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ABSTRACT: This paper investigates the design optimization of double pipe heat exchanger using mathematical programming. The heat exchanger area is minimized and the thermo-fluid dynamic conditions are considered for the use of the right transport correlations, together with design specifications, such as, maximum pressure drops and minimum excess area. The modular nature of this kind of heat exchanger and the allocation of the streams (inside the inner tube or in the annulus) are also contemplated. Two mixed-integer nonlinear programming (MINLP) approaches are proposed. One approach relates the binary variables to the nonlinear constraints directly. In the second, the resulting nonlinearities involving binary variables are formally linearized, without loss of rigor (e.g., no use of truncated Taylor series). The proposed methodology can get better solutions than traditional trial and error procedures. The flexibility of the model is illustrated, together with a comparison between the performances of both MINLP formulations. Additionally, computational time and local optimality issues are discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Although shell-and-tube heat exchangers are the most common heat transfer equipment in chemical process plants, there are many cases for which other heat exchanger types become more suitable. For instance, double pipe heat exchangers can be an economically more advantageous option when smaller services are in place (e.g., heat transfer area lower than 50 m²). If the stream contains solids in suspension, double pipe heat exchangers may also be a better alternative, because they can be built with an inner tube with larger diameter to avoid plugging. Smaller diameters of the outer tube in double pipe heat exchangers are advantageous for high-pressure services, because it implies a smaller wall thickness. In addition, double pipe heat exchangers are easily cleaned, and the longitudinal flow avoids the existence of stagnation regions, which in shell and tube exchangers are prone to fouling. Double pipe heat exchangers have also the benefit of flexibility due to its modular structure, which allows an easier adaptation to process modifications.

Several papers addressed the design of double pipe heat exchangers; however, a large number of them are focused on heat transfer enhancement devices, rather than on the general optimization of the design (e.g., diameter and length of the tubes were usually considered fixed parameters). For example, Sahiti et al. investigated the optimization of pin fins in the heat exchanger annulus aiming at the minimization of entropy generation. Their heat exchanger model was based on experimental data and the optimal set of variables was determined through a sensitivity analysis study. In turn, Syed et al. investigated the optimal configuration of the annulus with trapezoidal fins through the selection of the number of fins, fin height, fin thickness, and the radius ratio of the inner and outer tubes, using genetic algorithms and a trust region method. A similar investigation was also proposed by the same authors using parabolic fins and using a generalized optimization of the fin shape. Later, Han et al. investigated the design of the outer surface corrugation of the inner tube using multiobjective optimization for the determination of optimal values of the pitch, height, and radius of the corrugation. Their optimization was based on a response surface methodology (RSM) using simulation data generated through computational fluid dynamics (CFD). Finally, Dastmalchi et al. employed a particle swarm algorithm (PSO) associated with a CFD model for the optimization of the inner microfinned tube surface, contemplating the selection of the number of microfins, the microfin height, and the microfin helix angle.

The aforementioned studies did not account for operational and capital costs in their objective functions and were focused on enhancing the heat transfer variables such as Nusselt number and heat transfer coefficient, sometimes the...
minimization of entropy generation, but never discussing a complete optimal design.

Reducing costs is, after all, the main motivation for basic design optimization in practice. The literature involving the solution of the least-cost design problem of double pipe heat exchangers is scarce and the available papers were based on limited search spaces of the geometric variables. First, Söylemez1 investigated the optimization of double pipe heat exchangers for waste heat recovery, aiming at identifying the inner tube diameter, with a fixed ratio of the diameters of the outer and inner tubes, minimizing capital and operating costs. Later, Swamee et al.12 presented the optimization of double pipe heat exchangers focusing on operational costs, considering the heat load, the pumping power, and the utility consumption. The decision variables were the inner and outer tube diameters and the utility flow rate, but the tube length was assumed known. In addition, both studies considered the design variables as continuous variables, assuming implicitly that they may lead to suboptimal solutions when the nearest commercially available pipe is selected.

Finally, academic books2,13 usually use a larger set of design variables (geometric dimensions, fluid allocation, and arrangements with multiple units), and they use a traditional trial and verification procedure; in such procedure, design variables are selected first, followed by the calculation of the number of required hairpins for that configuration. Then, if the resulting heat exchanger is not feasible (e.g., the available pressure drop for a given stream is exceeded and/or the stream velocities are not within given bounds) a design change is proposed and the calculations remade. This work points out that this approach is dependent on the designer experience and does not guarantee any optimality. The designer choices for new trials are various: one can change length, pipe diameters, hairpin arrangements, and other features aiming at reducing pressure drop and/or increasing heat transfer coefficient, and the experts develop the right intuitive choices to end up with a feasible exchanger, which is the goal. It is for this reason that it is rare to see a set of rules as what adjustment in geometry leads to the right answer. In addition, it is unusual to see a trial—verification—improvement procedure in which changes are proposed to seek improvements over the feasible solutions found. In other words, in trial and verification, optimality is definitely not the goal, and even in trial—verification—improvement, optimality is not guaranteed.

To ameliorate the aforementioned deficiencies in the quest for the optimal design, this paper presents the economic optimization of the design of double pipe heat exchangers using a mathematical programming method that at the very least guarantees local optimality. The models are based on the hairpin as the elementary component, arranged in series to form what is here defined as a unit. These units are then considered as the basic component of arrangements in series, parallel, and series-parallel, and thus the modular structure of double pipe heat exchangers is explored.

In addition, the set of design variables considered in this study is broader than the one used in previous literature papers, considering the allocation of the streams (inside the inner tube or in the annulus), the inner and outer tube diameters, the tube length, the number of parallel branches, the number of units in series and in parallel in each branch, and the number of hairpins per unit, which determine the arrangement of the existing hairpins. The optimization problem is formulated as a mixed-integer nonlinear programming (MINLP) model. The fact that several geometric parameters (diameters, lengths, etc.) can be expressed in a form of discrete choices, as in industrial practice, is used as a convenient tool. A modified MINLP model, for which mathematical transformations are applied to exclude nonlinearities involving binary variables is also presented, so that methods requiring linearity in binary variables (like Outer Approximation14) can solve the model.

This paper is organized as follows: Initially the model is presented, followed by the first corresponding MINLP formulation and the modified MINLP problem formulation. To finish, numerical results are presented.

2. HEAT EXCHANGER ARCHITECTURE

The basic structure of a double pipe heat exchanger consists of two concentric tubes (Figure 1) and is usually commercialized in a hairpin structure (Figure 2). If the thermal service demands a higher heat transfer area, several hairpins can be interconnected. For example, Figure 3 illustrates two hairpins connected in series.

![Figure 1. Double pipe heat exchanger.](image)

![Figure 2. Hairpin structure.](image)

![Figure 3. Two hairpins connected in series.](image)

Different interconnection patterns among the heat exchanger hairpins provide flexible design alternatives better suited to attain the heat load and maximum pressure drop specifications of the service. The mathematical formulation proposed explores a general structure that encloses different arrangements. For that, the adopted nomenclature for the elements involved is as follows:

- hairpin: basic structure shown in Figure 2. The flow arrangement for a hairpin in this paper is always countercurrent
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• unit: multiple hairpins connected in series (Figure 3 shows an example of a unit of two hairpins)

• branch: A structure composed of units that can be arranged in three different ways, as illustrated in Figure 4: (i) tube-side and annulus-side streams aligned in series, (ii) tube-side stream aligned in series and annulus-side stream aligned in parallel, and (iii) tube-side stream aligned in parallel and annulus-side stream in series

• general structure: The association of one of the structures shown in Figure 4 in a set of parallel branches, as illustrated by Figure 5 for the tube-side stream aligned in parallel and annulus-side stream in series.

