Comparative performance evaluation of two compression ways of a single-effect mechanical vapor compression desalination system
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ABSTRACT

The current study aims to conduct a comparative performance evaluation of two compression methods, namely high-temperature compression (HTC) and injected-water compression (IWC), within a single-effect mechanical vapor compression desalination system. The system performance of two compression methods is evaluated by establishing a thermodynamic model, exergy-analysis model, and thermo-economic model. The results indicate that, under identical input parameter conditions, the HTC system exhibits a 6% increase in freshwater production compared to the IWC system. However, the performance of the HTC system is inferior to that of the IWC system in other aspects, including nearly three times higher compression power consumption, a 40% reduction in the second law efficiency of the system, and a 30% increase in the simplified cost of water (SCOW). The impact of various design parameters, including the temperature and mass flow rate of the feedwater, as well as the vapor temperature and the temperature difference between saturated heating steam and vapor, on system performance is subsequently discussed. The investigation reveals that a lower feedwater temperature is associated with an increased recovery ratio, enhanced second law efficiency, and reduced SCOW. The feedwater mass flow rate does not impact distillate efficiency and energy efficiency but solely influences distillate production and the SCOW. The higher vapor temperature is advantageous as it enhances the recovery ratio and second law efficiency while reducing the SCOW. It is crucial to define a compromise value for the temperature difference between saturated heating steam and vapor. A high-temperature difference results in an increased SCOW, whereas a low-temperature difference restricts the feedwater temperature range.
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1. Introduction

Seawater desalination is considered a viable solution to overcome the freshwater scarcity problem [1]. There are three primary desalination technologies: membrane, adsorption technology, and evaporation processes. Membrane technology such as reverse osmosis (RO) is characterized by low energy consumption but has several disadvantages including high operation costs, strict requirements, and short membrane lifespan [2]. Recently, adsorption technology has been invested in desalination applications. In this technology, an adsorbent material with a high affinity to water like silica gel can be used to separate the water from the salts [3,4]. However, the adsorption technology has not been greatly developed and widely used. Thermal desalination...
technology can be involved in several categories such as multi-stage flash (MSF), multi-effect evaporation (MEE), thermal vapor compression, and mechanical vapor compression (MVC) [5]. The advantages associated with MVC systems are high-quality water recovery that needs little or no treatment, compact equipment, low operating cost, stable operation, and simple integration with renewable energy systems. MVC is known to be an attractive and competitive solution for medium-scale water reclamation desalination for production capacities of less than 5,000 m³/d [6].

The concept of the MVC was initially introduced in 1969. Over several decades, it made great progress in theoretical and experimental research. Theoretical investigations primarily focus on elucidating the impact of different parameters and configurations on system performance through the establishment of various rigorous mathematical models. Al-Juwayhel et al. [7] conducted a comparative analysis of four different types of single-effect evaporator desalination systems and proposed a mathematical model to assess the performance ratio, specific power consumption, specific heat transfer area, and specific cooling water flow rate. In the MVC system, it was observed that the specific power consumption decreased as the boiling temperature increased and as its difference with the compressed vapor temperature widened. Ettouney et al. [8] analyzed the characteristics of single-effect MVC as a function of the system design and operating parameters. The results indicated that higher top brine temperatures and reduced temperature differences between boiling brine and steam condensate led to a decrease in specific power consumption. El-Dessouky et al. [9] presented a performance analysis for the vapor compression parallel feed multiple-effect evaporation water desalination system. The results demonstrated that, in the case of the parallel flow configuration, an increase in operating temperature led to a decrease in the conversion ratio. Aybar [10] investigated the operation characteristics of a low-temperature MVC desalination system. Ettouney [11] proposed a comprehensive design model of the single-effect mechanical vapor compression process with several new design features including the evaporator dimensions, demister dimensions, dimensions of the non-condensable gases venting orifice, and capacity of the vacuum system. Nafey et al. [12] developed exergy and thermal economic mathematical models for a multi-effect evaporation-mechanical vapor compression desalination process. The thermal performance ratio of the system, the unit product cost, the capital cost of the compressor, and specific power consumption are analyzed with/without external steam. Lara et al. [13] presented the detailed engineering and economics of an MVC system operating at 172°C. The utilization of elevated operating temperatures offers several advantages, including reduced compression work, minimized latent heat transfer area, and a compact compressor. Alasfour and Abdulrahim [14] proposed a hybrid MSF-MVC desalination system and studied the thermal performance of the MVC desalination system. Onishi et al. [15] introduced a new optimization model for the single and multiple-effect evaporation systems for shale gas flowback water desalination. The results highlighted the potential of the proposed model to cost-effectively optimize SEE/MEE systems by producing freshwater and reducing brine discharges and associated environmental impacts. Jamil and Zubair [16] focused on thermoeconomic analysis of a single-effect MVC desalination system operating with and without brine recirculation. Schwantes et al. [17] presented a technological design and economic analysis for membrane distillation and MVC for the same application. Elsayed et al. [18] studied exergy analysis of four different feed configurations of a multi-effect desalination with MVC system and proposed an exergy-economic model to assess the performance of a multi-effect desalination plant integrated into a mechanical vapor compressor unit (MED-MVC) [2].

