

# Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

## Recent Work

### **Title**

Thermodynamics of Wax Precipitation in Petroleum Mixtures

### **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9cb4w8ss>

### **Authors**

Lira-Galeana, C.  
Firoozabadi, A.  
Prausnitz, John M.

### **Publication Date**

1995-02-01



# Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## CHEMICAL SCIENCES DIVISION

Submitted to AIChE Journal

### Thermodynamics of Wax Precipitation in Petroleum Mixtures

C. Lira-Galeana, A. Firoozabadi, and J.M. Prausnitz

February 1995



REFERENCE COPY |  
Does Not |  
Circulate |  
Bldg. 50 Library.

LBL-36816

## **DISCLAIMER**

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

## Thermodynamics of Wax Precipitation in Petroleum Mixtures

C. Lira-Galeana\* and A. Firoozabadi

Reservoir Engineering Research Institute  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

and

John M. Prausnitz

Department of Chemical Engineering  
University of California, Berkeley

and

Chemical Sciences Division  
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

February 1995

\*Instituto Mexicano del Petróleo, Eje Central L. Cárdenas 152, Col. San Bartolo Atepehuacán, C.P. 07730; Deleg. G.A. Madero, Mexico City, Mexico.

All correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to A. Firoozabadi.

This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Chemical Sciences Division, of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098. A fellowship was provided by CONACYT, DEPFQ-UNAM and the Mexican Institute of Petroleum (IMP), Mexico City, Mexico.

# **THERMODYNAMICS OF WAX PRECIPITATION IN PETROLEUM MIXTURES**

**C. Lira-Galeana and A. Firoozabadi  
Reservoir Engineering Research Institute  
Palo Alto, CA 94304**

**and**

**John M. Prausnitz  
Chemical Engineering Department, University of California, Berkeley  
and Chemical Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory,  
Berkeley, CA 94720**

**Topical Heading: Thermodynamics.**

**Keywords: Multisolid wax, thermodynamic modeling, EOS.**

---

**C. Lira-Galeana is at the Instituto Mexicano del Petróleo, Eje Central L. Cárdenas 152, Col. San Bartolo Atepehuacán, C.P. 07730; Deleg. G.A. Madero, Mexico City, Mexico.**

**All correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to A. Firoozabadi.**

**Abstract:**

A thermodynamic framework is developed for calculating wax precipitation in petroleum mixtures over a wide temperature range. The framework uses the experimentally-supported assumption that precipitated wax consists of several solid phases; each solid phase is described as a pure component or pseudocomponent that does not mix with other solid phases. Liquid-phase properties are obtained from an equation of state. Calculated wax-precipitation data are in excellent agreement with experimental results for binary and multicomponent hydrocarbon mixtures, including petroleum.

## Introduction

The broad volatility and melting-point range of hydrocarbon components found in petroleum causes formation of vapor, liquid and solid phases in response to changes in pressure, temperature or composition. When the temperature falls, heavy hydrocarbon components in the liquid and vapor may precipitate as wax crystals. In the petroleum industry, wax precipitation is undesirable because it may cause plugging of pipelines and process equipment. Wax precipitation is an old problem (Fagin, 1945; Goldman and Nathan, 1957; Ford et al. 1965) but only recently have attempts been made to develop a thermodynamic description.

Published methods for describing wax precipitation are often in poor agreement with experimental data; they tend to overestimate the amount of wax at temperatures below the cloud-point temperature, which is the temperature where wax first begins to precipitate. Computational tools based on regular-solution theory of mixtures as well as on equations-of-state have been proposed to model wax precipitation (cf. Won, 1986, 1989; Hansen et al. 1988; K.S. Pedersen et al. 1991; Pedersen, 1993; Erickson et al. 1993). All of these methods assume that all the compounds that precipitate from the liquid or vapor form a *solid-solution*. However, recent spectroscopic and calorimetric studies by Snyder et al. (1992, 1993, 1994) and W.B. Pedersen et al. (1991) suggest that large hydrocarbons are mutually insoluble in the solid state.

To illustrate previous work, Fig. 1 shows the essential thermodynamic equations for a three-phase flash calculation for a waxy crude oil mixture assuming that only one solid phase is present; that phase is assumed to be a solid solution. At

fixed temperature and pressure, a liquid phase ( $l$ ) may coexist in equilibrium with a vapor phase ( $v$ ) and a solid phase ( $s$ ). At equilibrium, it is necessary that, for every component  $i$

$$f_i^v = f_i^l = f_i^s, \quad i=1,2,\dots,N \quad (1)$$

where  $f$  is the fugacity and  $N$  is the number of components. An equation-of-state (EOS) can be used to describe the vapor phase. The liquid phase can either be described by an activity-coefficient model or by an EOS. The solid solution is often described by an activity-coefficient model (Prausnitz et al. 1986).

For vapor-liquid equilibria, it is common practice to use K factors, where  $K_i^{vl} = y_i / x_i^l$ ;  $y_i$  is the mole fraction in the vapor phase and  $x_i^l$  is the mole fraction in the liquid phase. It can readily be shown that  $K_i^{vl} = \phi_i^l / \phi_i^v$ , where  $\phi$  is the fugacity coefficient as found from an EOS.

For solid-liquid equilibria, there is an analogous K-factor:  $K_i^{sl} = x_i^s / x_i^l$ . It can readily be shown that

$$K_i^{sl} = \frac{\gamma_i^l}{\gamma_i^s} \left( \frac{f^l}{f^s} \right)_{pure\ i} \quad (2)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the activity coefficient. At any temperature and pressure, the ratio  $(f^l / f^s)_{pure\ i}$  can be calculated from the melting temperature, the melting enthalpy and the heat capacities and densities of pure liquid  $i$  and pure solid  $i$ , as



discussed elsewhere (Prausnitz et al. 1986). The effect of pressure is usually negligible, unless the pressure is very high and/or the temperature very low.

As suggested in Figure 1, there is an alternate method for calculating  $K_i^{sl}$ . If the fugacity coefficient in the liquid mixture is found from an EOS, while the solid phase is described by an activity coefficient model, then  $K_i^{sl} = \phi_i^l P / \gamma_i^s f_{pure i}^s$ , where  $f_{pure i}^s$  and  $\phi_i^l$  are evaluated at the temperature and pressure of the mixture.