The design problem involves the determination of the following:

• stream allocation of the hot and cold streams (tube-side or annulus-side)

• diameter and length of the tubes of the heat exchanger hairpins (all hairpins are equal)

• layout (number of hairpins per unit, number of units in parallel for each flow side per branch and the number of branches)

The traditional heat exchanger design equations (LMTD method and Darcy–Weisbach equation) are employed, minimizing the total heat transfer area, constrained by maximum allowed pressure drops. Finally, it is only considered streams without phase change and constant physical properties (representing average values), but considering any flow regime (laminar, transitional, and turbulent). The LMTD method uses a logarithmic mean temperature difference given by inlet and outlet temperatures of counterflow patterns. Although in Figure 4 each unit corresponds to a number of hairpins of counter-current flow, the overall flow pattern in Figure 4, (ii) and (iii) does not correspond to a true countercurrent flow. To account
for the deviation of the internal flow pattern from that of a countercurrent flow, the logarithmic mean temperature difference is multiplied by a correction factor. This factor starts at 1 for pure countercurrent flow and reduces its value as the number of units per branch increases. Because the factor is obtained analytically, it is a rigorous correction and therefore does not change the accuracy of the formulation.

3. MODEL FORMULATION

The problem constraints are composed of the representation of the geometric variables, stream allocation equations, structural constraints, thermal and hydraulic modeling, and pressure drop and velocity bounds. The problem parameters that are kept constant during the optimization, are identified with a symbol \( \Lambda \) on top.

3.1. Discrete Representation of Geometric Variables. The diameter and length of the tubes employed in the construction of the heat exchanger are usually selected from a set of discrete values according to the available standard options. This design feature imposes the following relations involving the sets of binary variables that represent the available options:

\[
dte = \sum_{id=1}^{id_{\text{max}}} \tilde{p}dte_{id} yd_{id} = 1 \quad (1)
\]

\[
dti = \sum_{id=1}^{id_{\text{max}}} \tilde{p}dli_{id} yd_{id} = 1 \quad (2)
\]

\[
Dte = \sum_{iD=1}^{iD_{\text{max}}} \tilde{p}Dte_{iD} yD_{iD} = 1 \quad (3)
\]

\[
Dti = \sum_{iD=1}^{iD_{\text{max}}} \tilde{p}Dli_{iD} yD_{iD} = 1 \quad (4)
\]

\[
Lh = \sum_{iLh=1}^{iLh_{\text{max}}} \tilde{p}Lh_{iLh} yLh_{iLh} = 1 \quad (5)
\]

where \( dte \) and \( dti \) are the outer and inner diameters of the inner tube, \( Dte \) and \( Dti \) are the outer and inner diameters of the outer tube, and \( Lh \) is the tube length of each hairpin. The corresponding binary variables which indicate the discrete options selected are \( yd_{id} \) for the inner tube diameter (discrete values: \( \tilde{p}dte_{id} \) and \( \tilde{p}dli_{id} \)), \( yD_{iD} \) for the outer tube diameter (discrete values: \( \tilde{p}Dte_{iD} \) and \( \tilde{p}Dli_{iD} \)), and \( yLh_{iLh} \) for the tube length (discrete values: \( \tilde{p}Lh_{iLh} \)).

The selection of the number of parallel branches present in the heat exchanger design (\( NB \)) is represented by the binary variables \( yB_{iB} \):

\[
NB = \sum_{iB=1}^{iB_{\text{max}}} yB_{iB} = 1 \quad (9)
\]

where \( \tilde{p}NB_{iB} \) is the set of discrete values of the possible number of parallel branches (1, 2, ..., \( iB_{\text{max}} \)).

The number of units aligned in parallel in each branch for the tube-side stream (\( NP_t \)) and for the annulus-side stream (\( NP_a \)) as well as the number of countercurrent hairpins per unit (\( Nh \)) are also represented using binary variables according to their integer nature:
where $yPt_{iE}$ and $yPa_{iE}$ are the binary variables which represent the integer options of the number of units in parallel per branch for the tube-side and the annulus-side streams, and $p\overline{NE}_{iE}$ is the sequence of integer numbers representing the possible numbers of units interconnected along a branch (1, 2, ..., $sE_{\text{max}}$). For branch structure type 1 (Figure 4i-a) the number of parallel units selected for both flow-sides ($NPt$ and $NPa$) are equal to unity ($yPt_{iE=1} = yPa_{iE=1} = 1$). Similarly, $yNh_{Nh}$ is the binary variable that represent the integer options of the number of hairpins per unit, and $p\overline{Nh}_{Nh}$ is the sequence of integer numbers representing the number of hairpins possible per unit (1, 2, ..., $sNh_{Nh}$).

According to the structural options shown in Figure 4, an additional constraint must be included to ensure that if the tube-side has already more than one parallel passage, the annular side can be only arranged in series and vice versa:

$$yPt_{iE=1} + yPa_{iE=1} \geq 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

To force that the outer tube inner diameter is larger than the inner tube outer diameter one writes:

$$\sum_{iD=1}^{sD_{\text{max}}} pD_{iD} yD_{iD} \geq \sum_{iD=1}^{sD_{\text{max}}} pD_{iD} yD_{iD} + \varepsilon$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

where $\varepsilon$ is the smallest diameter difference. Alternatively, one can construct the model where each equation containing both diameters is written only for combinations ($sDsD$) that are allowed. This latter option is favored when sets can be used in programming environments such as GAMS.

The utilization of the proposed set of binary variables to describe the interconnection structure of double pipe heat exchanger elements is illustrated by the example depicted in Figure 6. According to the proposed approach, the nonzero binary variables that describe the structure presented in this figure are $yB_{B,3} = 1$ (three parallel branches), $yPt_{iE=1} = 1$ and $yPa_{iE=5} = 1$ (five units per branch aligned in series for the tube-side flow and in parallel for the annulus-side flow) and $yNh_{Nh=2} = 1$ (two hairpins per branch).

### 3.2. Stream Allocation.

The stream allocation is controlled by the binary variables $yT_c$ and $yT_h$. If $yT_c = 1$, then the cold stream flows inside the inner tube and the hot stream flows in the annulus; if $yT_h = 1$, then the hot stream flows inside the inner tube and the cold stream flows in the annulus.

One may associate known parameters of the hot and cold streams, such as mass flow rates ($\overline{m}_h$ and $\overline{m}_c$) for instance, to the corresponding variables for the tube-side and annulus-side flows:

$$mt = \overline{m}_h T_c + \overline{m}_c T_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

$$ma = \overline{m}_h T_c + \overline{m}_c T_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

Thus, if the cold stream flows inside the inner tube ($yT_c = 1$), then $mt = \overline{m}_c$ and $ma = \overline{m}_h$. Analogously, the following equations relate physical properties and fouling factors of the hot and cold streams to the corresponding values of the tube-side and annulus-side flows:

$$\rho t = \overline{\rho}_h yT_c + \overline{\rho}_c yT_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

$$\rho a = \overline{\rho}_h yT_c + \overline{\rho}_c yT_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

$$Cpt = \overline{C}_p yT_c + \overline{C}_p yT_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

$$Cpa = \overline{C}_p yT_c + \overline{C}_p yT_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

$$\mu t = \overline{\mu}_h yT_c + \overline{\mu}_c yT_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

$$\mu a = \overline{\mu}_h yT_c + \overline{\mu}_c yT_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

$$ka = \overline{k}_c yT_c + \overline{k}_h yT_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

$$fa = \overline{R} yT_c + \overline{R} yT_h$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)

$$yT_c + yT_h = 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)

where $m$ is the mass flow rate, $\rho$ is the density, $Cp$ is the heat capacity, $\mu$ is the viscosity, $k$ is the thermal conductivity, $Rf$ is the fouling factor, and the subscripts $c$ and $h$ indicate the cold and hot streams, respectively.

