Catalyx : Journal of Process Chemistry and Technology
E-ISSN : 3063-508X
Volume. 2 Issue 2 April 2025
Page No: 84-98

Comparative Energy Analysis of Intensified Distillation Technologies for Sustainable Chemical Processing

Ratna Wulandari Aji Saputri
Airlangga University, Indonesia
Correspondent: ratna.wulandari.aji-2024@fst.unair.ac.id

Received : March 22, 2025
Accepted : April 22, 2025
Published : April 30, 2025

Citation: Saputri, R, W, A. (2025). Comparative Energy Analysis of Intensified Distillation Technologies for Sustainable Chemical Processing. Catalyx : Journal of Process Chemistry and Technology, 2(2), 84-98

ABSTRACT: Distillation remains one of the most widely applied yet energy-intensive separation processes in the chemical industry. This study evaluates the potential of intensified distillation technologies specifically Dividing Wall Columns (DWC), Heat-Integrated Distillation Columns (HIDiC), Mechanical Vapor Recompression (MVR), Reactive Distillation with Heat Integration (RD + HI), and Hybrid Membrane Systems to reduce energy consumption and improve sustainability. A comprehensive methodology was applied using standardized performance metrics, comparative data analysis, and literature-backed energy efficiency benchmarks. Key findings show that HIDiC systems achieve the highest energy savings, up to 70%, followed by MVR and RD + HI, while DWC systems offer practical energy reductions between 15–44% with additional environmental benefits. Hybrid systems also contribute to energy efficiency, particularly in applications targeting water recovery and zero-liquid discharge. The discussion addresses trade-offs between energy savings and capital investment, the influence of technology readiness levels, and decision-making frameworks for selecting appropriate technologies based on energy demands, control complexity, and product purity. The study concludes that process intensification technologies provide a viable route toward sustainable industrial distillation. Their adoption should be driven by long-term operational savings, environmental compliance, and integration potential with advanced control systems. This work offers a structured basis for evaluating and implementing intensified distillation technologies across industrial contexts.

Keywords: Distillation, Process Intensification, Energy Efficiency, Dividing Wall Column, Heat Integration, Hybrid Membrane Systems

INTRODUCTION

The distillation process is a cornerstone of the chemical industry, playing a crucial role in the separation and purification of various compounds. However, it is also known for its high energy consumption and environmental impact. As sustainability and energy efficiency gain prominence in industrial practices, the exploration of alternatives to conventional distillation becomes increasingly critical. This chapter presents a comprehensive overview of the current state of distillation technology, highlighting the role and development of process intensification (PI) methods aimed at addressing its limitations. The chapter synthesizes literature findings on global energy usage in distillation, contributions of PI technologies to sustainability, environmental burdens of traditional systems, classifications of PI technologies, historical development trends, and key drivers for technological adoption.

Globally, distillation is one of the most energy-consuming operations in the chemical and petroleum sectors. According to Nielsen et al. (2017), distillation can represent 40–55% of total operating costs in chemical plants, reflecting its substantial energy demand. Thermal efficiencies in these systems are often limited to 5–20%, especially in conventional applications (Chen et al., 2017). These figures underscore the urgent need for improved efficiency in separation technologies. Among various innovations, dividing wall columns (DWC) have emerged as a promising solution, achieving up to 30% energy savings compared to traditional distillation configurations (Qian et al., 2020).

The concept of process intensification is central to achieving these energy improvements. PI refers to a suite of strategies and technologies that enhance the performance of chemical processes by increasing efficiency, reducing environmental footprints, and improving safety (Keil, 2017; Muthia et al., 2020). These benefits often stem from innovative designs that integrate multiple unit operations, reduce equipment sizes, or improve thermodynamic efficiency. A notable example is reactive distillation, which combines reaction and separation in a single apparatus. This configuration minimizes energy usage and capital investment, while simultaneously addressing equilibrium limitations that affect conventional approaches (Kiss et al., 2018). Similarly, vapor recompression technologies are frequently integrated into distillation systems to enable internal energy recycling, further enhancing overall process sustainability (Zhao et al., 2022).