Won (1986) used two thermodynamic models for describing the properties of the liquid phase. He used an EOS for computing  $\phi_i^l$  for vapor-liquid equilibria and a modified regular-solution model to estimate the nonidealities of the liquid and solid solutions,  $\gamma_i^l$  and  $\gamma_i^s$  respectively for calculating liquid-solid equilibria. He neglected the effect of the heat-capacity difference of the solid and liquid,  $\Delta C_{p,i}$  on the ratio  $(f^l / f^s)_{pure i}$ .

In 1989, Won used his method to calculate the solubilities of n-C<sub>28</sub> and n-C<sub>36</sub> solids in n-C<sub>5</sub> and n-C<sub>12</sub> at atmospheric pressure. He modified his earlier model by: 1) incorporating an extended regular-solution expression for activity-coefficients in the liquid phase, 2) assuming a pure-solid phase for the heavier hydrocarbon component, and 3) including the heat-capacity effect on the ratio  $(f^l / f^s)_{pure i}$ . The heat-capacity contribution improved prediction of the solubilities of the heavier n-alkanes in the liquid phase.

In 1988, Hansen et al. observed that Won's model (1986) was not satisfactory for calculation of the cloud-point temperature of 17 oil mixtures. They reasoned that since Won's model gives activity coefficients close to unity for the wax-

forming components, the  $K_i^{sl}$ -factor of Eq. 2 essentially depends only on the ratio of  $f_{pure i}^l$  to  $f_{pure i}^s$ . These authors proposed to use the polymer-solution theory of Flory (1953) for describing nonidealities in the liquid phase, and assumed  $\gamma_i^s = 1$ . Three adjustable parameters in the proposed model were estimated from measured cloud-point data. Using parameters from these data, agreement between calculated and experimental cloud points was good.

Extensive data on cloud-point temperature and amount of wax deposition became available in 1991. K.S. Pedersen et al. (1991) evaluated the performance of Won's (1986) and Hansen et al. (1988) procedures with the data; these models significantly overestimated the amount of wax deposition and cloud point temperature. To obtain an improved representation, K.S. Pedersen et al. (1991) proposed to modify Won's model by: 1) using solubility parameters  $\delta_i^l$  and  $\delta_i^s$  with one adjustable-parameter for each of the solid and liquid phases; 2) incorporating the paraffinic/naphthenic/aromatic (PNA) split for each pseudocomponent of the  $C_{7+}$ -fraction, and 3) modifying the melting-enthalpies of the P-, N- and A-pseudocomponents by means of one adjustable parameter, and 4) incorporating the effect of the heat-capacity difference,  $\Delta C_{p_i}$  on the computation of  $(f^l / f^s)_{pure i}$  with two-adjustable parameters. The five regression parameters were obtained by matching data and model results. This procedure revealed that; 1) the solid solution is highly nonideal, and 2) the heat capacities strongly influence the solid deposition. While this model provided an improved representation of wax precipitation over previous procedures, it requires abundant experimental data for determining various model parameters.

To overcome the overestimation of wax deposition by available models, Pedersen (1993) recently suggested assigning high fugacity coefficients to selected components (pseudocomponents) of the crude oil. Based on an empirical relationship with constants estimated from experimental deposition data, Pedersen proposed that only a portion of the heptanes-plus fraction of an oil may coexist in solid-liquid equilibrium. Pedersen used the SRK-EOS (Soave, 1972) to describe gas and liquid phases and assumed the wax to be an ideal solid solution. Fig. 2 illustrates the performance of Pedersen's latest model for two oil mixtures (the compositions to be provided later).

In this work, we present a thermodynamic method for wax precipitation with the assumption that wax deposition is a multisolid-phase process. Each solid phase is a pure-component (or pseudocomponent); its existence or non existence is determined by phase-stability considerations. An EOS is used to describe properties of the gas and of the liquid. Calculated results are compared with experimental deposition data for binary model systems and for petroleum mixtures.

### **Multisolid-Phase Model**

Recent reports in the literature describe the physics of solidification of crude-oil constituents below the cloud-point temperature. Solid-phase transitions and spontaneous demixing are parts of the wax-precipitation process. Differential-scanning-calorimetry studies by W.B. Pedersen et al. (1991) on a number of North-Sea crude oils show phase transitions below the cloud-point temperature of various petroleum mixtures. Similarly, recent spectroscopic studies of Snyder et al. (1992, 1993, 1994) on the kinetics of microphase demixing of binary

hydrocarbon mixtures show that the phase behavior below the cloud-point temperature of these systems follows an initial (unstable) solid-solution state where the components are temporarily miscible in all proportions. However, after a characteristic time, spontaneous demixing of the solid solution leads to the final stable state. Snyder et al. found that the final stable phases consist predominantly of *pure components*.

These experimental studies suggest that wax precipitation in multicomponent oil systems produces a solid mass that contains *mutually immiscible* precipitating components. Since the solubility of each precipitating species is a strong function of the temperature, it is expected that, as cooling proceeds, only a selected number of precipitating components will coexist in solid-liquid equilibrium. On the contrary, by assuming that *all* the crude oil components can coexist in the solid state, the *solid-solution* model of Fig. 1 overestimate the amount of precipitated wax. A more realistic thermodynamic procedure for calculating wax precipitation should be based on the following: a) the precipitated species from the crude oil consist essentially of pure-(pseudo) components that *do not mix* with other solid phases after precipitation, b) the number and identity of (pseudo) components which precipitate as pure solids are determined through phase-stability analysis.

Fig. 3 shows a schematic separation vessel for a petroleum mixture that flashes into a vapor, a liquid and several immiscible solid phases of pure components. The multisolid-phase model shown in Fig. 3, is best illustrated by a plot of wax precipitated vs. temperature, shown in Fig. 4. Below the cloud-point temperature, the precipitation of wax constitutes a consecutive deposition process that precipitates several pure solids, each completely *immiscible* with the others in

the solid state. At a given temperature, the total amount of precipitated wax is the sum of the contributions of all solid phases that exist in equilibrium with the liquid at that temperature.