### 3.3. Structural Constraints.

The flow area and length of the hydraulic path of the streams considering the complete double pipe heat exchanger structure depend on the selection of the

"..."
tube diameters and length, the number of hairpins and units in series and in parallel in each branch, and the number of parallel branches:

\[
A_t = \left( \frac{\pi dt^2}{4} \right) NB NP_t
\]  
(32)

\[
A_a = \left( \frac{\pi Di^2}{4} - \frac{\pi de^2}{4} \right) NB NP_a
\]  
(33)

\[
Lu = Nh Lh
\]  
(34)

\[
Lt = Lu NP_a
\]  
(35)

\[
La = Lu NP_t
\]  
(36)

where \(A_t\) and \(A_a\) are the tube-side and annulus-side flow area, \(Lu\) is the total length of one unit and \(Lt\) and \(La\) are the corresponding flow path lengths for the streams flowing in the inner tube and in the annulus, respectively.

### 3.4. Inner Tube Side Thermal and Hydraulic Modeling.

The Prandtl number is given by

\[
Prt = \frac{Cpt \mu_t}{kt}
\]  
(37)

The flow velocity and the corresponding Reynolds number are given by

\[
v_t = \frac{(mt/pt)}{At}
\]  
(38)

\[
Ret = \frac{dti vt pt}{\mu_t}
\]  
(39)

Ignoring the minor head losses in the connections and bends, the pressure drop of the flow in the inner tube is calculated by the Darcy–Weisbach equation (omitting the viscosity correction factor):\(^\text{15}\)

\[
\Delta P_t = \rho f_t \frac{L_t v_t^2}{2 dti}
\]  
(40)

where \(f_t\) is the Darcy friction factor.

The friction factor depends on the flow regime as follows:\(^\text{15}\)

\[
f_{\text{lam}} = \frac{64}{Ret} \quad \text{for } Ret \leq 1311
\]  
(41)

\[
f_{\text{trans}} = 0.0488 \quad \text{for } 1311 < Ret \leq 3380
\]  
(42)

\[
f_{\text{turb}} = 0.014 + \frac{1.056}{Ret^{0.42}} \quad \text{for } Ret > 3380
\]  
(43)

The values of the intervals of the different flow regimes in eqs 41 to 43 guarantee a continuous profile of the friction factor, as shown in Figure 7.

Regarding the Nusselt number, laminar, transitional, and turbulent flows are considered, with the threshold of \(Ret = 2300\) between the laminar and the transitional/turbulent flow. For the transitional and turbulent flow, the Gnielinski correlation is used:\(^\text{16}\)

\[
Nu^Gni = \frac{(ft/8)(Ret - 1000)Prt}{1 + 12.7(ft/8)^{1/3} + (Prt^{2/3} - 1)} \quad \text{for } Ret > 2300
\]  
(44)

Since the laminar flow is more affected by the entry region, more than one equation is utilized, according to the proposal of Incropera et al.\(^\text{16}\)

For \(Prt > 5\), the Hausen correlation is used:

\[
Nu^{\text{Haus}} = 3.66 + \frac{0.0668(2dt/Lh)Ret Prt}{1 + 0.04(2dt/Lh)Ret Prt^{3/5}}
\]  
(45)

\[
\text{for } Ret \leq 2300; Prt > 5
\]

For \(Prt \leq 5\), the Nusselt number is specified by the Sieder and Tate (S&T) correlation unless its given value is lower than the theoretical (theo) Nusselt number for fully developed flow (3.66), in which case the latter is applied:

\[
Nu^{\text{S&T}} = \frac{1}{1.86}\left(\frac{Ret Prt dti}{Lh/2}\right)^{1/3}
\]  
(46)

\[
\text{for } Ret \leq 2300, Prt \leq 5, \text{ Nut}^{\text{S&T}} \geq 3.66
\]

\[
\text{Nut}^{\text{theo}} = 3.66 \quad \text{for } Ret \leq 2300, Prt \leq 5, \text{ Nut}^{\text{S&T}} < 3.66
\]  
(47)

Without loss of generality, the viscosity correction factor in the Sieder and Tate correlation in eq 46 has also been omitted (i.e., the ratio between bulk and wall viscosities were considered equal to 1).

To formulate a set of constraints able to represent the friction factor and Nusselt number evaluation for all possible conditions described in eqs 41 to 47, binary variables are associated with the possible ranges of Ret, Prt, and Nut, as indicated in Figure 8. In this figure, \(URe, UPr, \text{ and } UNu\) are maximum values of Ret, Prt, and Nut, respectively. In each interval, the corresponding binary variable is equal to 1 and the others are 0.

The following equations relate the binary variables and their corresponding ranges:

\[
Ret \leq 1311 y_{Ret_1} + 2300 y_{Ret_2} + 3380 y_{Ret_3} + URe y_{Ret_4}
\]  
(48)

\[
Ret \geq 1311 y_{Ret_2} + 2300 y_{Ret_3} + 3380 y_{Ret_4} + \epsilon
\]  
(49)

\[
Prt \leq Sy_{Prt_1} + UPr y_{Prt_2}
\]  
(50)

\[
Prt \geq Sy_{Prt_2} + \epsilon
\]  
(51)

\[
Nut^{\text{S&T}} \leq 3.66 y_{Nut_1} + UNu y_{Nut_2} - \epsilon
\]  
(52)

\[
Nut^{\text{S&T}} \geq 3.66 y_{Nut_2}
\]  
(53)

where \(\epsilon\) is a small positive number.
Since only one binary variable must be selected for each set of intervals, it yields
\[ \sum_{k=1}^{\text{max}} y_{\text{Ret},k} = 1 \]  
(54)
\[ y_{\text{Prt},1} + y_{\text{Prt},2} = 1 \]  
(55)
\[ y_{\text{Nut},1} + y_{\text{Nut},2} = 1 \]  
(56)

Therefore, the friction factor and the Nusselt number are represented by
\[ ft = f_{\text{lam}}(y_{\text{Ret},1}) + f_{\text{tran}}(y_{\text{Ret},2} + y_{\text{Ret},3}) + f_{\text{turb}}y_{\text{Ret},4} \]  
(57)
\[ \text{Nut} = \text{Nut}_{\text{theo}}(y_{\text{Ret},1} + y_{\text{Ret},2})y_{\text{Prt},1}y_{\text{Nut},1} + \text{Nut}_{\text{skt}}(y_{\text{Ret},1} + y_{\text{Ret},2})y_{\text{Prt},1}y_{\text{Nut},2} + \text{Nut}_{\text{hau}}y_{\text{Ret},1}y_{\text{Ret},2}y_{\text{Prt},2} + \text{Nut}_{\text{gni}}(y_{\text{Ret},1} + y_{\text{Ret},2}) \]  
(58)

### 3.5. Annulus Side Thermal and Hydraulic Modeling.

The Prandtl number is
\[ \text{Pra} = \frac{C_{\text{pa}} \mu a}{\kappa a} \]  
(59)
The flow velocity inside the annular region is given by
\[ v_a = \frac{(ma/pa)}{A_a} \]  
(60)
The hydraulic diameter (four times the flow cross-sectional area divided by the wetted perimeter) can be simplified to:
\[ dh = D_{ti} - d_{te} \]  
(61)
The Reynolds number is
\[ \text{Rea} = \frac{dh v_a \rho a}{\mu a} \]  
(62)

Ignoring the head losses in the connections and bends, the pressure drop of the flow in the annulus is given by the Darcy–Weisbach equation using the hydraulic diameter (also omitting the viscosity correction factor):\textsuperscript{15}
\[ \Delta P_a = \rho_a \frac{f_t L v_a^2}{2h} \]  
(63)
where \( f_t \) is the Darcy friction factor for the annular flow.

