# Choosing between MVR and TVR is a strategic decision

RELCO®
A Kovalus Company

Understanding
**Falling Film Evaporators**

systems.**solutions.**

# Executive Summary

In industrial evaporation, the choice between Mechanical Vapor Recompression (MVR) and Thermal Vapor Recompression (TVR) has traditionally been treated primarily as a technical design decision. Today, that decision is increasingly strategic.

Energy prices, steam availability, electrical infrastructure, operating flexibility, decarbonization targets, plant integration, and long-term operating costs all influence which technology creates the greatest value over the life of the plant.

Both MVR and TVR recover and reuse part of the energy contained in process vapor, reducing the demand for fresh steam. TVR uses high-pressure motive steam to entrain and recompress process vapor. MVR uses mechanical energy, typically through a fan or compressor, to increase vapor pressure and saturation temperature so the vapor can be reused as a heating medium.

**Key message**

Neither technology is inherently superior. The right selection depends on process requirements, product behavior, operating profile, utility infrastructure, lifecycle economics, and the plant's long-term energy and sustainability strategy.

RELCO®
A Kovalus Company

# Why does vapor recompression matter?

Evaporation is fundamentally an energy-intensive separation process. Water must be converted from liquid to vapor, requiring significant latent heat.

Modern evaporator systems improve efficiency by recovering and reusing that vapor energy.

Instead of rejecting process vapor as waste heat, vapor recompression increases its pressure and saturation temperature, allowing the vapor to be reused as a heating medium.

This reduces the amount of fresh steam required by the process.

Two of the most widely used approaches are:

- Thermal Vapor Recompression — TVR
- Mechanical Vapor Recompression — MVR

Both improve energy efficiency, but they do so using very different utility inputs.

That distinction has important consequences for plant economics.

# How does TVR work?

A Thermal Vapor Recompressor uses high-pressure motive steam to entrain part of lower-pressure vapor generated by the evaporation process. The amount that can be entrained depends on the motive-steam condition and the required compression ratio.

The two vapor streams mix inside a thermocompressor nozzle.

The resulting mixed vapor leaves at an intermediate pressure and temperature that allows it to be reused as a heating medium within the evaporator. The mass of reusable vapor is usually significantly higher than the suction vapor mass.

The effectiveness of a TVR depends strongly on:

- motive steam pressure
- suction vapor pressure
- discharge pressure
- compression ratio
- entrainment ratio
- required temperature lift

Because the system is driven by steam rather than mechanical equipment, TVR systems can be mechanically simple.

This can provide advantages in applications where steam is readily available and where electrical infrastructure is limited.

However, the system still consumes live steam continuously, and performance is constrained by the available compression ratio and motive steam conditions.

# How does MVR work?

Mechanical Vapor Recompression uses an electrically driven fan or compressor to increase the pressure and saturation temperature of process vapor.

Once compressed, the vapor can be returned to the evaporator as the heating medium.

The main utility input therefore shifts from steam to electricity.

This can dramatically reduce live-steam consumption during normal operation, although steam may still be required for startup, heat treatment, process control, or thermal losses.

MVR is particularly attractive where:

- evaporation loads are large
- annual operating hours are high
- electricity is competitively priced
- steam generation is expensive
- decarbonization or electrification is a strategic priority

However, the MVR machine becomes a critical piece of rotating equipment, and the required compressor duty increases as the necessary temperature lift increases.

MVR performance therefore depends strongly on the thermodynamic design of the evaporation system.

# The fundamental trade-off: steam vs electricity

At the highest level, MVR and TVR use different primary utility inputs. However, the final decision extends beyond the relative price of steam and electricity.

A plant with inexpensive steam and relatively expensive electricity may reach a different conclusion from a plant with low-cost electricity and expensive steam.

The comparison should therefore include:

- electricity cost
- steam cost
- boiler efficiency
- fuel cost
- condensate return
- electrical demand charges
- annual operating hours
- expected future energy prices
- carbon costs or emissions targets

The same evaporator design can have very different economics at two different production sites.