From stability considerations, it follows that (pseudo) component  $i$  may exist as a pure solid if

$$f_i(P, T, \underline{z}) - f_{pure\ i}^S(P, T) \geq 0, \quad (i=1, 2, \dots, N) \quad (3)$$

where  $f_i(P, T, \underline{z})$  is the fugacity of component  $i$  with feed composition  $\underline{z}$ . The above stability criterion is easily derived from Eq. 5 of Michelsen (1982). The mixture components that fulfill the above expression will precipitate, while those which do not, will only be present in the liquid and vapor states. The Peng-Robinson EOS (Peng and Robinson, 1976) in the form described by Robinson et al. (1985) is used for calculating fugacities for components in the fluid phases.

### EOS-Modeling

At fixed temperature and pressure, for every component  $i$ , the multisolid-phase model must satisfy;

$$f_i^v = f_i^l = f_{pure\ i}^S \quad (i = N - (N_s - 1), \dots, N) \quad (4)$$

$$f_i^v = f_i^l \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, N - N_s) \quad (5)$$

where  $N_s$  is the number of solid phases determined from Eq. 3. Coupling material balance with Eqs. 4 and 5, there will be a set of  $N_s + 2N - 1$  simultaneous

equations with  $N_s + 2N - 1$  unknowns (see Appendix). If no vapor phase is present, the model reduces to  $N_s + N - 1$  variables. This multiphase-flash problem can be solved by Newton's method.

As required for Eqs. 4 and 5, the fugacities in the vapor and liquid phases are evaluated through the EOS. The solid-phase fugacities of the pure components,  $f_{pure\ i}^s$  can be evaluated from the ratio  $(f^s / f^l)_{pure\ i}$ . Neglecting the effect of pressure, this ratio is obtained from pure-component data for component  $i$  as shown elsewhere (Prausnitz et al. 1986):

$$\ln \left( \frac{f^s}{f^l} \right)_{pure\ i} = -\frac{\Delta h_i^f}{RT} \left( 1 - \frac{T}{T_i^f} \right) + \frac{1}{R} \int_T^{T_i^f} \frac{\Delta C p_i}{T} dT - \frac{1}{R} \int_T^{T_i^f} \Delta C p_i dT \quad (6)$$

where superscript  $f$  refers to fusion. The liquid-phase fugacity is obtained from  $f_{pure\ i}^l = \phi_{pure\ i}^l(P, T)P$ , where the fugacity coefficient,  $\phi_{pure\ i}^l$  is obtained from the EOS. In Eq. 6,  $T_i^f$ , is the fusion (melting) temperature;  $\Delta h_i^f$  is the enthalpy of fusion and  $\Delta C p_i = C p_i^l - C p_i^s$ , where  $C p_i$  is the heat capacity of pure  $i$  at constant pressure. For hydrocarbons and petroleum mixtures, a simple cubic-EOS such as the PR-EOS describes the liquid and gas phases well (away from the gas-liquid critical region, cf. Firoozabadi, 1988).

The flash calculation proceeds as follows: a) Characterize the *plus*-fraction of a given petroleum mixture using, say 7 to 12 pseudocomponents. Assign critical properties and acentric factors to all the pseudocomponents using available correlations. In this work, we used the correlations proposed by Cavett (1964) but other similar methods (Twu, 1984; Riazi and Daubert 1980) may be used.

b) For hydrocarbon pairs, use the component critical volumes,  $v_{c_i}$  to compute the values of binary interaction parameters for the EOS,  $k_{ij}^{EOS}$ , from the correlation of Chueh and Prausnitz (1967):

$$k_{ij}^{EOS} = 1 - \left[ \frac{2v_{c_i}^{1/6} v_{c_j}^{1/6}}{v_{c_i}^{1/3} + v_{c_j}^{1/3}} \right] \quad (7)$$

Eq. 7 is used to find the cross-parameter  $a_{ij}$  in the EOS:  $a_{ij} = (a_i a_j)^{1/2} [1 - k_{ij}^{EOS}]$ .

The critical volumes in Eq. 7 are estimated from the expression

$$v_{c_i} = \frac{RT_c}{P_c} (0.290 - 0.085\omega_i),$$

where  $\omega_i$  is the component acentric factor, as

estimated from the Edmister formula (Edmister, 1958).

c) Perform stability analysis (Eq. 3) for the feed at system temperature and pressure. Stability analysis gives the number and identities of the precipitating pure components (pseudocomponents) that form solid phases.

d) Solve the system of equations described in the Appendix. For liquid-multisolid equilibria, the unknowns are  $N_s$  solid-to-feed molar fractions,  $S_j / F$ , and  $(N-1)$  compositions in the liquid phase,  $x_i^l$ . For vapor-liquid-multisolid systems, the unknowns are  $2(N-1)$  compositions for the vapor and liquid phases,  $y_i$ ,  $x_i^l$ , respectively,  $N_s$  solid-to-feed molar phase fractions,  $(S_j / F)$ , and the fraction of feed that exists as vapor,  $(V / F)$ .

## Correlations for Calculating Fugacities of Pure Solids

As shown by Eq. 6, the fugacity of solid-component  $i$  depends upon the melting properties of component  $i$ : the melting-point temperature,  $T_i^f$ , the melting-point enthalpy,  $\Delta h_i^f$  and the heat-capacity difference,  $\Delta C_{p_i}$ . In previous work, these quantities have been evaluated using different procedures. Unless stated otherwise, in this work the melting-point properties of the components were evaluated as follows:

**Melting-Point Temperature,  $T_i^f$ :** Won (1986) has given a correlation for the melting points of pure n-alkanes:

$$T_i^f = 374.5 + 0.02617I_i - 20172/I_i \quad (8)$$

where  $T$  is in degrees Kelvin and  $I_i$  is molecular weight in grams per mole. To replace Eq. 8, we used experimental melting-point data of normal paraffinic (C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>30</sub>), naphthenic (C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>30</sub> alkylcycloalkanes) and aromatic (C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>30</sub> alkylbenzenes) hydrocarbons (Research Project 44, API 1964) to derive the following correlation (temperature in K)

$$T_i^f = 333.46 - 419.01 \exp(-0.008546I_i) \quad (9)$$

In the above equation as the molecular weight increases, the calculated melting points of petroleum fractions gradually lose the paraffinic contribution. The asymptotic temperature relation of Eq. 9 corresponds to the average melting-



temperature of heavy naphthenic and aromatic hydrocarbons with carbon numbers above 30. Fig. 5 shows Eq. 9 along with experimental data.