The annular region friction factor, analogously to the inner tube, depends on the flow regime according to the following equations:\textsuperscript{15}
\[ f_{\text{lam}} = \frac{64}{\text{Rea}} \quad \text{for Rea} \leq 500 \]  
(64)
\[ f_{\text{tran}} = 0.02696 + \frac{32.656}{\text{Rea}^{0.05}} \quad \text{for} \ 500 < \text{Rea} \leq 10000 \]  
(65)
\[ f_{\text{turb}} = \frac{0.178}{\text{Rea}^{0.1865}} \quad \text{for Rea} > 10000 \]  
(66)
The threshold Reynolds number values in this case are 500 and 10000 and these equations also form a continuous profile for calculation of the friction factor, as shown in **Figure 9**.

Regarding the Nusselt number, the same ranges and correlations used for the tube-side are applied, replacing the inner tube diameter by the hydraulic diameter:
\[ \text{Nua}_{\text{theo}} = 3.66 \quad \text{for Rea} \leq 2300, \ \text{Pra} \leq 5, \ \text{and Nua}_{\text{skt}} < 3.66 \]  
(67)
\[ \text{Nua}_{\text{skt}} = 1.86 \left( \frac{\text{Rea} \ \text{Pra} \ dh}{L_{h/2}} \right)^{1/3} \]  
(68)
\[ \text{Nua}_{\text{hau}} = 3.66 + \frac{0.0668(2dh/L_h)\text{Rea} \ \text{Pra}}{1 + 0.04(2dh/L_h)\text{Rea} \ \text{Pra}}^{2/3} \]  
(69)
\[ \text{Nua}_{\text{gni}} = \left( \frac{f_a/8}{8} \right)(\text{Rea} - 1000)\text{Pra} \]  
(70)
\[ \text{for Rea} \leq 2300 \text{ and } \text{Pra} > 5 \]
\[ \text{for Rea} > 2300 \]

Binary variables are then included to describe each interval of \( \text{Rea}, \ \text{Pra}, \ \text{and Nua}_{\text{skt}}, \text{ as depicted in Figure 10. The same approach used for the tube-side flow for the evaluation of the Nusselt number is implemented here as follows:} \]
\[ \text{Rea} \leq 500y_{\text{Rea},1} + 2300y_{\text{Rea},2} + 10000y_{\text{Rea},3} + \bar{U}R_e y_{\text{Rea},4} \]  
(71)
\[ \text{Rea} \geq 500y_{\text{Rea},1} + 2300y_{\text{Rea},3} + 10000y_{\text{Rea},4} + \varepsilon \]  
(72)
\[ \text{Pra} \leq 5y_{\text{Pra},1} + \bar{U}Pr y_{\text{Pra},2} \]  
(73)

---

**Figure 8.** Possible ranges for \( \text{Ret}, \ \text{Prt}, \ \text{Nut}_{\text{skt}} \) and its corresponding binary variables.

**Figure 9.** Annular friction factor profile in all three regimes generated from eqs 64–66.
3.6. Heat Transfer Coefficients. The convective heat transfer coefficient for the tube-side and annulus-side flows are given by

\[ h_t = \frac{N_u k_t}{d_t} \]
\[ h_a = \frac{N_u k_a}{d_h} \]

The overall heat transfer coefficient is then determined by

\[ U = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{h_t} \frac{d_t}{d_t} + R_f \frac{d_e}{d_t} + \frac{d_e \ln \left( \frac{d_e}{d_t} \right)}{2 k_{tube}} + R_f a + \frac{1}{h_a}} \]

where \( k_{tube} \) is the thermal conductivity of the inner tube.

3.7. Heat Transfer Rate. The heat transfer rate is given by

\[ \dot{Q} = U A_{rel} \Delta T_{lm} F \]
where the equipment heat transfer area is given by

\[ A = \pi d t e L u N B N P t N P a \]  \hspace{1cm} (92)

Therefore, the heat transfer rate shown in eq 85 can be reorganized as

\[ UA \geq \frac{\dot{Q}}{\Delta T \text{Im} F} \]  \hspace{1cm} (93)

### 3.8. Pressure Drop and Velocity Bounds

The lower and upper bounds on the velocities of the tube-side flow and annulus-side flow are given by

\[ vt \geq \bar{v}_{\text{min}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (94)

\[ vt \leq \bar{v}_{\text{max}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (95)

\[ va \geq \bar{a}_{\text{min}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (96)

\[ va \leq \bar{a}_{\text{max}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (97)

While the pressure drop bounds are represented by

\[ \Delta P_t \leq \Delta P_{\text{disp}} y_T + \Delta P_{\text{h disp}} y_T \]  \hspace{1cm} (98)

\[ \Delta P_a \leq \Delta P_{\text{disp}} y_T + \Delta P_{\text{h disp}} y_T \]  \hspace{1cm} (99)

### 3.9. Objective Function

The objective function is given by the minimization of the heat transfer area:

\[ \min A + ph Nh \]  \hspace{1cm} (100)

where \( ph \) is a penalty factor (a random small value) associated with the number of hairpins directing the optimization, in case of equivalent solutions, to the one with the smaller number of elements.

The above model is here called the raw MINLP. It uses a discrete representation of the geometric variables and several nonlinear relationships involving continuous variables. Additionally, some equations contain nonlinearities involving binary variables (eqs 57, 58, 80, 81, and 90), that are incompatible with the use of some optimization algorithms.

To make the model more amenable to be solved by algorithms that require linearity in binary variables, a reformulation to eliminate the nonlinearities involving binary variables (thus rendering the binary-linear MINLP model) is presented. The linear constraints or the constraints with continuous-only nonlinearities remain the same.

### 4. MINLP REFORMULATION

This section presents the reformulation of some constraints to eliminate the nonlinearities involving binary variables (thus rendering the binary-linear MINLP model). The linear constraints or the constraints with continuous-only nonlinearities remain the same.

#### 4.1. Reformulation Techniques

In the original optimization problem (raw MINLP model), there are two types of nonlinear terms involving binaries: the product of two or more binary variables and the product of a binary variable and a function of continuous variables.