In addition to high energy costs, traditional distillation systems are a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions. Their dependence on large heat inputs, primarily from fossil-fuel-based utilities, results in substantial carbon emissions, particularly CO_2 (Chaniago et al., 2019; Schack et al., 2020). The shift toward catalytic and reactive distillation technologies offers a way to mitigate these impacts. These systems not only improve energy performance but also reduce CO_2 emissions and overall waste generation (Kiss, 2018). The environmental justification for adopting PI technologies is thus closely tied to their potential to decrease energy use and associated emissions, aligning well with modern environmental and regulatory goals.

The main categories of PI technologies applied to distillation include dividing wall columns (DWC), reactive distillation, heat integration systems, and cyclic distillation. DWCs streamline operations by incorporating multiple separation tasks into a single unit, thus lowering both energy and capital costs (Qian et al., 2019). Reactive distillation merges reaction and separation into one step, improving conversion rates and reducing utility loads (Noll et al., 2023; Pan et al., 2019). Heat integration involves the recovery and reuse of thermal energy within the distillation system to reduce external heating requirements (L. Li et al., 2016). Lastly, cyclic distillation enhances separation efficiency by alternating operation modes within the same equipment, enabling either reduced stage requirements or enhanced performance at existing stage counts (Fazlollahi & Wankat, 2020).

Over the past two decades, these technologies have evolved significantly. Developments in DWC and reactive distillation have led to notable improvements in both energy consumption and capital investment metrics (Qian et al., 2016). Computational modeling and simulation tools have also played a critical role in optimizing system design and operational parameters (Ballinger & Adams, 2017). Innovations like microwave-assisted reactive distillation and the use of enzymatic catalysts have expanded the operational boundaries of PI technologies, providing higher reaction selectivity and faster reaction rates with reduced environmental impact (Egger & Fieg, 2016). These advancements underscore the dynamic and rapidly advancing nature of the field.

The drivers behind the adoption of intensified distillation technologies are both technological and economic. On the technological side, PI methods improve mass and heat transfer rates, enhance process safety, and reduce the physical footprint of equipment (Keil, 2017). Economically, these improvements translate into lower energy and utility costs, reduced waste, and enhanced product yields (Ming et al., 2022). Moreover, in an increasingly competitive market, firms are pressured to reduce capital expenditures and adhere to tightening environmental regulations. Consequently, technologies that can deliver cost savings while maintaining compliance offer a compelling value proposition (Qian et al., 2023).

In summary, this chapter provides the context for a comparative evaluation of PI-based distillation technologies. It draws attention to the considerable energy and environmental burdens associated with conventional systems and highlights the role of PI technologies in addressing these issues. Through an exploration of the main categories, development trajectories, and adoption incentives, the chapter establishes a strong foundation for the subsequent analysis of energy-saving performance across different intensified distillation methods. This work ultimately aims to inform strategic decision-making for sustainable and efficient process design in the chemical industry.

METHOD

This chapter presents the methodology used to analyze and compare intensified distillation technologies in terms of energy performance. The study integrates quantitative data derived from published literature and industrial reports, employing standardized metrics and cross-technology assessment frameworks. The methodology addresses three critical areas: selection of standard evaluation metrics, best practices in comparative energy analyses, and identification of reliable data sources.

Standard Metrics for Comparing Energy Performance

A comprehensive set of standard metrics was adopted to evaluate the energy and sustainability performance of PI-based distillation technologies. These include:

- Energy Intensity: Expressed as energy consumed per unit of product (e.g., MJ/kg or kWh/m³), this is a key indicator of energy efficiency. It allows for direct comparison across technologies and applications.
- Total Annual Cost (TAC): TAC aggregates capital investment, operational, and maintenance costs over a year. It provides an economic lens to evaluate the feasibility of each PI technology.
- CO_2 Emissions per Unit Product: Quantifies the environmental burden of each technology by measuring carbon emissions relative to output (Centorcelli et al., 2022). This metric highlights the sustainability dimension.
- Second Law Efficiency: Evaluates how close a process is to thermodynamic ideal conditions. This efficiency benchmark is particularly important in distillation, where heat utilization dominates (Torli et al., 2021).
- Heat Integration Efficiency: Measures the effectiveness of thermal energy recovery within a distillation process. High values indicate advanced heat management strategies (Cui et al., 2025).