**Melting-Point Enthalpy,  $\Delta h_i^f$ .** Won (1986) developed a correlation for calculating the melting-point enthalpies of paraffinic hydrocarbons using the molecular-weight of the paraffin as a characterization variable. The correlation has the form,

$$\Delta h_i^f = 0.1426 I_i T_i^f \quad (10)$$

The constant (0.1426), represents the average slope when the melting-entropy, ( $\Delta h_i^f / T_i^f$ ) is plotted against the molecular weight of paraffinic hydrocarbons.

K.S. Pedersen et al. (1991) argued that the melting enthalpies of different hydrocarbon species found in a petroleum fluid have a broad range of values for the same molecular weight, and therefore Eq. 10 overestimates the wax amount below the cloud-point temperature. These authors concluded that Eq. 10 should not be applied to petroleum mixtures.

Fig. 6 shows experimental data (Research Project 44, API, 1964) for the melting-entropy of various P-, N- and A- hydrocarbons as a function of molecular weight. The melting entropies of *n*-paraffins are indeed higher than those of N- and A- hydrocarbons with the same molecular weight. However, when the slope of the entropy-of-fusion -vs.- molecular-weight line for normal paraffins given by Eq. 11 is decreased by a factor between 2 and 3, the resulting melting entropies tend to deviate from the purely paraffinic-behavior to a more "multiensemble" hydrocarbon environment, which may correspond more closely to the wax precipitation context. Since the presence of paraffinic components decreases as

the carbon-number increases, smaller melting enthalpies than those proposed by Eq. 10 may be more representative for wax precipitation. A similar reduction process of the melting enthalpies of hydrocarbons was used by K.S. Pedersen et al. (1991) and by Erickson et al. (1993). We suggest the following expression for the melting enthalpy,

$$\Delta h_i^f = 0.05276 I_i T_i^f \quad (11)$$

where  $\Delta h_i^f$  is in calories/mole.

**Heat-Capacity of Fusion  $\Delta C_{p_i}$**  Toward including the heat-capacity data, K.S. Pedersen et al. (1991) analyzed the trend of the experimental heat-capacity data with molecular weight for various n-alkanes and found that the data could be represented by the expression

$$\Delta C_{p_i} = \alpha I_i + \beta I_i T \quad (12)$$

where  $\Delta C_{p_i}$  is in calories/mole-K. Correlation coefficients  $\alpha$  (0.3033 cal/g-K) and  $\beta$  ( $-4.635 \times 10^{-4}$  cal/g-K<sup>2</sup>) were determined by K.S. Pedersen et al. by tuning their model with experimental precipitation data for 17 North-Sea crude oils.

Here, we correlate heat-capacity data of heavy n-alkanes (Finke et al. 1954; Spaght et al. 1932) with molecular weight and temperature using the function given by Eq. 12. For the liquid phase below the melting point temperature, the heat capacity is assigned the value at the melting point. For the solid phase above the melting point temperature, the heat capacity at the melting point is

assigned. By using this procedure, we found that the values of the correlation coefficients  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in Eq. 12 are close to those found by K.S. Pedersen et al. (1991). We thus use their correlation coefficients. We also assume that hydrocarbon species other than n-alkanes follow Eq. 12 with the same coefficients. In order to test the validity of this assumption, thermal data of selected high-molecular-weight hydrocarbons other than n-alkanes (Parks et al., 1949; 1934; Fischl et al., 1945) were compared with predictions from Eq. 12. The predicted heat-capacity differences were 10 to 20 percent higher than the heat capacity data of heavy naphthenic and aromatic hydrocarbons. Therefore, the heat capacity correlation given by Eq. 12 appears to provide a reasonable estimate for the thermal effects on the fugacity of solid-forming component in petroleum mixtures.

## Results

### *Binary Systems*

Madsen and Boistelle (1976, 1979) measured binary solid solubilities of six *n*-alkane mixtures ( $nC_{32}$  in  $nC_5$  and  $nC_7$ ;  $nC_{28}$  in  $nC_7$  and  $nC_{12}$ ; and  $nC_{36}$  in  $nC_5$  and  $nC_6$ ). For normal paraffins, we used the *n*-alkane-based correlations for estimating the melting-point temperature and melting-point enthalpy given by Won (Eqs. 8 and 10). Figs. 7 and 8 show calculated and experimental results. Fig. 7 shows that the calculated solubilities are predicted very well for all systems. The effect of the heat-capacity data on calculated results is illustrated in Fig. 8 for systems  $nC_{28}$ - $nC_7$  and  $nC_{32}$ - $nC_5$ . Including the  $\Delta C_{p_i}$ -term provides a significant improvement. A similar effect was observed for other binary systems. The results shown in Figs. 7 and 8 are predicted without any parameter adjustment.

## *Crude-Oil Systems*

Table 1 shows compositions, component molecular weights and plus-fraction specific gravities of eight petroleum mixtures. W.B. Pedersen et al. (1991) have provided extensive data on wax formation behavior of these crude oils. The mixture numbers are the same as those used by these authors.

