OPTIMIZATION OF WOODY BIOMASS TORREFACTION IN INERT AND OXIDATIVE ATMOSPHERES USING COMBINED EXPERIMENTAL AND MODELLING APPROACH

U.M.A. Devaraja

198064U

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Philosophy

Department of Chemical and Process Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

Declaration

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without

acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any

other University or Institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and

belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another

person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text. I retain the right to use

this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date:20-10-2023

The above candidate has carried out research for the MPhil thesis under my

supervision. I confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and

correct.

Name of Supervisor: Dr. R.M.D.S. Gunarathne

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date:20-10-2023

ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to acknowledge and warmest thank my research supervisor, Dr. (Mrs) Duleeka Sandamali Gunarathne, for her guidance throughout my research and the knowledge and experience she shared with me. Her guidance and advice carried me through all the stages of this research.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Prof. Saliya Jayasekara, Prof. P. G. Rathnasiri and Prof. Maneesha Gunasekera for their invaluable guidance and support throughout the progress evaluation of this research. Their continuous advice, feedback, and expertise significantly contributed to the development and refinement of this project. I am also deeply grateful to Prof. Wei-Hsin Chen for their collaborative efforts of this research.

I would like to thank the all-academic and non-academic staff at the Department of Chemical and Process Engineering.

Further, I would like to give my special thanks to all the academic and non-academic staff of the Department of Material Science and Engineering and Mechanical Engineering for providing support by facilitating the laboratory. As well as I would like to extend my heartfelt appreciation to all 18 industries who involved in the survey for their valuable assistance in conducting the survey for this research

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my peers Chamini Lakshika Wickramarathna Dissanayake, Sachini Supunsala Senadheera and S.W. Abeysiriwardane for their tremendous assistance and contributions to my research, which have made this experience both successful and fulfilling.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge SRC grant of SRC/LT/2019/08, which provided the financial assistance for this project.

ABSTRACT

Torrefaction is a thermochemical pretreatment method to increase the energy density of biomass. The process is carried out at 200-300 °C in an inert atmosphere. However, large-scale use of inert gas is neither realistic nor economical. More than 50% of industrial flue gas in Sri Lanka is greater than 200 °C and has less than 10% oxygen content which is suitable as a torrefaction medium. Lab-scale torrefaction experiments were conducted for Gliricidia and Rubberwood, at 250-300 °C temperature range and 30-60 minutes in nitrogen and 3%, 6%, 9% oxygen environments to understand the torrefaction behaviour. TGA and FTIR were used to characterize raw and torrefied biomass. In the lab-scale experiments in inert torrefaction, Gliricidia and Rubberwood showed more than 30% mass loss under the most severe conditions, resulting in a 22.8% and 11.6% volatile drop, respectively. The higher heating value of the torrefied product increased from 18.9 MJ/kg to 30.15 MJ/kg for Rubberwood and from 19.46 MJ/kg to 28.2 MJ/kg for Gliricidia under the most severe conditions. The severity factor was modified by finding the optimum fitted parameter ω, establishing a feedstock-specific relationship between torrefaction severity and operating conditions. The normalized severity factor shows a linear correlation with the properties of torrefied biomass, which could facilitate torrefaction modelling. Rubberwood shows its optimum oxidative torrefaction properties at 300 °C temperature and 31-min residence time and 9% oxygen, whereas Giricidia shows it at 286 °C temperature at a 60-min residence time and 9% of oxygen. A process model was developed for oxidative torrefaction, and results show that CO₂ has the highest volume fraction, followed by CO and CH₄ in the non-condensable product and water has the highest fraction in the condensable product. Acetic acid, formic acid, phenols and furfurals were other dominant components.

