



# Chemical Reaction Engineering Processes Design and Scale-Up Issues in Gas-Liquid Reactions

Author: <sup>1</sup>B.N.PAVAN KUMAR, <sup>2</sup>Dr.B.Sarath Babu

<sup>1,2</sup> Department of Chemical Engineering

<sup>1,2</sup> Sri Venkateswara University College of Engineering, Tirupati, India

## Abstract

Gas-liquid reactions are common in the chemical process industries, forming the cornerstone of processes in hydrogenation, oxidation, chlorination, carbon dioxide capture, and biochemical fermentation. The design and subsequent scale-up of reactors for such systems present unique and complex challenges that extend beyond simple chemical kinetics. The intrinsic linkage of mass transfer with chemical reaction dictates the overall rate and selectivity of the process. This paper provides a comprehensive review of the fundamental principles controlling gas-liquid reaction

engineering, including the critical role of mass transfer parameters ( $k_L a$ ,  $a$ ,  $E$ ), and the application of classical theories such as the film, penetration, and surface renewal models. Furthermore, it delves into the primary reactor configurations stirred tanks, bubble columns, and packed beds highlighting their design considerations. The core of this work focuses on the significant issues encountered during scale-up, namely the misrepresentation of mixing systems, heat transfer limitations, and uneven distribution of phases. Strategies to reduce these challenges, including the use of dimensionless

numbers and advanced modelling techniques, are discussed. The paper concludes that a robust understanding of the interplay between hydrodynamics, mass transfer, and kinetics is

essential for the successful design and scale-up of industrial gas-liquid reactors.

**Keywords:** Gas-Liquid Reactions, Mass Transfer, Reactor Design, Scale-Up, Chemical Reaction Engineering, kLa, Hydrodynamics.

## 1.Introduction

Gas-liquid reactions involve a reactant in the gas phase dissolving into a liquid phase where it reacts, either with a component in the liquid or at the interface. These multiphase systems are critical for a vast array of industrial processes, from the synthesis of bulk chemicals like sulfuric acid and nitric acid to more specialized applications such as the hydroformylation of olefins and aerobic wastewater treatment (Doraiswamy & Sharma, 1984). The engineering of these processes is complicated by the fact that the observed global reaction rate is often not controlled by the intrinsic chemical kinetics alone but by the rate at which the gaseous reactant can be transferred from the bulk gas to the liquid phase where the reaction occurs.

The primary objective of chemical reaction engineering in this context is to design a reactor that maximizes the desired conversion and

selectivity efficiently and safely. This task is challenging at the laboratory scale but becomes profoundly more complex during scale-up to pilot and industrial production scales. Scale-up is not merely a matter of increasing volume; it is a process of maintaining critical performance parameters (e.g., mass transfer rate, mixing time, heat removal) that change non-linearly with size. Failures in scale-up can lead to reduced productivity, unsafe operating conditions, and costly design modifications.

This paper examines the fundamental design principles for gas-liquid reactors and the pervasive issues that arise during their scale-up.

## 2. Fundamental Principles and Theory

The analysis of gas-liquid reactions is built upon the foundation of mass transfer theory coupled with reaction kinetics.

## 2.1 Mass Transfer with Chemical Reaction

The dissolution of a gas (A) into a liquid containing a reactant (B) follows a two-step resistance model:

1. Mass Transfer: Diffusion of A through the gas-film and liquid-film interface.
2. Reaction: Reaction of A in the bulk liquid.

The rate of physical mass transfer is given by:

$$N_A = k_L a (C_A^* - C_{A,L})$$

where  $N_A$  is the volumetric mass transfer rate ( $\text{mol/m}^3\cdot\text{s}$ ),  $k_L$  is the liquid-side mass transfer coefficient ( $\text{m/s}$ ),  $a$  is the specific interfacial area ( $\text{m}^2/\text{m}^3$ ),  $C_A^*$  is the saturation concentration of A at the interface, and  $C_{A,L}$  is the concentration of A in the bulk liquid.