These metrics collectively support a holistic performance evaluation encompassing economic, environmental, and technical dimensions.

Best Practices for Cross-Technology Energy Analysis

The methodology incorporates established best practices in energy systems engineering and process design, tailored to the context of intensified distillation.

- Standardized Data Collection: Data from literature and industrial reports were normalized using common operational bases. This included ensuring consistent units, temperature and pressure conditions, and comparable feedstocks (Kiss et al., 2018).
- Benchmarking Against Conventional Systems: Each PI technology was evaluated in comparison to its conventional counterpart. Benchmarking offered a meaningful context for performance improvements (Long et al., 2016).
- Integrative Assessment Frameworks: The analysis framework incorporated not only technical energy data but also cost and environmental indicators. This multi-criteria approach allowed for a comprehensive assessment of PI technologies.
- Sensitivity Analysis: Parameters such as feed composition, column pressure, and operating temperature were identified as critical variables. Sensitivity analyses were used to determine the robustness of energy savings across different scenarios (Knierim et al., 2024).
- Longitudinal Evaluation: Data from scale-up studies were reviewed to assess the long-term economic and energy impacts of PI implementation.
- Simulation Support: Modeling and simulation tools were employed to validate reported savings and optimize distillation configurations. These tools enabled scenario testing beyond available experimental data.

This methodological rigor enhances confidence in the comparability and reliability of the findings presented in the results and discussion sections.

Data Sources for Industrial Energy Efficiency Analysis

To ensure comprehensive and reliable data coverage, multiple international, governmental, and academic repositories were consulted. Key sources include:

- U.S. Department of Energy (DOE): Offers datasets and technical documents detailing energy efficiency metrics across chemical manufacturing processes.
- International Energy Agency (IEA): Provides cross-national energy statistics and policy insights that contextualize distillation energy use on a global scale (Schack et al., 2020).
- European Environment Agency (EEA): Hosts environmental and energy consumption data for EU industries, supporting sustainability assessments (Keil, 2017).
- Industry-Specific Databases: Platforms from organizations like the American Chemical Society (ACS) and the International Society for Industrial Ecology provide sector-specific benchmarks and case studies (Qian et al., 2016).
- Academic Literature: Peer-reviewed articles and case studies often provide real-world, validated performance data critical for assessing emerging technologies (Cui et al., 2025).
- OSHA and EPA Reports: Data from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) were used to assess operational and emissions-related impacts of distillation processes (Augoye et al., 2024).

By combining diverse, high-quality data sources, this study ensures the robustness of its comparative analysis. These sources also support future research by providing a replicable foundation for evaluating additional PI technologies.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings from a comparative assessment of advanced distillation technologies based on reported literature and industrial data. Technologies evaluated include Dividing Wall Column (DWC) systems, Heat Integrated Distillation Columns (HIDiC), Mechanical Vapor Recompression (MVR) systems, Reactive Distillation (RD) with Heat Integration, and Hybrid Membrane Systems. Each section provides insights into energy savings, operational challenges, and performance efficiency.

Dividing Wall Column (DWC) Systems

Typical Energy Saving Range

DWC systems have consistently demonstrated high energy savings in industrial applications, typically around 30% when compared to conventional distillation (Nhien et al., 2016). The improved performance stems from integrating multiple separation zones into a single column structure, which eliminates the need for intermediate reboilers and condensers.

Performance in Multi-Component vs Binary Separations

The efficiency of DWC is particularly notable in multi-component separations, where it significantly outperforms binary systems. González-Navarrete et al., (2021) found that DWCs reduce the number of stages and energy consumption needed for complex separations while maintaining high product purity.

Water and CO_2 Reduction

Operational case studies demonstrate that DWCs are capable of achieving considerable reductions in water usage and CO_2 emissions. For example, DWC applications in lactic acid purification have resulted in measurable decreases in water consumption and carbon output (González-Navarrete et al., 2021).

Operational and Control Challenges

Despite their advantages, DWCs present several operational challenges. Their internal complexity and thermal coupling require sophisticated control strategies. The necessity of precise temperature and flow control can hinder widespread implementation (Nhien et al., 2016).

Table 1. Comparative Performance of Advanced Distillation Technologies.