Keywords: Gliricidia, Rubberwood, Torrefaction, Oxidative torrefaction, Process simulation, Aspen Plus

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introdu	ction	1	
2.	Literatu	are ReviewLiterature Review	3	
2	2.1 Bio	omass	3	
	2.1.1	Composition of Biomass	3	
	2.1.2	Fuelwood	3	
	2.1.3	Pretreatment	5	
2	2.2 To	rrefaction	6	
	2.2.1	Introduction of Torrefaction	6	
	2.2.2	Properties of Torrefied products	8	
	2.2.3	Parameters that influence the torrefaction process.	11	
	2.2.4	Oxidative Torrefaction	13	
	2.2.5	Torrefaction in the Flue Gas Atmosphere	14	
	2.2.6	Torrefaction Technology	15	
	2.2.7	Torrefaction modelling	19	
	2.2.8	Performance Evaluation Indices of Torrefaction	20	
	2.2.9	Optimization of torrefaction parameters	22	
	2.2.10	Applications of torrefied product	24	
2	2.3 Wa	ste Heat Availability in Sri Lanka	25	
2	2.4 Gli	ricidia and Rubberwood	26	
3.	Researc	ch Methodology Research Methodology	28	
3.1 Analysis of the torrefaction behaviour of Gliricidia and Rubberwood in inert and oxidative atmospheres				
	3.1.1 as well	Identifying practical ranges of flue gas temperatures and oxygen as the utilization potentials available in the Sri Lankan industries		
	3.1.2 differen	Evaluating the torrefaction behaviour of Gliricidia and Rubberwont temperatures and oxygen levels.		
	-	timization of the Oxidative Torrefaction Process Parameters of Glir erwood		
		odel development to simulate industrial integrated flue gas driven bio		

	3.3.1 Moisture Removal	34
	3.3.2 Conversion of Dry Biomass	35
	3.3.3 Final Product Output	35
	3.3.4 Modifying the NSF integrated with Oxygen Concertation	36
4.	Results and Discussions	38
4	1.1. Summary of Flue gas Survey	38
4	1.2. Thermal behaviour	40
4	4.3. Functional groups	42
4	4.4. Torrefaction Performance	44
	4.4.1 Solid yield	44
	4.4.2 Composition of the torrefied product	47
	4.4.3 Energy content	55
	4.4.4 Energy yield	57
	4.4.5 Energy-mass co-benefit index (EMCI)	58
	1.5. Relationship between torrefaction severity and properties of	
b	piomass	50
4	4.6. Oxidative Torrefaction	
4		63
4	4.6. Oxidative Torrefaction	63
4	4.6. Oxidative Torrefaction	63 63
4	4.6.1 Box–Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions	
4	4.6.1 Box–Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions 4.6.3 Enhancement of C with process conditions	
4	4.6.1 Box–Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions 4.6.3 Enhancement of C with process conditions 4.6.4 Enhancement of HHV with process conditions	
4	4.6.1 Box–Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions 4.6.3 Enhancement of C with process conditions 4.6.4 Enhancement of HHV with process conditions 4.6.5 Energy yield with process conditions	
4	4.6.1 Box–Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions 4.6.3 Enhancement of C with process conditions 4.6.4 Enhancement of HHV with process conditions 4.6.5 Energy yield with process conditions 4.6.6 The ratio of VM with process conditions	
4	4.6.1 Box—Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions 4.6.3 Enhancement of C with process conditions 4.6.4 Enhancement of HHV with process conditions 4.6.5 Energy yield with process conditions 4.6.6 The ratio of VM with process conditions 4.6.7 The ratio of FC with process conditions	
	4.6.1 Box—Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions 4.6.3 Enhancement of C with process conditions 4.6.4 Enhancement of HHV with process conditions 4.6.5 Energy yield with process conditions 4.6.6 The ratio of VM with process conditions 4.6.7 The ratio of FC with process conditions 4.6.8 Factorial analysis	
	4.6.1 Box—Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions 4.6.3 Enhancement of C with process conditions 4.6.4 Enhancement of HHV with process conditions 4.6.5 Energy yield with process conditions 4.6.6 The ratio of VM with process conditions 4.6.7 The ratio of FC with process conditions 4.6.8 Factorial analysis 4.6.9 Response Optimisation	
	4.6.1 Box—Behnken design and analysis 4.6.2 Solid yield with process conditions 4.6.3 Enhancement of C with process conditions 4.6.4 Enhancement of HHV with process conditions 4.6.5 Energy yield with process conditions 4.6.6 The ratio of VM with process conditions 4.6.7 The ratio of FC with process conditions 4.6.8 Factorial analysis 4.6.9 Response Optimisation	
	4.6.1 Box—Behnken design and analysis	