The types of crude oils shown in Table 1 cover a variety of oil mixtures. Mixtures 10, 12 and 15 originate from light petroleum systems of the gas-condensate type. Mixtures 8 and 11 originate from heavy oils. For calculation purposes, the *plus*-fractions in all mixtures require a systematic characterization procedure. For each oil, we used the experimental molecular weight, mole fraction and specific-gravity data of the plus-fraction to generate a number of pseudocomponents that preserve the measured characterization properties of the heavy fraction. The carbon-number distribution of petroleum waxes has recently been studied by some investigators. Ronningsen et al. (1991) reported wax composition of a given crude from carbon number C<sub>16</sub> to much higher carbon numbers. They estimated C<sub>40+</sub> content of a particular wax to be around 50 percent (volume). They also cautioned that the wax that they analyzed inevitably contained some trapped oil which affects the lower carbon number. In 1994, Bishop and Philp, using a high-temperature gas chromatographic technique have shown that the spectrum of hydrocarbon components found in petroleum waxes begin at approximately C<sub>20-25</sub>, but, unlike Ronningsen et al. (1991), Bishop and Philp analyzed the fraction of hydrocarbon components beyond C<sub>40+</sub>, and found that the carbon-number distribution extends to C<sub>90-100</sub>. From these two studies, it is evident that for precipitation calculations, a pseudocomponent slate with

components whose molecular weights exceed 1000 is desirable. The two-parameter gamma distribution function (Johnson and Kotz 1970; Whitson, 1983) was used for generating the molar distributions for the plus fractions of each of the 8 petroleum mixtures of Table 1. Fig. 9 shows the shape of the molar distributions for all mixtures and Table 2 shows the distribution-function parameters for each fraction. Table 3 shows the resulting characterization parameters for the heptanes-plus fraction of Oil 1.

Figs. 10 and 11 show results using our multisolid-phase model. These figures indicate that the multisolid-phase assumption appears to represent the wax-formation process in real petroleum mixtures. For all mixtures, the predicted trend for the solid amount with temperature is in good agreement with experiment. At a given temperature, the wax weight percent that precipitates from crude oil is calculated for one mol of feed from the relation

$$\text{Wax weight \%} = \frac{\text{Total precipitated mass}}{\text{Mass of feed oil}} \times 100 = \frac{\sum_j^{N_s} I_j \left( \frac{S_j}{F} \right)}{\sum_i^N z_i I_i} \times 100$$

Predictions for Oils 10, 12 and 15, which originate from gas-condensate mixtures, are as good as those for Oils 8 and 11, which originate from heavy petroleum systems.

Eq. 3 provides a useful criterion for determining those components which precipitate. Application of the stability test for all the mixtures revealed that, for temperatures in excess of 230 K, hydrocarbon components with molecular weights less than, say, 400, are unlikely to participate in the solid wax. For Oil 1, up to four different solid phases characterize the predicted wax weight percent

along the indicated temperature range. These four solids consist of pseudocomponents with average molecular weights 750, 800, 950 and 1350, respectively (see Table 3). Similar molecular weights characterize the solid phases for the other systems. The model proposed in this work suggests that, in typical real systems, the "carrying" capacity of the light fraction of the oil keeps hydrocarbons with molecular weights ranging from 100 (C<sub>7</sub>) to around 400 (C<sub>25</sub>) dissolved in the liquid phase (oil), which is agreement with the wax analysis by Bishop and Philp (1994). The solid-solution models predict the presence of light hydrocarbons in the solid was (Wong, 1989).

Fig. 12 shows the solid-phase-appearance history of Oil 1. As cooling proceeds, the multisolid-phase model predicts the appearance of solid phases along the experimental temperature range in a consecutive manner, as illustrated in Fig. 4. From our experience, the more discontinuous the experimental precipitation curve of a particular oil (as occurs for Oils 2, and 15), the more the number of precipitated phases predicted by the model (8 and 12 solid phases, respectively). On the other hand, for fluid systems showing an abrupt jump in the experimental precipitation-versus-temperature curve (i.e. Oils 5 and 11), a small number of precipitated solid phases provides a good representation of the data. As it can be seen, the characterization techniques employed for wax calculations differs from the conventional characterization schemes for hydrocarbons in that the number of pseudocomponents could be regarded as a model parameter. There is an optimum number of pseudocomponents that will yield the best representation of the experimental data. This approach contrasts with other characterization schemes in the sense that increasing the number of pseudocomponents is *only* expected to improve the accuracy of the representation.

Table 4 shows a comparison between experimental and calculated cloud-point temperatures for all mixtures. From the equations given in the Appendix, the cloud-point temperature of a given petroleum mixture is that temperature where the molar ratio of the first precipitating component of the system,  $(S_1/F)$  is greater than zero but smaller than a small positive value (i.e.  $10^{-8}$ ). The calculated cloud-point temperatures compare well with the data for all mixtures. We did not adjust any parameter in the calculation of wax precipitation. Unlike other methods, the method discussed here reproduces the experimentally observed discontinuous deposition behavior of real petroleum systems.

## CONCLUSIONS

An EOS-based thermodynamic method for calculating wax precipitation in petroleum mixtures has been developed and tested with experimental data. The method is based on the experimentally-supported assumption that wax precipitation is a multisolid-phase precipitation process. The number and identity of the potential precipitated phases can be determined by a simple stability test. Application of this method to several petroleum mixtures suggests that the precipitated waxy material consists of high-molecular-weight hydrocarbons with average carbon-atom numbers above 25. Calculated results of the new method reproduce experimental liquid-wax equilibria for several oil mixtures, indicating that the proposed method is both simple and accurate, requiring no adjustable mixture parameters.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Chemical Sciences Division of the US Department of Energy, under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098. C.L.-G. acknowledges CONACYT; DEPFQ-UNAM and the Mexican Institute of Petroleum, (IMP), Mexico City, Mexico, for a fellowship. Additional support from Norsk Hydro, A/S; Saudi Aramco and Texaco, Inc. is greatly appreciated. Dr. Andrzej Anderko of Simulation Sciences Inc., Brea, CA provided generous help and discussion during the early stages of this work.

## Notation

$C_p$  = heat capacity

$F$  = moles of feed phase

$f$  = fugacity

$h$  = enthalpy

$I$  = Molecular weight

$k$  = interaction parameter

$K$  = partition coefficient

$L$  = moles of liquid phase

$N$  = total number of components

$N_s$  = total number of solid phases or number of components that form a solid.

