} = 145$ kW and $Q_{C,min} = 112$ kW, while the Pinch temperature is 200 K (in modified temperature; half of ΔT_{min} above the supply temperature of cold stream C2). Three different cases are considered: (1) compression at cold utility temperature (C1) and expansion at hot utility temperature (H1), (2) Pinch compression and expansion, and (3) compression and expansion according to the manual design procedure suggested by Fu and Gundersen³⁹ (2016).

Table 3 Main results for the small illustrative example³⁹ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016)

Cases	0	1	2	3
Hot utility demand (kW)	145	300.2	47.6	9.6
Cold utility demand (kW)	112	193.6	36.0	13.0
Pinch temperature(s) (K)	200	200	140	140; 200; 250
Compression work (kW)	–	81.6	130.2	135.5
Expansion work (kW)	–	155.2	108.8	99.1
Exergy consumption (kW)	–	197.4	71.8	54.6

The results shown in Table 3 clearly illustrates the advantage of compression and expansion at the Pinch temperature (Case 2). Compared to Case 1 where stream H1 is expanded at ambient temperature (which is equal to the hot utility temperature) and stream C1 is compressed at cold utility temperature, hot utility requirements are reduced from 300.2 to 47.6 kW while cold utility requirements are reduced from 193.6 to 36.0 kW. It should be noticed that Case 1 indeed is representative for current industrial practice. Compression work increases from 81.6 to 130.2 kW, while expansion work decreases from 155.2 to 108.8 kW. From a situation with net production of work (73.6 kW) the use of Pinch expansion and compression results in a net consumption of work (21.4 kW). For this sub-ambient example, cold utility represents a considerable exergy consumption. Hot utility has zero exergy since its temperature is equal to the reference temperature (ambient) for exergy. Considering the arrangement as a refrigeration cycle, cold utility is reduced by 157.6 kW by investing in 95.0 kW of power. Thus, this

“refrigeration cycle” has a COP of 1.66. It should be noticed, however, that no new equipment is introduced, since according to the stream data in Table 2, streams H1 and C1 should be subject to pressure change. The essence of the scheme is that heat from compression and cooling from expansion are utilized to improve heat recovery. Of course, the sizes of the compressor and the expander will change. It should also be noticed that exergy consumption is reduced from 197.4 kW (Case 1 – industrial practice) to 71.8 kW (Case 2 – Pinch compression and expansion), i.e. a reduction of 63.6%.

Table 4 Key complexity properties for the small illustrative example

Property	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
Exergy Consumption (kW)	197.4	71.8	54.6
# of Pinch points	1	1	3
# of compressors	1	1	2
# of expanders	1	1	2
# of heat exchangers	8	7	10
# of stream splits	0	1	4

By following the manual design procedure based on the new insight about Appropriate Placement of compressors and expanders, it is possible (Case 3) to reduce exergy consumption even further. This comes, however, at the expense of significantly increased network complexity and obviously a considerable increase in investment cost. Details about the required equipment for the three cases are provided in Table 4. The final Work and Heat Exchange Network for Case 2 with only Pinch compression and expansion is shown in Figure 4. As indicated in this figure, the compression of C1 and expansion of H1 both start at the original Pinch temperature of 200 K. As a result, however, the Pinch temperature will change to 140 K. The lesson to be learned from this small illustrative example is that Pinch compression and expansion considerably improves the energy efficiency of the process. Even though energy (and exergy) efficiency can be improved even further by following the mentioned manual design procedure when Pinch points change, the savings in this case cannot justify the

modified temperatures in order to be able to draw hot and cold streams in the same diagram. When discussing compression and expansion at Pinch temperature, Fu and Gundersen³⁵⁻³⁸ (2015) used the original identity of the streams to determine which Pinch temperature (hot or cold) should be used. Since process streams in WHENs may change identity (hot or cold) due to pressure changes in the process between supply state and target state, Fu et al.⁴¹ (2017) emphasized that it is the identity of the stream segment subject to compression or expansion that should be used to determine the right Pinch temperature (hot or cold) at which compression or expansion should start, not the identity of the original (or parent) stream.

Optimal Thermodynamic Paths for Process Streams

Determining the presence and sequence of equipment for heating, cooling, compression and expansion can be referred to as the problem of identifying the optimal Thermodynamic Path for a process stream from its supply state to its target state. In HENs, it makes sense to classify process streams into hot and cold streams. Likewise, in WENs, it makes sense to classify process streams into high pressure (HP) and low pressure (LP) streams. In WHENs, however, such classifications cannot be made. In the most general case, the thermodynamic path for a process stream from its supply state to its target state may involve all four operations of heating, cooling, compression and expansion. As a result, process streams can temporarily be both hot and cold and they can be both high and low pressure. Even a process stream with the same supply and target pressure could be considered compressed and expanded. In such cases, the process stream acts as a utility or a working fluid in a thermodynamic cycle generating power (heat engine), heating (heat pump) or cooling (refrigeration).

The pressure-temperature diagrams in Figure 5 are used to illustrate different thermodynamic paths for a process stream that has supply (s) and target (t) temperature (T) and pressure (p) as follows: $T_t > T_s$ and $p_t > p_s$. For simplicity, only compression is considered for pressure manipulation in this case. Figure 5.a shows the case when the stream is first compressed. Then

depending on the outlet temperature from the compressor, the stream must be heated (i), cooled (iii), or the target temperature could be reached by coincidence through the compression (ii). Similar situations may occur if the stream is heated before compression (Figure 5.b) or the stream is cooled before compression (Figure 5.c). In total, even for this simple case with a process stream that is only subject to compression (no expansion), there are 9 different thermodynamic paths. When adding expansion as well as multi-stage operation with interstage heating or cooling, it is obvious that the complexity of the design problem becomes unmanageable using a manual procedure.




Fig. 5 Alternative Thermodynamic Paths for process streams from supply to target state:

(a) compress first, (b) heat and then compress, and (c) cool and then compress

The problem of identifying optimal thermodynamic paths for the process streams was therefore formulated as an optimization problem by Yu et al.⁴³ (2018). The optimization model is based on the superstructure in Figure 6, which illustrates a stream to be compressed. In fact, this superstructure represents all the 9 possible thermodynamic paths shown in Figure 5. With the stream split arrangement, even combinations of the 9 basic thermodynamic paths are possible. As a result, the different stream branches can be compressed at different temperatures, such as the original Pinch and new Pinch temperatures that may appear. The unknown heat exchangers before the compressors represent pre-heating or pre-cooling before compression as well as direct compression (if the heat exchanger duty is zero). Likewise, the unknown heat exchangers

after the compressors will adjust the stream temperature to reach the target. It is important to emphasize that for multiple hot and cold streams, the optimal inlet temperatures to pressure changing equipment are unknown and subject to optimization. As already discussed, the Pinch point(s) will change as a result of compression and expansion, thus the Appropriate Placement concept cannot be used ahead of optimization to identify the inlet temperatures to the compressors in Figure 6.




