

A MECHANISTIC STUDY OF COAL SWELLING AND CHAR STRUCTURE EVOLUTION DURING PYROLYSIS—EXPERIMENTS AND MODEL PREDICTIONS

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfillment of
the Requirement for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

By

Jianglong Yu

**SUPERVISORS: Dr. John A. Lucas
Professor Terry F. Wall**



DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING
THE UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE
AUSTRALIA

DECEMBER 2002

I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis is the result of original research and has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

(Signed) _____
(Jianglong Yu)

TO SHUJUAN AND WALTER...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to his supervisors, Dr. John Lucas and Professor Terry Wall, for their expert guidance and supervision during the course of this study. Without their constant encouragement, recognition and support during every stage of the study, this thesis would never be completed.

The author wishes to acknowledge the financial support provided by the Australian Research Council (IPRS Scholarship), the University of Newcastle (UNRS Scholarship Internal) and the Cooperative Research Centre for Coal in Sustainable Development – the former CRC for Black Coal Utilization – (Scholarship Supplementary). The financial support from Cooperative Research Centre for Coal in Sustainable Development (CCSD), which is funded in part by the Cooperative Research Centres Program of the Commonwealth Government of Australia, for doing research and attending conferences is also greatly appreciated. Financial assistance from the Combustion Institute to support my trip to the 29th International Symposium on Combustion (2002) is equally acknowledged. CRC for Clean Power from Lignite is also acknowledged for providing the financial assistance to my trip to the China-Australia Joint Workshop (2001) in Taiyuan, China.

A number of staffs were enormously helpful at various stages of this thesis work. Dr. Vladimir Strezov, Dr. Gregory Browning, Mr. Stephen Richardson, Dr. Gary Bryant, Dr. Liza Elliott, Ms. Jane Hamson, Mr. Con Safouris, Mr. Neil Gardner, Ms. Gillian Hensman and Mr John Waanders of the Department of Chemical Engineering helped to keep everything running smoothly during the course of the project research. Mr. Dave Phelan at the EM/X-Ray Unit assisted with SEM analysis and Ms. Jennifer Zobec at the EM/X-Ray Unit assisted with XRD experiments.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Guisu Liu, Dr. Hongwei Wu, Dr. Li Yan and Mr. Jack Du at the Black Coal CRC for their immense help and encouragement at the commencement of the project. Equally, I would like to thank Dr. Gary Bryant and Dr. Liza Elliot for the preparation of the density-fraction coal samples used in the project experiments. Dr. Vladimir Strezov played the major role in the single particle experiments conducted at the BHP Billiton Research Innovation. He even carried the heavy bag with the laptop computer to Sapporo for my presentation at the 29th Combustion Symposium, and sat down with me to check the slides the night before, which was very important for the success of the presentation. Dr. Gregory Browning, Mr. Steve Richardson and Dr. Moetaz Attalla assisted with the tough, but effective, experiments on the drop tube furnace at the CRC lab at the Department of Chemical Engineering. Mr. Steve Richardson helped with the safety issues during the course of all the experiments. My thanks also go to Dr. Tim Evan at BHP Billiton Innovation for his help with the Pressurized Single Particle Reactor. And Mr. Hadi Zulfiqar provided assistance with the PSD measurements on the Malvern Sizer. Dr. Raj Gupta, Dr Katharine Benfell and Dr. Guisu Liu provided a great deal of help to the modelling and experimental work.

It is a great opportunity that this thesis work has been conducted within the environment of the Cooperative Research Centre. The author wishes to thank Dr. David Harris and

Dr. Daniel Robert at CSIRO, Queensland Centre for Advanced Technologies, for providing the char samples prepared in the PEFR (included in the CCSD project 3.1) and for sharing the analysis data for those char and coal samples. Mr Graham O'Brien and Mrs Helen Beath at CSIRO Exploration and Mining provided support with the petrographic analysis of some of the density-fraction coal samples. I would like to thank all my CCSD colleagues for sharing technical ideas and life experience. I am grateful to Dr John Hart, the director of the former CRC for Black Coal Utilization, for his recognition to this work and the Special Award at the CRC colloquium 2001. His call for the paper to the Australia-China Joint Workshop (2001) triggered my various papers to a number of conferences and journals, including the one presented at the 29th International Combustion Symposium. The author equally thanks Dr Frank van Schagen, the director of the CCSD, and his colleagues, for the recognition to this work and the Award for the Best Presentation at the CCSD colloquium 2002. I'm grateful to my former CRC and current CCSD colleagues, Dr Raj Gupta, Dr Guisu Liu, Dr Hongwei Wu, Dr Li Yan, Dr Sushil Gupta, Dr Guoliang Shan, Dr Gregory Browning, Mr Steve Richardson, Dr Liza Elliott, Mr Shanwen Du, Dr Katharine Benfell, Mrs Jane Chen, Mr Hadi Zulfiqar, Dr Atul Bhargava, Mr Ahmed Raheem, Mr Bart Buhre, Mr Jim Hinkley, Mr Chatpol Meesri, Mr Emre Cetin, Mr Liangguang Tang, Dr Moetaz Attalla, Dr Changdong Sheng, Dr Atul Sharma, Mrs Jun Xu and Mr Dongchan Park.

