Contents lists available at ScienceDirect





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

Model-based feasibility assessment of a deep solar photobioreactor for microalgae culturing



M. Castrillo*, R. Díez-Montero, I. Tejero

Group of Environmental Engineering, Department of Water and Environmental Sciences and Technologies, University of Cantabria, Avda. Los Castros s/n, 39005 Santander, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Photobioreactor Microalgae Light utilization efficiency Light distribution Light guides Modelling

ABSTRACT

A deep photobioreactor (PBR) based on cone-shaped light guides was conceived to improve the solar light utilization efficiency of microalgae cultures, optimizing light distribution over the culture surface and thus minimizing photoinhibition and photosaturation occurrence. A preliminary model based on local light intensities and local growth rates was developed in order to check its viability. The model was applied to a conceptual PBR unit using irradiance data of Santander (Spain). Areal biomass productivities of 15.17 and $34.57 \text{ g m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ were predicted for the most unfavorable and favorable months respectively, both under monthly average cloud cover. These results are, in average, 2.72 times higher than predicted values for an open pond PBR under identical irradiance conditions. A procedure to scale-up the deep PBR in any location was developed. The procedure provides the optimal arrangement of the light guides and its operational parameters as a function of the surface incident light intensity. According to the obtained results, the novel configuration is highly efficient in land use, providing a low surface requirement solution.

1. Introduction

In the last few decades the culture of microalgae has awakened scientific and commercial interest since these microorganisms have been seen as an attractive source of valuable biomass. A wide variety of applications have been attributed to algal biomass and its byproducts. Its utilization with environmental purposes like bioremediation and CO_2 fixation, as well as with commercial purposes in different industrial sectors, has been reported [1]. However its production at large scale is still limited. The cost of producing 1 kg of biomass in raceway ponds, tubular reactors and flat panels is estimated in 4.95, 4.15 and 5.96 \in respectively (100 ha plants), which could be reduced to 1.28, 0.70 and 0.68 \in kg biomass⁻¹ by implementing improvements in the location, the mixing, the photosynthetic efficiency and the source of CO_2 and water [2]. A way to reduce its cost is to couple wastewater treatment based on microalgae with other purposes like biomass production for lipids extraction [3].

Microalgae are cultivated in production facilities called photobioreactors (PBR), which make use of light to produce biomass and byproducts. The design of large scale efficient PBRs is an issue that remains unsolved, mainly due to the nature of light that is attenuated while passing through the culture [4,5]. Illuminated surface to volume ratio ($S_{\rm I}/V$) is a key parameter in PBR design, and with this idea a wide variety of devices, mainly consisting on narrow channels or panels, have been developed [6]. Nowadays there is a trend to reduce the reactors depth in order to increase light availability and therefore biomass productivity. It has been reported that reducing the water depth in raceways from 30 to 5 cm, can increase biomass productivity up to 72% [7]. However, reducing the water depth entails higher surface requirements.

On the way to find an effective utilization of light energy, systems that include internal light sources have been proposed. Also for scalingup reasons, they are viewed as the only feasible configuration [8,9]. As conventional closed PBR, they are characterized by having a high S_I/V ratio, but additionally they allow for more compact designs [10]. Recently, PBR with internal LED have been found as a suitable configuration with remarkable advantages like the possibility to scale-up in a three-dimensional way and to avoid overheating [11].

Considering solar light, an efficient utilization of the sunlight hitting the PBR surface is the key factor to achieve sustainable designs [12]. In a given geographical location, the amount of light that a culturing device receives is determined by the surface exposed to solar irradiance, therefore PBR must be designed to maximize its conversion efficiency. With this purpose, light harvesting and distributing methods have been proposed, especially by making use of Fresnel lenses and optical fiber [13–15]. More recently, systems driving the light deep into the reactor

* Corresponding author. E-mail addresses: castrillom@unican.es (M. Castrillo), ruben.diezmontero@unican.es (R. Díez-Montero), tejeroi@unican.es (I. Tejero).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2017.12.004

2211-9264/ © 2017 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.



Received 20 July 2017; Received in revised form 6 November 2017; Accepted 6 December 2017