Fig. 6 Superstructure for the simple case of compression only⁴³ (Yu et al., 2018)

This means that the identities of the 6 sub-streams indicated in Figure 6 are unknown; they can be both hot and cold independent of the identity of the parent stream that should be heated or cooled from T_s to T_t . Duran and Grossmann⁴⁴ (1986) developed a Pinch location algorithm that was used for simultaneous process optimization and heat integration where the flowrates and temperatures are unknown. The problem described by the superstructure in Figure 6 has another complicating feature, since the stream identities are unknown. Yu et al.⁴⁵ (2018) extended the Duran-Grossmann model to allow for variable stream identities so that the model could be used to address WHENs problems. This was realized by adding binary variables to the model formulation. Both the original and the extended Duran-Grossmann algorithm use max operators to identify the Pinch point, and this causes non-smoothness in the model with corresponding problems for gradient based optimization algorithms. Yu et al.⁴⁵ (2018) presented and compared three alternative reformulations to overcome this problem; smooth

approximation, explicit disjunction and direct disjunction. For the two last alternatives, both big-M and convex hull formulations were tested. Process stream identities have also been treated as variables in a recent study by Onishi et al.⁴⁶ (2018). Their study presents a multistage superstructure including several stages of heat and work integration. It is indicated that global optimality can be obtained based on robust and effective model formulations.

Of course, the superstructure in Figure 6 is far from representing all possible structural alternatives, however, this will be discussed in a later section where challenges and future work are outlined. At this point, it could be mentioned that both compression and expansion should be considered, and to be even more realistic, multi-stage compression and expansion with heating or cooling between the stages should be included in the superstructure. It is important to notice that independent of the richness of the superstructure, as soon as the thermodynamic path is identified for all process streams, the remaining problem to be solved is the classical heat exchanger network design and optimization problem, for which there are a large number of different methodologies and tools available. This two-stage approach for WHENs is similar to Pinch Analysis for HENs, where performance targets are established ahead of the design stage.

A Comprehensive Review of WHENs

Based on the previous sections, the new field of Work and Heat Exchange Networks has been introduced, defined and to some extent illustrated. More detailed illustrations will be provided in the next section where the potential of this new methodology is indicated through small industrial case studies. Similar to neighboring engineering fields, methodologies for WHENs are based on combined use of thermodynamics (Pinch Analysis), heuristics (rules of thumb) and optimization (Mathematical Programming or Stochastic Search algorithms). As discussed earlier, the complexity of the WHENs problem is considerably larger than the HENs problem. This means that even small literature problems with 4-6 streams become unmanageable using

manual design procedures. As a result, some kind of optimization has to be applied, while thermodynamics and heuristics typically are used to narrow the scope, to assist in building adequate superstructures, and to guide the search for optimal solutions.

Since combined approaches are most common, it does not make sense to classify WHEN methodologies into groups. Thus, the following review will discuss the different contributions to the field in some kind of historical order. Focus will be on approaches used, representations, types of superstructures, model types, computing requirements and application areas. The limitations of the various studies are also mentioned to indicate areas of further research. More details can be found in the section Challenges and Future Research.

Setting the Stage – some early Contributions

Aspelund et al.³³ (2007) proposed a graphical methodology referred to as the Extended Pinch Analysis and Design (ExPANd) procedure, where traditional Pinch Analysis is extended with pressure considerations and Exergy Analysis. A set of 10 heuristic rules for manipulating the pressure of process streams were proposed to utilize pressure based energy (or exergy). They found that even the pressure of a stream with the same supply and target pressure can be manipulated in order to reduce total irreversibilities. This adds richness to the problem definition, but complicates the design of WHENs significantly. The ExPANd procedure was applied to develop a novel process for offshore liquefaction of natural gas⁴⁷ (Aspelund and Gundersen, 2009). Gundersen et al.³⁴ (2009) studied the integration of compression heat for a small heat recovery problem. By manipulating the inlet temperature to the compressor, they found in one case study that total exergy consumption was minimized when the inlet temperature to the compressor was exactly at the Pinch temperature. In another case study, the same result was obtained, however, they also observed that the Pinch temperature was changing as a result of compression at different temperatures. At the same time, Kansha et al.⁴⁸ (2009) developed the self-heat recuperation methodology that involves the use of compression and

expansion to improve heat recovery. Without any thermodynamic arguments, they arrived at a design for a small case study where the compressor and the expander both have inlet temperatures equal to the Pinch temperature.

Wechsung et al.⁴⁹ (2011) combined Pinch Analysis, Exergy Analysis, and Mathematical Programming to synthesize heat exchanger networks below ambient temperature considering compression and expansion of process streams. A state space model incorporating a Pinch operator (heat integration) and a pressure operator (work integration) was proposed. The Pinch operator is based on the simultaneous heat integration and process optimization model proposed by Grossmann et al.⁵⁰ (1998). The resulting Mixed Integer Non-Linear Programming (MINLP) model was applied to the offshore LNG process studied by Aspelund and Gundersen⁴⁷ (2009). In contrast to the model for identification of an optimal thermodynamic path discussed earlier⁴³ (Yu et al., 2018), Wechsung et al.⁴⁹ (2011) applied a fixed thermodynamic route from supply to target state. Nevertheless, it was demonstrated that the optimization formulation was capable of generating reasonable designs for different objective functions and constraints. The optimization model was also able to reproduce the design obtained by Aspelund and Gundersen⁴⁷ (2009). The simplifying assumption of ideal gas behavior was made.

An emerging new Research Field – more recent Contributions

Onishi et al.⁵¹ (2014) proposed a mathematical model for the simultaneous synthesis of work and heat exchange networks. The stage-wise superstructure of Yee and Grossmann⁵² (1990) for HENs was adapted to synthesize heat exchanger networks considering work recovery. This model used Generalized Disjunctive Programming (GDP) and was reformulated as an MINLP problem. The superstructure is based on the pre-fixed pressure manipulation route of expansion and compression proposed by Wechsung et al.⁴⁹ (2011). Onishi et al.⁵³ (2014) also proposed a multi-stage superstructure for HENs, wherein the pressure manipulation of process streams is

used to enhance heat integration. It was shown that the integration of work and heat reduces the need for thermal utilities in HENs significantly.

Starting from a different angle, Onishi et al.⁵⁴ (2014) proposed another superstructure for Work Exchange Networks (WENs) considering heat integration. The proposed WEN superstructure is composed of several stages of compression or expansion for each pressure-changing stream. The high-pressure streams only pass through pressure reduction equipment, while low-pressure streams are only subject to compression. However, as shown by Aspelund and Gundersen⁴⁷ (2009) and Wechsung et al.⁴⁹ (2011), allowing both compression and expansion for streams may lead to lower irreversibilities in the system. Therefore, the monotonic nature is a limitation of the superstructure by Onishi et al.⁵⁴ (2014). Heat integration is performed between the compression and expansion stages of the Work Exchange Network. Heaters and coolers were used to reach the target temperature for high-pressure and low-pressure streams respectively. The inherent assumption that high-pressure and low-pressure streams after pressure change are considered to be cold and hot streams respectively is another limitation of this superstructure. As a result, some promising configurations will not be identified. Onishi et al.⁵⁵ (2014) also established an MINLP optimization model for WHEN synthesis with focus on how to arrange the rotating equipment. Their model allows the use of several Single-Shaft-Turbine-Compressor (SSTC) units operating at different rotational speed, which is an obvious advantage compared to having all rotating equipment on the same shaft and with the same rotational speed.

