

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.  
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

**Author(s):** Kramb, Jason; Konttinen, Jukka; Gómez-Barea, Alberto; Moilanen, Antero; Umeki, Kentaro

**Title:** Modeling biomass char gasification kinetics for improving prediction of carbon conversion in a fluidized bed gasifier

**Year:** 2014

**Version:**

**Please cite the original version:**

Kramb, J., Konttinen, J., Gómez-Barea, A., Moilanen, A., & Umeki, K. (2014). Modeling biomass char gasification kinetics for improving prediction of carbon conversion in a fluidized bed gasifier. *Fuel*, 132(15 September), 107-115.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2014.04.014>

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

# Modeling biomass char gasification kinetics for improving prediction of carbon conversion in a fluidized bed gasifier

Jason Kramb<sup>a</sup>, Jukka Konttinen<sup>a</sup>, Alberto Gómez-Barea<sup>b</sup>, Antero Moilanen<sup>c</sup>, Kentaro Umeki<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemistry, Renewable Energy Programme, University of Jyväskylä, PO Box 35, FI-40014 Jyväskylä, Finland

<sup>b</sup> Bioenergy Group, Chemical and Environmental Engineering Department, Escuela Superior de Ingenieros, University of Seville, Camino de los Descubrimientos s/n, 41092 Seville, Spain

<sup>c</sup> VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, P.O. Box 1000, 02044 VTT, Finland

<sup>d</sup> Division of Energy Science, Department of Engineering Sciences and Mathematics, Luleå University of Technology, 971 87 Luleå, Sweden

---

## Abstract

Gasification of biomass in a fluidized bed (FB) was modeled based on kinetic data obtained from previously conducted thermogravimetric analysis. The thermogravimetric analysis experiments were designed to closely resemble conditions in a real FB gasifier by using high sample heating rates, in situ devolatilization and gas atmospheres of H<sub>2</sub>O/H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>/CO mixtures. Several char kinetic models were evaluated based on their ability to predict char conversion based on the thermogravimetric data. A modified version of the random pore model was shown to provide good fitting of the char reactivity and suitability for use in a reactor model. An updated FB reactor model which incorporates the newly developed char kinetic expression and a submodel for the estimation of char residence time is presented and results from simulations were compared against pilot scale gasification data of pine sawdust. The reactor model showed good ability for predicting char conversion and product gas composition.

**Keywords:** biomass, gasification, reaction kinetics, modeling, fluidized bed

---

## 1. Introduction

Gasification of biomass has become a topic of increasing interest as a potentially renewable method of electricity, heat and liquid fuel production. The gasification process can be divided into a number of steps, of which char gasification is often the slowest. As a result, char gasification tends to represent a rate controlling step of the overall thermo-chemical conversion process. Char can contain 25% of the energy content of the biomass fuel [1] and the total char conversion can significantly influence the composition of the product gas as well as the overall efficiency of the gasification process. As a result, accurate prediction of char conversion is a key factor to optimize a biomass gasifier.

Mathematical models for fluidized bed gasification (FBG) can be used in all stages of the gasifier design and operation. The models can vary significantly in terms of complexity and scope, where the two extremes are often considered to be thermodynamic equilibrium models for simplicity and computation fluid dynamical models for complexity [2]. For all modeling approaches obtaining experimental data for model validation is a widely acknowledged challenge.

This work presents a method for predicting the reactivity of biomass char as a function of conversion, temperature and pressure based on experimental data obtained from dedicated thermogravimetric analysis, where operating conditions are applied to closely resemble conditions in a FBG. Various char reactiv-

ity models were examined for their ability to predict the experimental conversion rate and suitability for use in a FBG model. One of these char reactivity models was implemented into a FBG model and the modeling results were compared against measured char conversion and product gas composition from a pilot scale gasifier. The focus of the model is to examine the effects of char reactivity on the performance of FBGs. The model is intentionally simple in that the required inputs are easily obtained experimental characterization of the fuel and basic reactor operating conditions.

## 2. Theory and methods

This section presents the approach followed in this work to model a FBG from thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) measurements. Four different aspects are discussed: (i) definitions of char reactivity and reaction rates; (ii) how to calculate these quantities from TGA measurements in which the whole conversion of the sample occurs, including devolatilization and char gasification; (iii) selection of a model to represent the effects of temperature, gas composition and carbon conversion in the form of a kinetics equation; (iv) development of a FBG model where the char reactivity model is implemented together with devolatilization and reactor considerations (e.g. input flow rate of biomass fuel, ash bed inventory, reactor size).

### 2.1. Definitions

Char conversion of a fuel sample being converted at uniform and constant temperature and gas composition is defined

---

Email address: jason.kramb@jyu.fi (Jason Kramb)

## Nomenclature

### Abbreviations

DAF	dry ash-free fuel
FB	fluidized bed
FBG	fluidized bed gasifier
HRPM	hybrid random pore model
MRPM	modified random pore model
PPW	proposed in present work
RPM	random pore model
TGA	thermogravimetric analysis
UCM	uniform conversion model

### Symbols

$\alpha$	kinetic parameter for hybrid models [-]
$\psi$	random pore model surface parameter [-]
$\tau$	char residence time [s]
$\tau_2$	time constant for bottom ash removal [s]
$\tau_3$	time constant for fly ash removal [s]
$\tau_R$	char conversion time [s]
$\xi$	catalytic deactivation coefficient [-]
$c$	modified random pore model parameter [-]
$E$	activation energy [J/mol]
$k_0$	frequency factor for Arrhenius terms [1/s]
$k_3$	Arrhenius term of $K_r$ [1/s]
$K_r$	kinetic coefficient [1/s]
$k_{1b}$	Arrhenius term of $K_r$ [1/s]
$k_{1f}$	Arrhenius term of $K_r$ [1/s]