$P$  = pressure

$R$  = gas constant

$S$  = moles of solid phase

$T$  = temperature



$v$  = molar volume

$V$  = moles of vapor phase

$x$  = liquid or solid composition, depending on superscript

$y$  = vapor composition

$z$  = overall (feed) mole fraction

$\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}$  = composition vectors

### **Greek Letters**

$\alpha, \beta$  = constants in heat capacity correlation, Eq. 12

$\gamma$  = activity coefficient

$\phi$  = fugacity coefficient

$\rho$  = density

$\Delta$  = difference operator

$\Sigma$  = sum operator

### **Superscripts**

EOS = equation-of-state quantity

$l, v, s$  = liquid, vapor and solid phase index

$f$  = fusion-point index

### **Subscripts**

$c$  = property at the critical point

$i$  = component index

## Literature Cited

American Petroleum Institute, *Selected Values for Physical and Thermodynamic Properties of Hydrocarbons and Related Compounds*, Res. Proj. 44, Texas A & M. University, College Station, TX. section *m* (1964).

Bishop , A. and P. Philp, "Prediction of Potential Wax Deposition Problems During Petroleum Production," Internal report, Organic Geochemistry Group, U. of Oklahoma, Norman OK (1994).

Cavett, R.H., "Physical Data for Distillation Calculations, Vapor-Liquid Equilibria," Proc. , 27th. Midyear Meeting, API Division of Refining, San Francisco, CA, May 15 (1964).

Chueh, P.L. and J.M. Prausnitz, "Vapor-Liquid Equilibria at High Pressures: Calculation of Partial Molar Volume in Non-Polar Liquid Mixtures," *AIChE J.*, **13**, 6, 1099 (1967).

Edmister, W.C., "Compressibility Factors and Equations of State," *Petroleum Refiner*, **37**, 4 173 (1958).

Erickson, D.D., V.G. Niesen, and T.S. Brown, "Thermodynamic Measurement and Prediction of Paraffin Precipitation in Crude Oil," paper SPE 26604 pres. at the 68th Annual Tech. Conf. an Exhib. of the Society of Petroleum Engineers, Houston, TX., Oct. 3-6 (1993)

Fagin, K.M., "Automatic Scrapers Used in West Edmond Oil Wells," *Pet. Eng.*, June p. 105 (1945)

Finke, H.L., M.E. Gross, G. Waddington and H.M. Huffman, "Low-Temperature Thermal Data for the Nine Normal Paraffin Hydrocarbons from Octane to Hexadecane," *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **76**, 333 (1954).

Firoozabadi, A., "Reservoir-Fluid Phase Behavior and Volumetric Prediction with Equations of State," *J. Pet. Tech.*, April, 397 (1988).

Fischl, F.B., B.F. Naylor, C.W. Ziemer, G.S. Parks and J.G. Aston, "The Heat Capacity, Heat of Fusion and Entropy of 11-n-decylheneicosane," *J. Phys. Chem.*, **67**, 2075 (1945).

Flory, P.J., *Principles of Polymer Chemistry*, Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, New York (1953).

Ford, P.E., J.W. Ells and R.J. Russell, "Frequent Pigging Helps Move Waxy Crude Below Its Pour-Point," *Oil & Gas J.*, May 10, 183 (1965).

Goldman, M.S. and C.C. Nathan, *Prevention of Paraffin Deposition and Plugging*. U.S. Pat. No. 2 817 635, Dec 24, (1957)

Hansen, J.H., Aa. Fredenslund, K.S. Pedersen, and H. P. Ronningsen, "A Thermodynamic Model for Predicting Wax Formation in Crude Oils," *AIChE J.*, **34**, 12, 1937 (1988).

Johnson, N.L. and S. Kotz, *Continuous Univariate Distributions-I*, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston (1970).

Madsen, H.E. L. and R. Boistelle, "Solubility of Long-Chain n-Paraffins in Pentane and Heptane," *J. Chem. Soc. Farad. Trans.*, **72** 1078 (1976).

Madsen, H.E.L. and R. Boistelle, "Solubility of Octacosane and Hexatriacontane in Different n-Alkane Solvents," *J. Chem. Soc., Farad. Trans.*, **75** 1254 (1979).

Michelsen, M.L., "The Isothermal Flash Problem. Part I: Stability," *Fluid Phase Equilibria*, **9** 1(1982).

Parks, G.S., Moore, G.E., Renquist, M.L., Naylor, B.F., McClaine, L.A., Fuji, S.P. and John A. Hatton, "Thermal Data on Organic Compounds. XXV. Some Heat Capacity, Entropy and Free Energy Data for Nine Hydrocarbons of High Molecular Weight," *J. Phys. Chem.*, **71**, 3386 (1949).

Pedersen, W.B., A.B. Hansen, E. Larsen, A.B. Nielsen and H.P. Ronningsen, "Wax Precipitation from North-Sea Crude Oils. 2. Solid-Phase Content as Function of Temperature Determined by Pulsed NMR," *Energy and Fuels*, **5**, 908 (1991).

Pedersen, K.S., P. Skovborg and H.P. Ronningsen, "Wax Precipitation from North-Sea Crude Oils. 4. Thermodynamic Modeling," *Energy and Fuels*, **5**, 924 (1991).

Pedersen, K.S., "Prediction of Cloud-Point Temperatures and Amount of Wax Precipitation," unsolicited paper SPE 27629 available at the Society of Petroleum Engineers, Richardson, TX 75080 (1993).

Peng, D.-Y. and D.B. Robinson, "A New Two-Constant Equation of State," *Ind. Eng. Chem. Fund.* **15**, 59 (1976).

Prausnitz, J.M., R.N. Lichtenthaler and E.G. Azevedo *Molecular Thermodynamics of Fluid Phase Equilibria*, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, (1986), Chap. 9.

Riazi, M.R. and T.E. Daubert, "Simplify Property Predictions," *Hyd. Proc.*, March, 115 (1980).

Robinson D.B., D.Y. Peng and S. Y-K. Chung, "The Development of the Peng-Robinson Equation and its Application to Phase Equilibrium in a System Containing Methanol," *Fluid Phase Equil.*, **24**, 25 (1985).