The series of papers by Fu and Gundersen³⁵⁻³⁸ (2015) was thoroughly discussed earlier, thus only highlights will be repeated here. New insight was established for the Appropriate Placement of compressors and expanders both above and below ambient temperature. The main outcome of their work is that optimal inlet temperatures to compressors and expanders,

assumed to be part of the heat recovery problem, are limited to the following set of temperatures:

- Expansion above ambient: hot utility, Pinch or ambient temperature
- Compression above ambient: Pinch or ambient temperature
- Expansion below ambient: Pinch or ambient temperature
- Compression below ambient: cold utility, Pinch or ambient temperature

In these studies, it was assumed that ambient temperature acted as cold utility above ambient and hot utility below ambient. Only one hot and one cold utility were included, both assumed to be at constant temperature. This new insight was formulated as a set of 4 Theorems and used to establish a manual and iterative design procedure with extensive use of the Grand Composite Curve⁵⁶ (Fu and Gundersen, 2015). The objective function was to minimize exergy consumption (or maximize exergy production). A small case study with 5 process streams, where 2 streams are subject to pressure change shows 38.5% reduction in exergy consumption by maximum utilization of Pinch compression and expansion. A more thorough discussion about integration of compressors and expanders below and above ambient is provided by Fu and Gundersen^{39,40} (2016). While exergy is used to handle heat and work in a consistent way, it should be mentioned that cost does not always follow the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics. This will be further discussed later. The mentioned manual design procedure was applied to three carbon capture processes⁵⁷ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016). Two of these are presented in some detail in the next section. A novel sensible heat pump was also developed where expander and compressor inlet temperatures are based on the manual design procedure⁵⁸ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016). The optimal compression ratio is determined by mathematical analysis while minimizing exergy consumption.

Marmolejo-Correa and Gundersen⁵⁹ (2016) proposed a new design method combining heuristic rules from the ExPANd procedure and the above mentioned insight about Appropriate

Placement of compressors and expanders. The resulting design methodology is particularly useful for processes operating below and across ambient temperature. The main novelty is that exergy analysis is performed at the conceptual stage of design, rather than being used as a post-design tool. An exergy cascade and a new exergy diagram are proposed to target the requirement, rejection, destruction and recovery of exergy. The procedure only considers single stage pressure manipulation, and the use of heuristic rules makes it difficult to apply to large-scale problems while guaranteeing optimal solutions.

Based on the study by Onishi et al.⁵⁴ (2014), Huang and Karimi⁶⁰ (2016) proposed a similar Work and Heat Exchange Network (WHEN) superstructure consisting of two distinct, but interconnected networks. One network is exclusively for heat integration, and the other is for work integration. The main difference from the work of Onishi et al.⁵⁴ (2014) is the superstructure that allows for the flexibility of selecting heaters or coolers at the end of the HEN superstructure. Onishi et al.⁵⁴ (2014) had fixed heaters for high-pressure streams (assumed to be cold streams) and coolers for low-pressure streams. Huang and Karimi⁶⁰ (2016) compared their model with the one by Onishi et al.⁵⁴ (2014) and showed that their model has fewer variables, fewer and/or tighter constraints, tighter relaxations, fewer nonlinear terms, better numerical stability, faster solutions, and better objective function values. However, some unrealistic assumptions were made by Huang and Karimi⁶⁰ (2016) in their case studies, such as high and constant hot utility temperature of 680 K resulting in optimistic efficiencies for the turbines. In addition, their model had the same limitation regarding the assumption of high/low pressure streams being cold/hot streams before entering the WEN stage. The purpose of this assumption is to boost the power generation from high-pressure streams and to reduce the power consumption for low-pressure streams. This is in line with the assumption that mechanical energy (work) is more valuable than thermal energy (heating/cooling), which is not always correct, especially in sub-ambient processes.

Onishi et al.⁶¹ (2015) proposed a new mathematical model for the retrofit of Heat Exchanger Networks considering pressure recovery of process streams. The proposed multi-stage superstructure allows additional heat transfer area to existing heat exchangers, as well as the purchase of new heat exchangers and pressure manipulators. Later, Onishi et al.⁶² (2017) proposed a new multi-objective mathematical model for optimal WHEN synthesis considering both environmental impacts and economic performance based on the superstructure proposed by Onishi et al.⁵⁴ (2014). The LCA-based Eco-indicator 99 methodology is chosen to evaluate the environmental effects. This mathematical model can determine a set of alternative Pareto-optimal solutions to support decision-makers towards more environment-friendly and cost-effective WHENs. This paper is the first study considering the conflicting environmental and economic objective functions in WHENs.

Uv⁴² (2016) proposed a new model with and without using the thermodynamic insight for WHEN synthesis developed by Fu and Gundersen³⁵⁻³⁸ (2015). By including this insight, it is possible to fix the inlet and outlet temperatures for pressure changing units at specific temperatures. As a result, the optimization model reduces to a simple LP model. However, the model is only suitable for targeting and cannot design optimal WHENs.

Vikse et al.⁶³ (2017) discussed and compared the three different optimization models for WHENs proposed by Wechsung et al.⁴⁹ (2011), Huang and Karimi⁶⁰ (2016) and Uv⁴² (2016). They noticed that all three models share the common problem of having equations that are not differentiable everywhere, thus Vikse et al.⁶³ (2017) proposed to use recent non-smooth algorithms to deal with these problems. These algorithms will be discussed later.

Zhuang et al.⁶⁴ (2017) proposed a step-wise WHEN synthesis methodology, combining mathematical programming and heuristic rules. The method first synthesizes a direct WEN based on a transshipment model. To remove small load compressors and expanders and thereby reduce equipment cost, heat exchangers are introduced to substitute small load pressure change

equipment and then adjust the load of direct work exchangers. Five rules and three strategies are proposed to integrate heat exchange equipment into direct work exchange networks. With the heuristic and manual elements in the procedure, optimal network configuration cannot be guaranteed. In addition, the method appears to be rather complicated to implement.

Zhuang et al.⁶⁵ (2018) proposed a model for simultaneous synthesis of WHENs based on a superstructure considering thermodynamic and economic factors. First, a model to determine the hot or cold identity of process streams is developed based on exergy analysis. Then, an economic analysis is performed by formulating an MINLP model to optimize the sequence of work and heat integration, minimizing total annual cost (TAC).