The product of binary variables can be substituted by a continuous variable and a set of linear inequalities, as follows. Let \( y_{p_i} y_{q_j} \ldots \) and \( y_z \) be a set of binary variables. The product of these variables can be substituted by a continuous nonnegative variable \( w_{i,j,k} \).

\[ w_{i,j,k} = y_{p_i} y_{q_j} \ldots y_z \]  \hspace{1cm} (101)

where this equality is guaranteed by the inclusion of these constraints:

\[ w_{i,j,k} \leq y_{p_i} \]  \hspace{1cm} (102)

\[ w_{i,j,k} \leq y_{q_j} \]  \hspace{1cm} (103)

\[ \ldots \]  \hspace{1cm} (104)

\[ w_{i,j,k} \leq y_z \]  \hspace{1cm} (105)

where \( m \) is the number of binary variables in the product.

The reformulation of the product between a binary variable and a function of continuous variables also involves the introduction of an additional continuous variable and a set of inequality constraints. Let \( f(x_1, x_2, \ldots) \) be a function of continuous variables such that \( 0 \leq f \leq \Phi \) in the problem domain and \( y \) is a binary variable. The product of this function and the binary variable can be substituted by a continuous nonnegative variable \( w \) together with the inclusion of these constraints:

\[ w - \Phi y \leq 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (106)

\[ f(x_1, x_2, \ldots) - w - \Phi (1 - y) \leq 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (107)

\[ f(x_1, x_2, \ldots) - w \geq 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (108)

#### 4.2. Resultant Formulation

The application of the approach described above modifies the following set of constraints: inner tube side thermal and hydraulic modeling, annulus side thermal and hydraulic modeling, and heat transfer rate. The detailed description of each equation modified is described in the Supporting Information.

### 5. HEURISTIC APPROACH

To later compare our MINLP approach to some heuristic approaches, a proposal of a heuristic design procedure is presented here. Unlike for other equipment (e.g., distillation trays) there is no step-by-step heuristic procedure widely available in the literature. There, the identification of a feasible solution depends entirely on the intervention of the designer using a trial and verification method. Serth, for example applies a trial-and-viability-verification without outlining any rule. Thus, his example is used here as a simple source to propose one such procedure. The proposed procedure is as follows:

- Assume a starting structure, as simple as possible. A good candidate is a one-unit branch structure as in Figure 4i-a.
- Pick hairpin dimensions from the discrete available options (diameters and length).
- Calculate the heat transfer coefficient, the required area (which together with a reasonable excess area, e.g., minimum of 10%, gives the necessary number of hairpins for the selected structure), and pressure drops.
- If the results meet the design requirements (e.g., velocities and pressure drops according to acceptable values) the procedure stops.
- Otherwise, a structure change is made, a step that is highly dependent on the designer, who, according to the unmet requirement, can (a) change fluid allocation, (b) change the hairpin dimensions (diameters and length), (c) select


more or less branches, or (d) select another branch structure (Figure 4).

Quite clearly, some changes, such as dimensions, are the obvious first target: for example, if the area is smaller than the area required, and the pressure drop is lower than the limit, increasing length may be the first thing to consider. If pressure drop is the limiting factor, the obvious dimension to modify is the diameter, or the number of branches. The analysis of all the starting options and the decisions to make when the service requirements are not met, which would be in the direction of creating a rule-based automatic algorithm, is not pursued here.

6. RESULTS

Three aspects are explored in the analysis of the results:

Table 1. Initial Estimates for Key Binary Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>initial estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inner tube diameter selection</td>
<td>$y_{i1} = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stream allocation</td>
<td>$yT_1 = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range of Reynolds identification</td>
<td>$y{\text{Ret}} = y{\text{Ret}}_a = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range of Nusselt identification</td>
<td>$y{\text{Nut}} = y{\text{Nut}}_a = 1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Initial Estimates for Key Continuous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>initial estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length of one unit</td>
<td>$L_h = \frac{1}{2} (L_{\text{hot}} + L_{\text{cold}})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds number$^a$</td>
<td>$Re_X = \frac{Re_{\text{hot}} + Re_{\text{cold}}}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusselt number$^a$</td>
<td>$Nu_X = \frac{Nu_{\text{hot}} + Nu_{\text{cold}}}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seider and Tate Nusselt number$^d$</td>
<td>$Nu_{\text{St}} = 3.66$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausen Nusselt number$^d$</td>
<td>$Nu_{\text{St}} = 3.66$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$x being $t$ (tube side) or $a$ (annulus side).

Table 3. Example 1: Stream Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parameter</th>
<th>unit</th>
<th>cold stream (benzene)</th>
<th>hot stream (aniline)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mass flow, $\dot{m}_{ST}$</td>
<td>kg/s</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inlet temp, $T_{ST}$</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>65.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outlet temp, $T_{\text{out}}$</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>37.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>density, $\rho_{ST}$</td>
<td>kg/m$^3$</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viscosity, $\mu_{ST}$</td>
<td>Pa·s</td>
<td>$5.5 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat capacity, $C_{p,ST}$</td>
<td>J/(kg·°C)</td>
<td>1758.46</td>
<td>2177.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thermal conductivity $k_{ST}$</td>
<td>W/(m·°C)</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fouling resistance, $R_{f,ST}$</td>
<td>m$^2$·°C/W</td>
<td>$1.76 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$1.76 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available pressure drop, $\Delta p_{\text{available}}$</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. comparison of the mathematical programming solution with a result from the literature
ii. comparison of the mathematical programming solution with a solution generated by the procedure explained in section 5
iii. comparison between the proposed MINLP approaches

Complementarily, the Supporting Information material contains additional examples that explore the flexibility of the proposed approach in relation to different flow regimes and structural alternatives.

The results explored in sections 6.1 and 6.2 are generated by our raw MINLP formulation, which is then compared with our linear-binary MINLP approach in section 6.3. All numerical results were obtained using the GAMS software version 23.7.3 and a branch-and-bound solver (SBB). Without good initial estimates, the SBB solver used does not converge for neither MINLP models. The result of the root node relaxation of the SBB solver is highly sensitive to the initial estimate. Thus, it was necessary to identify a suitable initial set of values for some of the problem variables to have convergence. GAMS default initial value for all variables is zero, unless zero is not within the bounded range (in which case the default is the bound closest to zero) or the user determines otherwise. Six binary variables were identified to relate tube diameter, stream allocation, and range of Reynolds numbers that, in our examples, need initial values to promote the convergence. The values shown in Table 1 are the ones found to work well for the set of proposed examples for this set of variables. Furthermore, it was found that when using SBB, the convergence also depends on the initial estimate for some continuous variables, as shown in Table 2. Finally, DICOPT does not provide results for any of the two MINLP approaches, no matter what initial values are provided. This issue on initialization is not investigated further, because it is not the aim of the current paper to seek a general systematic route to find robust and automatic initialization procedures. Rather, all the difficulties associated with the use of local solvers are simply pointed out and these are difficulties known to many.

6.1. Comparison with Literature Results.

Example 1 is a design problem proposed by Serth, which consists of determining the number of required hairpins and their arrangement for the service shown in Table 3.

The design methodology employed by Serth consists of a trial-and-verify procedure, similar to the one shown in section 5. Serth does not provide rules or hints of how to obtain a different design and stops its procedure when the first viable equipment is found.

The solution obtained by Serth is illustrated in Figure 11 and consists in a single branch of type II structure (Figure 4i-a), with an inner pipe stream connected in series and annulus side stream aligned in parallel in two units, each containing five hairpins using pipes with a thermal conductivity of 16.27 W/(m·°C).