Theoretical research is advancing rapidly, while simultaneously witnessing the construction of various experimental devices and commercial applications. Matz and Fisher [19] showed that MVC systems have an equal total production cost compared with the RO method. Lucas and Tabourier [20] introduced a 1,500 m³/d unit constructed by Sidem installed in the Nuclear Power Plant of Flamanville in France. In 1994, more than 200 units with very small capacity were reported by Matz and Zimmer man [21]. Veza [22] presented that the Las Palmas Port Authority desalination plant consists of two low-temperature vapor compression units with a production capacity of 500 m³/d each. Kronenberg and Lokiec [23] described the practical commercial application for steam-driven multi-effect distillation plants in dual-purpose applications and the latest developments for single-purpose mechanical vapor compression plants. Wu et al. [24] presented a new single-effect MVC system with a rotating disk evaporator. Shen et al. [25] developed and applied a 50 m³/d double-effect MVC system with a water-injected twin-screw compressor. Hong et al. [26] described the mathematical and experimental study of the MVC system driven by the roots compressor.

The vapor compressor is a critical component in the MVC system, significantly impacting its performance. It compresses the secondary steam generated in the evaporator to enhance its internal energy, which is then reused as input energy for the system. In previous literature, it was common to compress secondary vapor into superheated steam at high temperatures and pressure. However, with recent advancements in compressor technology, a water-injected compression technique has been developed and increasingly adopted. This technique involves injecting liquid water into the working chamber to lower the steam temperature at the compressor outlet [27]. When designing an MVC system, the designer’s priority lies in determining the optimal compression method. However, there is a dearth of literature comparing the performance of different compression methods in MVC desalination systems. This paper presents a comprehensive evaluation of the thermodynamics, economics, and exergy analysis for two compression methods employed in a single-effect mechanical compression system. Additionally, mathematical models have been enhanced to incorporate critical factors such as the relationship between inlet/outlet temperatures of the preheater and distillate water, as well as the mass fraction of feedwater between two preheaters. The model results elucidate distinct characteristics of both compression methods theoretically and provide decision-makers with a foundation for selecting appropriate design approaches.
2. MVC system description

Fig. 1 depicts the schematic of a single-effect MVC process featuring two distinct compression methods, comprising a horizontal-tube falling film evaporator, two shell-tube-type preheaters, a vapor mechanical compressor, transfer pumps, and other components. The vacuum system is omitted for simplicity. The evaporator is a conventional horizontal-tube falling film evaporator including spray nozzles, vapor suction tube, horizontal heat-exchange tubes, and a wire mesh mist eliminator [28]. The preheater is selected as a shell-tube type because of its relatively simple manufacturing and adaptability to different operating conditions [29]. Currently, centrifugal, roots and screw compressors are the three main kinds of vapor compressors. Due to the advantage of good stability, larger compression ratio, and wet compression, a screw compressor is chosen as the main type for medium-scale water reclamation desalination [30].

Within the MVC system, seawater is directed to the preheaters for heat exchange with the distillate. The warmed brine then enters the evaporator and descends through a horizontal tube via a spray nozzle. A portion of the brine undergoes evaporation, generating secondary steam which is subsequently compressed by a vapor mechanical compressor to enhance its internal energy as input for the system. The main distinction between Fig. 1a and b lies in the compression process. In Fig. 1a the secondary steam undergoes compression from saturated to superheated state, whereas in Fig. 1b the secondary steam, mixed with a minimal amount of distillate water, is compressed to saturated steam at a lower temperature.

3. System modeling

Several mathematical models, including the thermodynamic, exergy-analysis, and thermo-economic models, have been developed to analyze the performance of a single-effect mechanical compression system with different compression methods and to investigate the effects of major design parameters.

The MVC system, being a complex and nonlinear system, necessitates the consideration of certain reasonable assumptions:

- Steady-state operation;
- Thermodynamic losses have been assumed to be 1°C as a real design value between the brine and the vapor in one evaporator [31];
- Steam is completed condensed at the end of the horizontal tubes;
- Compression process is assumed to be isentropic compression.

3.1. Thermodynamic model

A thermodynamic model is used to calculate the design parameters of the system and each node. The thermodynamic model mainly includes mass balance, energy balance, and salinity balance equations in the evaporator, compressor, and preheaters.