$k_{ccg,1}$	three parallel reaction model rate coefficient [1/s]
$k_{ccg,2}$	three parallel reaction model rate coefficient [1/s]
$k_{ncg}$	three parallel reaction model rate coefficient [1/s]
$m_0$	initial char mass [g]
$N$	number of reactor sections in FBG model [-]
$n_{c,fix}$	char carbon flow from devolatilization stage [mols/s]
$N_{C,tot}$	total carbon inventory in the reactor bed [mol]
$n_{CO_2,eq,(i)}$	equilibrium adjusted $CO_2$ flow leaving reactor section $i$ [mol/s]
$n_{H_2O,eq,(i)}$	equilibrium adjusted steam flow leaving reactor section $i$ [mol/s]
$p$	modified random pore model parameter [-]
$p_i$	partial pressure of gas $i$ [bar]
$r$	conversion rate [1/s]
$r''$	instantaneous reaction rate [1/s]
$r_{(i)}^*$	apparent instantaneous reactivity in $i$ th section of gasifier model [1/s]
$T$	temperature [ $^{\circ}C$ ]
$W_{b,tot}$	total bed inventory [kg]
$w_{c,ch,b}$	weight percentage of carbon in char in the bed [-]
$w_{c,ch,d}$	weight percentage of carbon in char from devolatilization [-]
$X_{ch}$	char conversion [-]
$X_c$	overall fuel carbon conversion [-]
$X_{g,(i)}$	fractional molar conversion of reactant gas in section $i$ of FBG reactor model [-]

53 as,

$$X_{ch} = \frac{m_0 - m_t}{m_0} \quad (1)$$

54 where  $m_0$  and  $m_t$  are, respectively, the ash-free mass of the sam-  
55 ple at the start of gasification and time  $t$ .

56 The conversion rate is defined as,

$$r = \frac{dX_{ch}}{dt}, \quad (2)$$

57 and the instantaneous reactivity is calculated by normalizing the  
58 conversion rate by the mass of the sample at time  $t$ ,

$$r'' = -\frac{1}{m_t} \frac{dm_t}{dt} = \frac{1}{1 - X_{ch}} \frac{dX_{ch}}{dt}. \quad (3)$$

### 2.2. Measuring char reactivity for FBG from thermogravimetric measurements

59 As the purpose of this work is to model gasification of bio-  
60 mass in FBGs, the TGA experiments were designed to mimic  
61 the conditions of those gasifiers as closely as possible. The ex-  
62 perimental setup and data used in the present work has been  
63 described in detail elsewhere [3]. In the experiments the sam-  
64 ple is lowered into the preheated reactor chamber causing de-  
65 volatilization and gasification reactions to begin immediately.  
66 This way of operation closely simulates the char generation  
67 in a FBG in a number of key ways: high heating rates dur-  
68 ing devolatilization, devolatilization occurs in the presence of  
69 the gasification agent, and, most importantly, the sample is not  
70 cooled between devolatilization and char gasification.  
71

72 The tests were carried out in isothermal conditions on pine  
73 sawdust samples at  $750^{\circ}C$  and  $850^{\circ}C$  using atmospheres con-  
74

75 taining mixtures of either H<sub>2</sub>O/H<sub>2</sub> or CO<sub>2</sub>/CO. Proximate and  
 76 ultimate analysis of the fuel samples have been published pre-  
 77 viously by Moilanen and Saviharju [4]. The volume fraction  
 78 of each gas component in the atmosphere during each TGA test  
 79 was varied to observe the inhibiting effects of H<sub>2</sub> and CO on the  
 80 char reactivity. Table 1 summarizes the operating conditions for  
 81 the TGA tests [4].

82 While this setup more accurately resembles a fuel particle  
 83 being injected into a hot fluidized bed, it adds the complication  
 84 of separating the devolatilization and gasification stages in order  
 85 to correctly model only the char gasification. The approach  
 86 used in this work to define the initial char conversion is based  
 87 on the method proposed by Umeki et al. [5] who established  
 88 clearly how to obtain char conversion versus time data from  
 89 similar TGA data where the overall fuel conversion takes place.  
 90 For all TGA experiments the starting point of gasification was  
 91 between 60 and 120 seconds from when the sample was lowered  
 92 into the reactor chamber.

### 93 2.3. Modeling of char reactivity

94 A variety of approaches have been proposed to describe the  
 95 gasification reactivity of biomass char in the past [6][2]. The  
 96 variation of conversion rate with temperature, gas composition  
 97 and carbon conversion can be written in the general form as

$$dX_{ch}/dt = f(T, p_i, X_{ch}), \quad (4)$$

98 where  $T$  is the temperature at which the conversion occurs and  
 99  $p_i$  is the partial pressure of gas species  $i$ . Most often in char  
 100 gasification reactivity studies, it is assumed that the effects of  
 101 operating conditions and char conversion can be separated in a  
 102 convenient form to fit the measurements, giving the following  
 103 expression to represent the conversion rate

$$dX_{ch}/dt = K_r(T, p_i)F(X_{ch}), \quad (5)$$

104 where  $K_r(T, p_i)$  is the kinetic coefficient and the second term,  
 105  $F(X_{ch})$ , is the term which expresses the reactivity dependence  
 106 on conversion and can take a number of different forms. Both  
 107 terms,  $K_r(T, p_i)$  and  $F(X_{ch})$ , may contain parameters to be fit by  
 108 measurements [6].

109 Experimental representation of the function  $f$  in Equation  
 110 4 is difficult and there is not yet a general model where  $f$  is  
 111 explicitly obtained. Despite this, there are some models that  
 112 have tried to find such an expression for certain operating con-  
 113 ditions. A model of this type, the three parallel reaction model  
 114 [5], is briefly analyzed below. In contrast, a variety of expres-  
 115 sions have been presented in literature to fit both  $K_r(T, p_i)$  and  
 116  $F(X_{ch})$  to measurements. Some of these models are based on  
 117 fundamental description of the processes taken at the char sur-  
 118 face and others by empirical expressions. Table 2 shows the  
 119 conversion rate equations that were considered in this work for  
 120 modeling char gasification reactivity of pine sawdust.