Deng et al.⁶⁶ (2017) proposed a systematic method for synthesizing WHENs based on Pinch Analysis. A pressure Pinch is proposed in a similar way as the temperature Pinch. The method is applied to a rectisol process in the coal-water slurry gasification section of an ammonia plant. Unfortunately, this method can only deal with liquid streams, and since the temperature effect of pressure change is neglectable for liquid streams, the WEN has little effect on the HEN synthesis.

Based on a state space superstructure, Liao et al.⁶⁷ (2017) developed a process network design for effluent gas recovery at sub-ambient temperature. The superstructure contains operators for the HEN, pressure and separation. To recover the effluent gas, the flashing temperature and pressure should be within certain ranges. Compressors and turbines are considered in the condensing block and the cryogenic separation block respectively. To avoid rigorous thermodynamic calculations and still guarantee the accuracy, empirical correlations are adopted to calculate the thermodynamic properties of the effluent gas streams.

As an application of WHENs in industry, Zhang et al.⁶⁸ (2018) investigated the optimal design of the hydrogenation system in a refinery. They established an NLP model to determine the

optimal inlet and outlet temperatures of compressors while simultaneously considering compression work and HEN utilities.




Fig. 7 An advanced WHEN superstructure⁶⁹ (Nair et al., 2018)

Nair et al.⁷⁰ (2017) proposed a generalized framework for WHENs based on a very rich superstructure and an MINLP model. A more detailed presentation of this approach is provided by Nair et al.⁶⁹ (2018). Streams are not pre-classified as hot/cold or high/low pressure. Pressure change is allowed for non-pressure changing streams, and vapor-liquid phase change can be handled. This framework is applied successfully to a propane-propylene separation process and a simplified offshore natural gas liquefaction process. At present, this methodology appears to be the most advanced WHENs tool, and the developed superstructure is shown in Figure 7. The reported computing times for the mentioned case studies are considerable, primarily caused by a large number of binary variables. Based on this work, Nair and Karimi⁷¹ (2018) investigated the synergy between work and heat for holistic energy integration. The advantage of treating stream identities as unknown variables was demonstrated.

The most recent contribution from Onishi et al.⁴⁶ (2018) was briefly mentioned earlier in the section on Optimal Thermodynamic Paths for Process Streams and the discussion about unknown stream identities. They used their previous HENs/WENs superstructure with TAC as objective function. The identities (hot or cold, high pressure or low pressure) of the streams are treated as variables. Stream splitting is not included in the superstructure. Yu et al.⁴³ (2018) illustrates that the performance of WHENs can be improved with compression (or expansion) of stream branches from different temperatures in their case studies.

Rademacher et al.⁷² (2018) investigated the effect of electricity prices on the design of WHENs. The concept of reconfigurable design was introduced and demonstrated through a case study. They compared and analyzed the optimal configurations of WHENs during off-peak, mid-peak and on-peak periods. The authors introduced the term WHEN “suprastructure” to indicate a reconfigurable flowsheet that can modify each optimal configuration in an ad-hoc fashion to have more common equipment for the modified configurations. The objective is to minimize capital investment.

The work by Yu et al.^{43,45} (2018) was thoroughly presented earlier, and will not be detailed here. A superstructure was developed for identifying optimal thermodynamic paths for process streams, where the corresponding optimization model used an extension of the Pinch location algorithm by Duran and Grossmann⁴⁴ (1986), capable of handling unknown stream identities. As a continuation of Fu et al.⁷³ (2017), Yu et al.⁷⁴ (2018) discussed opportunities and challenges in WHENs, both from a methodology and an application point of view. Both Pinch based and Mathematical Programming based methods are discussed. Applications of WHENs are illustrated by an offshore LNG process, a post-combustion carbon capture process, and a sensible heat pump for industrial heat recovery.

It should be noticed that the WHENs problem has been further extended to include mass exchange. Dong et al.⁷⁵ (2014) developed a state space model for the simultaneous integration

of heat, mass and pressure exchange networks. In order to optimize HENs, MENs and WENs simultaneously, exergoeconomic analysis was used as a unified criterion for the three different networks. The proposed state space model performed well for the synthesis of water distribution networks with integrated MENs, HENs and WENs. However, since pressure change of water hardly causes temperature change, the HENs and WENs are weakly related, and the interaction between them was neglected. Dong et al.⁷⁶ (2015) extended their previous study to hydrogen distribution networks considering pressure and heat recovery. It was shown that simultaneous integration of work and heat reduces energy consumption and cost significantly.

Finally, it should be mentioned that Yu and Gundersen⁷⁷ (2017) provided a brief review of the research contributions to WENs and WHENs, while Fu et al.⁷⁸ (2018) provided a comprehensive reference list when they described Work and Heat Integration (WHI) as an emerging research area. The main motivation behind the current paper has been to introduce WHI as a new field in Process Synthesis and PSE. While the paper has included most of the relevant literature, it should not be regarded as a regular review paper. Thus, focus has been on describing established insight based on thermodynamics, discussing current limitations, and to illustrate opportunities for industrial applications.

Illustrative Examples

The emerging methodologies for Work and Heat Exchange Networks are expected to find applications in a large number of processes where both thermal and mechanical energies are important. In particular, there is an expectation that the recent developments in this field will increase the use of Process Integration in sub-ambient processes, and thereby enable the design of significantly more efficient low temperature processes. This does not mean that improvements cannot be made in processes operating above ambient temperature, in fact the two small industrial applications presented in this section are indeed above ambient processes.

The manual design procedure⁴⁰ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016) based on Appropriate Placement of compressors and expanders are used to derive the design solutions for the two case studies.

Membrane Separation of Air for Oxy-Combustion Processes

This example illustrates the case where both compression and expansion are involved in heat integration, and the details are provided in Fu and Gundersen⁵⁷ (2016). Figure 8 shows the original process (referred to as Case A) as it is described in literature⁷⁹ (DOE/NETL, 2008). An Ion Transport Membrane (ITM) operating at high pressure (14 bar) and high temperature (800°C) is used. Ambient air is compressed in four stages with interstage cooling to minimize compression work, then pre-heated by the effluent N₂ stream, before it reaches the required inlet temperature to the ITM (800°C) by a natural gas combustor. The thermal energy in the O₂ depleted N₂ stream is then recovered by preheating air, while the mechanical energy is recovered by expanding the stream to ambient pressure. The heat exchanger is specified in such a way that the outlet temperature from the expander exactly reaches ambient temperature (15°C) when expanding from 14 to 1 bar.




Fig. 8 Original flowsheet for membrane separation of air⁵⁷ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016)

By using the earlier mentioned manual design procedure that is based on the new insight about Appropriate Placement of compressors and expanded, with guidelines provided in Table 1, the improved process (from an energy point of view) shown in Figure 9 can be established (referred to as Case B). Near isothermal compression (four stages with intercooling) is replaced by

adiabatic compression. As a result, heat at high temperature from compression can be recovered in the pre-heating process rather than being wasted to cooling water. In this case the heat exchanger is specified by the need for a minimum approach temperature of 50°C. The two process alternatives are compared in Table 5.