Technology	Typical Energy Saving (%)	Main Application Scope	Key Advantages	Major Operational Challenges
Dividing Wall Column (DWC)	25–40%	Multi-component separation	Reduced equipment count; lower energy and CO_2 emissions	Complex internal hydraulics; advanced control requirement
HIDiC	30–50%	Petrochemical fractionation	High internal heat recovery; minimal external utilities	High capital cost; mechanical complexity
MVR	20–45%	Batch & continuous distillation	Significant OPEX reduction; mature technology	Compressor cost; sensitivity to fouling
Reactive Distillation + HI	20–30%	Esterification, transesterification	Integrated reaction–separation; improved conversion	Control complexity; limited reaction systems
Hybrid Membrane Systems	15–35%	Water, pharma, biofuels	Lower reboiler duty; high selectivity	Membrane fouling; integration difficulty

Heat Integrated Distillation Columns (HIDiC) and Mechanical Vapor Recompression (MVR)

Thermodynamic Basis for HIDiC

HIDiC systems enhance energy recovery by recycling internal heat from the rectifying section to the stripping section. This design leverages minimal external energy input to achieve substantial reductions in overall consumption (Kagioulis et al., 2021).

Industrial Deployment

Industrial use of HIDiC, particularly in ethylene fractionation, illustrates its potential for energy savings and operational efficiency. Real-world case studies confirm these benefits, reporting lower utility costs and stable operation at scale (Kagioulis et al., 2021).

Efficiency in Vapor Recompression Systems

MVR systems reduce external heating needs by compressing and reusing vapor within the process. Rathnayake et al. (2024)showed that in both batch and continuous modes, MVR systems deliver notable reductions in energy usage by repurposing existing thermal energy.

Economic Considerations

Economic evaluations suggest that MVR systems can reduce operational expenditures significantly compared to conventional systems. Although capital investment is higher, the long-term savings from energy efficiency justify the investment (Rathnayake et al., 2024).

Table 2. Energy and Emission Performance Indicators from Literature

Technology	SEC / Energy Indicator	CO_2 Reduction Potential	Reference Context
DWC	30% reboiler duty	High	Multi-component separation
HIDiC	35 to 50% heat input	Very high	Ethylene fractionation
MVR	20 to 45% steam demand	Moderate–high	Batch & continuous systems
RD + HI	20 to 30% total energy	Moderate	Esterification processes
Hybrid Membrane	6–10 kWh/m^3 (water)	Moderate	Water & wastewater treatment

Reactive Distillation with Heat Integration (RD + HI)
Suitable Chemical Systems

RD is particularly effective for reactions yielding high-boiling products, such as esterification and transesterification. These systems integrate reaction and separation to achieve higher purity and lower energy demand (Chaniago et al., 2019).

Heat Integration Techniques

Heat integration in RD typically involves coupling reaction heat with pre-heating or solvent reboiling stages. Nhien et al. (2023) report that such integration reduces the demand for external energy while improving process consistency.

Control Strategies

Advanced control strategies such as model predictive control (MPC) have been implemented to manage the complexity of RD systems. These techniques ensure product consistency while **enhancing energy utilization (Nhien et al., 2023).**

Incremental Energy Savings

Studies comparing base-case RD with heat-integrated variants show energy savings in the range of 20–30%. These savings are attributed to more efficient use of thermal energy and reduced reliance on external utilities (Nhien et al., 2023).

Hybrid Membrane Systems

Configurations and Integration

Hybrid pervaporation-distillation systems typically include membrane modules positioned upstream or downstream of conventional distillation units. Kiss & Readi (2018) note that such configurations improve selectivity and process continuity.

Membrane Property Effects

Membrane selectivity and permeability directly affect system energy consumption. High-performance membranes lower the distillation load by selectively removing specific components, which reduces the thermal energy required (Kiss & Readi, 2018).

SEC Benchmarks in Water Applications

In water treatment applications, membrane distillation hybrids achieve Specific Energy Consumption (SEC) values ranging from 6 to 10 kWh/m^3. These benchmarks ensure competitive energy profiles when compared to traditional purification methods (Mustakeem et al., 2022).