3.1.1. Evaporator model

Mass balance:

\[ M_f = M_v + M_i \]  

Energy balance: High-temperature compression (HTC) system:

\[ Q_c = (H_{i1} - H_i)M_{v1} + M_vc_v(T_{s1} - T_i) \]  

Fig. 1. Schematic of a single-effect MVC process with two different compression ways. (a) High-temperature compression and (b) injected-water compression.
Injected-water compression (IWC) system:

\[ Q_s = M_s \lambda_s = M_s \lambda_{s1} + M_s C_p (T_s - T_f) \]  

(3)

Salinity balance:

\[ M_j S_{in} = M_j S_{out} \]

(4)

where \( Q_s \) is the heat consumption in the evaporator, can be calculated as:

\[ Q_s = h A \text{LMTD}_s \]

(5)

where \( A \) is the heat transfer area, \( h \) is the overall heat transfer coefficient, and for the sake of comparison it can be estimated according to Eq. (6) [32]:

\[ h = 1961.9 + 12.6 T_s - 9.6 \times 10^{-2} T_s^2 + 3.16 \times 10^{-4} T_s^3 \]

(6)

The logarithmic mean temperature difference \( \text{LMTD}_s \) is calculated:

HTC system:

\[ \text{LMTD}_s = \frac{(T_{sa} - T_f) - (T_s - T_f)}{\ln \left( \frac{T_{sa} - T_f}{T_s - T_f} \right)} \]

IWC system:

\[ \text{LMTD}_s = \frac{T_s - T_f}{\ln \left( \frac{T_s - T_f}{T_s - T_f} \right)} \]

(8)

In one evaporator, the temperature difference between the brine temperature and the vapor temperature exists, which can be obtained by the following:

\[ T_v = T_s - (\text{BPE} + \Delta T_s) \]

(9)

where BPE is the boiling point elevation, \( \Delta T_s \) is the hydraulic head loss [33], the sum of them is assumed to be 1°C.

3.1.2. Preheater model

The preheater model is based on energy balance and heat transfer equations. For simplification of the design process, some assumptions are proposed:

- The counter current mode is used in the preheaters, that is heat flow and cold flow have opposite directions.
- The outlet temperature difference on both sides of the preheater is equal.

Taking feedwater-distillate preheater for example (Fig. 2), the energy that the distillate released equals that of the feedwater absorbs, which can be calculated:

\[ Q_{p,1} = C_p v \left( T_s - T_{s1} \right) M_s = C_p f \left( T_{f1} - T_{cw} \right) M_{f1} \]

(10)

where \( M_s \) is the steam mass flow at the compressor outlet, \( M_h \) is the seawater mass flow entering the feedwater-distillate preheater, it can be expressed by:

\[ M_{f1} = M_f X \]

(11)

where \( X \) is the feed split between preheaters Eq. (10) is transformed:

\[ M_{f1} = \frac{C_p v}{C_p f} = \frac{M_f X}{M_f} \]

(12)

where \( M_f / M_s = RR \), the recovery ratio (RR) is an important parameter to measure the distillate efficiency of an MVC system.

Therefore, as shown in Eq. (13),

\[ X = \frac{C_p v}{C_p f} \cdot RR \]

(13)

The feed split between preheaters \( X \) is not defined arbitrarily, it should be determined by various recovery ratios of an MVC system.

The heat exchange area can be calculated as follows:

\[ Q_h = h A \text{LMTD}_p \]

(14)

where \( \text{LMTD}_p \) is the logarithmic mean temperature difference, is determined by the following equation:

\[ \text{LMTD}_p = \frac{(T_s - T_{f1}) - (T_s - T_{cw})}{\ln \left( \frac{T_s - T_{f1}}{T_s - T_{cw}} \right)} \]

(15)

The overall heat transfer coefficients of the two preheaters are estimated according to Eq. (16):

\[ h_s = 1.7194 + 3.2063 \times 10^{-3} T_v + 1.5971 \times 10^{-3} T_v^2 - 1.9918 \times 10^{-7} T_v^3 \]

(16)
Similar to the feedwater-distillate preheater, the parameters of the feedwater-brine preheater are calculated:

$$Q_{T,TM,TM} = h_A pb Tb bb fT_{fT}$$

$$(17)$$

$$M_{j2} = M_j - M_{j1}$$

$$M_{j2} = M_j - M_{j1}$$

$$(18)$$

$$LMTD_{T,TM,TM} = \frac{\left(T_s - T_{j2}\right) - \left(T_{s1} - T_{cw}\right)}{\ln \left(\frac{T_s - T_{j2}}{T_{s1} - T_{cw}}\right)}$$

$$M_{j2} = M_j - M_{j1}$$

$$(19)$$

Leaving the preheaters, the temperature of two strands of the seawater increases and then join together. The mixing temperature is given as:

$$T_f = XT_j + (1 - X)T_{j2}$$

$$(20)$$

### 3.1.3. Compressor model

For the sake of clear expression, two different compression ways high-temperature compression and injected-water compression are plotted in the T-S diagram (Fig. 3).