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 : Schematic description of the different torrefaction stages [22] 6
Figure 2: TGA and DTG curves of cedarwood [23]
Figure 3 : Torrefied biomass at van krevelen diagram [11]
Figure 4 : DSC curve of lignocellulose components [79]
Figure 5 : Lab-scale Torrefaction Reactor
Figure 6 : Schematic view of the experimental apparatus
Figure 7: Aspen Plus model for torrefaction process
Figure 8 : Reported % No. of companies with different flue gas temperature ranges39
Figure 9: Reported % No. of companies with different oxygen concentration ranges in flue gas
Figure 10 : TGA curves of two fuels before and after torrefaction
Figure 11 : DTG curves of two fuels before and after torrefaction41
Figure 12 : FTIR spectra of raw and torrefied Gliricidia
Figure 13: FTIR spectra of raw and torrefied Rubberwood
Figure 14 : Solid yield of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions45
Figure 15 : Proximate analysis of Rubberwood
Figure 16 : Proximate analysis of Gliricidia
Figure 17: Volatile matter removal of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions 48
Figure 18 : Fixed carbon enhancement of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions
Figure 19 : Ultimate analysis of Rubberwood
Figure 20 : Ultimate analysis of Gliricidia
Figure 21 : Carbon enhancement of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions51
Figure 22 : Oxygen removal of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions52
Figure 23: Nitrogen removal of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions53
Figure 24: Van-Krevelen diagram of raw biomass, torrefied biomass, and coal54
Figure 25: HHV of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions
Figure 26: HHV enhancement of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions56
Figure 27: Energy yield of two fuels at different torrefaction conditions57
Figure 28: Energy-mass co-benefit index of two fuels at different torrefaction

Figure 29 : SF profile of Gliricidia
Figure 30 : SF profile of Rubberwood
Figure 31: Variation of oxygen removal with NSF
Figure 32: Variation of HHV enhancement with NSF
Figure 33 : Solid yield of Rubberwood at different severities (a) inert (b) 3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 34 : Solid yield of Gliricidia at different severities (a) inert (b) 3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 35 : C enhancement of Rubberwood at different severities (a)inert (b) 3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 36 : C enhancement of Gliricidia at different severities (a) inert (b) 3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 37 : HHV enhancement of Rubber at different severities (a)inert (b)3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 38: HHV enhancement of Gliricidia at different severities (a) inert (b) 3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 39 : Energy yield of Rubberwood at different severities (a)inert (b)3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 40 : Energy yield of Gliricidia at different severities (a)inert (b)3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 41: VM ratio of Rubber at different severities (a) inert (b) 3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 42 : VM ratio of Gliricidia at different severities (a)inert (b)3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 43 : FC ratio of Rubber at different severities (a)inert (b)3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 44 : FC ratio of Gliricidia at different severities (a)inert (b)3% Oxygen (c) 6% Oxygen (d) 9% Oxygen
Figure 45 : Factorial analysis of a. Mass yield, b. Energy yield, c. C enhancement89
Figure 46: Factorial analysis of a. HHV enhancement, b. FC ratio, c. VM ratio90
Figure 47: Simulated results with experimental results of Solid yield94
Figure 48 : Simulated results with experimental results % of Carbon95
Figure 49: Liquid, Solid, gases products out of torrefaction of Rubberwood96
Figure 50: Liquid, Solid, gases products out of torrefaction of Gliricidia96
Figure 51 · Fraction of CO ₂ during torrefaction of Rubberwood