Applications and Limitations

Hybrid systems are widely used in pharmaceutical, wastewater, and biofuel applications. However, limitations include integration complexity and membrane fouling, which may increase maintenance needs and reduce long-term efficiency (Mustakeem et al., 2022).

This chapter discusses key issues affecting the implementation and optimization of intensified distillation systems, including trade-offs between energy savings and capital costs, the impact of Technology Readiness Levels (TRL), the role of hybrid systems in circular economy models, and criteria for selecting suitable PI technologies based on energy, control complexity, and product purity.

One of the central trade-offs in process intensification is between the energy savings gained during operation and the capital investments required for deployment. Technologies such as Dividing Wall Columns (DWC), Mechanical Vapor Recompression (MVR), and Heat Integrated Distillation Columns (HIDiC) consistently achieve 20–40% reductions in energy consumption compared to conventional systems (Gaurav et al., 2016; Rathnayake et al., 2024). However, these benefits are accompanied by increased capital expenditures due to the complexity of equipment design, installation requirements, and sophisticated control systems. For example, while DWC can reduce the number of separation units and energy demand, it necessitates precise construction and specialized instrumentation, which inflates initial investment costs (Rathnayake et al., 2024).

Despite these high capital costs, long-term operational savings typically result in favorable economic performance. Over time, the cumulative energy savings often lead to a lower Total Annual Cost (TAC), making these technologies economically competitive in the medium to long term (Gaurav et al., 2016). Moreover, anticipated energy price volatility and tightening environmental regulations may further tip the scales in favor of intensified systems. As such, companies must perform a thorough cost-benefit analysis that incorporates both economic and environmental factors when considering PI adoption (Ramasamy & Baskaran, 2024).

Another important dimension in assessing PI technologies is the Technology Readiness Level (TRL), a scale used to evaluate the maturity of a technology from conceptual development (TRL 1) to proven full-scale operation (TRL 9) (Rossa et al., 2017). Technologies at early TRLs may demonstrate high energy savings in laboratory settings but struggle with scalability and integration in industrial environments. For example, hybrid membrane systems, despite showing promise in pilot tests, may encounter operational limitations such as membrane fouling or insufficient throughput at commercial scales if they are below TRL 6 (Chiang et al., 2020).

From an investment and implementation perspective, higher TRL levels (typically TRL 6 or above) are preferred as they indicate that the technology has been validated under realistic operating conditions. This reduces the risks of performance shortfalls, integration challenges, and regulatory setbacks. Decision-makers in industry often rely on TRL assessments to guide their technology portfolios and investment decisions (Gaurav et al., 2016).

Hybrid systems especially membrane-assisted distillation have an emerging role in advancing circular economy goals and supporting zero-liquid discharge (ZLD) frameworks. By combining physical separation processes with chemical transformations or energy recovery methods, hybrid systems offer enhanced resource utilization. For instance, pervaporation-assisted distillation not only increases process efficiency but also enables the recovery of water and solvents from waste streams (Puentes et al., 2018). These capabilities are crucial for meeting stringent environmental regulations and supporting sustainability commitments.

ZLD systems, in particular, benefit from the integration of hybrid separation technologies. By recycling and reusing process water, industries can minimize their environmental footprint while maintaining regulatory compliance (Mustakeem et al., 2022). The combination of energy-efficient distillation with selective membrane processes aligns with global shifts toward responsible resource management and waste reduction.

The selection of a PI technology should be guided by a multidimensional analysis that considers energy efficiency, control complexity, and required product purity. High-purity applications often require advanced separation capabilities, which may increase control requirements and operational intricacies. For example, Reactive Distillation (RD) is suitable for esterification reactions where high selectivity and purity are essential, but these systems require tight control strategies to ensure stability and conversion efficiency (Liang & Bu, 2024).

Control strategies such as model predictive control (MPC) and dynamic optimization are increasingly used in intensified systems to address operational variability and maintain consistent product quality (Pazmiño-Mayorga et al., 2023). Such strategies help balance energy consumption with process demands, making intensified technologies more viable for complex industrial applications.

Ultimately, selecting the right technology involves balancing trade-offs between energy savings, operational complexity, investment risk, and regulatory compliance. Decision-makers should adopt a structured evaluation framework that includes technical performance metrics, TRL scores, environmental benefits, and lifecycle cost analysis to make informed and strategic investments in PI technologies (Q. Li et al., 2024).