For the high-temperature compression process, point 2 represents the secondary steam in a saturated state, which is subsequently compressed to a superheated state within the compressor. The vertical lines 2-3 depict an isentropic compression process. Line 3-4-5 illustrates the condensation process where the superheated steam undergoes complete condensation within the tube. According to the energy balance, the compressor power can be calculated as follows:

$$W_c = M_{j} (H_j - H_s)$$

$$(21)$$

where the subscript 2 and 3 denoted the point in the T-S diagram in Fig. 3.

The calculation relation of temperature and pressure is determined by:

$$T_s = T_j \cdot \left(\frac{P_j}{P_s}\right)^{\gamma/(\gamma-1)}$$

$$(22)$$

where $\alpha$ is the pressure ratio, $\gamma$ is the isentropic coefficient that is estimated to be 1.3 [11].

For the injected-water compression process, it is the heat transfer and phase change process of the same material [34]. The distillate water is introduced into the compressor to blend with the saturated vapor, effectively reducing the temperature of superheated steam at the outlet of the compressor. The mass fraction of injected-water in the compressor outlet total flow ($x$) is calculated by the following equation [13]:

$$x = \frac{S_2 - S_4}{S_4 - S_1}$$

$$(23)$$

The compressor power is determined based on the energy balance as:

$$W_c = M_{j}H_j - M_{j}H_s - xM_{j}H_2$$

$$(24)$$

where $S$ and $H$ are entropy and enthalpy, respectively, the subscript of that are the point in the T-S diagram in Fig. 3.

The fluid flow into the compressor is the sum of the secondary steam and a small fraction of the condensed water, so:

$$M_s = M_j + xM_j$$

$$(25)$$

### 3.2. Exergy-analysis model

According to the second law of thermodynamics, in a natural process, under the condition without external energy input, the chaos (‘entropy’) of an isolated system does not increase. Second law efficiency is a key indicator to quantify how close the practical systems are to the thermodynamic limit. In general, second law efficiency is defined as the exergy change of the system to exergy input:

$$\eta_{II} = \frac{\text{exergy change of the system}}{\text{exergy input}} = \frac{\Delta E}{W_r}$$

$$(26)$$

To sustain the operation of a mechanical vapor compression desalination system, additional external energy input such as a compressor and transfer pump is required. The exergy input to the system is the sum of the compressor and transfer pump power, which can be obtained:

$$W_r = W_c + \sum W'_{p}$$

$$(27)$$

where $W_c$ and $W'_{p}$ are the compressor power and transfer pump power, respectively.

The exergy change of the system is determined by the net exergy transfer across its boundaries. The specific exergy of a fluid stream with negligible kinetic and
potential energies is given by \( e = h - h_0 (s - s_0) \) [12]. So, the exergy change of the system can be calculated as:

\[
\Delta E = M_s \left[ h_s - h_{s,0} - T_s (s_s - s_{s,0}) \right] + M_t \left[ h_t - h_{t,0} - T_t (s_t - s_{t,0}) \right] - M_f \left[ h_f - h_{f,0} - T_f (s_f - s_{f,0}) \right]
\]

(28)

3.3. Thermo-economic model

The thermo-economic model is primarily utilized for estimating the cost of the final product, which serves as a crucial criterion for comparing the commercial costs associated with two distinct compression methods.

In most papers [35], a parameter named the simplified cost of water (SCOW) is used to define the initial capital cost, which is given as:

\[
SCOW = \frac{(I_0 \cdot \varphi) + C}{M_s}
\]

(29)

where the amortization factor \((\varphi)\) is defined as:

\[
\varphi = \frac{i(1+i)^n}{(1+i)^n - 1}
\]

(30)

where \(i\) is the interest rate and \(n\) is the number of years of the economic life of the system, taken as 0.05 and 20, respectively [35].

In Eq. (30) it is assumed that every year (from year 1 to year \(n\)) the desalination plant produces the same amount of water \((M_s)\) and has the same running cost \((C)\).

Capital cost \((I_0)\) refers to the total cost of the equipment at the initial investment that consists of hardware, engineering, construction, project management, initial design, permitting, and land etc. [36]. For the sake of comparison, the equipment and materials costs are only taken into account which is listed in Table 1.

Running cost \((C)\) is the annual operating cost which mainly includes the cost of energy (heat and electricity), seawater pretreatment chemicals, labor, maintenance, and management, which are listed in Table 2.