Fig. 9 Improved flowsheet for membrane separation of air⁵⁷ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016)

Table 5 Key results for the air separation example⁵⁷ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016)

Property	Case A	Case B
Compression work (kW)	29,350	41,140
Expansion work (kW)	23,419	30,902
Net work consumption (kW)	5,931	10,238
Heating demand (kW)	27,815	10,275

The performance comparison in Table 5 between Cases A and B shows that net work consumption increases by 4,307 kW, however, the heating demand is reduced by 17,540 kW. Assuming that the thermal efficiency of a natural gas based power plant is 55%, the reduced heating demand in Case B (i.e. natural gas for the combustor) can be used to generate 9,647 kW of work. This means that net work consumption is reduced from 5,931 kW to 591 kW (10,238 – 9,647), i.e. a 90% reduction. Thus, in this case it was not necessary to use exergy arguments to demonstrate improved energy efficiency.

Two-stage membrane process for capturing CO₂

This example is related to post-combustion carbon capture in a power plant, where a two-stage membrane process is used to separate CO₂ from N₂ in the exhaust gas⁸⁰ (Zhao et al., 2010). As indicated in Figure 10, the permeate from the first stage (Mem1) is further separated in a second stage (Mem2). The feed to both stages are at 8 bar and 25°C. Inter-stage and after-stage coolers are not shown in order to keep the flowsheet simple. The retentate from both stages are expanded to 1 bar for work recovery. The process in Figure 10 without integration will be referred to as Case A. The work recovery can, however, be increased by pre-heating the retentate in the combustion air pre-heater. This design with integration will be referred to as Case B and is shown in Figure 11.




Fig. 10 Original flowsheet for carbon capture by a two-stage membrane process⁵⁷ (Fu and Gundersen, 2016)

The results in Table 6 shows that it is only expander Exp1 that is affected by the design modification. More work is produced in this expander due to integration of the retentate stream with flue gas in the air preheater. Notice that the retentate from the first membrane is split and expanded at two different temperatures. The improvement in specific energy consumption for the carbon capture process is 12.9%.

Industrial Requirements

The current WHEN methodologies have varying but in general low realism when it comes to solving industrial problems. Ultimately, the approaches for WHENs must address as many as possible of the following issues: (i) multiple hot/cold utilities, (ii) gliding temperature utilities such as flue gas, hot oil circuits, etc., (iii) multi-stage compression and expansion, (iv) variable pressure ratios for multi-stage operation, (v) phase change, (vi) rigorous thermodynamic models, and (vii) realistic efficiencies for compressors and expanders.

Focus may well be on energy efficiency; however, the ultimate objective should be to minimize Total Annualized Cost (TAC). It should be noticed that shifting focus from energy to economy will make the mathematical models considerably more complex. One example is the need for binary variables to represent cost equations with a fixed charge term. Another example is that economy of scale type cost laws introduce non-convexities. There are also other challenges such as sizing of equipment for cost calculations and all the uncertain factors in cost evaluations.

In addition, industrial requirements related to operability, controllability, maintainability, flexibility and reliability must be considered when suggesting solutions that involve higher levels of Process Integration. One of the main insights from WHENs is to operate compressors at high (above Pinch) temperature and expanders at low (below Pinch) temperature. This is the opposite of current industrial practice, and practical issues related to operating rotating machinery in these temperature ranges must be addressed. This is, however, mainly a task for the vendors.

Finally, WHENs should of course be optimized together with the rest of the background process, since important interactions exist between the core process (reactors and separators), the work and heat recovery system, and the utility system for heating, cooling and power.

Challenges in Methodologies

Methodologies have been proposed for WHENs that are based on thermodynamics (Pinch and Exergy Analyses), optimization (Mathematical Programming and Stochastic Search) and heuristics (Rules of Thumb). As argued in this paper, the complexity of WHENs requires some use of mathematical optimization. The role of thermodynamics and heuristics is to narrow the scope, to assist in building adequate superstructures, and to guide the search for optimal solutions.

Based on thermodynamics, new insight has been developed related to the Appropriate Placement of compressors and expanders in heat recovery systems. Unfortunately, the proposed Theorems and the corresponding manual and iterative design procedure are only applicable to rather simplified situations. Thus, a major challenge in WHENs is to extend this insight to more complex cases that are closer to industrial reality. With multi-stage operation of compressors and expanders, new degrees of freedom become available that can be used to reduce thermodynamic losses related to heat transfer. The total pressure ratio can be distributed among the stages in such a way that heating or cooling resulting from pressure manipulations will better match the requirements of the Grand Composite Curve.

When using optimization for WHENs, a number of challenges must be dealt with. As always in Process Synthesis and Process Integration, decisions related to selection and sequence of equipment result in the use of binary (0,1) variables. The problem size and the optimization search in a Branch and Bound tree grow exponentially with the number of binary variables. The other major challenge for these optimization formulations is the fact that the model equations are non-linear and non-convex. This means that most optimization algorithms will fail to identify the global optimum and end up in local optima.

Irrespective of using thermodynamics or optimization, there are features in the HENs field that would be most valuable in WHENs. One such feature is the concept of establishing best

performance targets ahead of design. Some of the proposed methodologies for WHENs are more related to targeting than actual design. Another issue is the fact that compressors and expanders are considerably more expensive and complex pieces of equipment than heat exchangers. Procedures should therefore be developed that enable the removal of low duty compressors and expanders by paying a penalty in thermal utilities and heat transfer area. This would be similar to the use of Heat Load Loops and Paths in Pinch Analysis for removing low duty heat exchangers.

As described earlier, the optimal thermodynamic paths for streams from supply state to target state may involve all four operations of heating, cooling, compression and expansion. Thus, any future WHENs method must be able to handle unknown stream identities (hot/cold).

It should also be mentioned that as long as exergy is used to handle energy forms of different quality, such as heat and work, a challenge is to avoid using the Carnot equations to establish the exergy of heat. This means that reversible processes are assumed, and the value or quality of heat is over-estimated. Thus, some kind of correction factor is required to better balance work and heat. Of course, this problem will disappear when moving to economy focused methods minimizing TAC.

Another important topic in the use of optimization for WHENs is the development of sufficiently rich but still efficient superstructures. The superstructure of Nair et al.⁶⁹ (2018) shown in Figure 7 is an example of a very rich superstructure, but the reported computing times even for fairly small problems indicate that it is not very efficient. Further research on superstructures is expected. One very recent and quite promising superstructure that may be applicable to WHENs is the one presented by Li et al.⁸¹ (2018). A so-called block superstructure is used for Process Synthesis with automated flowsheet generation and optimization.

New Paradigms for Modeling and Optimization

As mentioned above, the two main challenges in the use of mathematical optimization for design of WHENs are related to binary variables (combinatorial explosion) and non-convex models (local optima). There is a massive amount of research reported to address these issues, however, so far without any real breakthrough. One additional feature with models for WHENs that causes problems for gradient based optimization methods is the presence of discontinuities in nature (e.g. when passing a phase boarder) and in models (e.g. the use of max operators). New developments in the area of nonsmooth analysis may well form the basis for a new paradigm for modeling and optimization that may prove valuable in the field of WHENs. Two areas that may prove successful are the handling of discontinuities and the avoidance of using binary variables in the models.

