



## Chemwork

[Discussions](#)

[Members](#)

[Search](#)

[Manage](#)



[Unfollow Alireza](#)

### Finger type or vessel slug catcher

[Alireza Rashidkhani](#)

Senior Process Engineer at Aker Solutions

Hello Everyone,

I would like to know when we go for finger type slug catchers and when we use the vessels, what are the cons and pros for each one and which are the major criteria for this selection?

[Like](#) • [Comment \(2\)](#) • [Share](#) • [Follow](#) • [Reply Privately](#) • November 30, 2011

[Add to Manager's Choice](#) • [Close Discussion](#)

#### Comments

2 comments



[Mojtaba Habibi](#)

Process Engineer at Petroleum Engineering and Development Company (PEDEC)

Top Contributor

Mojtaba

In my view the important parameters for selection of slug catcher type are:

1. Design Pressure:

If design pressure is high then the vessel thickness and consequently vessel cost will be higher. So in this case finger type made from piping elements will be more economical option.

2. Slug Volume:

For low to moderate slug volume (say 200 m<sup>3</sup>) vessel type can be used with reasonable dimensions. For higher slug volumes the vessel type dimensions will fall in a range that is costly and difficult to fabricate and finger type should be selected instead. I have seen finger type slug catchers sized for slug volumes of 1000 m<sup>3</sup> and 2500 m<sup>3</sup>.

3. Plant Plot Area:

For offshore projects there is limitation at plot area. So vessel type will be feasible option.

[Like](#) • [Reply privately](#) • [Delete](#) • December 1, 2011



Obumneme

[Obumneme Uyaemesi](#)

Process / Flow Assurance Engineer

The "multiple-pipe" slug catchers ("Finger Type") equipment is the most common equipment to handle slug volume, it is efficient and the operation is well known, however the common practice recommends that for volumes less than 100 m<sup>3</sup>, it is better to use the "vessel type".

Another factor to consider is the weight that is a transportation risk, because some roads may have only one lane that allows the passing of equipment less than 90 tons. So the one that way less should be considered.

[Like](#) • [Reply privately](#) • [Delete](#) • December 12, 2011

Add a comment...

[Send me an email for each new comment.](#)

[Add Comment](#)