121 The Langmuir-Hinshelwood kinetic model has been widely  
 122 used to model the kinetic coefficient,  $K_r(T, p_i)$ , in gasification  
 123 processes. Although there remains some criticism to this ki-  
 124 netic model [7], the Langmuir-Hinshelwood model has been

125 widely used with success to model measurements in char reac-  
 126 tivity [8], and so has been chosen to represent  $K_r(T, p_i)$  in this  
 127 study. In previous work [9] Equations 6 and 7, as described by  
 128 Barrio [10], have been used for the kinetic coefficient for CO<sub>2</sub>  
 129 and steam gasification:

$$K_{r-CO_2} = \frac{k_{1f}p_{CO_2}}{1 + \frac{k_{1f}}{k_3}p_{CO_2} + \frac{k_{1b}}{k_3}p_{CO}} \quad (6)$$

and

$$K_{r-H_2O} = \frac{k_{1f}p_{H_2O}}{1 + \frac{k_{1f}}{k_3}p_{H_2O} + \frac{k_{1b}}{k_3}p_{H_2}} \quad (7)$$

130 These equations account for the inhibiting effects of CO and  
 131 H<sub>2</sub> on the gasification reaction rate and show a good ability to  
 132 predict the measured reactivities. The kinetic parameters ( $k_{1f}$ ,  
 133  $k_{1b}$ ,  $k_3$ ) have the form of the Arrhenius equation,  
 134

$$k = k_0 \exp(-E/RT), \quad (8)$$

135 where  $k_0$  is the frequency factor and  $E$  the activation energy.  
 136 Figure 1 shows the predicted reactivities from Equations 6 and  
 137 7 with the measured averaged reactivity (averaged from approx-  
 138 imately 30-80% char conversion) at 750°C and 850°C for both  
 139 steam and CO<sub>2</sub> gasification [9]. Throughout this work it can be  
 140 assumed that all kinetic coefficients,  $K_r$ , follow Equations 6 and  
 141 7 for CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O gasification respectively.




Figure 1: Average reactivity values for steam (A) and CO<sub>2</sub> (B) gasification from TGA data and the reactivities calculated from fitted kinetic parameters using Eq 7 and Eq 6 [9].

Regarding the variation of reactivity with conversion, represented by  $F(X_{ch})$ , five reactivity models (see Table 2) are

Table 1: TGA testing conditions of pine sawdust used for char reactivity modeling showing reactor temperature and gas partial pressures [4].

CO <sub>2</sub> gasification			H <sub>2</sub> O gasification		
Temperature (°C)	p <sub>CO<sub>2</sub></sub> [bars]	p <sub>CO</sub> [bars]	Temperature (°C)	p <sub>H<sub>2</sub>O</sub> [bars]	p <sub>H<sub>2</sub></sub> [bars]
750	1	0	750	1	0
750	0.95	0.05	750	0.95	0.05
750	0.89	0.11	750	0.9	0.1
750	0.8	0.2	750	0.86	0.14
850	1	0	850	1	0
850	0.95	0.05	850	0.95	0.05
850	0.89	0.11	850	0.86	0.14
850	0.8	0.2			

144 examined in this work using the TGA experimental data for  
 145 sawdust: the uniform conversion model (UCM), random pore  
 146 model (RPM), modified random pore model (MRPM), and a  
 147 'hybrid' version of the RPM (HRPM) and MRPM (HMRPM)  
 148 which attempts to better model the higher conversion rate which  
 149 is observed at low conversion levels.

150 The three parallel reaction model was developed by Umeki  
 151 et al. [5] to describe the catalytic effects of ash in biomass gasi-  
 152 fication and is an example of a conversion model in the form of  
 153 Equation 4. The model can be expressed as

$$r = k_{ccg,1} \exp(-\xi X_{ch}^2) + k_{ncg}(1 - X_{ch}) + k_{ccg,2}, \quad (9)$$

154 where  $\xi$  is a structural parameter for the fuel type and  $k_{ccg,1}$ ,  
 155  $k_{ncg}$  and  $k_{ccg,2}$  are kinetic coefficients. The model divides the  
 156 char gasification into three stages: a regime of high reactivity  
 157 where catalyst deactivation occurs, a slower first-order kinetic  
 158 regime in which non-catalytic gasification takes place, and a  
 159 zeroth order kinetic regime where the catalyst is again influ-  
 160 ential. Figure 2 shows the model prediction for the conversion  
 161 rate of four sets of TGA reactivity data from sawdust. While  
 162 this parallel reaction model can accurately predict the reactivity  
 163 and conversion time of biomass char for CO<sub>2</sub> gasification, the  
 164 kinetic coefficients  $k_{ccg,1}$ ,  $k_{ncg}$ , and  $k_{ccg,2}$  have complex pressure  
 165 and temperature dependence. The correlation factor  $\xi$  has also  
 166 been shown to have dependence on temperature. As a result,  
 167 the three parallel reaction model is currently limited to predict-  
 168 ing conversion rates only at the temperature and pressure con-  
 169 ditions of the experimental data. This limitation makes this model  
 170 currently unsuitable for use in the carbon conversion predictor  
 171 presented below.

172 The random pore model developed by Bhatia and Perlmutter  
 173 [11][12] attempts to describe the changes in the pore struc-  
 174 ture during the conversion of the fuel. It has been widely used  
 175 for oxidation and gasification of numerous fuels. Zhang et. al.  
 176 [13] created a modified random pore model (MRPM) in order to  
 177 fit conversion data of biomass chars which showed a maximum  
 178 in the conversion rate at high char conversion. This was done  
 179 by adding a new conversion term to the original RPM, as shown  
 180 in Equation 12. The two dimensionless parameters introduced  
 181 in the MRPM were shown to be correlated with the amount of  
 182 active potassium in the fuel sample.