Aground occupied surface of the PBR unit, m^2 $L_{R(n-1)}$ depth of the cone where the previous reflection hits, mAzAzimuth angle, ° $L_{R(n-1)}$ depth of the cone where the previous reflection hits, mbdistance between the apex of the cone and the pivot joint, mqheight of the cones above the water level to avoid splashing, mCcord of the base of the cone in the direction that they tilt, mmQheight of the cones above the water level to avoid sub- mersion, mCcord of the base of the cone in the direction that they tilt, mRreflected lightC_bculture biomass concentration, kg m ⁻³ Sspecular factor, %Dcone base diameter, mS1illuminated surface, m ² Fminimum distance between contiguous cones, mS1/Villuminated surface to volume ratio, m ² m ⁻³	Abbreviations		n ₃ Luca	culture suspension refractive index, dimensionless depth of the cone where reflected radiation hits, m
AzAzimuth angle, °nnbdistance between the apex of the cone and the pivot joint, mqheight of the cones above the water level to avoid splashing, mCcord of the base of the cone in the direction that they tilt, mQheight of the cones above the water level to avoid sub- 	А	ground occupied surface of the PBR unit, m^2	$L_{R(n-1)}$	depth of the cone where the previous reflection hits, m
bdistance between the apex of the cone and the pivot joint, msplashing, mCcord of the base of the cone in the direction that they tilt, mQheight of the cones above the water level to avoid sub- mersion, mCcord of the base of the cone in the direction that they tilt, mRreflected lightC_bculture biomass concentration, kg m ⁻³ Sspecular factor, %Dcone base diameter, mS_Iilluminated surface, m ² Fminimum distance between contiguous cones, mS_I/Villuminated surface to volume ratio, m ² m ⁻³	Az	Azimuth angle, °	q	height of the cones above the water level to avoid
$ \begin{array}{cccc} m & & & & & & \\ C & & & & & \\ cord of the base of the cone in the direction that they tilt, \\ & & & & \\ m & & & & \\ C_b & & & & \\ culture biomass concentration, kg m^{-3} & & \\ D & & & & \\ cone base diameter, m & & \\ F & & & \\ minimum distance between contiguous cones, m & \\ F & & & \\ minimum distance between contiguous cones, m & \\ F & & \\ F$	b	distance between the apex of the cone and the pivot joint,		splashing, m
$ \begin{array}{ccc} C & \mbox{cord} of the base of the cone in the direction that they tilt, & mersion, m \\ m & R & reflected light \\ C_b & \mbox{culture biomass concentration, kg m^{-3}} & S & specular factor, % \\ D & \mbox{cone base diameter, m} & S_I & illuminated surface, m^2 \\ F & minimum distance between contiguous cones, m & S_I/V & illuminated surface to volume ratio, m^2 m^{-3} \\ F & minimum distance between contiguous cones, m & S_I & illuminated surface to volume ratio, m^2 m^{-3} \\ F & \mbox{minimum distance between contiguous cones, m} & S_I & \mbox{minimum distance between contiguous cones, m} \\ \end{array} $		m	Q	height of the cones above the water level to avoid sub-
$ \begin{array}{cccc} m & R & reflected light \\ C_b & culture biomass concentration, kg m^{-3} & S & specular factor, % \\ D & cone base diameter, m & S_I & illuminated surface, m^2 \\ F & minimum distance between contiguous cones, m & S_I/V & illuminated surface to volume ratio, m^2 m^{-3} \\ \end{array} $	С	cord of the base of the cone in the direction that they tilt,		mersion, m
		m	R	reflected light
Dcone base diameter, m S_I illuminated surface, m²Fminimum distance between contiguous cones, m S_I/V illuminated surface to volume ratio, m² m⁻³Fminimum distance between contiguous cones, m S_I/V illuminated surface to volume ratio, m² m⁻³	Cb	culture biomass concentration, kg m ^{-3}	S	specular factor, %
F minimum distance between contiguous cones, m S_{I}/V illuminated surface to volume ratio, m ² m ⁻³	D	cone base diameter, m	SI	illuminated surface, m ²
The maintenant distance between two continuous in the The Annual Market Highs	F	minimum distance between contiguous cones, m	S_I/V	illuminated surface to volume ratio, $m^2 m^{-3}$
F_{β} minimum distance between two contiguous cones in the 1 transmitted light	Fβ	minimum distance between two contiguous cones in the	Т	transmitted light
direction of β, m Tr transmittance, %		direction of β, m	Tr	transmittance, %
F_{N-S} minimum distance between two contiguous cones in the Y_x biomass yield, (g biomass/mol PAR photons)	F _{N-S}	minimum distance between two contiguous cones in the	Y _x	biomass yield, (g biomass/mol PAR photons)
N-S direction, m z distance between the wall of the cone and a point P(x,y),		N-S direction, m	Z	distance between the wall of the cone and a point P(x,y),
F_{W-E} minimum distance between two contiguous cones in the m	F_{W-E}	minimum distance between two contiguous cones in the		m
W-E direction, m α inclination angle of the cones to the horizontal, in any		W-E direction, m	α	inclination angle of the cones to the horizontal, in any
I direct light intensity over the cones' base, $\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$ direction, °	Ι	direct light intensity over the cones' base, $\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$		direction, °
I' direct light intensity over the internal surface of the cones, α_s maximum inclination angle of the cones in the South di-	I′	direct light intensity over the internal surface of the cones,	$\alpha_{\rm S}$	maximum inclination angle of the cones in the South di-
$\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$ rection, °		$\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$		rection, °
I_1 local light intensity in a point of the culture volume, α_{min} maximum inclination angle of the cones in any direction, °	I_1	local light intensity in a point of the culture volume,	α_{min}	maximum inclination angle of the cones in any direction, $\ensuremath{^\circ}$
$\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$ β half of the rhombus angle in the grid formed by the cones,		$\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$	β	half of the rhombus angle in the grid formed by the cones,
LPFD Local Photon Flux Density	LPFD	Local Photon Flux Density		0
K_a light extinction coefficient, $m^2 kg^{-1}$ μ_{max} maximum growth rate, d^{-1}	Ka	light extinction coefficient, $m^2 kg^{-1}$	μ_{max}	maximum growth rate, d^{-1}
K_i half-saturation constant, $\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$ θ_i incident angle, °	Ki	half-saturation constant, $\mu E m^{-2} s^{-1}$	θ_i	incident angle, °
n_1 air refractive index, dimensionless θt refractive angle, °	n_1	air refractive index, dimensionless	θt	refractive angle, °
n_2 cone's material refractive index, dimensionless ϕ half aperture angle of the cones, °	n ₂	cone's material refractive index, dimensionless	φ	half aperture angle of the cones, \degree