As discussed several times in this paper, methods for WHENs trying to utilize concepts from HENs often arrive at the point where thermal utilities must be obtained for the case with variable temperatures and even possibly unknown stream identities. This can be achieved by so-called Pinch location algorithms. The model that obtains the best scaling in terms of the number of process streams is the NLP formulation by Duran and Grossmann⁴⁴ (1986). However, the formulation includes nonsmooth elements (max operators) for locating the Pinch point, resulting in a formulation that is not differentiable everywhere. Smooth approximations have frequently been used to deal with non-differentiabilities. However, the choice of parameters for smooth approximations is non-trivial, and may affect both the condition and accuracy of the formulation⁵⁰ (Grossmann et al., 1998).

Alternatively, there are extensions to the concept of derivatives that are applicable to certain classes of nonsmooth functions. One such generalized derivative is the Clarke generalized Jacobian for locally Lipschitz continuous functions⁸² (Clarke, 1990). A difficulty with using elements of the Clarke Jacobian, however, is that these elements follow calculus rules (e.g. the

chain rule) as inclusions rather than as equations. As a result, they are impractical to calculate for most composite functions. Another generalized derivative for functions that satisfy conditions for lexicographic (L-)smoothness as described by Nesterov⁸³ (2005) are lexicographic (L-)derivatives. The L-derivatives have been proven to be just as useful elements in nonsmooth numerical methods as the Clarke generalized Jacobian⁸⁴ (Khan and Barton, 2014). The lexicographic directional (LD-)derivative is the equivalent extension of the directional derivative to that of L-smooth functions. The LD-derivatives are calculated by taking the higher order directional derivatives sequentially in directions indicated by the columns of the directions matrix **M**. Furthermore, LD-derivatives follow sharp calculus rules and can be calculated for composite functions using an automatic differentiation framework for L-smooth functions⁸⁵ (Khan and Barton, 2015). An extensive review on evaluating LD-derivatives and their applications is provided by Barton et al.⁸⁶ (2017).

Flowsheet optimization using LD-derivatives for sensitivity calculations have already been applied to liquefied natural gas (LNG) processes. Liquefaction processes for natural gas exhibit strong resemblance to work and heat exchange networks, in that they mainly consist of compressors and a liquefaction part. The large temperature span from ambient temperature to about -160°C along with small temperature differences in the heat exchangers make natural gas liquefaction processes challenging to analyze. Small driving forces are a result of heat exchange at very low temperatures where thermodynamic irreversibilities become large. In particular, conventional state-of-the-art process simulators lack rigorous checks to avoid temperature crossovers in multistream heat exchangers, and a feasible operating condition must therefore be determined through a manual iterative approach. Consequently, a simulation and optimization tool was developed using a nonsmooth flowsheeting strategy. The model includes a reformulation for preventing temperature crossovers⁸⁷ (Watson et al., 2015) when using the simultaneous optimization and heat integration algorithm by Duran and Grossmann⁴⁴ (1986).

Additional nonsmooth equations are included for correct phase detection of the process streams⁸⁸⁻⁹⁰ (Watson et al., 2017 and Watson and Barton, 2017). The resulting simulation model was applied to single mixed refrigerant (SMR) and dual mixed refrigerant (DMR) processes^{91,92} (Vikse et al., 2018) using a nonsmooth Newton solver. Later, optimization was included using IPOPT⁹³ (Raghunathan and Biegler, 2005). Despite assumptions of twice differentiable objective functions and constraints, IPOPT provided good results when using LD-derivatives for sensitivity information, as long as the dual feasibility criterion is relaxed⁹⁴ (Watson et al. 2018).

Concluding Remarks

The field of Work and Heat Exchange Networks (WHENs) has received considerable attention during the last five years. A total of 36 publications from the period 2014-2018 have been discussed in this paper, while the number of publications before 2014 is only 4. In order to provide a relevant background for the emerging field of WHENs, some key publications from neighboring fields such as Heat Exchanger Networks (HENs), Work Exchange Networks (WENs) and Heat and Power systems have been included.

Since compressors and expanders are used in WHENs to reduce the use of thermal utilities, there are strong similarities to heat pumps and refrigeration cycles. However, methodologies for WHENs take a Process Systems Engineering approach, where heat pumps and refrigeration cycles are designed as an integral part of the process and its heat recovery system. In fact, the working fluids for heat pumps and refrigeration cycles may be regular process streams.

While WHEN methodologies have considerable potential for industrial applications and even innovations, there are a number of challenges that must be addressed in future research. These challenges have been thoroughly outlined in this paper, and they are related to both industrial realism and features of the design methodologies. Future use of the new paradigm for modeling and optimization based on nonsmooth analysis is expected in the field of WHENs.

Acknowledgements

This publication has been funded by HighEFF – Centre for an Energy Efficient and Competitive Industry for the Future. The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the Research Council of Norway and user partners of HighEFF, an 8 year Research Centre under the FME-scheme (Centre for Environment-friendly Energy Research, 257632/E20).

References

1. Rudd DF, Powers GJ, Siirola JJ. *Process synthesis*: Prentice-Hall; 1973.
2. Hohmann EC. *Optimum networks for heat exchange*. PhD thesis, University of Southern California, 1971.
3. Huang F, Elshout RV. Optimizing the heat recovery of crude units. *Chemical Engineering Progress*. 1976;72(7):68-74.
4. Umeda T, Itoh J, Shiroko K. Heat exchange system synthesis. *Chemical Engineering Progress*. 1978;74:70-76.
5. Linnhoff B, Flower JR. Synthesis of heat exchanger networks: I. Systematic generation of energy optimal networks. *AIChE Journal*. 1978;24(4):633-642.
6. Linnhoff B, Mason DR, Wardle I. Understanding heat exchanger networks. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*. 1979;3(1-4):295-302.
7. Linnhoff B, Hindmarsh E. The pinch design method for heat exchanger networks. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 1983;38(5):745-763.
8. Linnhoff B, Dunford H, Smith R. Heat integration of distillation columns into overall processes. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 1983;38(8):1175-1188.
9. Smith R, Jones PS. The optimal design of integrated evaporation systems. *Heat Recovery Systems and CHP*. 1990;10(4):341-368.

