#### Fuel 199 (2017) 380-393

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Fuel

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/fuel

# Char structure dependence on formation enthalpy of parent coal

### Martyna Tomaszewicz<sup>a,\*</sup>, Andrzej Mianowski<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Institute for Chemical Processing of Coal, Zabrze, Poland

<sup>b</sup> Department of Inorganic, Analytical Chemistry and Electrochemistry, Faculty of Chemistry, Silesian University of Technology, Gliwice, Poland

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 8 September 2016 Received in revised form 31 January 2017 Accepted 22 February 2017 Available online 10 March 2017

*Keywords:* Coal Char Formation enthalpy Structure/texture

#### ABSTRACT

The aim of this work was to investigate char structure dependency on parent coal rank expressed by the formation enthalpy. For this purpose, a detailed characterization of eleven char samples obtained under the same pyrolysis conditions was performed. The porous structure was investigated in terms of micro-, meso- and macropores by employing nitrogen adsorption at 77 K, carbon dioxide adsorption at 273 K and mercury intrusion porosimetry. In order to assess both the carbon crystalline structure and degree of structure organization, the X-ray diffraction and Raman spectroscopy techniques were employed as well. The found correlations revealed a strong linear dependency of aromaticity index and char rank parameters from the formation enthalpy of parent coal. Other char parameters, like micropore and macropore surface area, average crystalline sizes and band area ratio from Raman spectroscopy demonstrate weaker correlation but still the results suggest a valid relationship with formation enthalpy of parent coal.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

#### 1. Introduction

It is generally accepted that coal will still play a crucial role in world's energy mix for the next decades. So far, coal has been consumed to supply energy mostly by combustion, but it can be exploited to generate energy and produce chemicals and fuels through gasification processes as well. One of the advanced clean coal technologies incorporates  $CO_2$  as a co-gasifying agent enhancing course of the reverse Boudouard-Bell reaction. The  $CO_2$  acts as a carbon and oxygen donor allowing for increasing the syngas production economy as compared to conventional gasification technologies [1]. This technology is currently being investigated in a 1 MW<sub>th</sub> circulating fluidized bed reactor at Institute for Chemical Processing of Coal.

The coal subjected to gasification process undergoes devolatilization followed by the gasification with the latter taking place on the surface of a nascent char. The formation of char involves major transformations within the organic matter and results in decreasing reactivity of residual char. In consequence, the char gasification step is considered rate-determining for overall process. The reactivity loss is partly associated with ordering of carbon crystalline structure [2–4] and, to a lesser extent, changing the phase composition of the inherent mineral matter due to partial oxidation or reduction, sublimation of metals and oxides [5–6], and deactivation during partial sintering [7].

Numerous instrumental techniques should be employed in order to assess the structure of carbonaceous material. The porous structure characteristics can be examined by using of many different techniques, including physisorption, mercury intrusion porosimetry (MIP) and scanning electron microscopy (SEM). The carbon crystalline structure can be characterized by such advanced methods like X-ray diffraction (XRD) and Raman spectroscopy.

During the heterogeneous reactions between gasifying agents and carbon, the reaction rate is strictly connected with the accessible surface area of the solid fuel [8–13]. The type of porosity (namely, existence and properties of micro-, meso- and macropores) will influence the surface area of resultant char [14–15]. Thus, the knowledge concerning the properties of micro-, mesoand macropores is fundamental for evaluating the porous structure as a whole. This can be done assessing the data from both N<sub>2</sub> and  $CO_2$  adsorption isotherms and mercury intrusion porosimetry, covering together the very broad range of pore sizes. The initial textural properties of the solid will influence the reactivity behavior during gasification [15].

The crystalline structure of different carbonaceous materials can be quantitatively obtained by employing the X-ray diffraction which is the most commonly used technique to examine the degree of aromaticity and the crystallite features [14,16–17].

Raman spectroscopy was found as a viable tool for evaluating the structural properties of highly disordered carbonaceous materials by many investigators [18–21] due to its high sensitivity to crystalline, molecular and amorphous structure and minimal influence of mineral constituents of the inorganic matter.