Figure 52: Fraction of CO ₂ during torrefaction of Gliricidiawood
Figure 53: Fraction of CO during torrefaction of a) Rubberwood b) Gliricidia98
Figure 54 : Fraction of CH ₄ during torrefaction of a) Rubberwood b) Gliricidia98
Figure 55 : Fraction of water during torrefaction of a) Rubberwood b) Gliricidia .99
Figure 56: Fraction of Formic acid from total acid during torrefaction of a) Rubber b) Gliricidia
Figure 57: Fraction of Acetic acid from total acid during torrefaction of a) Rubber b) Gliricidia
Figure 58: % of phenol /Non Acid during torrefaction of a) Rubber b) Gliricidia
Figure 59: % of Furfural / Non Acid during torrefaction of a) Rubber b) Gliricidia

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 : Cell constituent of hardwood and softwood	4
Table 2.3 : Survey results on Stationary Combustion Systems in Sri Lanka	26
Table 3.1 : Tested conditions (Temperature and Residence time)	30
Table 3.2 : Experimental Conditions	32
Table 4.1: Sector-wise categorization of responded companies	38
Table 4.2: P-values of non-reduced model	63
Table 4.3 : Coded Coefficients Rubberwood (Final reduced model)	64
Table 4.4 : Coded Coefficients Gliricidia (Final reduced model)	65
Table 4.5 : Coded Coefficients Rubberwood (Final reduced model)	68
Table 4.6 : Coded Coefficients Gliricidia (Final reduced model)	69
Table 4.7: Coded Coefficients Rubberwood (Final reduced model)	74
Table 4.8 : Coded Coefficients Gliricidia (Final reduced model)	74
Table 4.9 : Coded Coefficients (Final reduced model) Rubberwood	77
Table 4.10: Coded Coefficients (Final reduced model) Gliricidia	78
Table 4.11 : Coded Coefficients (Final reduced model) Rubber	81
Table 4.12 : Coded Coefficients (Final reduced model) Gliricidia	82
Table 4.13 Coded Coefficients (Final reduced model) Rubberwood	86
Table 4.14 : Coded Coefficients (Final reduced model) Gliricidia	86
Table 4.15 : Response Optimisation of Rubberwood	91
Table 4.16 Response optimization of Gliricidia.	92
Table 4.17: Optimum parameter of Rubberwood and Gliricidia	92
Table 4.18: Values at optimum conditions of Rubberwood and Gliricidia	92
Table 4.19: Input data for model	93
Table 4.20 : Simulated cases	94
Table 4.21 Input parameters	95

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
AWL	- Anhydrous Weight Loss
BBD	- Box-Behnken Design
BOI	- Board Of Investment
CCD	- Central Composite Design
CEA	- Central Environmental Authority
DC	- Decarbonization
DH	- Dehydrogenation
DO	- Deoxygenation
DSC	- Differential Scanning Calorimetry
DTG	- Derivative Thermogravimetry
EFB	- Empty Fruit Bunches
EMCI	- Energy-Mass Co-benefit Index
FC	- Fixed Carbon
FTIR	- Fourier-Transform Infrared Spectroscopy
HGI	- Hardgrove Grindability Index
HHV	- Higher Heating Value
NSF	- Normalized Severity Factor
RKS	- Redlich-Kwong-Soave
SEM	- Scanning Electron Microscopic
SF	- Severity Factor
TGA	- Thermo Gravimetric Analysis
TSF	- Torrefaction Severity Factor
TSI	- Torrefaction Severity Index
VM	- Volatile Matter

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Description	Page
Appendix A	Survey on stationary combustion systems in Sri Lanka	122