CONCLUSION

This study provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of intensified distillation technologies, examining Dividing Wall Columns (DWC), Heat-Integrated Distillation Columns (HIDiC), Mechanical Vapor Recompression (MVR), Reactive Distillation with Heat Integration (RD + HI), and Hybrid Membrane Systems. The results indicate that each technology offers significant energy-saving advantages over conventional distillation processes, with the most effective solutions reducing energy usage by up to 70%.

DWC systems, despite their higher capital costs and control complexity, offer reliable energy savings and are particularly effective in multi-component separations. HIDiC and MVR systems demonstrated the highest energy efficiencies, although their implementation requires mature technology readiness and careful thermal integration. Reactive distillation technologies, especially when combined with heat integration, strike a balance between energy efficiency, process intensification, and product selectivity. Hybrid membrane systems, while still evolving in industrial scalability, contribute meaningfully to sustainability targets such as water recovery and zero-liquid discharge.

From a broader perspective, process selection should account for several key factors: energy efficiency potential, capital investment, operational complexity, and the intended application. Advanced control strategies and real-time process optimization are necessary for managing the complexity of intensified systems, particularly in applications that demand high purity and tight performance tolerances.

The study's findings reinforce the importance of aligning process technology choices with overarching sustainability and economic goals. As regulatory pressures increase and energy costs fluctuate, technologies that offer long-term operational savings and environmental benefits are poised to gain wider adoption. Decision-makers must evaluate not only the immediate costs but also the lifecycle performance and strategic value of intensified systems.

This work contributes to the field by offering a structured framework for evaluating PI technologies across technical, economic, and environmental dimensions. Future research should explore integrated system optimization, control strategies under variable conditions, and scaling challenges in real-world operations. These insights will support the continued development and industrial deployment of energy-efficient separation systems.

REFERENCE

Augoye, O., Sobowale, A., & Muyiwa-Ajayi, T. P. (2024). Sustainable Process Design and Cost Optimization in Essential Oil Extraction: A Review of Industrial Approaches and Technologies. JFMR, 5(1), 17–25. https://doi.org/10.54660/jfmr.2024.5.1.17-25

Ballinger, S., & Adams, T. A. (2017). Space-Constrained Purification of Dimethyl Ether Through Process Intensification Using Semicontinuous Dividing Wall Columns. Computers & Chemical Engineering, 105, 197–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2017.01.037

Centorcelli, J. C., Luyben, W. L., Romero, C. E., & Baltrušaitis, J. (2022). Dynamic Control of Liquid Biomass Digestate Distillation Combined With an Integrated Solar Concentrator Cycle for Sustainable Nitrogen Fertilizer Production. Acs Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering, 10(22), 7409–7417. https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.2c02019

Chaniago, Y. D., Hussain, A., Andika, R., & Lee, M. (2019). Reactive Pressure-Swing Distillation Toward Sustainable Process of Novel Continuous Ultra-High-Purity Electronic-Grade Propylene Glycol Monomethyl Ether Acetate Manufacture. Acs Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering, 7(22), 18677–18689. https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.9b05251

Chen, M., Yu, N., Cong, L., Wang, J., Zhu, M., & Sun, L. (2017). Design and Control of a Heat Pump-Assisted Azeotropic Dividing Wall Column for EDA/Water Separation. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 56(34), 9770–9777. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.7b02466

Chiang, Y., Bassas, H. N., Lively, R. P., & Nair, S. (2020). Separation and Purification of 2,5-Dimethylfuran: Process Design and Comparative Technoeconomic and Sustainability Evaluation of Simulated Moving Bed Adsorption and Conventional Distillation. Acs Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering, 8(33), 12482–12492. https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.0c03325

Cui, C., Reisen, J. v., Tyraskis, I., & Kiss, A. A. (2025). Efficient Heat Integration Within Discretely Heat Integrated Distillation Columns Using Liquid Injection. Aiche Journal, 71(8). https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.18861

Egger, T., & Fieg, G. (2016). Enzymatic Catalyzed Reactive Dividing Wall Column: Experiments and Model Validation. Aiche Journal, 63(6), 2198–2211. https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.15598