For this reason, technology selection should not be based only on generic energy-consumption figures.

RELCO®
A Kovalus Company

# MVR efficiency depends on temperature lift

One of the most important parameters in MVR design is the required vapor temperature lift. The compressor must provide enough lift to overcome product boiling-point elevation, pressure losses through the vapor circuit, and the effective temperature difference required for heat transfer.

The larger this lift, the more mechanical energy the compressor must supply.

A well-designed MVR evaporator therefore aims to operate with the smallest practical temperature difference while still maintaining adequate heat-transfer area, stable film formation, required evaporation capacity, acceptable fouling behavior and appropriate product temperatures.

This creates an important design trade-off.

A smaller temperature difference can reduce compressor power but may require more heat-transfer area.

A larger temperature difference can reduce required surface area but increases compressor duty.

The optimum is therefore a balance between CAPEX and OPEX. This is one reason why MVR should not be evaluated only by looking at the compressor.

The full heat-transfer design matters.

# TVR is limited by compression requirements

TVR systems are also sensitive to pressure and temperature lift.

A thermo-compressor can only entrain and compress a certain amount of vapor for a given motive steam condition.

As the required compression ratio increases, the entrainment ratio generally decreases, meaning that more motive steam may be required relative to the amount of suction vapor recompressed.

Therefore, TVR performs best when the evaporation system is designed around realistic steam conditions and moderate recompression requirements.

TVR is not simply a “low-cost MVR.”

It is a different thermodynamic approach with its own operating envelope.

RELCO®
A Kovalus Company

# CAPEX vs OPEX

CAPEX must be evaluated at system level.

MVR and TVR are often compared as a trade-off between initial investment and operating cost.

TVR generally has lower equipment cost and fewer mechanical components. However, depending on the required steam economy, it may require more evaporator effects, heat-transfer area, pumps, piping, and steam infrastructure.

MVR adds a fan or compressor, motor, drive, controls, and electrical infrastructure. However, extensive vapor reuse can reduce steam demand and allow a different evaporator configuration.

Therefore, neither technology has an inherently lower total installed CAPEX.

The evaluation should include:
- recompression equipment
- number of effects and heat-transfer area
- steam and electrical infrastructure
- auxiliaries, controls, and installation

The correct comparison is based on total lifecycle cost:

Total lifecycle cost = CAPEX + energy + maintenance + utilities + operating losses

The lowest initial investment is not necessarily the lowest-cost solution over the plant's operating life.

# Operating hours can change the answer

Annual operating hours have a major influence on the economics.

A large MVR system operating continuously throughout the year has many hours available to recover its higher initial investment through lower energy consumption.

A system that operates only intermittently may not accumulate enough savings to justify the same investment.

This can make TVR more attractive for:

- seasonal production
- low-utilization plants
- short production campaigns
- systems with frequent shutdowns

By contrast, MVR is often more attractive for:

- high-throughput plants
- continuous operation
- long annual campaigns
- plants where steam cost is significant

The technology should therefore be matched to the actual operating profile, not only the nominal design capacity.

# Operating flexibility matters

Energy efficiency is not the only operating consideration. Plants rarely operate at one fixed design point.

Operating conditions may change because of product mix, feed concentration, production rate, partial-load operation, startups and shutdowns, seasonal demand, or downstream constraints.

The evaporation system must respond to these conditions. Both MVR and TVR can operate successfully over a defined turndown range, but their behavior is different.

MVR compressor performance is linked to vapor flow, compression ratio, rotational speed, and machine characteristics.

TVR performance depends strongly on motive steam conditions and vapor entrainment.

The expected operating envelope should therefore be evaluated during technology selection.

A system optimized only for one design point may perform poorly under the conditions where the plant actually spends a significant portion of its operating time.

# Product characteristics cannot be ignored

The energy system must also match the product. In dairy and food evaporation, product properties change as concentration increases.