Figure 2: Four sets of TGA conversion rate data with corresponding predictions from the three parallel reaction model developed by Umeki et. al [5], shown in Equation 9. A - 850°C, 1 bar CO<sub>2</sub>; B - 850°C, 0.8 bar CO<sub>2</sub>, 0.2 bar CO; C - 780°C, 1 bar CO<sub>2</sub>; D - 780°C, 0.95 bar CO<sub>2</sub>, 0.05 bar CO

183 Both the RPM and MRPM showed good ability to fit the  
 184 measured conversion rate curves of pine sawdust for high con-  
 185 version ( $X_{ch} > 0.4$ ) as seen in Figures 3 and 4 which show  
 186 measured conversion rates for two TGA test conditions and the  
 187 predicted conversion rates for various models. The TGA mea-  
 188 surements typically show slightly higher conversion rates at the  
 189 end of char conversion ( $X_{ch} > 0.8$ ) than predicted by the RPM,  
 190 but this is not as pronounced as what was observed by Zhang et  
 191 al. [13] and as a result the improvements offered by the MRPM  
 192 in modeling the  $dX_{ch}/dt$  curve is less significant. The deviation  
 193 of the models from the measured data at low char conversion is  
 194 attributed to the char generation conditions. In previous works  
 195 where the random pore model or modified random pore model  
 196 have been used, the char samples were prepared before gasi-  
 197 fication, usually by heating at a controlled rate in a nitrogen  
 198 atmosphere [13][15]. This differs significantly from the in situ  
 199 char formation process described in Section 2.2 and used in this  
 200 work. The higher than expected char reactivity at low conver-  
 201 sion may be explained by small amounts of remaining volatiles  
 202 being released through ongoing devolatilization, as well as the

Table 2: Char conversion equations considered for modeling TGA data. All equations were used for both CO<sub>2</sub> and steam gasification. As mentioned, the kinetic coefficient terms,  $K_r$ , follow Equations 6 and 7 for CO<sub>2</sub> and steam gasification respectively. Acronyms: UCM - Uniform conversion model, RPM - Random pore model, MRPM - Modified random pore model, HMRPM - Hybrid random pore model, HMRPM - Hybrid modified random pore model, PPW - Proposed in the present work.

Model	$f(T, p_i, X_{ch}) = K_r(T, p_i)F(X_{ch})$	Eq.	Model parameters	Reference
UCM	$K_r(1 - X_{ch})$	(10)	$K_r$	[14]
RPM	$K_r(1 - X_{ch})\sqrt{1 - \psi \log(1 - X_{ch})}$	(11)	$K_r, \psi$	[11]
MRPM	$K_r(1 - X_{ch})\sqrt{1 - \psi \log(1 - X_{ch})}(1 + (cX_{ch})^p)$	(12)	$K_r, \psi, c, p$	[13]
HRPM	$K_r(\alpha \exp(-\xi X_{ch}^2) + (1 - X_{ch})\sqrt{1 - \psi \log(1 - X_{ch})})$	(13)	$K_r, \alpha, \xi, \psi$	PPW
HMRPM	$K_r(\alpha \exp(-\xi X_{ch}^2) + (1 - X_{ch})\sqrt{1 - \psi \log(1 - X_{ch})}(1 + (cX_{ch})^p))$	(14)	$K_r, \alpha, \xi, \psi, c, p$	PPW

203 dependence of char properties and reactivity on devolatiliza-  
 204 tion conditions. It has been shown for several types of biomass  
 205 that higher pyrolysis heating rates will generally lead to higher  
 206 reactivities [16]. This section of the conversion curve also cor-  
 207 responds with the regime describing catalytic gasification with  
 208 deactivation of the catalyst in the three parallel reaction model  
 209 and this fact was used to develop the present version of a char  
 210 kinetic model as discussed below.




Figure 3: Measured char conversion rate from CO<sub>2</sub> gasification at 850°C, 1 bar CO<sub>2</sub> and the predicted conversion rates from the UCM, RPM, MRPM, and HMRPM. The RPM and MRPM are identical for  $0 < X_{ch} < 0.6$ , after which the RPM model begins to show lower conversion rate than the MRPM.

211 In order to improve the ability of the modified random pore  
 212 model to predict the conversion rate of the char as measured in  
 213 the TGA, a hybrid kinetic model was developed which consid-  
 214 ers two different periods during char gasification: an initial pe-  
 215 riod following the catalytic gasification with deactivation of the  
 216 catalyst regime from the three parallel reaction model shown




Figure 4: Measured char conversion rate from steam gasification at 850°C, 0.95 bar H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.05 bar H<sub>2</sub> and the predicted conversion rates from the UCM, RPM, MRPM, and HMRPM. The RPM and MRPM are identical for  $0 < X_{ch} < 0.7$ , after which the RPM model begins to show lower conversion rate than the MRPM.

217 in Equation 9 and a second period following either the RPM  
 218 or MRPM. In order to separate the kinetic and structural terms  
 219 of the conversion rate equation according to Equation 5, it was  
 220 assumed that the kinetic coefficient  $k_{ccg,1}$  was proportional to  
 221 the kinetic coefficient of the RPM/RMPRM ( $k_{ccg,1} = \alpha K_r$ ) and  
 222 that the correlation factor  $\xi$  was not dependent on temperature.  
 223 These hybrid models are shown by Equations 13 and 14 in Ta-  
 224 ble 2.