The author wishes to acknowledge Professor Thomas. H. Fletcher at Brigham Young University for providing the online CPD code. It's a great research opportunity that the author has been able to take advantage of this eminent achievement from his group. I am indebted to professor Zhidong Zhang, my former supervisor at the Institute of Metal Research, Science Academy of China, for his constant support and help. I am also grateful to professor Erric Suuberg at Brown University for his instructive comments and discussion regarding to this project during his visit at the CCSD and the University of Newcastle. I would like to thank Dr Stephen Niksa at Niksa Energy Associates (U.S.A.) for his review of the paper submitted to the 29th Combustion Symposium and his encouragement to my presentation at the Symposium.

My sincere thanks also go to all the others, whose names have not appeared in this thesis, for their support and help in various ways to the project and this thesis.

Finally, I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to my parents, my mother-in-law, my brothers and sisters, my beloved, Shujuan, and son, Walter. In particular, my wife, Shujuan, suspended her job to accompany me in Australia during the difficult time. Without your support, tolerance and love, this thesis would never be possible. I am proud of my son, Walter. He's been doing so well in his daily life and school study that I've been very often feeling encouraged by his nice jobs. He makes my life filled with happiness and hope.

Publication

Awards during PhD study:

1. Special Award for Presentation, The Colloquium of Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) for Black Coal Utilization, August 2001, Sydney;
2. Award for the Best Presentation, The Colloquium of Cooperative Research Centre for Coal in Sustainable Development (CCSD), August 2002, Newcastle.

Memberships of professional associations:

Student member of the Combustion Institute (International).

Publications during the period of PhD study:

International Symposium on Combustion:

1. **Yu, J.**, V. Strezov, J. Lucas, G. Liu and T. Wall. *A mechanistic study on char structure evolution during coal devolatilization—experiments and model predictions*, 29th International Symposium on Combustion (International), August 2002, Japan. Combustion Institute. (In press)

Review:

2. Wall, T., **J. Yu**, H. Wu, G. Liu, J. Lucas, D. Harris, “*Effect of pressure on ash formation during pulverized coal combustion and gasification*”, Preprints of Symposia - American Chemical Society, Division of Fuel Chemistry (2002), 47 (2), p. 801-806.

Journals:

3. Zhang Z.D., **J.L. Yu**, J.G. Zheng I. Skorvanek, J. Kovac, X.L. Dong, Z.J. Li, S.R. Jin, H.C. Yang, Z.J. Guo, W. Liu and X.G. Zhao, *Structure and magnetic properties of boron-oxide-coated Fe(B) nanocapsules prepared by arc discharge in diborane*. Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys., 2001. **64**(2): p. 024404/1-024404/5;
4. **Yu, J.**; Strezov, V.; Lucas, J.; Wall, T., *Swelling behaviour of Australian coals during pyrolysis in a single particle reactor*, Fuel (accepted);
5. **Yu, J.**; Lucas, J.; Strezov, V.; Wall, T., “*Coal and carbon nanotube production*”, Fuel (accepted);

6. Zhang, Z.D., J.G. Zheng, I. Skorvanek, J. Kovac, **J.L. Yu**, X.L. Dong, Z.J. Li, S.R. Jin, X.G. Zhao and W. Liu, *Synthesis, characterization, and magnetic properties of carbon- and boron-oxide-encapsulated iron nanocapsules*. J. Nanosci. Nanotechnol. 2001. **1**(2): p. 153-158;
7. **Yu, J.**; Lucas, J.; Strezov, V.; Wall, T., *Swelling and structure of DTF chars from density-fraction samples of pulverized coal*, Energy & Fuel; (Submitted)
8. **Yu, J.**; Harris, D.; Lucas, J.; Roberts, D.; Strezov, V.; Wall, T., *Effect of the ambient pressure on char formation during pyrolysis of pulverized coal*, Energy & Fuel (Submitted);
9. **Yu, J.**; Strezov, V.; Lucas, J.; Liu, G.; Sheng, C.; Wall, T., *Modelling the char structure evolution of pulverized coal during pyrolysis*, Combustion & Flame (Submitted);

Conference Publications:

