Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY

A new air-fuel WSGGM for better utility boiler simulation, design and optimization

Yin, Chungen

Publication date:
2013

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Link to publication from Aalborg University

Citation for published version (APA):
Yin, C. (2013). *A new air-fuel WSGGM for better utility boiler simulation, design and optimization*. Paper presented at International Conference on Power Engineering 2013, Wuhan, China.

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from vbn.aau.dk on: August 23, 2025

International Conference on Power Engineering,
Oct 23-27, 2013, Wuhan, China

A new air-fuel WSGGM

(weighted sum of gray gas model) **for better utility boiler simulation, design & optimization**

Chungen Yin, Ph.D.

Associate Prof, Aalborg University, Denmark

(+45) 9940 9279; chy@et.aau.dk

Oct 24, 2013

Outline

- **Intro: Why is WSGGM important**
- **Why need a new model**
- **The new air-fuel WSGGM**
- **Demo: Implementation & impacts**
- **Conclusions**

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY
AALBORG UNIVERSITY

Intro: Why is WSGGM important

- Energy eq. $\frac{\partial(\rho h)}{\partial t} + div(\rho \vec{u} h) = div(k_{eff} \nabla T) + (S_{h,\text{rad}} + S_{h,\text{react}} + S_{h,\text{DPM}})$

$$\begin{cases} S_{h,\text{rad}} = f_1(I(\vec{r},\hat{s}), T_g) \\ \frac{dI(\vec{r},\hat{s})}{ds} = \alpha(\vec{r})[I_b(\vec{r}) - I(\vec{r},\hat{s})] + \sigma_s(\vec{r})\left[\frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{4\pi} I(\vec{r},\hat{s}')\,\phi(\hat{s}' \Rightarrow \hat{s})\,d\omega' - I(\vec{r},\hat{s})\right] \\ \alpha(\vec{r}) = f_2(P, T, L, X_i) \end{cases}$$

- WSGGM: $\varepsilon = \sum_{i=0}^{N} a_{\varepsilon,i}(T_g) \cdot \left(1 - e^{-k_i \cdot P \cdot L}\right)$ $\qquad a_{\varepsilon,i}(T) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_{\varepsilon,i,j} \left(T_g\right)^{j-1}$

  A multiple gray gas model – Good compromise between the most comprehensive approach (*fully addressing wavelength-dependency by dividing the entire spectrum into high-resolution intervals*) and the simplest gray assumption (*constant properties over the entire spectrum*); computationally effective; applicable to CFD.

Why need new model (1/6): *the existing*

- The Smith et al. (1982) WSGGM – most widely used
- 5 tables for 5 partial pressures of CO_2 and H_2O vapor:
  - (1) $P_c \rightarrow 0$ atm;
  - (2) $P_w/P_c=1$ ($P_c=0.1$ atm);
  - (3) $P_w/P_c=2$ ($P_c=0.1$ atm);
  - (4) $P_w \rightarrow 0$ atm;
  - (5) $P_w=1$ atm;
- used for T_g up to 2400K; supplemented by the Coppalle and Vervisch (1983) WSGGM for higher temperatures till 3000K.

Why need new model (2/6): *the existing*

- To account for variations in CO_2 and H_2O vapor concentrations in a flame

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{if } (P_w \le 0.5P_c), \text{ use } P_c \to 0 \text{ atm table}\\
&\text{else if } (P_w \le 1.5P_c), \text{ use } (P_w/P_c) = 1 \text{ table}\\
&\text{else if } (P_w \le 2.5P_c), \text{ use } (P_w/P_c) = 2 \text{ table}\\
&\text{else if } (P_w \le 0.5), \text{ use } P_w \to 0 \text{ atm table}\\
&\text{else, use } P_w = 1 \text{ atm table}
\end{aligned}
$$

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY
AALBORG UNIVERSITY

Why need new model (3/6): *problems*



- **Inaccurate.** Relatively large error comparing the validated reference model, Exponential Wide Band Model (EWBM) – $f(T_g, P, L, X_i)$ – accurate but computationally prohibitive for CFD;
- **Incomplete.** (1) In representative conditions, e.g., when (P_w=0.499 P_c) → (P_w=0.501 P_c) which corresponds to a negligible change in composition, but the table to calculate the emissivity switched from $P_c \to 0$ to P_w/P_c=1 (a big change in ε); (2) incomplete in parameter ranges

Why need new model (4/6): *problems*



DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY
AALBORG UNIVERSITY

Why need new model (5/6): *problems*



DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY
AALBORG UNIVERSITY

Why need new model (6/6): *problems*



The new WSGGM (1/7): *How to derive*

- Determine 7 representative air-fuel conditions in terms of P_c, P_w – *to effectively smoothen the effects of in-flame gas composition variations on the calculated gaseous radiative properties.*
- For each condition: use the validated EWBM to generate emissivity database, spanning a larger T_g-range (T_g=500-3000K, with a smaller interval of 25K) and also a larger P·L range (P·L=0.001-60 atm·m). Large emissivity database matrix: 146 discrete values for P·L times 101 data points for T_g.
- For each condition: use data-fitting optimization technique to derive new coefficients for a 4-gray gas plus 1-clear gas WSGGM from the emissivity database. T_{ref}=1200 [K] used to simplify the optimization and improve the data-fitting accuracy.