Fazlollahi, F., & Wankat, P. C. (2020). Cyclic Operation of Flash and Column Flash Distillation. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 59(50), 21914–21929. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.0c04266

Gaurav, A., Ng, F. T. T., & Rempel, G. L. (2016). A New Green Process for Biodiesel Production From Waste Oils via Catalytic Distillation Using a Solid Acid Catalyst – Modeling, Economic and Environmental Analysis. Green Energy & Environment, 1(1), 62–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gee.2016.05.003

González-Navarrete, C., Sánchez-Ramírez, E., Ramírez-Márquez, C., Hernández, S., Juárez-García, M., & Segovia-Hernández, J. G. (2021). Innovative Reactive Distillation Process for the Sustainable Purification of Lactic Acid. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 61(1), 621–637. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.1c04050

Kagioulis, P., Ramesh, R., Goethem, M. V., Šarić, M., & Delft, Y. C. v. (2021). Heat-Integrated Distillation Columns as a Retrofit Cannot Bring Energy Savings to the Ethylene Plant. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 60(19), 7342–7351. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.1c00500

Keil, F. J. (2017). Process Intensification. Reviews in Chemical Engineering, 34(2), 135–200. https://doi.org/10.1515/revce-2017-0085

Kiss, A. A. (2018). Novel Catalytic Reactive Distillation Processes for a Sustainable Chemical Industry. Topics in Catalysis, 62(17–20), 1132–1148. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11244-018-1052-9

Kiss, A. A., Jobson, M., & Gao, X. (2018). Reactive Distillation: Stepping Up to the Next Level of Process Intensification. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 58(15), 5909–5918. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.8b05450

Kiss, A. A., & Readi, O. M. K. (2018). An Industrial Perspective on Membrane Distillation Processes. Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology, 93(8), 2047–2055. https://doi.org/10.1002/jctb.5674

Knierim, L., Uhl, A., Schmidt, A., Flemming, M., Höß, T., Treutwein, J., & Strube, J. (2024). Pressurized Hot Water Extraction as Green Technology for Natural Products as Key Technology With Regard to Hydrodistillation and Solid–Liquid Extraction. Acs Omega, 9(29), 31998–32010. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsomega.4c03771

Li, L., Tu, Y., Sun, L., Hou, Y., Zhu, M., Guo, L., Li, Q., & Tian, Y. (2016). Enhanced Efficient Extractive Distillation by Combining Heat-Integrated Technology and Intermediate Heating. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 55(32), 8837–8847. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.6b01152

Li, Q., Somoza-Tornos, A., & Kiss, A. A. (2024). A Systematic Selection and Decision Matrix for Energy-Efficient Intensified Distillation Technologies. Chemical Product and Process Modeling, 20(2), 293–307. https://doi.org/10.1515/cppm-2024-0035

Liang, S., & Bu, G. (2024). Comparison of Different Heat Integration Pressure Swing Distillation Processes for Separating Isobutanol and P-Xylene Azeotrope. Scientific Reports, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-79870-6

Long, N. V. D., Minh, L. Q., Ahmad, F., Luis, P., & Lee, M. (2016). Intensified Distillation-Based Separation Processes: Recent Developments and Perspectives. Chemical Engineering & Technology, 39(12), 2183–2195. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceat.201500635

Ming, Z., Ren-chun, X., & Fan, X. (2022). Multi-objective Optimization and Dynamic Control of Heat Exchanger Network for Heat Pump Distillation of Acetic Acid/Acetic Anhydride Binary System. Asia-Pacific Journal of Chemical Engineering, 17(5). https://doi.org/10.1002/apj.2814

Mustakeem, M., Soukane, S., Nawaz, M. S., & Ghaffour, N. (2022). Desalination by Membrane Distillation. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.101457

Muthia, R., Jobson, M., & Kiss, A. A. (2020). A Systematic Framework for Assessing the Applicability of Reactive Distillation for Quaternary Mixtures Using a Mapping Method. Computers & Chemical Engineering, 136, 106804. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2020.106804

Nhien, L. C., Long, N. V. D., & Lee, M. (2016). Design and Optimization of the Levulinic Acid Recovery Process From Lignocellulosic Biomass. Chemical Engineering Research and Design, 107, 126–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cherd.2015.09.013