#### 2.4. Carbon conversion predictor model

225 An improved carbon conversion predictor has been devel-  
 226 oped to model biomass gasification in a fluidized bed. The origi-  
 227 nal model has been described previously [17][9]. The goal of  
 228 the model is to limit the required inputs to easily obtained data  
 229

on the fuel properties and reactor parameters while providing an accurate estimate of the overall carbon conversion and product gas composition. A schematic outline of the model is shown in Figure 5. The basic input to the model consists of proximate and ultimate analysis of the fuel as well as the char reactivity data from the TGA measurements. The reactor feed rates for air, steam and the fuel and the reactor operating conditions are also required. The model contains a simple devolatilization submodel which assumes this stage (releasing of volatiles from the fuel particle) to happen instantly when the fuel particle is injected into the reactor. The products of the devolatilization submodel, char and gas streams, are calculated based on thermochemical equilibrium which is explained in more detail elsewhere [9].

Figure 6 shows the basic calculation procedure involved in the FBG model. The fluidized bed is divided into  $N$  vertical sections which are modeled as ideally stirred reactors. For each vertical section the char conversion and product gas composition is calculated and the gas composition leaving section  $i$  is used for calculating the char reactions of section  $i + 1$ . In order to be consistent with previous results from the carbon conversion predictor [9],  $N=8$  was used in this work. This value was chosen in the original model because when the number of vertical sections of the gasifier model is greater than eight the model results become sufficiently independent of this parameter.

In addition, the updated reactor model incorporates a new submodel to calculate the char residence time,  $\tau$ , which was not calculated in the previous version of the model [9] but assumed to equal the char conversion time,  $\tau_R$ . The equations developed by Gómez-Barea and Leckner [18] were implemented in the new version of the FBG model, which relate  $\tau$  with the mass fraction of carbon in the char of the reactor bed,  $w_{c,cb}$ , and the char conversion attained in the reactor,  $X_{ch}$ . These are shown in Equations 15, 16 and 17 respectively:

$$\tau = \frac{1}{(1/\tau_2 + 1/\tau_3)} \left(1 - \frac{w_{c,cd}/\tau_R}{(1/\tau_2 + 1/\tau_3 + 1/\tau_R)}\right), \quad (15)$$

$$w_{c,cb} = \frac{(1/\tau_2 + 1/\tau_3)w_{c,cd}}{1/\tau_2 + 1/\tau_3 + (1 - w_{c,cd})/\tau_R}, \quad (16)$$

and

$$X_{ch} = 1 - \frac{w_{c,cb}}{w_{c,cd}} \left(\frac{\tau}{\tau_2} + \frac{\tau}{\tau_3}\right), \quad (17)$$

where  $\tau_2$  is the time constant for bottom ash removal,  $\tau_3$  is the time constant for fly ash removal,  $w_{c,cd}$  is the mass fraction of carbon in char from the devolatilization submodel and  $\tau_R$  is the char conversion time which is calculated as

$$\tau_R = \int_0^{X_{ch}} \frac{1}{\left(K_r \left(\alpha \exp(-\xi X_{ch}^2) + (1 - X_{ch}) \sqrt{1 - \psi \log(1 - X_{ch})}\right)\right)} dX_{ch} \quad (18)$$

according to the proposed HRPM shown in Equation 13. This method allows for the accounting of carbon lost through bottom and fly ash on carbon conversion and residence time, which was missing in the original model design. Due to the new conversion dependence of the reaction time an initial guess for  $X_{ch}$

must be made at the beginning of the calculation process. These calculations are then iterated until the values of  $\tau$  and  $X_{ch}$  converge.

The balance equation for the carbon consumed in the steam and  $\text{CO}_2$  gasification reactions in the  $i$ th section of the reactor are given as,

$$\frac{N_{c,tot}}{N} r_{H_2O,(i)}^* = n_{H_2O,eq(i-1)} X_{g,H_2O,(i)}, \quad (19)$$

and

$$\frac{N_{c,tot}}{N} r_{CO_2,(i)}^* = n_{CO_2,eq(i-1)} X_{g,CO_2,(i)}, \quad (20)$$

where  $N_{c,tot}$  is the total carbon inventory in the reactor bed,  $r_{H_2O,(i)}^*$  and  $r_{CO_2,(i)}^*$  are the effective char reactivities in the  $i$ th section of the reactor,  $n_{H_2O,eq(i-1)}$  and  $n_{CO_2,eq(i-1)}$  are the flows of steam and  $\text{CO}_2$  from the previous reactor section, and finally  $X_{g,H_2O,(i)}$  and  $X_{g,CO_2,(i)}$  are the fractional molar conversion of the reactant gases. The carbon inventory,  $N_{c,tot}$ , and  $w_{c,cb}$  are related by the total bed inventory,  $W_{b,tot}$ , which must be supplied as a model input. The effective reactivities,  $r_{H_2O,(i)}^*$  and  $r_{CO_2,(i)}^*$ , are assumed to be of the form  $r^* = \beta r''_{avg}$  where  $r''_{avg}$  is the averaged reactivity from the beginning of char conversion to  $X_{ch}$  as calculated in Equation 17. The coefficient  $\beta$  is found by the carbon balance relation,

$$X_{ch} n_{c,fix} = N_{c,tot} (r''_{H_2O,avg} + r''_{CO_2,avg}) \beta, \quad (21)$$

where  $n_{c,fix}$  is the carbon flow from the devolatilization stage. It can then be shown that

$$\beta = \frac{X_{ch}}{\tau (r''_{H_2O,avg} + r''_{CO_2,avg})}. \quad (22)$$

The requirement to maintain simplicity in the carbon conversion predictor has imposed some limitations in the current FBG model. First, the temperature of the reactor is a required input to the model, rather than calculated through an energy balance. Similarly, methane concentration in the product gas is determined from the methane yields determined experimentally during measurements in FBG and is therefore considered an input term. The yield of methane depends on the fuel type and process temperature. For a typical FBG biomass fuels the methane yield is in the range of 50-80 g/kgdaf [19]. Finally, the estimation method for  $\tau_3$  as a function of operating conditions prevents the use of the model without additional measurements from which the fly ash flow can be estimated. The method used for estimating  $\tau_3$  for a pilot plant is discussed in Section 3.2.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Reactivity modeling