4. Computational method and process

The present study develops a set of computational procedures in Python language for the design and calculation of the MVC system. An additional advantage of utilizing Python is its convenience in calculating the physical properties of water vapor and brine, facilitated by an IAPWS module.

In the computational process, inlet variables are first defined including seawater temperature \(T_{cw}\), seawater mass flow rate \(M_s\), and seawater salinity \(S_{in}\). Then the secondary steam temperature \(T_s\), the temperature difference between the heating steam and the secondary steam \(\Delta t\), and the feedwater temperature are assumed. The above variables and parameters are input into the three mathematical models to calculate the rest of the detailed results. Finally, the paper concludes by comparing two compression methods. The required input parameters used for the MVC system simulation are defined in Table 3.
5. Results and discussion

5.1. Model accuracy verification

For substantiation of the accuracy of the mathematical models of two compression ways of the MVC system, the model results from Jamil and Zubair [16] and calculated by the mathematical models in the paper are compared in Table 4.

As shown in Table 4, the HTC model results fit well with that of Jamil and Zubair [16] with a minor error below 3%. With the same high-temperature compression way the HTC model and the Jamil and Zubair [16] lead to minor differences. This shows that the HTC model in the paper is reliable.

As the IWC model has been proposed in recent years, few experimental data on the IWC model in an MVC system appeared in the previous literature. Although the IWC model has not been verified by the experimental data, the injected-water compressor theory in the paper has been introduced in many references. This work is mainly focused on the performance comparison of the two models at the numerical simulation. The results indicate that under the same parameter conditions, the compressed vapor temperature of the HTC model is higher and exhibits a larger recovery.
ratio and plant capacity compared to the IWC mathematical model (Table 4). Furthermore, additional distinctions between these two models.

The same input parameters are essential for comparing the performance of the two systems. Under the same parameter input condition of \( M_f = 10 \text{ kg/s}, T_v = 60^\circ\text{C}, T_f = 57^\circ\text{C}, \Delta t = 10^\circ\text{C} \), the detailed results of the two systems are listed in Table 5.

The primary distinction between the two systems lies in their compression methods, as illustrated in Table 5. Under identical temperature differentials between the heating steam and secondary steam, along with a constant compression ratio, the HTC system exhibits significantly higher steam temperatures at the compressor outlet compared to the IWC system. Consequently, this results in a nearly three-fold increase in compression power for the former when compared to the latter.

Due to the higher enthalpy of superheated steam entering the evaporator in the HTC system compared to saturated steam in the IWC system, a larger amount of heat

### Table 4
Comparison based on the study of Jamil & Zubair [16] and model results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Jamil and Zubair [16]</th>
<th>HTC model</th>
<th>IWC model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intake seawater temperature, °C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed seawater temperature, °C</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaporation temperature, °C</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapor temperature, °C</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressed vapor temperature, °C</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression ratio, ( \alpha )</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake seawater salinity, g/kg</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brine salinity, g/kg</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed split ratio between preheaters, X, %</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed flow rate, kg/s</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant capacity, kg/s</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery ratio, RR</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
Detailed comparison results of the two systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermodynamic model</th>
<th>HTC system</th>
<th>IWC system</th>
<th>HTC system</th>
<th>IWC system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( T_{\text{sc}} ), °C</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Q_s, kW</td>
<td>13,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_v ), °C</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>( A_s ), m²</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_e ), °C</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>( A_{ev} ), m²</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{ev} ), °C</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>( A_{ev} ), m²</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{ev} ), °C</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>( M_s ), kg/s</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_f ), °C</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>( M_s ), kg/s</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_f ), °C</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>Recovery ratio</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_f ), °C</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Feedwater split between preheaters, X</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{\text{pre}} ), °C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Compression ratio, ( \alpha )</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( W_{\text{comp}} ), kW</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exergy-analysis model</th>
<th>HTC system</th>
<th>IWC system</th>
<th>HTC system</th>
<th>IWC system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta E ), kW</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>( \eta_{\text{li}} )</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermo-economic model</th>
<th>HTC system</th>
<th>IWC system</th>
<th>HTC system</th>
<th>IWC system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( Z_{\text{evap}} ) $</td>
<td>19,165</td>
<td>21,142</td>
<td>( Z_{\text{comp}} ) $</td>
<td>227,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Z_{\text{pump}} ) $</td>
<td>23,972</td>
<td>24,977</td>
<td>( Z_{\text{pump}} ) $</td>
<td>52,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_s ) $</td>
<td>247,188</td>
<td>106,748</td>
<td>SCOW, $/ton</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( I_s ) $</td>
<td>323,880</td>
<td>307,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
power is released during condensation, resulting in a 9% reduction in required heat transfer area and a 6% increase in total freshwater production. When comparing the freshwater output performance of both systems under similar input parameters, it can be concluded that the HTC system outperforms the IWC system.