The thermo-fluid dynamic relations used by Serth are different from the model employed in this paper, particularly the friction factor and the Nusselt number correlations. For comparison, Serth’s correlations are used in the optimization applied to this example. Details of the resultant formulation using Serth’s correlations employed in this example are shown in the Supporting Information material. In all other examples, the correlations presented in section 3 are employed.
Additionally, it is also important to mention that the heat exchanger modeling employed in the optimization does not consider the pressure drops in the nozzles and return bends, and therefore these elements were excluded from the analysis. The results of pressure drop reported here from Serth\textsuperscript{13} also excluded the head loss in these elements. An analysis of the trial-and-verification procedure adopted by Serth\textsuperscript{13} indicates that the exclusion of these minor losses during the sequence of design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parameter\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>discrete options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p_{NB_{l,b}}$</td>
<td>1 to 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{NB_{l,b}}$</td>
<td>1 to 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{L_{h,s,b}}$</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>5 10 15 20 25 32\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{L_{h,s,b}}$</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1.524 3.048 4.572 6.096 7.620 9.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inner tube NPS</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>1 1/4 7/4 1 1/4 1 1/4 1 1/2 2 2 1/2 3 3 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inner tube OD ($p_{D_{l,b}}$)</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.021 0.027 0.033 0.042 0.048 0.060 0.073 0.089 0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outer tube NPS</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>1 1/4 1 1/2 2 2 1/2 3 3 1/2 4 4 1/2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outer tube OD ($p_{D_{l,b}}$)</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.042 0.048 0.060 0.073 0.089 0.102 0.114 0.127 0.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}NPS = nominal pipe size, OD = outer diameter.  
\textsuperscript{b}Option used only in section 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>units</th>
<th>Serth\textsuperscript{13}</th>
<th>raw MINLP using Serth correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tube side stream</td>
<td></td>
<td>aniline</td>
<td>aniline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total heat exchanger area, $A$</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>12.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required heat exchanger area</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inner tube NPS–OD</td>
<td>in–m</td>
<td>1 1/4 0.042</td>
<td>1 1/4 0.042 7/4 0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outer tube NPS–OD</td>
<td>in–m</td>
<td>2 0.060</td>
<td>2 0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairpin length, $L_{h}$</td>
<td>ft–m</td>
<td>32–9.75</td>
<td>32–9.75 10–3.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of hairpins per units, $N_{h}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of branches, $N_{B}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube side units in parallel, $N_{P_{t}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annular side units in parallel, $N_{P_{a}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube side velocity, $v_{t}$</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annulus side velocity, $v_{a}$</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube side film coefficient, $h_{t}$</td>
<td>W/(m² °C)</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>996 1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annulus side film coefficient, $h_{a}$</td>
<td>W/(m² °C)</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1446 977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall heat transfer coefficient, $U$</td>
<td>W/(m² °C)</td>
<td>391.8</td>
<td>395.9 423.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correction factor, $F$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.836 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube side pressure drop, $dP_{t}$</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>78.9 49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annulus side pressure drop, $dP_{a}$</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>71.1 123.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}NPS = nominal pipe size, OD = outer diameter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parameter</th>
<th>unit</th>
<th>cold stream</th>
<th>hot stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mass flow, $m_{AS}$</td>
<td>kg/s</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inlet temperature, $T_{AS}$</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outlet temperature, $T_{AS}$</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>density, $\rho_{AS}$</td>
<td>kg/m³</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viscosity, $\mu_{AS}$</td>
<td>Pa·s</td>
<td>5.5 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>2 × 10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat capacity, $C_{AS}$</td>
<td>J/(kg °C)</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thermal conductivity, $k_{AS}$</td>
<td>W/(m °C)</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fouling resistance, $R_{AS}$</td>
<td>m² °C/W</td>
<td>2 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>2 × 10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Example 1: Optimal solution obtained by our raw MINLP (with Serth correlations).

Figure 13. Example 2: Trial and verification procedure solution.
steps would not modify the result obtained, which enables a direct comparison of the results.

The optimization search space employed in the proposed analysis is depicted in Table 4, and includes the original design proposed by Serth.\(^13\) The velocity bounds applied in the optimization runs were 0.9 to 3 m/s and a minimum excess area of 10% (same as used by Serth\(^13\)). Also, for comparison purposes, the initial estimate was the first heat exchanger attempted by Serth in his trial-and-verification procedure, which consisted of a one countercurrent unit branch (structure on Figure 4i-a) with six hairpins (of the same dimensions as Serth’s final solution) and benzene in the inner pipe. Table 5 contains the reported values by Serth,\(^14\) the results obtained using the raw MINLP model modified to use Serth’s correlations using the same geometry, and the corresponding optimal solution. The diameters for both inner and outer tubes are calculated considering pipe schedule 40.

The formulation proposed in this paper was able to find equivalent results from Serth\(^3\) for the same heat exchanger structure (only the structural binary variables were fixed), therefore validating the model implemented. The small difference in the pressure drops were expected since Serth\(^13\) accounts for the viscosity correction factor which is here omitted in eqs 40 and 63. Our optimization approach obtained an optimal result (illustrated in Figure 12) that shows a reduction of 23% in area, which is attained due to a combination of higher LMTD correction factor \(F\) resulting from the counter-current arrangement of the set of units of the proposed heat exchanger and a higher heat transfer coefficient resulting from a substantial improvement of the annulus heat transfer film coefficient, in turn enhanced by a higher velocity.

6.2. Comparison with Heuristic Approaches. The advantages of an MINLP approach over a heuristic trial-and-verification procedure are illustrated in example 1, originally solved by Serth.\(^13\) For example 2, the stream data are depicted in Table 6.

The discrete options applied to this design problem are shown in Table 4, where a thermal conductivity of 55 W/(m °C) is used for the material of the pipes, flow velocity in both sides is between 1 and 3 m/s, available pressure drop for both streams is equal to 50 kPa, and there is a minimum excess area of 20%.

Heuristics shown in section 5 are used to obtain a viable solution, which is illustrated in Figure 13. The Supporting Information material depicts the steps taken during the procedure.

However, when using the raw MINLP formulation, one gets an area reduction of 17.8%, with the structure illustrated in Figure 14. This area reduction is achieved by using higher flow velocities compatible with available pressure drops (Table 7).

6.3. Comparison of the Performance of the MINLP Models. The two MINLP approaches are compared in this section. For examples 1 and 2, the optimization using the linear-binary MINLP formulation results in the same solutions as the ones from the raw MINLP formulation, already reported in the previous subsections. However, this is not a rule for every possible scenario, as illustrated here with examples 3 and 4, where both MINLP approaches give different results. The stream data for both examples are shown in Table 8.