The reactivity models from Table 2 were fitted to the measured TGA reactivity data and the ability of each model to accurately predict observed char conversion times was evaluated. For all models the kinetic coefficient  $K_r(T, p_i)$  was taken as Equation 6 for  $\text{CO}_2$  gasification and Equation 7 for steam gasification. For each reactivity model a single set of parameters




Figure 5: A schematic diagram of the carbon conversion predictor, including model inputs and the outputs of the pyrolysis and FBG submodels.




Figure 6: A schematic diagram of the FBG submodel showing the basic calculation procedure for determining char conversion. The final outputs of the model are the overall char conversion,  $X_{ch}$ , char residence time,  $\tau$ , and product gas composition ( $n_{CO,eq,N}$ ,  $n_{CO_2,eq,N}$ ,  $n_{H_2O,eq,N}$ ,  $n_{H_2,eq,N}$ ). These are taken as the values calculated in the final reactor section.

was found using a least squares method which minimized the error between the model prediction and measured conversion times for all sets of TGA data.

The mean absolute percentage error in predicting experimental conversion times for each model was calculated as,

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{j=1}^{N_j} \frac{1}{N_{ji}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{ji}} |(t_{i,j,exp} - t_{i,j,model}) / t_{i,j,exp}| \quad (23)$$

where  $N_j$  is the number of TGA data sets,  $N_{ji}$  is the number of data points in data set  $j$ ,  $t_{i,j,exp}$  is the experimental conversion time for data point  $i$  in set  $j$ , and  $t_{i,j,model}$  is the model value for point  $t_{i,j,exp}$ . The errors are shown in Table 3. The RPM offers significant improvement over the uniform conversion model in all the cases, especially at high conversion. The MRPM improves conversion time prediction slightly compared with the RPM. Using the HRP and HMRPM decreases the error in predicting conversion time significantly compared with the original RPM and MRPM. The HMRPM gives either minimal or no improvement over the HRP. The relatively small benefit in using the MRPM over the RPM and the HMRPM over the HRP is likely this is due to the low ash content, and therefore low potassium content, of the sawdust which would reduce the potential benefits for using the additional terms proposed by Zhang et al. in the MRPM. It was concluded that the HRP was the best option for modeling the measured char conversion rate as it combines good conversion time predictions with a reasonable amount of fitting parameters. The best fit kinetic and structural parameters in the HRP for  $CO_2$  and  $H_2O$  gasification are shown in Table 4.

The conversion times predicted by the RPM, MRPM, HRP and UCM are shown with the measured values for twelve sets of

Table 3: Mean absolute percentage error for estimating conversion times of pine sawdust for five char reactivity models when compared with TGA experiments.

	$CO_2$	$H_2O$
UCM	82%	110%
RPM	33%	28%
MRPM	28%	26%
HRPM	22%	19%
HMRPM	22%	18%

TGA data for both  $CO_2$  and  $H_2O$  gasification in Figures 7 and 8 (see Table 1 for all test conditions). It is clear that the UCM often deviates significantly from the measured conversion times, in particular for the  $H_2O$  tests. This was expected as the the UCM in steam gasification has the highest mean absolute percentage error as shown in Table 3. The RPM and MRPM tend to produce very similar conversion time results and while the HRP improves upon the RPM and MRPM in most test conditions there are examples where the HRP underperforms. This is to be expected due to the range of test conditions which have been used for the kinetic parameter fitting and it is unlikely that a simple conversion rate expression, such as the HRP, will be able to produce the most accurate char conversion times in every situation. For this reason the mean absolute percentage error (Table 3) was used in determining the best model for describing the char conversion, indicating the superiority of the HRP as described above. For both  $CO_2$  and  $H_2O$  tests the improvement for using the HRP was greater at  $750^\circ C$  than  $850^\circ C$ , which shows that accurate modeling of the early stage of char conversion is particularly important at lower tempera-






Figure 7: Conversion times for CO<sub>2</sub> gasification as predicted by the UCM, the RPM, MRPM and the HRPM. The predicted conversion times are compared with the measured conversion time from the TGA data. A - 750°C, 1 bar CO<sub>2</sub>; B - 750°C, 0.95 bar CO<sub>2</sub>, 0.05 bar CO; C - 750°C, 0.8 bar CO<sub>2</sub>, 0.2 bar CO; D - 850°C, 1 bar CO<sub>2</sub>; E - 850°C, 0.89 bar CO<sub>2</sub>, 0.11 bar CO; F - 850°C, 0.8 bar CO<sub>2</sub>, 0.2 bar CO.




Figure 8: Conversion times for H<sub>2</sub>O gasification as predicted by the UCM, the RPM, MRPM and the HRPM. The predicted conversion times are compared with the measured conversion time from the TGA data. A - 750°C, 0.95 bar H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.05 bar H<sub>2</sub>; B - 750°C, 0.9 bar H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1 bar H<sub>2</sub>; C - 750°C, 0.86 bar H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.14 bar H<sub>2</sub>; D - 850°C, 1 bar H<sub>2</sub>O; E - 850°C, 0.95 bar H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.05 bar H<sub>2</sub>; F - 850°C, 0.86 bar H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.14 bar H<sub>2</sub>.

Table 4: Arrhenius and structural parameters for CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O gasification of pine sawdust using the HRPm. The units are s<sup>-1</sup> for the frequency factors, k<sub>0</sub>, and J/mol for the activation energies, E.