The Hatta number ( $Ha$ ) is a dimensionless number that quantifies the relative rates of reaction and diffusion:

$$\text{Ha} = \frac{\text{Maximum possible reaction rate in film}}{\text{Maximum rate of diffusion through film}} = \frac{\sqrt{D_A k_n C_A^{n-1} C_B^m}}{k_L}$$

where  $D_A$  is the diffusivity of A, and  $k_n$  is the reaction rate constant (Fogler, 2020).

·  $Ha \ll 1$  (Slow Reaction): Reaction occurs

predominantly in the bulk liquid. The rate is kinetically controlled.

·  $Ha > 3$  (Fast Reaction): Reaction occurs entirely within the liquid film. The rate is enhanced by mass transfer.

·  $Ha \gg 1$  (Instantaneous Reaction): Reaction occurs at a sharp plane within the film. The rate is entirely mass transfer controlled.

Theories from Whitman (1923), Higbie (1935), and Danckwerts (1970) with their film, penetration, and surface renewal models, respectively, provide the framework for understanding and estimating  $k_L$ .

## 2.2 Reactor Selection and Design

The choice of reactor is a critical design decision based on the reaction regime ( $Ha$  number), required gas hold-up, and necessary mixing intensity.

1. Stirred Tank Reactors (STRs): The most common laboratory and industrial choice for reactions requiring high mass transfer and good mixing. Agitation controls bubble size ( $a$ ), gas hold-up, and thus  $kLa$ . They are versatile but suffer from high power consumption and complex scaling (Tattersson, 1991).

2. Bubble Columns: Simple vessels where gas is sparged at the bottom. They offer good mass transfer with low operating and maintenance costs. They are ideal for slow reactions and large-scale operations but can suffer from backmixing and chaotic flow patterns.

3. Packed Bed Reactors (Trickle Beds): Liquid trickles down over a packed solid catalyst while gas flows concurrently or counter-currently. They are used for catalytic hydrogenations and oxidations. Design challenges include ensuring uniform liquid distribution and managing catalyst wetting efficiency (Dudukovic, Larachi, & Mills, 1999).

### 3. Scale-Up Issues and Challenges

Scale-up is the process of translating a process from a small, well-controlled laboratory unit to a large, industrial-scale plant. For gas-liquid systems, this process is fraught with difficulties.

#### 3.1 Mixing and Fluid Dynamics

The flow patterns in a large vessel are fundamentally different from those in a small one. In a lab-scale STR, mixing is often nearly perfect (homogeneous). In a large tank, zones of poor mixing can develop, leading to concentration gradients.

Power Input per Unit Volume (P/V): A common but often flawed scale-up criterion. Keeping P/V constant upon scale-up typically results in lower tip speed for the impeller, reducing shear and often leading to larger bubble sizes and lower  $k_La$  (Tatterson, 1991).

- Impeller Tip Speed: Related to shear and bubble breakup. Maintaining constant tip speed can lead to excessively high P/V on a small scale or be impractical on a large scale.

- Mixing Time: Increases significantly with scale. This can lead to regions of high and low concentration of the liquid-phase reactant (B), affecting selectivity for complex reaction networks.

#### 3.2 Mass Transfer ( $k_La$ )

Achieving the same  $k_La$  value at different scales is notoriously difficult. Since  $k_La \propto (P/V)^\alpha (V_s)^\beta$ , where  $V_s$  is the superficial gas velocity, and  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are empirical exponents, scaling requires careful consideration. A small change in operating conditions or geometry can drastically alter  $k_La$ . Poor scale-up can result in a mass transfer-limited large reactor that underperforms laboratory predictions.