10. **Yu, J.**, V. Strezov, J. Lucas, G. Liu and T. Wall. “*A single particle reactor for investigating the thermoplastic behaviour of Australian coals during pyrolysis*”. 18th Annual International Pittsburgh Coal Conference, 2001, Newcastle, Australia;
11. **Yu, J.**, J. Lucas, V. Strezov and T. Wall. “*Coal and carbon nano-materials--a review*”. 18th Annual International Pittsburgh Coal Conference, 2001, Newcastle, Australia;
12. **Yu, J.**, V. Strezov, J. Lucas and T. Wall. “*Investigation of Swelling Behaviour of Australian Coal During Pyrolysis*”. Australia-China Joint Workshop on Clean Power from Coal with Maximized Efficiency, 2001, Taiyuan, China; (in English)
13. **Yu, J.**; V. Strezov; J. Lucas; T. Wall. “*Swelling behaviour of Australian coals during pyrolysis in a single particle reactor*”, 4th UK Meeting on Coal Research and its Applications; 2002, London, UK;
14. **Yu, J.**; J. Lucas; V. Strezov; T. Wall. “*Is coal a potential source material for carbon nanotube?*”, 4th UK Meeting on Coal Research and its Applications; 2002, London, UK;
15. Wall, T., **J. Yu**, H. Wu, G. Liu, J. Lucas, D. Harris, “*Effect of pressure on ash formation during pulverized coal combustion and gasification*”, 224th ACS Annual Meeting, Division of Fuel Chemistry (2002), Boston, U.S.A.

Presentations:

1. “Project proposal for char formation and devolatilization at pressure”, Cooperative Research Centre for Black Coal Utilization (CRC) Colloquium, Newcastle, May 2000;

2. “Investigation of Swelling Behavior of Australian Coals During Pyrolysis”, Australia-China Joint Workshop on Clean Power from Coal with Maximized Efficiency, Taiyuan, China, August 2001; (In English)
3. “Char formation and devolatilization at pressure”, Cooperative Research Centre for Coal in Sustainable Development (CCSD) Colloquium, Sydney, August 2001;
4. “A single particle reactor for investigating the thermoplastic behaviour of Australian coals during pyrolysis”. 18th Annual International Pittsburgh Coal Conference. December 2001. Newcastle, Australia;
5. “Coal and carbon nano-materials”. 18th Annual International Pittsburgh Coal Conference. December 2001. Newcastle, Australia;
6. “A mechanistic study on char structure evolution during coal devolatilization—experiments and model predictions”. 29th International Symposium on Combustion (International), July 2002, Japan; (In English)
7. “Char structure evolution during coal devolatilization”. Colloquium of Cooperative Research Centre for Coal in Sustainable Development (CCSD), August 2002, Newcastle, Australia;
8. “Swelling behavior of Australian coals during pyrolysis in a single particle reactor”, 4th UK Meeting on Coal Research and its Applications; September 2002, London, UK;
9. “Is coal a potential source material for carbon nanotube”, 4th UK Meeting on Coal Research and its Applications; September 2002, London, UK.

Research projects:

1. A Fundamental Investigation of the Thermoplastic Behavior and Porous Structural Evolution of Coke and Char Particles, Australian Research Council Project (large grant), DP0209307, in University of Newcastle, Australia (involved as a PhD student) (2001-2002);
2. Entrain Flow Gasification, CCSD project 3.1, in University of Newcastle, Australia (involved as a PhD student) (2000-2002);
3. Synthesis and mechanism of carbon nanotubes from coal by catalytic pyrolysis, Australian Research Council Discovery Project, DP0345434, in University of Newcastle, Australia (Application submitted) (2002);

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	I
PUBLICATION	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
ABSTRACT	IX
LIST OF FIGURES	XII
LIST OF TABLES	XVII
NOMENCLATURE	XIX
ACRONYMS	XX
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. Outline of the thesis.....	3
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	4
2.1 Coal and its heterogeneity—general descriptions.....	4
2.2 Coal devolatilization	9
2.2.1 Mechanism of coal pyrolysis.....	11
2.2.2 Product yields and heating conditions.....	17
2.2.3 Devolatilization models.....	25
2.2.4 Changes in physical properties	26
2.3 Char structure of bituminous coal.....	32
2.3.1 Importance of the char structure.....	32
2.3.2 Classification of char structure.....	35
2.3.3 Char structure and coal properties.....	38
2.3.4 Char structure and heating conditions.....	41
2.3.5 Swelling and the char structure	46
2.3.6 Density separation techniques.....	50
2.3.7 Modelling effort.....	52
2.4 Summary and implications.....	56
2.5 Scope of the present work	57
CHAPTER 3. EXPERIMENTAL.....	59
3.1 Coal sample preparation.....	59
3.2 The single particle reactor (SPR)	65
3.3 Char preparation in DTF and PEFR.....	66
3.4 Char characterization.....	68
3.4.1 Determination of weight loss	68
3.4.2 Particle size distribution of chars.....	68
3.4.3 Pore size and porosity of individual char particles	69
3.5 Summary of this chapter.....	70