The exergy-analysis model is used to calculate the exergy loss and second-law efficiency of the system. The exergy loss remains nearly identical due to the negligible disparity in the inlet and outlet parameters between the two systems. However, there is a significant difference in the second law efficiency between the two systems, with values of 17.6% and 39%, respectively. This discrepancy can be attributed to the fact that the exergy input for compression power in the HTC system far exceeds that of the IWC system. As per Eq. (26), the denominator is inversely proportional to this ratio, meaning that a higher exergy input corresponds to lower second-law efficiency. In terms of energy efficiency, it can be concluded that the IWC system outperforms the HTC system.

The cost of the desalination plant serves as a crucial criterion for decision-makers, representing a significant indicator to assess the economic viability of a system model. According to the thermo-economic model analysis, the cost of both the evaporator and preheater is determined by the heat transfer area. Consequently, the evaporator cost in the HTC system exhibits a reduction of approximately 10% compared to that in the IWC system, while the cost difference for preheaters between these two systems remains below 4%. Given the relatively low sensitivity of compression power to compressor cost, the HTC system exhibits over three times higher power compared to the IWC system, with a mere 8% increase in cost. Overall, considering total capital costs, there is no significant disparity between the HTC and IWC systems.

However, the running cost of the HTC system is almost 2 times much more than that of the IWC system. That is because the electricity cost that is directly proportional to the compression power plays the most important part in running costs with 80% and 53%, respectively. Although the total freshwater production of the HTC system is higher, the cost of the system increases more seriously, which leads to the simplified cost of water per mass flow of the HTC model is about 30% more than that of the IWC system.

As discussed above, at the same parameters input conditions, the HTC system has an advantage over the IWC system in terms of freshwater production about a 6% increase, while it is far inferior to the IWC system in other aspects, such as almost 3 times on compression power, 40% decrease on the second law efficiency of the system, 30% more on the simplified cost of water per mass flow. The aforementioned conclusions are derived from specific input parameters, and further discussion is required to explore the impact of variations in these parameters on system performance. Therefore, this detailed analysis focuses on four key parameters: compression power, recovery ratio, SCOW, and second law efficiency. These parameters exhibit significant disparities in the calculation results between the two models.

### Table 6
Compositions of the running cost of two systems (a) HTC model and (b) IWC model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HTC model</th>
<th>IWC model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Determination and effect of the feedwater temperature

In conventional MEE system design, the feedwater temperature is typically assumed to be several degrees lower than the heating steam temperature. However, for the single-effect MVC system, the determination of feedwater temperature is not arbitrary and requires specific calculations within a defined range. The phenomenon is explained as follows:

Taking the HTC system as an example, according to Eq. (2), feedwater temperature can be expressed as:

$$ T_j = T_v - \frac{(H_s - H_l - \lambda_{j}T_v)M_s + (M_s - M_f)\lambda_{j}T_v}{M_{C_p}} $$

(31)

The recovery ratio can be obtained by:

$$ RR = \frac{(T_s - T_j)C_p}{H_s - H_l - \lambda_{j}} $$

(32)

For the MEE or multi-effect MVC system, $M_s > M_f$ satisfies the requirement. In the single-effect recirculation MVC system $M_s$ must equal to $M_f$, which leads to a narrow range of the feedwater temperature than that of the MEE or multi-effect MVC system.

Under the other constant design conditions, feedwater temperature mainly affects the distillate production and Recovery ratio. At $M_s = 10 \text{ kg/s}$, $T_v = 60^\circ C$, $\Delta t = 10^\circ C$, the feedwater temperature and the Recovery ratio are listed in Fig. 5.

The recovery ratio decreases with an increase in feedwater temperature, as observed in Fig. 5. This can be attributed to the gradual enlargement of the molecular size of Eq. (32) due to the rise in feedwater temperature and constant brine temperature. The HTC model exhibits a larger variation magnitude compared to the IWC model. Furthermore, at the same feedwater temperature, the HTC system demonstrates a higher recovery ratio than that of the IWC system. In the HTC system, superheated steam serves as the heat source, while saturated steam is utilized in the IWC system. Consequently, hotter steam results in increased production of secondary steam. In the paper, the maximum allowable brine salinity is defined from 60 to 160 g/kg corresponding with the recovery ratio from 0.32 to 0.73. The superposition part of the temperature range of the two compression models in Fig. 5 is considered to be the feedwater temperature simulation range.
In the feedwater temperature simulation range, the effect of the variation of the feedwater temperature will be discussed. With the feedwater temperature increase, the recovery ratio, compression power, and second law efficiency of the two models have a downward trend (Fig. 6a, b, and d). However, increasing the compression power does not lead to a simultaneous increase in the specific cooling water consumption (SCOW) affected by distillate production. The SCOW has been observed to increase with an increase in feedwater temperature (Fig. 6c). Considering all factors comprehensively within the simulation range, it is more appropriate to maintain a lower temperature despite the larger compression power resulting in a higher recovery ratio, second-law efficiency, and lower SCOW.