The new WSGGM (2/7): *Formulation*

$$\varepsilon = \sum_{i=0}^{N} a_{\varepsilon,i}(T_g)\left(1 - e^{-k_i PL}\right)$$

$$a_{\varepsilon,i}(T) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_{\varepsilon,i,j}\left(\frac{T_g}{T_{ref}}\right)^{j-1}$$

$i = 1, \ldots, N$

$a_{\varepsilon,i} > 0$

band i	k_i	$b_{\varepsilon,i,1}$	$b_{\varepsilon,i,2}$	$b_{\varepsilon,i,3}$	$b_{\varepsilon,i,4}$
Carbon Dioxide, $P_c \to 0$ atm					
1	0.163233	0.204623	−0.378060	0.666639	−0.203453
2	13.096584	−0.020227	0.256006	−0.195201	0.040493
3	175.474735	0.044221	0.003850	−0.020175	0.004919
4	1310.847307	0.039311	−0.054832	0.025370	−0.003891
Mixture, $P_w/P_c = 0.05$ ($P_c = 0.1$ atm)					
1	0.352505	0.315106	0.023475	−0.057930	0.008408
2	8.210621	0.092474	0.109146	−0.121000	0.027145
3	137.410012	0.031702	0.037396	−0.040731	0.008742
4	1269.710976	0.046138	−0.061392	0.027164	−0.003996
Mixture, $P_w/P_c = 1$ ($P_c = 0.1$ atm)					
1	0.261021	0.500119	−0.447068	0.286878	−0.059165
2	3.147817	0.071592	0.508252	−0.384253	0.073477
3	54.265868	0.155320	−0.104294	0.014096	0.001643
4	482.900353	0.072615	−0.100601	0.046681	−0.007224
Mixture, $P_w/P_c = 2$ ($P_c = 0.1$ atm)					
1	0.179160	0.542458	−0.658411	0.466444	−0.100186
2	2.388971	0.101734	0.518429	−0.386151	0.073453
3	28.415805	0.146066	−0.008745	−0.058325	0.015984
4	253.059089	0.129511	−0.187993	0.090709	−0.014493
Water Vapor, $P_w \to 0$ atm					
1	0.085523	0.966357	−0.790165	−0.050144	0.115202
2	0.475777	0.662059	−2.262877	2.309473	−0.572895
3	8.549733	0.060870	0.436788	−0.395493	0.085146
4	201.906503	0.103568	−0.153135	0.074910	−0.012091
Water Vapor, $P_w = 0.05$ atm					
1	0.232724	0.340618	−0.105469	0.068051	−0.017828
2	2.134299	0.175818	−0.063466	0.086631	−0.026581
3	9.266065	0.044325	0.288376	−0.258205	0.054333
4	134.988332	0.126628	−0.186480	0.090755	−0.014569
Water Vapor, $P_w = 1$ atm					
1	0.065411	−0.077336	0.661776	−0.362515	0.053534
2	0.696552	0.506777	−0.758948	0.516146	−0.102909
3	4.862610	−0.079989	0.851078	−0.604264	0.113500
4	60.255980	0.373898	−0.540887	0.258923	−0.040957

[a] $P_T = 1$ atm; $0.001 \le L \le 60$ m; $0.001 \le PL \equiv (P_w + P_c)L \le 60$ atm m; and $500 \le T_g \le 3000$ K.

The new WSGGM (3/7): *Comparison*



DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY
AALBORG UNIVERSITY

The new WSGGM (4/7): *Comparison*



DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY
AALBORG UNIVERSITY

The new WSGGM (5/7): *Comparison*



DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TECHNOLOGY
AALBORG UNIVERSITY