CO <sub>2</sub>			H <sub>2</sub> O		
	k <sub>0</sub>	E		k <sub>0</sub>	E
k <sub>1f</sub>	1.2·10 <sup>11</sup>	1.6·10 <sup>5</sup>	k <sub>1f</sub>	1.9·10 <sup>7</sup>	2.0·10 <sup>5</sup>
k <sub>1b</sub>	5.9·10 <sup>8</sup>	1.7·10 <sup>5</sup>	k <sub>1b</sub>	2.9·10 <sup>10</sup>	2.4·10 <sup>5</sup>
k <sub>3</sub>	2.2·10 <sup>10</sup>	2.8·10 <sup>5</sup>	k <sub>3</sub>	2.4·10 <sup>9</sup>	2.5·10 <sup>5</sup>
$\psi$	$\alpha$	$\xi$	$\psi$	$\alpha$	$\xi$
5.30	5.6	48	3.9	3.8	24




Figure 9: Modeling results from the carbon conversion predictor showing carbon conversion as a function of char residence time in the reactor at 780°C for three models: the model as reported by Konttinen et. al [9], the model as reported by Konttinen et. al but using the HRPm, and the current model described in Section 2.4.

ash and added bed material were reported for the pilot plant tests which were simulated (see Table 5) so the flowrate of fly ash was estimated from measured parameters. From these data, the char residence time,  $\tau$ , can be estimated which corresponds to a given value of  $\tau_3$ .

Table 5: Operating conditions for pilot scale tests using pine sawdust (SD)[20], corresponding to modeling results.

	Test A	Test B
Fuel	Pine SD	Pine SD
Bed temperature, °C	780	840
Bed additive	Dolomite	Sand
Bed additive rate, g/s	0.44	0
Fuel feed rate, g/s	12.8	9.7
Steam feed, g/s	2.0	2.5
Bottom ash discharge, g/s	0	0
Estimated bed inventory, kg	12.7	12.7
Estimated fly ash discharge, g/s	0.8	0.2

The predicted carbon conversion and product gas composition from both the current reactor model and the previously published version of the model are compared to the measured values in Table 6. The results show reasonable agreement with the experimental data. Prediction of carbon conversion has improved significantly due to the improved char conversion model. The error in the char conversion prediction at 780°C is noticeably larger than 840°C which may be due to the addition of dolomite in the lower temperature test and to uncertainties in the experimental measurement leading to over reporting of the carbon conversion. While the differences in experimental setups can make comparison of results tenuous, fluidized bed gasification tests performed by others using pine sawdust gen-

Table 6: Measurements of carbon conversion and product gas composition of pine sawdust at 780°C and 840°C [20] compared with the results from the carbon conversion predictor model. The error values reported in the table are the absolute error. \* Methane production in the model is calculated using an empirical adjustment factor where 15% of volatile carbon is assumed to form CH<sub>4</sub>, corresponding to 78 g/kgdaf.

	780°C			840°C		
	Measured	Current model	Previous model	Measured	Current model	Previous model
Carbon conversion	95.9	89.2	81.0	97.8	98.6	100
Dry gas composition (vol %)						
N <sub>2</sub>	53.0	50.3	53.2	58.0	54.4	52.3
H <sub>2</sub>	10.9	15.2	13.6	8.4	13.0	14.2
CO <sub>2</sub>	15.7	16.3	17.7	15.1	16.5	15.4
CO	14.2	13.7	10.8	14	12.3	14.3
CH <sub>4</sub> *	5.7	4.4	4.7	4.1	3.8	3.7
H <sub>2</sub> O (wet gas)	13.8	13.5	16.1	19.1	15.6	13.8
Average  error  in gas composition		12.9%	15.9%		17.8%	20.2%

erally report reaching lower carbon conversion at temperatures around 780°C [21][22] than what is measured in the pilot tests used in this work.

The average error in the product gas composition also decreased in the current model. The error in the gas composition model results increases with temperature but the temperature dependent trends in the gas composition are correct with the exception of CO<sub>2</sub>. Hydrogen content of the product gas is overestimated by the model at both temperatures and has the largest error of the product gas components. Overestimation of hydrogen formation in biomass gasification is common to equilibrium models and has been noted elsewhere [23][24][25]. As this model adjusts the product gas composition according to the equilibrium of the water-gas shift reaction this could contribute to the overestimation of H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> in the final gas composition. Published work indicates that it is unlikely that water-gas shift reaction equilibrium is achieved at either 780°C or 840°C [2] and so this simplification of the model limits the accuracy of the product gas composition estimation.

#### 4. Conclusion

A method for modeling char reactivity of pine sawdust measured in TGA experiments has been presented. Based on the TGA measurements for sawdust a catalytic gasification with deactivation of the catalyst stage was observed at low char conversion. By combining the three parallel reaction model with the random pore model, significant improvement in estimated char conversion times was achieved. This reactivity model showed good ability to predict the measured char conversion times and was used to model a pilot scale fluidized bed gasifier. An existing carbon conversion predictor model for fluidized bed gasification of biomass was updated to include the newly developed char gasification kinetic expression and submodel for estimation of char conversion and residence time. The results of the model show improved ability to estimate measured carbon conversion and product gas composition of pine sawdust in a pilot scale fluidized bed gasifier. The FBG model cannot currently be

used to completely predict gasifier behavior because some measurements are required to estimate the entrainment of char from the gasifier. Developing an entrainment submodel is required to address this issue.

#### Acknowledgment

Financial support for this work from the Academy of Finland through the GASIFREAC project is gratefully acknowledged.