Table 7. Example 2: Design Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable(^a)</th>
<th>unit</th>
<th>trial and verification</th>
<th>raw MINLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tube side stream</td>
<td>m(^3)</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total heat exchanger area, (A)</td>
<td>m(^3)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required heat exchanger area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inner tube NPS–OD</td>
<td>in–m</td>
<td>1−0.033</td>
<td>1/(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outer tube NPS–OD</td>
<td>in–m</td>
<td>2−0.060</td>
<td>1/(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairpin length, (L_h)</td>
<td>ft–m</td>
<td>5−1.52</td>
<td>15−4.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of hairpins per unit, (N_h)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of branches, (N_B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube side units in parallel, (N_{Pt})</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annular side units in parallel, (N_{Pa})</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube side velocity, (v_t)</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annulus side velocity, (v_a)</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube side film coefficient, (h_t)</td>
<td>W/(m(^2)°C)</td>
<td>6496</td>
<td>4292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annulus side film coefficient, (h_a)</td>
<td>W/(m(^2)°C)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall heat transfer coefficient, (U)</td>
<td>W/(m(^2)°C)</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>991.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correction factor, (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube side pressure drop, (dP_t)</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annulus side pressure drop, (dP_a)</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)NPS = nominal pipe size, OD = outer diameter.
Hairpins are built with a material with a thermal conductivity of 55 W/(m°C). The additional design specifications include flow velocity in both sides between 1 and 3 m/s for both examples, and a minimum excess area of 20% for example 3, and of 10% for example 4. The results obtained for example 3 and example 4, for both MINLP approaches, are depicted in Tables 9 and 10, and Figures 15 and 16, respectively. In the case of Table 9, there is a large difference between the number of branches associated with

### Table 8. Examples 3 and 4: Stream Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Example 3 (Hot Stream)</th>
<th>Example 3 (Cold Stream)</th>
<th>Example 4 (Hot Stream)</th>
<th>Example 4 (Cold Stream)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass flow, ( \dot{m}_{ST} )</td>
<td>kg/s</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inlet temperature, ( T_{in,ST} )</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlet temperature, ( T_{out,ST} )</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density, ( \rho_{ST} )</td>
<td>kg/m³</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscosity, ( \mu_{ST} )</td>
<td>Pa·s</td>
<td>1.89 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>7.2 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>9.5 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat capacity, ( \dot{C}_{p,ST} )</td>
<td>J/(kg°C)</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td>4187</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity, ( k_{ST} )</td>
<td>m²°C/W</td>
<td>2 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>4 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>3 × 10⁻⁴</td>
<td>3 × 10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available pressure drop, ( \Delta P_{ST,dry} )</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9. Example 3: Optimization Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Raw MINLP</th>
<th>Linear-binary MINLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tube side stream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total heat exchanger area, ( A )</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>88.73</td>
<td>91.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required heat exchanger area</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>73.94</td>
<td>75.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner tube NPS–OD</td>
<td>in–m</td>
<td>1 1/4–0.048</td>
<td>1–0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer tube NPS–OD</td>
<td>in–m</td>
<td>2 1/4–0.073</td>
<td>2–0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairpin length, ( L_h )</td>
<td>ft–m</td>
<td>20–6.096</td>
<td>25–7.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hairpins per unit, ( N_h )</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of branches, ( N_B )</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube side units in parallel, ( N_{Pt} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular side units in parallel, ( N_{Pa} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube side velocity, ( v_t )</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annulus side velocity, ( v_a )</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube side film coefficient, ( h_t )</td>
<td>W/(m²°C)</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annulus side film coefficient, ( h_a )</td>
<td>W/(m²°C)</td>
<td>9129</td>
<td>7449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall heat transfer coefficient, ( U )</td>
<td>W/(m²°C)</td>
<td>601.3</td>
<td>579.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction factor, ( F )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube side pressure drop, ( dP_t )</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annulus side pressure drop, ( dP_a )</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Example 4 – Optimization Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Raw MINLP</th>
<th>Linear-binary MINLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tube side stream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total heat exchanger area, ( A )</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>40.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required heat exchanger area</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>55.92</td>
<td>37.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner tube NPS–OD</td>
<td>in–m</td>
<td>1 1/4–0.042</td>
<td>3 1/2–0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer tube NPS–OD</td>
<td>in–m</td>
<td>2 1/4–0.073</td>
<td>4 1/2–0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairpin length, ( L_h )</td>
<td>ft–m</td>
<td>25–7.620</td>
<td>10–3.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of hairpins per unit, ( N_h )</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of branches, ( N_B )</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube side units in parallel, ( N_{Pt} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular side units in parallel, ( N_{Pa} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube side velocity, ( v_t )</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annulus side velocity, ( v_a )</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube side film coefficient, ( h_t )</td>
<td>W/(m²°C)</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annulus side film coefficient, ( h_a )</td>
<td>W/(m²°C)</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>3276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall heat transfer coefficient, ( U )</td>
<td>W/(m²°C)</td>
<td>237.2</td>
<td>360.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction factor, ( F )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube side pressure drop, ( dP_t )</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>117.1</td>
<td>110.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annulus side pressure drop, ( dP_a )</td>
<td>kPa</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>110.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
different structures, but there is a consistency between them. For the annular-flow side for example, in the solution obtained with the raw MINLP formulation there are eight branches \((NB = 8)\), and in each branch there are two units in parallel \((NPa = 2)\), while in the linear-binary MINLP solution, there are 19 branches \((NB = 19)\) but there are no units in parallel in each branch \((NPa = 1)\); therefore, in both cases the total flow for the annular side would be divided by 19. Since both inner and outer tubes had their OD’s decreased from the first solution to the second, the annular flow area did not change significantly, and therefore, the velocities are quite similar in both cases (2 and 1.98 m/s). Now, if one looks to the tube flow side, there are 8 branches for the raw MINLP solution and 19 branches for the linear-binary solution, and in both cases there are no units in parallel \((NPt = 1)\). Therefore, the mass flow per unit in the second case would be half the first one and a great decrease in the flow velocity would be expected. However, there is also a decrease in the available flow area per unit, since the inner tube OD goes from 1 \(\frac{1}{2}\) in to 1 in., compensating a portion of the decrease in mass flow, so that the velocity only decreases from 1.71 to 1.41 m/s.

The computational times for both examples are shown in Table 11, indicating that the linear-binary MINLP approach requires more computational effort, which also occurred on the first two examples where the heat transfer areas obtained were the same for both formulations. These values were obtained using a computer with a processor Intel Core i7 3.41 GHz with 16.6 GB RAM memory.

To reformulate the problem to obtain the linear-binary MINLP, the problem variables and equations increase. This appears to be directly connected to the larger computational effort. For the given discrete available options given in examples 3 and 4, the raw MINLP has the number of 179 variables and 120 constraints, compared to 283 and 440 of the linear-binary approach.

The optimum values of the two MINLP approaches show that, for a given example, there may be more than one optimal solution. For example 3, the raw MINLP approach found a solution with a heat transfer area only 2.65% smaller than the one found with the linear-binary MINLP approach. On the contrary, for example 4 the smaller area was achieved using the

---

**Figure 15.** Example 3: (i) raw MINLP solutions; (ii) linear-binary. (a) General structure; (b) branch structure.
linear-binary MINLP approach, with a significant reduction of 36.7% when compared to the solution obtained with the raw MINLP result. The results do not show any pattern regarding which formulation is able to achieve a better solution, but the wide difference between solutions in example 4 illustrates the importance of the utilization of a global optimization scheme to address the design problem.

Thus, both MINLP approaches were also solved with BARON considering (i) no initial estimates, (ii) the same initial estimates used to run the problem using the solver SBB, and (iii) initial estimates obtained from the solution of the SBB. The results are shown in Table 12.

For all three scenarios the global optimal solution was achieved for both examples 3 and 4. There was no significant computational effort gained between scenarios (i) and (ii). In scenario (iii), in which the solutions obtained from sBB runs were employed as initial estimates, there is a significant reduction in computational effort for the BARON run isolated. Since it is necessary to generate the initial estimates first by a sBB optimization run, the computational effort shown in Table 12 corresponds to the sum of both elapsed times. Nevertheless, in two situations (example 3 with linear-binary approach and example 4 solved with raw MINLP approach), the gains are approximately 28% and 89%, respectively, showing that the methodology proposed here can also be applied as a preprocessing method for global optimization procedures.