**Full Length Article** 



<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author at: Zamkowa 1 St., 41-803 Zabrze, Poland. *E-mail address:* mtomaszewicz@ichpw.pl (M. Tomaszewicz).

The aforementioned structure-based parameters of chars are considered as being influenced mainly by one factor, explicitly, the rank of parent coal. The degree of coal metamorphism determines its structure in terms of pore characteristics, and both crystalline and molecular arrangement. However, the classification of coals by rank is still under discussion in terms which parameters should be taken into account. Moreover, the char-like forms of carbonaceous material, which are sometimes abundant in organicrich rocks, were included in the specially introduced classification system as natural coke or natural char [22]. According to the paper of Ściążko [23], the existing classification systems are not consistent and the technological needs are not directly addressed. Incorporating the thermodynamical parameter being the enthalpy of formation, allows for better characterization of solid fuel in terms of its potential for further processing.

Since the gasification reactivity is of primary importance to the process, any factors influencing the char reactivity will have essential implications for the gasifier operation. Thus, the knowledge on char structure and its dependency from parent coal rank (expressed by the formation enthalpy) is essential for rational predicting the char reactivity behavior. Therefore, the objective of this study is to assess the structure of chars obtained under the same pyrolysis conditions from coals of differed origin and to find a structure dependency from the parent coal rank.

#### 2. Experimental

#### 2.1. Parent coals characteristics

Eleven coal samples, four lignites, two sub-bituminous and five high volatile bituminous were selected for the studies. The samples

#### Table 1

The results of analyses of the parent coals.

were obtained from Polish mines, with particle sizes ranging from 1 to 50 mm. The thorough characterization of parent coal samples is given in Table 1 where the data regarding proximate, ultimate analyses are gathered together with the heating values, chemical composition of ash and huminite/vitrinite reflectance values. The results show that the studied samples varied significantly with their composition. The high volatile bituminous Budryk coal (which is commercially used as a coalblend component for caking processes) distinguishes itself with highest content of ash of nearly 25 wt. %, while lower rank Turów lignite and Wieczorek-2 bituminous coal have the lowest content of mineral matter and the ash content yielding of 8.1 and 3 wt. %, respectively.

#### 2.2. Formation enthalpy of parent coals

The parent coals were characterized also in terms of their formation enthalpy,  $\Delta_f H^o$ . As reported by Ściążko [23], the rank of a given coal can be expressed by its thermodynamical potential which value is, indeed, a reflection of time and temperature conditions occurring during processes of geological formations of the organic matter [23]. The formation enthalpy can be calculated by using of formula introduced by Ściążko [23–25] combining the thermodynamic heat of combustion and a corrective parameter, *f*:

$$\Delta_f H^o = \Delta_c H^o(1 - f) \tag{1}$$

where:  $\Delta_c H^o$  denotes the specific heat of combustion calculated from empirical correlations involving the mass concentration of carbon, hydrogen and organic form of sulfur to be combusted into CO<sub>2</sub>, water and SO<sub>2</sub>, respectively; and *f* is the corrective parameter defined by Eq. (2):