### 3.3 Heat Transfer

The surface area-to-volume ratio decreases dramatically upon scale-up. While a lab reactor can easily remove heat through the vessel wall, an industrial reactor requires internal coils or external loops. Inadequate heat removal can lead to hot spots, runaway reactions, reduced selectivity, and safety hazards. Scaling based on constant heat removal capacity per volume is often necessary but challenging to achieve.

### 3.4 Gas Distribution and Hold-up

Achieving uniform gas distribution in a large-diameter vessel is difficult. Maldistribution can lead to poor utilization of the reactor volume, effectively creating stagnant zones. The gas hold-up, which directly affects the interfacial area ( $a$ ), is a function of sparger design, agitation (in STRs), and physical properties. Scaling sparger design is non-trivial.

## 4. Scale-Up Strategies and Mitigation

To overcome these challenges, engineers employ a combination of empirical, semi-empirical, and modern modeling approaches.

1. Dimensional Analysis: Using dimensionless numbers (Reynolds, Froude, Weber, etc.) to maintain dynamic similarity. However, it is impossible to keep all numbers constant

requiring a focus on the most critical parameters.

2. Geometric Similarity: Building larger reactors with the same relative proportions (e.g., D/T impeller to tank diameter ratio) is a common starting point, though it is rarely sufficient alone.

3. Constant Key Parameter Criterion: Identifying and scaling to maintain the parameter most critical to performance (e.g., constant  $kLa$ , constant mixing time, constant tip speed). This often requires trade-offs with other parameters like P/V.

4. Pilot Plants: Operating an intermediate-scale pilot plant is a costly but often essential step to de-risk scale-up, uncover hydrodynamic issues, and validate models.

5. Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD): Advanced CFD modeling is becoming an indispensable tool. It can simulate complex multiphase hydrodynamics, predict velocity profiles, gas hold-up, and  $kLa$  distribution in large-scale vessels, providing insights that are difficult to obtain experimentally (Joshi, Nere, & Rane, 2011).

## 5. Conclusion

The design and scale-up of reactors for gas-liquid reactions remain a central challenge in chemical reaction engineering. The inherent complexity arises from the tight coupling between physical mass transfer rates and chemical kinetics. While fundamental theories provide a strong conceptual framework, the practical transition from laboratory to industrial scale is non-linear and fraught with pitfalls related to mixing, mass transfer, heat transfer, and flow distribution.

Successful scale-up is not a single-step process but a multidisciplinary exercise requiring deep phenomenological understanding, strategic use of pilot plants, and the growing application of advanced computational tools like CFD. There is no universal rule for scale-up; the strategy must be tailored to the specific reaction system and its controlling regime. By focusing on the critical scaling parameters and understanding the compromises involved, engineers can mitigate risks and design efficient, safe, and productive large-scale gas-liquid reaction processes.

## References

1. Danckwerts, P. V. (1970). Gas-Liquid Reactions. McGraw-Hill.
2. Doraiswamy, L. K., & Sharma, M. M. (1984). Heterogeneous Reactions: Analysis, Examples, and Reactor Design, Volume 2: Fluid-Fluid-Solid Reactions. John Wiley & Sons.
3. Dudukovic, M. P., Larachi, F., & Mills, P. L. (1999). Multiphase reactors revisited. Chemical Engineering Science, 54(13-14), 1975-1995.
4. Fogler, H. S. (2020). Elements of Chemical Reaction Engineering (6th ed.). Prentice Hall.
5. Higbie, R. (1935). The rate of absorption of a pure gas into a still liquid during short periods of exposure. Transactions of the AIChE, 31, 365-389.
6. Joshi, J. B., Nere, N. K., & Rane, C. V. (2011). CFD modeling of gas-liquid agitated vessels. Chemical Engineering Research and Design, 89(9), 1583-1595.
7. Tatterson, G. B. (1991). Fluid Mixing and Gas Dispersion in Agitated Tanks. McGraw-Hill.
8. Whitman, W. G. (1923). The two-film theory of gas absorption. Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering, 29(4), 146-148.