10. Townsend DW, Linnhoff B. Heat and Power Networks in Process Design. Part I: Criteria for Placement of Heat Engines and Heat Pumps in Process Networks. *AIChE Journal*. 1983;29(5):742-748.
11. Glavič P, Kravanja Z, Homšak M. Heat integration of reactors—I. Criteria for the placement of reactors into process flowsheet. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 1988;43(3):593-608.
12. El-Halwagi MM, Manousiouthakis V. Synthesis of mass exchange networks. *AIChE Journal*. 1989;35(8):1233-1244.
13. Wang YP, Smith R. Wastewater minimisation. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 1994;49(7):981-1006.
14. Alves JJ, Towler GP. Analysis of refinery hydrogen distribution systems. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2002;41(23):5759-5769.
15. Zhelev TK, Ntlhakana JL. Energy-environment closed-loop through Oxygen Pinch. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*. 1999;23:S79-S83.
16. Tan RR, Foo DCY. Pinch analysis approach to carbon-constrained energy sector planning. *Energy*. 2007;32(8):1422-1429.
17. Cheng CY, Cheng SW, Fan LT. Flow work exchanger. *AIChE Journal*. 1967;13(3):438-442.
18. Huang YL, Fan LT. Analysis of a work exchanger network. *Industrial & engineering chemistry research*. 1996;35(10):3528-3538.
19. Zhou H, Liu G, Feng X. Problem table method for work exchange network with efficiency considered. *Journal of Chemical Industry and Engineering (China)*. 2011;62(6):1600-1605.

20. Chen H, Feng X. Graphical Approach for Targeting Work Exchange Networks. *International Journal of Chemical, Molecular, Nuclear, Materials and Metallurgical Engineering*. 2012;6(8):716-720.
21. Liu G, Zhou H, Shen R, Feng X. A graphical method for integrating work exchange network. *Applied Energy*. 2014;114:588-599.
22. Zhuang Y, Liu L, Zhang L, Du J. Upgraded graphical method for the synthesis of direct work exchanger networks. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2017;56(48):14304-14315.
23. Amini-Rankouhi A, Huang YL. Prediction of Maximum Recoverable Mechanical Energy via Work Integration: A Thermodynamic Modeling and Analysis Approach. *AIChE Journal*. 2017;63(11):4814-4826.
24. Razib MS, Hasan MMF, Karimi IA. Preliminary synthesis of work exchange networks. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*. 2012;37:262-277.
25. Du J, Zhuang Y, Liu LL, Li JL, Fan J, Meng QW. Synthesis of indirect work exchanger network based on transshipment model. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2015;37:1139-1144.
26. Zhuang Y, Liu L, Li J, Fan J, Teng J, Du J. Synthesis of work exchange network based on transshipment model. *Chemical Industry & Engineering Progress*. 2015;37:1139-1144.
27. Zhuang Y, Liu L, Du J. Direct Work Exchange Networks Synthesis of Isothermal Process Based on Superstructure Method. *Chemical Engineering Transaction*. 2017;61:133-138.
28. Colmenares TR, Seider WD. Heat and power integration of chemical processes. *AIChE Journal*. 1987;33(6):898-915.

29. Yoon H-JA. *Heat and work integration in the synthesis of chemical plants*, PhD Thesis, Department of Chemical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1990.
30. Linnhoff B, Dhole VR. Shaftwork targets for low-temperature process design. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 1992;47(8):2081-2091.
31. Holiastos K, Manousiouthakis V. Minimum hot/cold/electric utility cost for heat exchange networks. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*. 2002;26(1):3-16.
32. Marmolejo-Correa D, Gundersen T. A comparison of exergy efficiency definitions with focus on low temperature processes. *Energy*. 2012;44(1):477-489.
33. Aspelund A, Berstad DO, Gundersen T. An Extended Pinch Analysis and Design procedure utilizing pressure based exergy for subambient cooling. *Applied Thermal Engineering*. 2007;27(16):2633-2649.
34. Gundersen T, Berstad DO, Aspelund A. Extending pinch analysis and process integration into pressure and fluid phase considerations. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*. 2009;18:33-38.
35. Fu C, Gundersen T. Integrating compressors into heat exchanger networks above ambient temperature. *AIChE Journal*. 2015;61(11):3770-3785.
36. Fu C, Gundersen T. Integrating expanders into heat exchanger networks above ambient temperature. *AIChE Journal*. 2015;61(10):3404-3422.
37. Fu C, Gundersen T. Sub-ambient heat exchanger network design including compressors. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 2015;137:631-645.
38. Fu C, Gundersen T. Sub-ambient heat exchanger network design including expanders. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 2015;138:712-729.
39. Fu C, Gundersen T. Appropriate placement of compressors and expanders in sub-ambient processes. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2016;38:1767-1772.

40. Fu C, Gundersen T. Correct integration of compressors and expanders in above ambient heat exchanger networks. *Energy*. 2016;116, Part 2:1282-1293.
41. Fu C, Uv PM, Nygreen B, Gundersen T. Compression and expansion at the right pinch temperature. *Chemical Engineering Transaction*. 2017;57:1939-1944.
42. Uv PM. *Optimal design of heat exchanger networks with pressure changes*, MSc Thesis, Department of Industrial Economy and Technology Management, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, 2016.
43. Yu H, Fu C, Vikse M, He C, Gundersen T. Identifying optimal thermodynamic paths in work and heat exchange network synthesis. *AIChE Journal*. 2018; <https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.16437>
44. Duran MA, Grossmann IE. Simultaneous optimization and heat integration of chemical processes. *AIChE Journal*. 1986;32(1):123-138.
45. Yu H, Vikse M, Gundersen T. Comparison of reformulations of the Duran-Grossmann model for work and heat exchange network (WHEN) synthesis. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2018;43:489-494.
46. Onishi VC, Quirante N, Ravagnani MASS, Caballero JA. Optimal synthesis of work and heat exchanger networks considering unclassified process streams at sub and above-ambient conditions. *Applied Energy*. 2018;224:567-581.
47. Aspelund A, Gundersen T. A liquefied energy chain for transport and utilization of natural gas for power production with CO₂ capture and storage—Part 1. *Applied Energy*. 2009;86(6):781-792.
48. Kansha Y, Tsuru N, Sato K, Fushimi C, Tsutsumi A. Self-heat recuperation technology for energy saving in chemical processes. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2009;48(16):7682-7686.

49. Wechsung A, Aspelund A, Gundersen T, Barton PI. Synthesis of heat exchanger networks at subambient conditions with compression and expansion of process streams. *AIChE Journal*. 2011;57(8):2090-2108.
50. Grossmann IE, Yeomans H, Kravanja Z. A rigorous disjunctive optimization model for simultaneous flowsheet optimization and heat integration. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*. 1998;22:S157-S164.
51. Onishi VC, Ravagnani MASS, Caballero JA. Simultaneous synthesis of heat exchanger networks with pressure recovery: Optimal integration between heat and work. *AIChE Journal*. 2014;60(3):893-908.
52. Yee TF, Grossmann IE. Simultaneous optimization models for heat integration—II. Heat exchanger network synthesis. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*. 1990;14(10):1165-1184.
53. Onishi VC, Ravagnani MASS, Caballero JA. MINLP Model for the Synthesis of Heat Exchanger Networks with Handling Pressure of Process Streams. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2014;33:163-168.
54. Onishi VC, Ravagnani MASS, Caballero JA. Simultaneous synthesis of work exchange networks with heat integration. *Chemical Engineering Science*. 2014;112:87-107.
55. Onishi VC, Ravagnani MASS, Caballero JA. MINLP Optimization Algorithm for the Synthesis of Heat and Work Exchange Networks. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2014;33:115-120.
56. Fu C, Gundersen T. Appropriate placement of compressors and expanders in above ambient processes. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*. 2015;45:643-648.
57. Fu C, Gundersen T. Heat and work integration: Fundamental insights and applications to carbon dioxide capture processes. *Energy Conversion and Management*. 2016;121:36-48.