Important considerations include:

- viscosity
- boiling-point elevation
- fouling tendency
- heat sensitivity
- final solids target
- recirculation requirements
- minimum wetting rate
- allowable product temperature
- residence time
- expected run length
- heat-treatment requirement
- product quality constraints

For example, a high-protein concentrate may become highly viscous at relatively moderate total solids. That can limit practical concentration long before the evaporator reaches its theoretical thermal capacity.

The optimum energy concept must therefore be compatible with product rheology, heat sensitivity, concentration profile, minimum wetting requirements, and expected run length.

A highly efficient energy system is of little value if the evaporator cannot maintain stable film formation or product quality.

# Plant integration is important

An evaporator is rarely an isolated energy user. It sits inside a larger utility and production system.

The site may include spray dryers, pasteurizers, CIP systems, boilers, hot-water systems, condensate recovery, refrigeration systems, heat pumps, steam consumers, electrical generation, and combined heat and power systems.

This creates opportunities and constraints.

For example, a facility may have low-marginal-cost steam available because of cogeneration, waste-heat recovery, or its existing site utility balance. In that case, reducing steam consumption may have less economic value than expected.

Another site may be constrained by boiler capacity but have sufficient electrical infrastructure. MVR may then create value beyond its direct energy savings by avoiding a boiler expansion.

On the other hand, a facility may have limited electrical supply, making a large MVR installation expensive because of transformer, switchgear, and distribution upgrades.

The strategic decision is therefore:

Which solution integrates most effectively with the site's overall energy system?

# Decarbonization changes the comparison

Historically, the MVR versus TVR decision was primarily economic. Increasingly, it is also environmental.

TVR depends on steam.

The carbon footprint of that steam depends on how it is generated. If steam is produced from natural gas or another fossil fuel, TVR operation can carry significant direct emissions.

MVR shifts a greater share of the energy input toward electricity.

Where electricity comes from renewable or increasingly decarbonized sources, MVR can substantially reduce the carbon intensity of evaporation.

This makes MVR especially relevant to companies pursuing:

- electrification
- Scope 1 emission reductions
- renewable electricity strategies
- carbon-neutral production
- reduced fossil-fuel dependence

However, electricity cannot automatically be considered carbon-free. The local electricity-generation mix, and contractual energy supply still matter.

A robust evaluation should therefore compare both energy cost and carbon intensity.

# Future energy scenarios can change today's decision

The decision should also account for how the site's energy system may change over the life of the plant. Evaporators can remain in operation for decades.

Over that period:

- fuel prices may change
- electricity prices may change
- carbon taxes may increase
- renewable power availability may increase
- fossil-fuel boilers may be replaced
- electrical infrastructure may expand
- production volumes may change

Technology selection based only on today's energy prices can therefore be short-sighted.

A lifecycle analysis should test multiple future scenarios.

For example:

- high gas price / low electricity price
- low gas price / high electricity price
- carbon-tax scenario
- renewable electricity scenario
- increased production scenario

The technology that performs best today may not be the most resilient option over the next fifteen to twenty years.

# Maintenance and reliability

Maintenance strategy, spare parts, condition monitoring, and supplier support should be considered during project development.

MVR relies on a major rotating machine. Depending on the design, this can include:

- fan or compressor
- bearings
- lubrication systems
- seals
- variable-frequency drive
- motor
- vibration monitoring

Therefore, the MVR machine is often one of the evaporator's most critical assets.

TVR contains fewer moving components and is mechanically simple, but its performance still depends on:

- steam quality
- nozzle condition
- operating pressure
- erosion
- fouling
- correct system pressure balance

Reliability comparisons should therefore evaluate the complete system rather than assuming that one technology is automatically more reliable.

# MVR + TVR can make sense

The decision is not always binary. Some evaporation systems combine MVR and TVR.

A hybrid arrangement can be used to optimize different parts of the evaporation duty.

In hybrid configurations, MVR may recover the main evaporation load, while TVR can be applied to another effect or used where additional steam-based integration provides an operational or economic advantage.

Possible benefits can include:

- improved energy integration
- reduced compressor temperature lift
- increased operating flexibility
- optimization of steam and electricity use
- better adaptation to site utility conditions

However, hybrid systems add complexity.