Snyder, R.G., M.C. Goh, V.J.P. Srivastavoy, H.L. Strauss and D.L. Dorset, "Measurement of the Growth Kinetics of Microdomains in Binary n-Alkane Solid Solutions by Infrared Spectroscopy," *J. Phys. Chem.* **96** 10008 (1992).

Snyder, R.G., G. Conti, H.L. Strauss and D.L. Dorset, "Thermally-Induced Mixing in Partially Microphase Segregated Binary n-Alkane Crystals," *J. Phys. Chem.*, **97**, 7342 (1993).

Snyder, R.G., V.J.P. Srivatsavoy, D.A. Cates, H.L. Strauss, J.W. White and D.L. Dorset, "Hydrogen/Deuterium Isotope Effects on Microphase Separation in Unstable Crystalline Mixtures of Binary n-Alkanes", *J. Phys. Chem.*, **98**, 674 (1994).

Soave, G., "Equilibrium Constants from a Modified Redlich-Kwong Equation of State," *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, **27**, 1197 (1972).

Spaght, M.E., S.B. Thomas and G.S. Parks, "Some Heat-Capacity Data on Organic Compounds Obtained with a Radiation Calorimeter," *J. Phys. Chem.*, **36**, 882 (1932).

Twu, C.H., "An Internally Consistent Correlation for Predicting the Critical Properties and Molecular Weights of Petroleum and Coal-Tar Liquids," *Fluid Phase Equil.*, **16**, 137 (1984).

Whitson, C.H., "Characterizing Hydrocarbon Plus Fractions," *Soc. Pet. Eng. J.* Aug., 683 (1983).

Won, K.W., "Thermodynamics for Solid Solution-Liquid-Vapor Equilibria: Wax Phase Formation from Heavy Hydrocarbon Mixtures," *Fluid Phase Equil.*, **30**, 265 (1986).

Won, K.W., "Thermodynamic Calculation of Cloud Point Temperatures and Wax Phase Compositions of Refined Hydrocarbon Mixtures," *Fluid Phase Equil.*, **53** 377 (1989).

## Appendix: Model Formulation.

Consider a system of  $N_s$  precipitating species, and  $N$  components. The equations of phase equilibrium are:

$N$  vapor-liquid isofugacity equations

$$f_i^v(P, T, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{N-1}) - f_i^l(P, T, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{N-1}) = 0 \quad (i = 1, \dots, N) \quad (\text{A1})$$

$N_s$  liquid-solid isofugacity equations

$$f_i^l(P, T, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{N-1}) - f_{\text{pure } i}^s(P, T) = 0 \quad (i = (N - N_s) + 1, \dots, N) \quad (\text{A2})$$

$N - 1$  material-balance equations

a) for the non-precipitating components:

$$z_i - x_i^l \left[ 1 - \sum_j^{N_s} S_j / F - \frac{V}{F} \right] - K_i^{vl} x_i^l \frac{V}{F} = 0 \quad (i = 1, \dots, (N - N_s)) \quad (\text{A3})$$

b) for precipitating components, where all solid phases are pure:

$$z_i - x_i^l \left[ 1 - \sum_j^{N_s} S_j / F - \frac{V}{F} \right] - S_i / F - K_i^{vl} x_i^l \frac{V}{F} = 0 \quad (i = (N - N_s) + 1, \dots, N - 1) \\ (N_s > 1) \quad (\text{A4})$$

where  $K_i^{vl} = \phi_i^l(P, T, \underline{x}^l) / \phi_i^v(P, T, \underline{y})$ .

## List of Tables

**Table 1.** Compositions and properties of oil mixtures.

**Table 2.** Statistical properties for molar distributions of oil mixtures.

**Table 3.** EOS-characterization for the heptanes-plus fraction of Oil 1.

**Table 4.** Experimental and calculated cloud points.



## Figure Captions

**Fig. 1.** Typical vapor-liquid-solid-solution model for wax precipitation used by previous authors.

**Fig. 2.** Comparison of measured and calculated wax-precipitation results for two petroleum mixtures at 1 bar.

**Fig. 3.** Proposed multisolid-phase model for wax precipitation.

**Fig. 4.** Multisolid-phase precipitation concept for a petroleum mixture below its cloud-point temperature.

**Fig. 5.** Melting-point temperatures of hydrocarbons.

**Fig. 6.** Melting entropies of hydrocarbons.

**Fig. 7** Measured and predicted solid solubilities for four binary alkane mixtures at 1 bar.

**Fig. 8.** Effect of heat-capacity difference  $\Delta C_p$  on calculated solid solubilities for two alkane mixtures at 1 bar.