by means of vertical plastic light guides or empty chambers have been employed [16–18].

The use of solar light implies a big challenge in PBR design, since it is a non-scalable parameter that follows cyclical variations, but it is also affected by the weather and atmospheric conditions. In nutrient-limited systems, the limiting factor is a component of the medium, so it can be controlled by varying the dilution rate, but in light-limited systems, the limiting factor is not directly dependent on the dilution rate and cannot be assumed to be homogeneously distributed in the PBR volume [19]. Ideally, in a PBR the light inhibition and the complete dark zones should be avoided or at least minimized, keeping the light intensity between the critical and the saturation intensities. Then, the challenge consists on modulate the irradiance over the culture surface by varying its geometry or orientation in order to achieve a 'light dilution effect', with dilution factors ranging from 5 to 10 [20]. According to Posten [21], the answer of process engineering is to design vertically mounted PBR with a large surface, where the sunlight falling on a given ground area is spread over a larger reactor surface. As a guidance value, it is reported that the surface to ground area ratio should be 10 or higher.

Solar tracking systems can help to achieve solar light capture optimization. Its use has been mainly applied to flat panels. It has been shown that using solar tracking systems enables a higher irradiance in winter days by facing the panel perpendicular to the solar beams, thus increasing the overall productivity. On the contrary, at low cell densities or at high irradiances it is possible to provide lower irradiance over the culture by adjusting the tilt angle of the panel. According to the work of Hindersin et al. [22], the main advantages of using solar tracking systems are: (i) the possibility to decrease photoinhibition of photosynthesis in a microalgal culture of low density, by reducing the irradiance; (ii) enhancing the irradiance beyond 100% of the horizontal irradiance in high cell density cultures by exposure of the reactor perpendicular to the sun light and (iii) regulating culture temperature by adjusting the irradiance or cooling to avoid heat stress.

Large scale PBR optimization and modelling is governed by two main types of phenomena: on the one hand the biokinetics of the species to be cultured, and on the other hand the PBR physical structure that determines the radiant light transport. At the same time, when designing a solar based PBR, two main types of factors must be taken into account. Firstly, the shape and geometry of the PBR, like its exposed surface and the presence of shadowing elements, and secondly geographical factors like the latitude and the relative position of the Sun. In non-sun tracking PBR, direct irradiance over the reactor surface depends on the incident angle, which depends on the solar position. However, sun tracking PBR are usually designed to receive the optimal radiation over the time, thus their geometry and dimensions must be designed and calculated according to the different positions of the Sun from the sunrise to the sunset through the year. Since daily Sun path varies along the year, especially in high latitudes, the optimized design must satisfy the global maximum productivity, thus averaged irradiance values should be avoided.

Knowing the angle of incidence of the direct light beams all over the day becomes essential to calculate light gradients inside the culture and to avoid heterogeneously irradiated surfaces. The study of the tilt angle for optimal year-round energy collection and, when possible, the adjustment of this angle through the year has been recognized to result in an enhancement of the overall annual productivity [23,24].

Many approaches can be found in scientific literature to model volumetric or areal productivity of microalgae. As a first classification, two border cases can be distinguished: models that predict the photosynthetic activity according to the local conditions of a cell at a given position inside the PBR and models that use averaged parameters. Secondly, within each group, the light dependence can be calculated in different ways although the most common approach is to consider that light dependence follows Monod-type kinetics. Among the models that use averaged parameters, the most basic approach is to consider the light intensity in the PBR as the average of all the local intensities within the same. The average irradiance can be defined as the irradiance experienced by a single cell randomly moving inside the culture [25]. However, average irradiance is not a sufficient criterion of culture performance because it considers only the total length of the dark and the light periods, not their frequency and reactors presenting identical averaged irradiances can show different productivity [10,26], so more Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8086276

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8086276

Daneshyari.com