5.3. Effect of the feedwater mass flow rate

The feedwater mass flow rate is a crucial parameter for determining the system’s capacity and processing capability. Under the special parameters \( T_f = 57°C, T_v = 60°C, \Delta t = 10°C \), with the increase of the feedwater mass flow rate (from 10 to 60 kg/s) the compression power has a linear increase (Fig. 7). The higher the feedwater mass flow rate, the larger the disparity between HTC and IWC models. At other constant parameters, the recovery ratio and second law efficiency remain constant. These results show that feed seawater flow rate only affects plant capacity, not distillate efficiency. The reason for this is that, by Eq. (32), the recovery ratio remains unaffected by variations in the feedwater mass flow rate. In terms of freshwater cost, an increase in the feedwater mass flow rate leads to a decline in SCOW. Initially, the SCOW experiences a rapid decline, while at flow rates exceeding 25 kg/s, the SCOW undergoes significant changes. During the design phase, it may seem
straightforward to opt for a higher feedwater mass flow rate to achieve increased distillate production and reduced freshwater costs. However, decision-makers must consider that higher capacity entails additional floor space requirements and manufacturing complexities.

5.4. Effect of the vapor temperature

At the condition of $M_f = 10$ kg/s, $\Delta t = 10^\circ$C, $T_f = T_v - 2$, the effect of the variations of the vapor temperature (between 40$^\circ$C and 90$^\circ$C) are discussed in this section. The vapor temperature corresponds to the compressor's inlet temperature, exerting a significant influence on the compression power. According to the operational principle of the compressor, an increase in the inlet vapor temperature leads to a heightened level of compression difficulty. With an increase in vapor temperature, the compression power exhibits an upward trend (Fig. 8a). Although the high vapor temperature corresponds to the bigger compression power, it leads to a bigger recovery ratio, second law efficiency, and lower SCOW which is beneficial for the MVC system. The higher vapor temperature should be better when designing the system. However, high vapor temperature will bring serious scaling problems. It is reasonable to define a high vapor temperature while avoiding scaling problems.

5.5. Effect of the temperature difference of the saturated heating steam and the vapor

Although the temperature difference between the saturated heating steam and the vapor remains consistent for both compression models, it corresponds to distinct compressor processes. For the IWC system, the temperature difference refers to the increase in temperature between the outlet and inlet points. In contrast, for the HTC system, it represents the temperature difference between the compressor inlet and saturated steam, rather than including superheated steam from the compressor outlet (Fig. 9). The increase in temperature difference primarily impacts the compression ratio, as illustrated in Fig. 10. This results in the upward movement of the apex of the isentropic line (from point 3 to point 3'). Under the parameters of $T_v = 60^\circ$C, $M_f = 10$ kg/s, a curve of the compression ratio with the temperature difference is demonstrated in Fig. 10. With the increase in temperature difference, there is a linear upward trend observed in the compression ratio, leading to a simultaneous rise in compression power. However, it should be noted that while compression power is not the decisive indicator for evaluating system performance, further discussion will focus on exploring recovery ratio and SCOW as more significant parameters.

The recovery ratio from 0.32 to 0.73, as illustrated in Fig. 11, corresponds to different feedwater temperature ranges under various temperature differences. The increase in temperature difference leads to an expansion of the feedwater temperature range. The extended operational temperature range can effectively mitigate the impact of manufacturing errors on system performance. Another advantage of the significant temperature difference lies in its ability to induce variations in the Recovery ratio between the two models. At lower temperature differences (between 5 and 15), the HTC model exhibits a higher recovery ratio.
compared to the IWC system. As the temperature difference increases, the error in the recovery ratio diminishes. As discussed earlier, while having a superior recovery ratio is one of the HTC model’s key advantages, it falls short when compared to the IWC model in various aspects. However, this advantage disappears at higher temperature differences. Therefore, when designing an MVC system under high-temperature differences with saturated heating steam and vapor conditions, choosing the IWC model undoubtedly becomes preferable.

Fig. 8. Compression power (a), recovery ratio (b), SCOW (c), and ηIII (d) with vapor temperature.

Fig. 9. Variation of the temperature difference in a T-S diagram.

Fig. 10. Compression ratio with the temperature difference.