58. Fu C, Gundersen T. A Novel Sensible Heat Pump Scheme for Industrial Heat Recovery. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2016;55(4):967-977.
59. Marmolejo-Correa D, Gundersen T. Process Design Methodology for Energy - Efficient Processes Operating Below and Across Ambient Temperature. *AIChE Journal*. 2016;62(7):2324-2340.
60. Huang K, Karimi IA. Work-heat exchanger network synthesis (WHENS). *Energy*. 2016;113:1006-1017.
61. Onishi VC, Ravagnani MASS, Caballero JA. Retrofit of heat exchanger networks with pressure recovery of process streams at sub-ambient conditions. *Energy Conversion and Management*. 2015;94:377-393.
62. Onishi VC, Ravagnani MASS, Jiménez L, Caballero JA. Multi-objective synthesis of work and heat exchange networks: Optimal balance between economic and environmental performance. *Energy Conversion and Management*. 2017;140:192-202.
63. Vikse M, Fu C, Barton PI, Gundersen T. Towards the Use of Mathematical Optimization for Work and Heat Exchange Networks. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*. 2017;61:1351-1356.
64. Zhuang Y, Liu L, Liu Q, Du J. Step-wise synthesis of work exchange networks involving heat integration based on the transshipment model. *Chinese Journal of Chemical Engineering*. 2017;25(8):1052-1060.
65. Zhuang Y, Zhang L, Liu L, Meng Q, Du J. Simultaneous Synthesis of WHEN based on Superstructure Modelling considering Thermodynamic and Economic Factors. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2018;44:1033-1038.
66. Deng JQ, Cao Z, Zhang DB, Feng X. Integration of energy recovery network including recycling residual pressure energy with pinch technology. *Chinese Journal of Chemical Engineering*. 2017;25(4):453-462.

67. Liao Z, Tu G, Huang Z, Jiang B, Wang J, Yang Y. Optimal process design for recovering effluent gas at subambient temperature. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2017;144:130-141.
68. Zhang Y, Li J, Zhang Q. Simultaneous optimization of power consumption and heat exchange network in refinery hydrogenation system. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2018;44:1123-1128.
69. Nair SK, Rao HN, Karimi IA. Framework for Work-Heat Exchange Network Synthesis (WHENS). *AIChE Journal*. 2018;64(7):2472-2485.
70. Nair SK, Rao HN, Karimi IA. Framework for Work-Heat Exchange Network Synthesis. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*. 2017;61:871-876.
71. Nair SK, Karimi IA. Exploiting the Synergy between Work and Heat for Holistic Energy Integration. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2018;44:403-408.
72. Rademacher M, Liu Y, El-Farra NH, Palazoglu A. Optimal Configuration of Work-Heat Exchanger Networks (WHEN) in the Presence of Demand Response Objectives. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2018;44:1813-1818.
73. Fu C, Vikse M, Gundersen T. Challenges in Work and Heat Integration. *Chemical Engineering Transactions*. 2017;61:601-606.
74. Yu H, Fu C, Gundersen T. Work and Heat Exchange Networks – Opportunities and Challenges. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2018;44:481-486.
75. Dong R, Yu Y, Zhang Z. Simultaneous optimization of integrated heat, mass and pressure exchange network using exergoeconomic method. *Applied Energy*. 2014;136:1098-1109.
76. Dong R, Yu Y, Zhang Z. Optimization of Hydrogen Distribution Network Considering Pressure and heat recovery. *Energy Procedia*. 2015;75:1147-1152.

77. Yu H, Gundersen T. Review of Work Exchange Networks (WENs) and Work and Heat Exchange Networks (WHENs). *Chemical Engineering Transactions*. 2017;61:1345-1350.
78. Fu C, Vikse M, Gundersen T. Work and heat integration: An emerging research area. *Energy*. 2018;158:796-806.
79. DOE/NETL. Pulverized coal oxy-combustion power plants. Washington D.C.:DOE/NETL. 2008;2007/1291.
80. Zhao L, Riensche E, Blum L, Stolten D. Multi-stage gas separation membrane processes used in post-combustion capture: Energetic and economic analyses. *Journal of membrane science*. 2010;359(1):160-172.
81. Li J, Demirel SE, Hasan MMF. Process synthesis using block superstructure with automated flowsheet generation and optimization. *AIChE Journal*. 2018;64(8):3082-3100.
82. Clarke FH. *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*. Siam; Philadelphia, 1990.
83. Nesterov Y. Lexicographic differentiation of nonsmooth functions. *Mathematical programming*. 2005;104(2-3):669-700.
84. Khan KA, Barton PI. Generalized derivatives for solutions of parametric ordinary differential equations with non-differentiable right-hand sides. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*. 2014;163(2):355-386.
85. Khan KA, Barton PI. A vector forward mode of automatic differentiation for generalized derivative evaluation. *Optimization Methods and Software*. 2015;30(6):1185-1212.
86. Barton PI, Khan KA, Stechlinski P, Watson HAJ. Computationally relevant generalized derivatives: theory, evaluation and applications. *Optimization Methods and Software*. 2017:1-43.

87. Watson HAJ, Khan KA, Barton PI. Multistream heat exchanger modeling and design. *AIChE Journal*. 2015;61(10):3390-3403.
88. Watson HAJ, Vikse M, Gundersen T, Barton PI. Reliable flash calculations: Part 1. Nonsmooth inside-out algorithms. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2017;56(4):960-973.
89. Watson HAJ, Vikse M, Gundersen T, Barton PI. Reliable Flash Calculations: Part 2. Process flowsheeting with nonsmooth models and generalized derivatives. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2017;56(50):14848-14864.
90. Watson HAJ, Barton PI. Modeling phase changes in multistream heat exchangers. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*. 2017;105:207-219.
91. Vikse M, Watson HAJ, Gundersen T, Barton PI. Versatile Simulation Method for Complex Single Mixed Refrigerant Natural Gas Liquefaction Processes. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*. 2017;57(17):5881-5894.
92. Vikse M, Watson HAJ, Barton PI, Gundersen T. Simulation of a Dual Mixed Refrigerant LNG Process using a Nonsmooth Framework. *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. 2018;44:391-396.
93. Raghunathan AU, Biegler LT. An interior point method for mathematical programs with complementarity constraints (MPCCs). *SIAM Journal on Optimization*. 2005;15(3):720-750.
94. Watson HAJ, Vikse M, Gundersen T, Barton PI. Optimization of single mixed-refrigerant natural gas liquefaction processes described by nondifferentiable models. *Energy*. 2018;150:860-876.