They should only be used when the thermodynamic and economic benefits justify the additional equipment and controls.

The objective is not to maximize the number of energy-recovery technologies, but to minimize overall lifecycle cost while maintaining process stability.

RELCO®
A Kovalus Company

# A practical decision framework

Rather than asking whether MVR or TVR is generally better, project teams should evaluate a defined set of site-specific criteria.

| Decision Factor | Typically Favors MVR | Typically Favors TVR |
|---|---|---|
| High annual operating hours | Generally favorable | Less decisive |
| Existing low-cost steam | Site-dependent | Generally favorable |
| Low-cost electricity | Generally favorable | Less influential |
| Limited boiler capacity | Generally favorable | Potential constraint |
| Limited electrical infrastructure | Potential constraint | Generally favorable |
| Low initial CAPEX priority | Often less favorable | Often favorable |
| Decarbonization / electrification | Favorable with low-carbon electricity | Depends on steam source |
| Simple mechanical system | More complex | Generally favorable |
| Large continuous duty | Often favorable | Technically possible |

# Questions to be answered before selecting the technology

Before choosing MVR or TVR, the project team should be able to answer several fundamental questions.

**Process**

- What is the required evaporation capacity?
- What products will be processed?
- What is the feed concentration and required final concentration?
- How does viscosity change with concentration?
- What is the expected boiling-point elevation?
- What product temperature is acceptable?
- What operating turndown is required?
- What is the expected continuous run length?

**Utilities**

- What is the actual steam cost?
- What motive steam pressure is available?
- What is the electricity cost?
- Are electrical demand charges significant?
- Is sufficient electrical capacity available?
- Would MVR require transformer or switchgear expansion?
- Is boiler capacity constrained?

# Questions to be answered before selecting the technology

**Operations**

- How many hours per year will the plant operate?
- Is production continuous or seasonal?
- How frequently will products change?
- What operating flexibility is required?
- What maintenance capability exists onsite?

**Strategy**

- What are the company's decarbonization targets?
- Is plant electrification planned?
- Could carbon pricing change future steam economics?
- What is the expected project lifetime?
- How sensitive is the business case to future energy prices?

Only after these questions are answered does an MVR-versus-TVR comparison become meaningful.

# Wrapping up

The choice between MVR and TVR has become increasingly complex.

Energy prices are changing, plants are electrifying, carbon reduction is becoming a design requirement, utility systems are becoming more integrated, and production requirements are becoming more flexible.

The key question is:

Which technology creates the greatest long-term value for this specific plant?

The answer depends on the interaction between process requirements, product behavior, utility infrastructure, operating profile, energy economics, and corporate strategy.

The right solution is the one that delivers the required process performance while supporting the plant's long-term economic and energy strategy.

## FINAL TAKEAWAY

Choosing between MVR and TVR is becoming a strategic decision because evaporation is no longer evaluated only as a process unit. It is increasingly part of the plant's broader energy, sustainability, and operating strategy.

RELCO®
A Kovalus Company

We’re delivering excellence in every drop, every batch and at every stage. Connect with our team of experts for a seamless experience.


**CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS**
2331 Third Avenue SW
Willmar, MN 56201 USA
+1.320.231.2210

**US REGIONAL OFFICE**
213004 Legion Street
Stratford, WI 54484 USA
+1.320.231.2210

**NEW ZEALAND, AUSTRALIA & ASIA PACIFIC OFFICE**
10 Forests Road
Stoke, 7011 New Zealand
+64.27.621.5327

**MEXICO, CENTRAL AMERICA & SOUTH AMERICA OFFICE**
Alameda Caulim, 115, CEP: 09531-195
Sao Caetano do Sul – Sao Paulo Brazil
+55.11.4118.3233

**INDIA OFFICE**
1st Floor, Ishan Building, Block-F, Sarabhai Campus,Vadodara - 390023, GJ India
+91 9099 769 229


**www.relco.net**

systems.**solutions.**