In terms of the freshwater cost, a larger temperature difference leads to an increased SCOW (Fig. 12). While
theoretically, a smaller temperature difference may be preferable when designing an MVC system, it should be noted that a narrower feedwater temperature range associated with this choice is challenging to control in practical applications. This can result in minor errors having significant impacts on system performance. From my perspective, prioritizing stable operation states outweighs marginal freshwater savings. Therefore, defining a compromise temperature difference that offers a wider operating range and moderate SCOW is more favorable.

6. Conclusion

The paper introduces two distinct compression methods, namely high-temperature compression (HTC) and injected-water compression (IWC), for a single-effect MVC desalination system. Subsequently, thermodynamic modeling, exergy-analysis modeling, and thermo-economic modeling are established to facilitate the comparative performance evaluation of these two compression approaches.

The results indicate that, under identical input parameter conditions, the HTC model exhibits a 6% increase in freshwater production compared to the IWC model. However, it significantly lags behind the IWC model in other aspects: compression power is nearly three times higher, second law efficiency of the system experiences a 40% decrease, and there is a 30% higher simplified cost of water per mass flow.

The impact of various design parameters, including the feedwater temperature, feedwater mass flow rate, vapor temperature, and the temperature difference between the saturated heating steam and the vapor on system performance is discussed.

It has been observed that within the simulation range, a lower feedwater temperature is more suitable due to its higher Recovery ratio, second-law efficiency, and lower SCOW. The distillate efficiency and energy efficiency are not affected by the feedwater mass flow rate. This implies that as the feed seawater flow rate increases, the amount of distillate produced also increases while maintaining a constant recovery ratio and second-law efficiency. Although an increase in feedwater mass flow rate results in higher total freshwater cost, there is a decreasing trend in the simplified cost of water per mass flow. A higher vapor temperature yields greater benefits concerning recovery ratio, second law efficiency, and lower SCOW.

The significant temperature disparity between the saturated heating steam and vapor enables a broad operational range, capable of accommodating system fluctuations resulting from uncertain factors. However, this may lead to increased costs associated with freshwater consumption. Consequently, it is deemed impractical to define a high-temperature difference when designing an MVC system.

Symbols

- \( M_f \) — Mass flow rate of feed water, kg/s
- \( M_{f1} \) — Mass flow rate of feed water in Feedwater-distillate preheater, kg/s
- \( M_{f2} \) — Mass flow rate of feed water in Feedwater-brine preheater, kg/s
- \( M_s \) — Mass flow rate of heating steam, kg/s
- \( M_b \) — Mass flow rate of brine, kg/s
- \( M_v \) — Mass flow rate of vapor, kg/s
- \( T_{cw} \) — The seawater temperature, °C
- \( T_{f1} \) — Outlet feed water temperature of the Feedwater-distillate preheater, °C
- \( T_{f2} \) — Outlet feed water temperature of the Feedwater-brine preheater, °C
- \( T_f \) — Feed water temperature, °C
- \( T_b \) — Remaining brine temperature, °C
- \( T_{v0} \) — Outlet vapor temperature of the compressor of the HTC system, °C
- \( T_v \) — Outlet vapor temperature of the compressor of the IWC system, °C
- \( T_r \) — Vapor temperature, °C
- \( T_{v1} \) — Outlet water temperature of the Feedwater-distillate preheater, °C
$T_{in}$ — Outlet water temperature of the feedwater-brine preheater, °C

$X$ — Feed split between preheaters

$H_v$ — Enthalpy value of the outlet vapor of the compressor of HTC system, kJ/kg

$H_h$ — Enthalpy value of the outlet vapor of the tubes of HTC system, kJ/kg

$C_r$ — Specific heat at a constant pressure of seawater, kJ/kg·K

$\lambda$ — Latent heat of evaporation, kJ/kg

$S$ — Salt mass fraction, g/kg

$A$ — Heat transfer area, m²

$Q$ — Special heat consumption, kW

$h$ — Heat transfer coefficient, W/m²·K

$LMTD$ — Log mean temperature difference, °C

$RR$ — Recovery ratio

$BPE$ — Boiling point elevation, °C

$dt$ — Temperature difference of the outlet hot flow and cold flow, °C

$W_c$ — Power of the compressor, kW

$P_{in}$ — Outlet vapor pressure of the compressor, kPa

$P_{out}$ — Inlet vapor pressure of the compressor, kPa

Subscripts

in — Parameters entering the effect

out — Parameters leaving the effect

$s$ — Steam

$b$ — Brine

$e$ — Evaporator

$f$ — Feed

$v$ — Vapor

$p$ — Preheater

$1$ — Feedwater-distillate preheater

$2$ — Feedwater-brine preheater

References