**Fig. 9.** Estimated molar distribution for plus-fractions of oil mixtures.

**Fig. 10.** Experimental and predicted wax-precipitation results for Oils 1, 2, 5 and 8.

**Fig. 11.** Experimental and predicted wax-precipitation results for Oils 10, 11, 12 and 15.

**Fig. 12.** Predicted solid-phase-appearance temperatures for Oil 1 as cooling proceeds.

Oil No.	1		2		5		8		10		11		12		15	
Comp.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.
C <sub>1</sub>	1.139				0.056				0.016				0.021			
C <sub>2</sub>	0.507		0.009		0.368		0.113		0.145		0.100		0.173		0.254	
C <sub>3</sub>	0.481		0.476		1.171		1.224		1.392		0.118		1.605		1.236	
i-C <sub>4</sub>	0.563		0.585		0.466		0.645		1.180		0.106		1.148		0.588	
C <sub>4</sub>	0.634		1.572		1.486		2.832		3.088		0.099		3.596		2.512	
i-C <sub>5</sub>	1.113		1.705		0.961		1.959		2.980		0.162		3.086		1.955	
C <sub>5</sub>	0.515		1.985		1.396		3.335		3.802		0.038		4.171		3.485	
C <sub>6</sub>	2.003		1.491		2.251		5.633		7.207		0.458		7.841		6.842	
C <sub>7</sub>	5.478	90.9	9.110	92.3	6.536	88.8	9.933	92.8	11.333	94.1	2.194	90.8	11.11	94.1	12.85	92.2
C <sub>8</sub>	8.756	105.0	10.84	105.9	8.607	101.0	10.75	106.3	12.465	107.0	2.847	106.5	13.43	105.4	13.98	105.4
C <sub>9</sub>	7.222	117.7	7.413	120.0	4.882	116.0	7.179	120.0	7.784	122.0	1.932	122.3	9.419	119.0	9.190	119.0
C <sub>10</sub>	5.414	132.0	6.394	133.0	2.830	133.0	6.561	134.0	5.314	136.0	5.750	135.0	5.583	135.0	6.435	134.0
C <sub>11</sub>	5.323	148.0	5.649	148.0	3.019	143.0	5.494	148.0	5.033	147.0	4.874	149.0	4.890	148.0	5.118	148.0
C <sub>12</sub>	4.571	159.0	5.270	163.0	3.119	154.0	4.547	161.0	3.989	161.0	5.660	162.0	3.864	162.0	4.111	161.0
C <sub>13</sub>	5.289	172.0	4.541	177.0	3.687	167.0	4.837	175.0	3.869	175.0	6.607	176.0	4.298	175.0	4.231	175.0
C <sub>14</sub>	4.720	185.0	4.921	190.0	3.687	181.0	3.700	189.0	3.627	189.0	6.149	189.0	3.272	188.0	3.682	188.0
C <sub>15</sub>	4.445	197.0	3.903	204.0	3.637	195.0	3.520	203.0	3.165	203.0	5.551	202.0	2.274	203.0	3.044	202.0
C <sub>16</sub>	3.559	209.0	2.894	217.0	3.079	207.0	2.922	216.0	2.311	214.0	5.321	213.0	2.791	216.0	2.255	214.0
C <sub>17</sub>	3.642	227.0	3.420	235.0	3.657	225.0	3.072	233.0	2.472	230.0	5.022	230.0	2.311	232.0	2.405	230.0
C <sub>18</sub>	3.104	243.0	2.399	248.0	3.289	242.0	2.214	248.0	2.815	244.0	4.016	244.0	1.960	246.0	2.006	245.0
C <sub>19</sub>	2.717	254.0	2.737	260.0	3.109	253.0	2.493	260.0	2.110	258.0	4.176	256.0	1.821	256.0	1.766	257.0
C <sub>20</sub> *	2.597	262.0	0.909	269.0	38.4+	423.0	17.0+	544.0	14.4+	418.0	38.8+	473.0	11.3+	388.0	12.0+	399.0
C <sub>21</sub>	1.936	281.0	2.207	283.0												
C <sub>22</sub>	2.039	293.0	1.463	298.0												
C <sub>23</sub>	1.661	307.0	1.226	310.0												
C <sub>24</sub>	1.616	320.0	0.933	322.0												
C <sub>25</sub>	1.421	333.0	1.327	332.0												
C <sub>26</sub>	1.233	346.0	1.074	351.0												
C <sub>27</sub>	1.426	361.0	0.852	371.0												
C <sub>28</sub>	1.343	374.0	0.900	382.0												
C <sub>29</sub>	1.300	381.0	0.662	394.0												
C <sub>30+</sub>	13.23	624.0	8.177	612.0												
Sp.Gr.+	0.953		0.935		0.893		0.934		0.880		0.963		0.872		0.887	

\* C<sub>20</sub> or C<sub>20+</sub>

<b>Oil No.</b>	<b>Initial Mol.Wt.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>413.0</b>	<b>624.0</b>	<b>24194.5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>413.0</b>	<b>612.0</b>	<b>23020.7</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>273.0</b>	<b>423.0</b>	<b>8006.8</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>273.0</b>	<b>544.0</b>	<b>34802.9</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>273.0</b>	<b>418.0</b>	<b>8442.9</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>273.0</b>	<b>473.0</b>	<b>14282.2</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>273.0</b>	<b>388.0</b>	<b>5105.8</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>273.0</b>	<b>399.0</b>	<b>6300.0</b>

Table 2

No.	Mole %	Mol. Wt.	Tc / K	Pc / bar	$\omega$	Vc/cm <sup>3</sup> /mol
1	5.417	91.00	521.40	32.49	0.340	349.00
2	8.658	104.95	550.30	29.98	0.417	388.80
3	7.140	117.05	572.80	28.25	0.478	421.60
4	20.364	152.35	630.28	23.87	0.633	517.96
5	9.062	190.79	680.00	20.29	0.779	626.15
6	10.18	225.70	716.55	17.61	0.901	725.98
7	9.158	269.99	754.20	14.92	1.051	847.40
8	7.274	332.08	795.87	12.29	1.258	897.90
9	5.260	407.07	835.30	10.40	1.507	1087.6
10	4.638	529.05	888.40	8.92	1.848	1107.3
11	2.170	649.95	935.20	8.58	2.038	1152.0
12	1.169	750.04	970.80	8.50	2.160	1143.5
13	1.407	799.45	987.30	7.52	2.129	1297.60
14	0.703	949.47	1032.15	6.49	2.190	1450.00
15	0.350	1350.09	1173.7	5.35	2.248	2021.49

<b>Oil No.</b>	<b>Exp., K</b>	<b>Calcd., K</b>	<b>Exp.-Calcd.,K</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>304.15</b>	<b>305.9</b>	<b>-1.75</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>312.15</b>	<b>311.8</b>	<b>0.35</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>313.15</b>	<b>312.4</b>	<b>0.75</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>311.15</b>	<b>308.2</b>	<b>2.95</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>314.15</b>	<b>316.0</b>	<b>-1.85</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>295.15</b>	<b>299.3</b>	<b>-4.15</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>305.15</b>	<b>301.2</b>	<b>3.95</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>308.15</b>	<b>309.5</b>	<b>-1.35</b>


$$f_i^v = \phi_i^v y_i P$$

or

$$f_i^l = \gamma_i^l x_i^l f_{pure\ i}^l$$

$$f_i^l = \phi_i^l x_i^l P$$

$$f_i^s = \gamma_i^s x_i^s f_{pure\ i}^s$$







Fig. 3






Fig. 4




Fig. 5









Fig. 6


















Fig. 9










# Oil 1



LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT  
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720