Table 11. Examples 3 and 4: Performance Comparison of the Two MINLP Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>example</th>
<th>raw MINLP</th>
<th>linear-binary MINLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area (m²)</td>
<td>elapsed time (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88.73</td>
<td>54.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>26.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Elapsed Time Comparison of BARON Solver with Different Initial Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>example</th>
<th>area (m²)</th>
<th>(i) GAMS default initial estimates</th>
<th>(ii) same initial estimates as the ones used for sBB solver</th>
<th>(iii) results from sBB solver used as initial estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw MINLP</td>
<td>linear-binary MINLP</td>
<td>raw MINLP</td>
<td>linear-binary MINLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88.73</td>
<td>279.04</td>
<td>407.82</td>
<td>279.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>796.15</td>
<td>400.26</td>
<td>718.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. CONCLUSIONS

This paper presented the solution of the design problem of double pipe heat exchangers using mathematical programming. The design variables are selected among discrete values, due to their physical nature or available commercial alternatives. Therefore, the problem is formulated as an MINLP problem, which is presented here in two versions. The first approach (raw MINLP) is based on the original nonlinear equations and the second approach (linear-binary MINLP) involves mathematical transformations that eliminate the nonlinearities in the binary variables, rendering a linear model in those. A comparison with the literature shows that our MINLP approach can obtain a solution superior to that of trial and verification. The application of the original and modified formulations to a sample of design problems indicated that the latter approach demands more computational time. The analysis of the heat transfer area of the solutions indicated the presence of multiple locally optimal solutions. The large difference between the objective functions in a pair of local optima, resultant of the nonconvexity of the MINLP, illustrates the importance of the investigation of alternatives that can identify rigorously the global optimum.
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Continuous variables
\( \Delta \Delta Pa = \) Annulus-side pressure drop (Pa)
\( \Delta \Delta Pt = \) Tube-side pressure drop (Pa)
\( \mu a = \) Annulus-side stream viscosity (Pa·s)
\( \mu t = \) Tube-side stream viscosity (Pa·s)
\( \rho a = \) Annulus-side stream density (kg/m³)
\( \rho t = \) Tube-side stream density (kg/m³)
\( A = \) Heat transfer area (m²)
\( A_{req} = \) Required heat transfer area (m²)
\( Aa = \) Annulus-side flow area (m²)
\( At = \) Tube-side flow area (m²)
\( Cpa = \) Annulus-side stream heat capacity (J/(kg °C))
\( Cpt = \) Tube-side stream heat capacity (J/(kg °C))
\( dh = \) Hydraulic diameter (m)
\( dte = \) Inner tube external diameter (m)
\( Dte = \) Outside tube external diameter (m)
\( dti = \) Inner tube internal diameter (m)
\( Dti = \) Outside tube internal diameter (m)
\( F = \) Correction factor
\( fa = \) Annulus-side friction factor
\( fa^{\text{lin}} = \) Annulus-side friction factor for laminar flow
\( fa^{\text{trf}} = \) Annulus-side friction factor for transitional flow
\( fa^{\text{turb}} = \) Annulus-side friction factor for turbulent flow
\( ft = \) Tube-side friction factor
\( ft^{\text{lin}} = \) Tube-side friction factor for laminar flow
\( ft^{\text{trf}} = \) Tube-side friction factor for transitional flow
$f_{	ext{tub}}^\text{turb} =$ Tube-side friction factor for turbulent flow
$\text{ht}$ = Annulus-side convective heat transfer coefficient ($\text{W}/(\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{°C})$)
$\text{ka}$ = Annulus-side stream thermal conductivity ($\text{W}/(\text{m} \cdot \text{°C})$)
$\text{kt}$ = Tube-side stream thermal conductivity ($\text{W}/(\text{m} \cdot \text{°C})$)
$\text{L_a}$ = Annulus-side hydraulic length (m)
$\text{L_t}$ = Tube-side hydraulic length (m)
$\text{m}_{a}$ = Annular region mass flow (kg/s)
$\text{mt}$ = Inside tube mass flow (kg/s)
$\text{NB}$ = Number of parallel branches
$\text{Nh}$ = Number of hairpins per unit
$\text{NPa}$ = Annulus-side units in parallel per branch
$\text{NPt}$ = Tube-side units in parallel per branch
$\text{Nua}$ = Annulus-side Nusselt number
$\text{Nua}_{\text{Gni}}$ = Annulus-side Gnielinski Nusselt number
$\text{Nua}_{\text{Hau}}$ = Annulus-side Hansen Nusselt number
$\text{Nua}_{\text{Sei and Tate}}$ = Annulus-side Seider and Tate Nusselt number
$\text{Nua}_{\text{theo}}$ = Annulus-side theoretical Nusselt number
$\text{Nut}$ = Tube-side Nusselt number
$\text{Nut}_{\text{Gni}}$ = Tube-side Gnielinski Nusselt number
$\text{Nut}_{\text{Hau}}$ = Tube-side Hansen Nusselt number
$\text{Nut}_{\text{Sei and Tate}}$ = Tube-side Seider and Tate Nusselt number
$\text{Nut}_{\text{theo}}$ = Tube-side theoretical Nusselt number
$\text{Pra}$ = Annulus-side stream Prandtl number
$\text{Prt}$ = Tube-side stream Prandtl number
$\text{Rea}$ = Annulus-side stream Reynolds number
$\text{Ret}$ = Tube-side stream Reynolds number
$\text{Rfa}$ = Annulus-side stream fouling resistance ($\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{°C}/\text{W}$)
$\text{Rft}$ = Tube-side stream fouling resistance ($\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{°C}/\text{W}$)
$\text{U}$ = Overall heat transfer coefficient ($\text{W}/(\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{°C})$)
$\text{va}$ = Annulus-side velocity (m/s)
$\text{vt}$ = Tube-side velocity (m/s)

**Binary variables**

$y_{B}B$ = Number of branches selection
$y_{d}D$ = Inner tube diameter selection
$y_{D}d$ = Outer tube diameter selection
$y_{Lh}_{\text{ha}}$ = Hairpin tube length selection
$y_{Nh}_{Nh}$ = Number of hairpins per unit selection
$y_{Nua}_{Nua}$ = Range of annular region Seider and Tate Nusselt number selection
$y_{Nut}_{Nut}$ = Range of inner tube Seider and Tate Nusselt number selection
$y_{NP}_{NP}$ = Annulus-side number of units in parallel per branch selection
$y_{Pra}_{Pra}$ = Range of annular region Prandtl number selection
$y_{Prt}_{Prt}$ = Range of inner tube Prandtl number selection
$y_{T}_{T}$ = Tube-side number of units in parallel per branch selection
$y_{Rea}_{Rea}$ = Range of annular region Reynolds number selection
$y_{Ret}_{Ret}$ = Range of inner tube Reynolds number selection
$y_{T_{ST}}$ = Stream $sT$ allocation ($1 = \text{tube-side}; 0 = \text{annulus-side}$)

**Subscripts**

$sB$ = Index of number of branches
$sD$ = Index of inner tube diameters
$sE$ = Index of outer tube diameters
$sT$ = Index of number of units per branch
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