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2"
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	
Heating values   HHV <sup>ad</sup> , kJ/kg 18,894 20,687 20,696 26,015 23,900 23,848 24,516 27,478 25,544 26,456 32,289   LHV <sup>ad</sup> , kJ/kg 17,905 19,639 19,533 24,723 22,842 22,897 23,442 26,511 24,699 25,445 31,223   Chemical composition of ash (by ICP-OES)   SiO <sub>2</sub> , wt. % 28.15 35.60 32.02 32.7 46.48 51.42 41.34 52.07 50.40 51.85 21.06   Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> , wt. % 21.60 9.49 12.63 24.5 28.42 27.03 33.50 21.77 25.99 32.87 16.96   Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> , wt. % 6.04 12.00 2.58 11.4 9.59 7.23 10.88 9.00 7.27 5.26 10.07	
HHV <sup>ad</sup> , kJ/kg 18,894 20,687 20,696 26,015 23,900 23,848 24,516 27,478 25,544 26,456 32,289   LHV <sup>ad</sup> , kJ/kg 17,905 19,639 19,533 24,723 22,842 22,897 23,442 26,511 24,699 25,445 31,223   Chemical composition of ash (by ICP-OES) 50.0 32.02 32.7 46.48 51.42 41.34 52.07 50.40 51.85 21.06   Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> , wt. % 21.60 9.49 12.63 24.5 28.42 27.03 33.50 21.77 25.99 32.87 16.96   Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> , wt. % 6.04 12.00 2.58 11.4 9.59 7.23 10.88 9.00 7.27 5.26 10.07	
LHV <sup>a1</sup> , kj/kg 17,905 19,639 19,533 24,723 22,842 22,897 23,442 26,511 24,699 25,445 31,223   Chemical composition of ash (by ICP-OES) SiO <sub>2</sub> , wt. % 28.15 35.60 32.02 32.7 46.48 51.42 41.34 52.07 50.40 51.85 21.06   Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> , wt. % 21.60 9.49 12.63 24.5 28.42 27.03 33.50 21.77 25.99 32.87 16.96   Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> , wt. % 6.04 12.00 2.58 11.4 9.59 7.23 10.88 9.00 7.27 5.26 10.07	
Chemical composition of ash (by ICP-OES)   SiO2, wt. % 28.15 35.60 32.02 32.7 46.48 51.42 41.34 52.07 50.40 51.85 21.06   Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> , wt. % 21.60 9.49 12.63 24.5 28.42 27.03 33.50 21.77 25.99 32.87 16.96   Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> , wt. % 6.04 12.00 2.58 11.4 9.59 7.23 10.88 9.00 7.27 5.26 10.07	
SiO2, wt. % 28.15 35.60 32.02 32.7 46.48 51.42 41.34 52.07 50.40 51.85 21.06   Al <sub>2</sub> O3, wt. % 21.60 9.49 12.63 24.5 28.42 27.03 33.50 21.77 25.99 32.87 16.96   Fe <sub>2</sub> O3, wt. % 6.04 12.00 2.58 11.4 9.59 7.23 10.88 9.00 7.27 5.26 10.07	
$F_{e_2O_3}$ wt. $\%$ 26.15 55.06 54.05 54.06 54.05 54.06 54.05 54.06 54	
$Fe_2O_3$ , wt. % 6.04 12.00 2.58 11.4 9.59 7.23 10.88 9.00 7.27 5.26 10.07	
11.4 5.55 7.25 10.00 5.00 7.27 5.20 10.07	
CaO wt % 21 93 16 70 35 87 4 10 3 33 2 71 3 03 5 04 2 78 1 15 15 01	
MarQ wrf % 436 175 112 624 276 330 190 448 266 127 872	
P.O. wt % 0.63 0.11 0.06 0.18 0.15 0.13 0.12 0.34 0.58 0.63 0.35	
So wit 1521 2130 1189 100 146 261 151 325 229 059 1972	
$M_{\rm Tr}_{\rm O}$ wt % 0.04 0.10 0.05 0.10 0.03 0.13 0.03 0.27 0.07 0.03 0.24	
TiO <sub>2</sub> wt % 0.95 0.71 1.20 1.86 1.11 1.04 1.45 0.73 1.08 1.44 0.57	
SrQ wt % 0.09 0.11 0.35 0.02 0.06 0.05 0.05 0.08 0.07 0.10 0.18	
$N_{2}O$ wt % 0.08 0.15 0.16 6.38 3.49 2.06 2.94 1.46 1.11 0.56 4.19	
K <sub>2</sub> O, wt. % 0.22 0.98 0.18 1.50 2.46 2.40 1.34 2.27 3.33 3.34 1.25	
Virinite/numentate rejectance $P = 0.25$ 0.21 0.22 0.44 0.50 0.42 0.70 0.04 0.64 0.90	
r, & 0.25 0.52 0.51 0.25 0.44 0.58 0.43 0.78 0.94 0.64 0.80	

M – moisture content; VM – volatile matter content; A – ash content; HHV – high heating value, LHV – lower heating value, R – reflectance; ad – air-dried basis; db – dry basis; daf – dry and ash-free basis; diff – calculated by difference.

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6474784

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6474784

Daneshyari.com