The new WSGGM (6/7): *Comparison*



The new WSGGM (7/7): *How to use*

if $(P_w \leq 0.01P_c)$, use $P_c \rightarrow 0$ atm table

else if $(P_w \leq 0.5P_c)$, use $(P_w/P_c) = 0.005$ table

else if $(P_w \leq 1.5P_c)$, use $(P_w/P_c) = 1$ table

else if $(P_w \leq 2.5P_c)$, use $(P_w/P_c) = 2$ table

else if $(P_w \leq 0.01)$, use $P_w \rightarrow 0$ atm table

else if $(P_w \leq 0.2)$, use $P_w = 0.05$ atm table

else, use $P_w = 1$ atm table

Demo (1/5): *Problem description*





(1) Coal Analysis Data

proximate analysis [as received (ar)]					ultimate analysis [dry and ash free (daf)]				
moisture (%)	volatile matter (%)	fixed carbon (%)	ash (%)	LHV (kJ/kg) (ar)	C (%)	H (%)	O (%)	N (%)	S (%)
8.5	16.0	52.5	23.0	24965	85.01	4.79	7.18	1.70	1.32

(2) Coal Feeding Rate and Coal Particle Size (Rosin–Rammler Size Distribution)

coal feed (kg/s) (ar)	minimum size (μm)	mean size (μm)	maximum size (μm)	spread parameter
59.53	15	57	132	1.3

(3) Combustion Air

primary air		secondary air (including OFA)		air composition		
rate (N m^3/h)	temperature (K)	rate (Nm^3/h)	temperature (K)	O_2 (wt %)	N_2 (wt %)	H_2O (wt %)
271845	358	1458415	640	22.6	75.3	2.1

[a]ar, as received; LHV, lower heating value; and OFA, over-fire air.

Demo (2/5): *Cases & sub-models*

	Gaseous Radiative Prop.	Part-Rad. Inter.	Purpose
case-1	Smith et al. (1982) WSGGM	Not included	case-**1** vs. **A**: to conclude effects of the refined WSGGM on gas combustion;
case-2	Smith et al. (1982) WSGGM	Included	
case-A	Refined WSGGM (via UDF)	Not included	case-**2** vs. **B**: to conclude effects of the refined WSGGM on solid fuel combust.
case-B	Refined WSGGM (via UDF)	Included	

Mesh of the boiler	**Structured mesh: 3,191,580 high-quality hexahedral cells**
Gaseous radiative property	Smith et al. (1982) air-fuel WSGGM vs. the new air-fuel WSGGM
Coal and feeding rate	Real coal fed into the furnace (with 8.5% moisture) used and moisture release appropriately addressed
Coal particle trajectories	432,000 coal particle streams tracked
Furnace wall: T_w & ε_w	The same wall emissivity (ε_w=0.7) used. The same rule for wall temperature estimation used. (the purpose is to check if the two WSGGMs make big difference in CFD results)
Other sub-models	RNG k-ε; 2-step global mechanism for gas-phase combustion, Eddy dissipation for turbulence-chemistry interaction; Kinetics/diffusion-limited char oxidation (into CO); DO for radiation; ……

Demo (3/5): *Novel for BW release*

- ~~Wet combustion model (e.g., drying in FLUENT)~~
- ~~Complicated particle model using FVM*~~
- NOVEL compromise for BW release
  - Bound water (BW) in fuel released with volatiles
  - Modified "lumped" volatiles to include BW content, with modified formulation enthalpy
  - Modified latent heat of devolatilization to include evaporation heat



$$CH_{3.6992}O_{0.3494}N_{0.0944}S_{0.032}\cdot 0.4857\,H_2O + 1.2821\,O_2 \rightarrow CO + 2.3353\,H_2O\,(g) + 0.032\,SO_2 + 0.0472\,N_2$$

*: e.g., **C. Yin**, et al. (2010). "Co-firing straw with coal in a swirl-stabilized dual-feed burner: modeling and experimental validation". *Bioresource Technology* 2010; 101(11): 4169-4178.

Demo (4/5): *Results*





1, 2: Smith et al. WSGGM

A, B: the new WSGGM

Demo (5/5): *Results*









Conclusions

- The new air-fuel WSGGM is much more accurate & complete; can be used alone; applicable to both non-gray and gray calculations.
- The new WSGGM makes distinct difference with the existing WSGGMs for gaseous fuel comb. processes.
- Such impacts are greatly compromised under solid-fuel combustion scenario because of the important role of particle-radiation interaction.
- The new air-fuel WSGGM is expected to replace all the existing for better CFD in future ☺!

Key references

C. Yin. "Refined weighted sum of gray gases model for air-fuel combustion and its impacts". *Energy & Fuels* 2013; 27(10): 6287-94 [(a)]

C. Yin. "Nongragy-gas effects in modeling of large-scale oxy-fuel combustion processes". *Energy & Fuels* 2012; 26(6): 3349-56.

C. Yin, L.C.R. Johansen, L. Rosendahl, S.K. Kær. "A new weighted sum of gray gases model applicable to CFD modeling of oxy-fuel combustion: Derivation, validation and implementation". *Energy & Fuels* 2010; 24(12): 6275-82.

[(a)]: an extended version of the ICOPE conference paper

Thank you for your attention!

Any questions?