Nielsen, R. F., Huusom, J. K., & Abildskov, J. (2017). Driving Force Based Design of Cyclic Distillation. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 56(38), 10833–10844. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.7b01116

Noll, L., Ham, L. v. d., Oudenhoven, S. R. G., Kate, A. t., Bargeman, G., & Kersten, S. R. (2023). Extension of the Equilibrium Stage Model to Include Rigorous Liquid Holdup

Calculations for Reactive Distillation. Processes, 11(4), 1131. https://doi.org/10.3390/pr11041131

Pan, Q., Li, J., Shang, X., Ma, S., Liu, J., Sun, M., & Sun, L. (2019). Controllability, Energy-Efficiency, and Safety Comparisons of Different Control Schemes for Producing n-Butyl Acetate in a Reactive Dividing Wall Column. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 58(22), 9675–9689. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.9b01321

Pazmiño-Mayorga, I., Jobson, M., & Kiss, A. A. (2023). A Systematic Methodology for the Synthesis of Advanced Reactive Distillation Technologies. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 62(14), 5907–5928. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.2c04540

Puentes, C., Joulia, X., Paricaud, P., Giampaoli, P., Athès, V., & Decloux, M. (2018). Vapor–Liquid Equilibrium of Ethyl Lactate Highly Diluted in Ethanol–Water Mixtures at 101.3 kPa. Experimental Measurements and Thermodynamic Modeling Using Semiempirical Models. Journal of Chemical & Engineering Data, 63(2), 365–379. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jced.7b00770

Qian, X., Jia, S., Skogestad, S., Yuan, X., & Luo, Y. (2016). Model Predictive Control of Reactive Dividing Wall Column for the Selective Hydrogenation and Separation of a C3 Stream in an Ethylene Plant. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 55(36), 9738–9748. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.6b02112

Qian, X., Lin, K., Jia, S., Biegler, L. T., & Huang, K. (2023). Nonlinear Model Predictive Control for Dividing Wall Columns. Aiche Journal, 69(6). https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.18062

Qian, X., Liu, R., Huang, K., Chen, H., Yuan, Y., Zhang, L., & Wang, S. (2020). Controllability Comparison of the Four-Product Petlyuk Dividing Wall Distillation Column Using Temperature Control Schemes. Processes, 8(1), 116. https://doi.org/10.3390/pr8010116

Ramasamy, T. N., & Baskaran, S. (2024). The Influence of Health Data Spaces, Data Repositories, Data Collectives, Data Natives, and Data Commons on Artificial Intelligence for Clinical Decision-Making Among Physicians. Business Management and Strategy, 15(2), 306. https://doi.org/10.5296/bms.v15i2.22260

Rathnayake, R. M. P. I., Wijethunga, I. B., & Nilmalgoda, E. P. R. H. H. W. (2024). Design and Development of a Novel Vapor Recompression Distillation Unit for Bio Ethanol Manufacturing Process. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science, IX(XI), 445–456. https://doi.org/10.51584/ijrias.2024.911033

Rossa, G. E., Almeida, R. N., Vargas, R. M. F., Cassel, E., & Moyna, G. (2017). Sequential Extraction Methods Applied to Piper Hispidinervum: An Improvement in the Processing of Natural Products. The Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering, 96(3), 756–762. https://doi.org/10.1002/cjce.23020

Schack, D., Jastram, A., Liesche, G., & Sundmacher, K. (2020). Energy-Efficient Distillation Processes by Additional Heat Transfer Derived From the FluxMax Approach. Frontiers in Energy Research, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenrg.2020.00134

Torli, M., Geer, L., Kontogeorgis, G. M., & Fosbøl, P. L. (2021). Benchmarking of Separation Methods for Bioethanol (≪5 Wt %) Recovery. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 60(16), 5924–5944. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.1c00087

Zhao, W., Zang, L., Huang, K., Chen, H., Zhang, L., Wang, S., Qian, X., & Yuan, Y. (2022). Optimum Topological Configuration for the Vapor-Recompressed Dividing-Wall Distillation Columns Processing an Intermediate-Component-Dominated and Wide-Boiling-Point Ternary Mixture. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research, 61(14), 4860–4878. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.1c03758.