#### References

- [1] C. Baskar, S. Baskar, R. S. Dhillon (Eds.), *Biomass Conversion*, Springer, 2012.
- [2] A. Gómez-Barea, B. Leckner, Modeling of biomass gasification in fluidized bed, *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science* 36 (4) (2010) 444–509. doi:10.1016/j.peccs.2009.12.002.
- [3] A. Moilanen, Thermogravimetric characterisations of biomass and waste for gasification processes, Ph.D. thesis, Åbo Akademi (2006).
- [4] A. Moilanen, K. Saviharju, Gasification reactivities of biomass fuels in pressurised conditions and product gas mixtures, in: A. V. Bridgwater, D. G. B. Boocock (Eds.), *Developments in Thermochemical Biomass Conversion*, Blackie Academic and Professional, London, 1997, pp. 828–837.
- [5] K. Umeki, A. Moilanen, A. Gómez-Barea, J. Kontinen, A model of biomass char gasification describing the change in catalytic activity of ash, *Chemical Engineering Journal* 207–208 (2012) 616–624. doi:10.1016/j.cej.2012.07.025.
- [6] C. Di Blasi, Combustion and gasification rates of lignocellulosic chars, *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science* 35 (2) (2009) 121–140. doi:10.1016/j.peccs.2008.08.001.
- [7] S. Katta, D. L. Keairns, Study of kinetics of carbon gasification reactions, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Fundamentals* 20 (1) (1981) 6–13. doi:10.1021/i100001a002.
- [8] W. Klose, M. Wolki, On the intrinsic reaction rate of biomass char gasification with carbon dioxide and steam, *Fuel* 84 (7–8) (2005) 885–892. doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2004.11.016.
- [9] J. T. Kontinen, A. Moilanen, N. DeMartini, M. Hupa, Carbon conversion predictor for fluidized bed gasification of biomass fuels—from TGA measurements to char gasification particle model, *Biomass Conversion and Biorefinery* 2 (3) (2012) 265–274. doi:10.1007/s13399-012-0038-2.
- [10] M. Barrio, Experimental investigation of small-scale gasification of woody biomass, Ph.D. thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (2002).

- 502 [11] D. D. P. S. K. Bhatia, A random pore model for fluid-solid reactions: I.  
503 Isothermal, kinetic control, *AIChE Journal* 26 (3) (1980) 379–386.
- 504 [12] D. D. P. S. K. Bhatia, A random pore model for fluid-solid reactions: II.  
505 Diffusion and transport effects, *AIChE Journal* 27 (2) (1981) 247–254.
- 506 [13] Y. Zhang, M. Ashizawa, S. Kajitani, K. Miura, Proposal of a  
507 semi-empirical kinetic model to reconcile with gasification reactivity  
508 profiles of biomass chars, *Fuel* 87 (4-5) (2008) 475–481.  
509 doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2007.04.026.
- 510 [14] D. Kunii, O. Levenspiel, *Fluidization Engineering*, Butterworth-  
511 Heineremann, 1990.
- 512 [15] Y. Okumura, T. Hanaoka, K. Sakanishi, Effect of pyrolysis condi-  
513 tions on gasification reactivity of woody biomass-derived char, *Pro-  
514 ceedings of the Combustion Institute* 32 (2) (2009) 2013–2020.  
515 doi:10.1016/j.proci.2008.06.024.
- 516 [16] E. Cetin, B. Moghtaderi, R. Gupta, T. Wall, Influence of pyrolysis condi-  
517 tions on the structure and gasification reactivity of biomass chars, *Fuel*  
518 83 (16) (2004) 2139–2150. doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2004.05.008.
- 519 [17] J. Kontinen, A. Moilanen, M. Hupa, E. Kurkela, Carbon conversion pre-  
520 dictor for fluidized bed gasification of biomass fuels—model concept, in:  
521 *Science in thermal and chemical biomass conversion*, 2006, pp. 590–604.
- 522 [18] A. Gómez-Barea, B. Leckner, Estimation of gas composition and  
523 char conversion in a fluidized bed biomass gasifier, *Fuel* (2012) 20–  
524 22doi:10.1016/j.fuel.2012.09.084.
- 525 [19] N. Jand, V. Brandani, P. U. Foscolo, Thermodynamic Limits and Ac-  
526 tual Product Yields and Compositions in Biomass Gasification Processes,  
527 *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* 45 (2) (2006) 834–843.  
528 doi:10.1021/ie050824v.
- 529 [20] E. Kurkela, P. Ståhlberg, J. Laatikainen-Luntama, Pressurized fluidized-  
530 bed gasification experiments with wood, peat and coal at VTT in 1991-  
531 1994. Part 2. Experiences from peat and coal gasification and hot gas  
532 filtration, VTT Publications, 1994.
- 533 [21] J. Herguido, J. Corella, J. Gonzalez-Saiz, Steam gasification of lignocel-  
534 lulosic residues in a fluidized bed at a small pilot scale. Effect of the type  
535 of feedstock, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* 31 (5) (1992)  
536 1274–1282. doi:10.1021/ie00005a006.
- 537 [22] P. M. Lv, Z. H. Xiong, J. Chang, C. Z. Wu, Y. Chen, J. X.  
538 Zhu, An experimental study on biomass air-steam gasification in  
539 a fluidized bed., *Bioresource technology* 95 (1) (2004) 95–101.  
540 doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2004.02.003.
- 541 [23] M. Puig-Arnavat, J. C. Bruno, A. Coronas, Review and analysis of  
542 biomass gasification models, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*  
543 14 (9) (2010) 2841–2851. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2010.07.030.
- 544 [24] X. Li, J. Grace, C. Lim, a.P. Watkinson, H. Chen, J. Kim, Biomass gasifi-  
545 cation in a circulating fluidized bed, *Biomass and Bioenergy* 26 (2) (2004)  
546 171–193. doi:10.1016/S0961-9534(03)00084-9.
- 547 [25] M. Ruggiero, G. Manfreda, An equilibrium model for biomass gasifica-  
548 tion processes, *Renewable energy*.