CHAPTER 4. SWELLING BEHAVIOUR OF INDIVIDUAL COAL PARTICLES IN THE SINGLE PARTICLE REACTOR	71
4.1 Introduction	71
4.2 Experimental procedure	74
4.3 Results and discussion	77
4.3.1 Heterogeneity of pyrolysis behaviour of coal particles	77
4.3.2 Transient morphology changes of particle during heating	84
4.3.3 Particle morphology of char residues after pyrolysis	86
4.3.4 Effect of heating rate on pyrolysis behaviour	89
4.4 Conclusions of this chapter	92
CHAPTER 5. THE SWELLING AND STRUCTURE OF CHARs PREPARED IN THE DROP TUBE FURNACE	94
5.1 Introduction	94
5.2 Experimental procedure	95
5.3 Experimental results and discussion	98
5.3.1 Results of char samples of density fraction	98
5.3.2 Swelling of size fraction samples	118
5.3.3 Effect of pyrolysis temperature on swelling of DTF chars	121
5.4 Conclusions of this chapter	122
CHAPTER 6. MODELLING THE CHAR STRUCTURE EVOLUTION— MODEL DEVELOPMENT	124
6.1 Introduction	124
6.2 Model development	126
6.2.1 Pre-plastic and re-solidified stages	127
6.2.2 Physical process and model assumptions for the plastic stage	128
6.2.3 Mathematical equations	130
6.2.4 Determination of physical properties	134
6.3 Sensitivity study	137
6.3.1 General information	137
6.3.2 Sensitivity study of initial bubble density, viscosity model, and surface tension	141
6.3.3 Parameters and correlations used in the present char structure model	146
6.3.4 Effect of raw coal particle size	147
6.4 Conclusions of this chapter	148
CHAPTER 7. MODELLING THE CHAR STRUCTURE EVOLUTION— THE MODEL VALIDATION	150
7.1 Introduction	150
7.2 Comparison of model prediction with experimental data of DTF chars	151
7.2.1 Model predicted results	151
7.2.2 Comparisons of model prediction with experimental data	154
7.3 Model prediction on effect of heating conditions	157
7.3.1 Effect of heating rates	158
7.3.2 Effect of ambient pressure	162
7.4 Discussion	166
7.5 Conclusions of this chapter	168

CHAPTER 8. EFFECT OF PRESSURE ON CHAR STRUCTURE FORMATION	171
8.1 Introduction	171
8.2 PEFR char properties.....	176
8.3 SEM morphology and structures of PEFR chars	177
8.4 Discussion—char formation at pressure.....	184
8.5 Conclusions of this chapter.....	187
CHAPTER 9. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	188
9.1 Conclusions.....	188
9.2 Recommendations for future work	192
APPENDICES	195
REFERENCES:.....	209

ABSTRACT

This work presents a systematic study on swelling and char formation during pf coal pyrolysis using both experimental measures and modelling. By using the density fraction samples, i.e. F1.25, F1.30, F1.35, F1.50 and S1.50, prepared using the sink-float method, transient observations using a single particle reactor (SPR) and the analysis of drop tube furnace (DTF) chars prepared at atmospheric pressure consistently reveal the heterogeneity of the pyrolysis behaviour and char structures from pf coal. Particles from light density fractions, i.e. F1.25 and F1.30, experience intensive softening and swelling during heating. Apparent bubbling phenomena have been observed in single particle experiments, which is responsible for the coal swelling. On the contrary, particles from heavy density fraction samples, i.e. F1.50 and S1.50, do not exhibit softening and swelling. Correspondingly, the porosity of DTF chars decrease drastically for heavy density fraction samples. It is observed that Group I chars (porous structure) are mainly generated from two light density fraction samples, while Group III chars (solid structure) are yielded from heavy density fractions. The medium density fraction sample contains a mixture of different types of chars. The heterogeneity of char characteristics is attributed to the variations in the raw coal properties among different density fractions. The characters of PEFR (pressurized entrained flow reactor) chars prepared at the elevated pressure of 2.0 MPa are examined, and compared with PDTF (pressurized drop tube furnace) and DTF chars. Consistent with previous work, the results suggest that high pressures increase the swelling, the number of bubbles and char porosity, while the population of both cenospheric char and solid char decreases at elevated pressures.

A mathematical model for coal swelling and char structure formation of single coal particles during devolatilization is developed based on a simplified multi-bubble mechanism. The char formation has been considered as two successive steps: the multi-bubble stage followed by a single bubble stage. During the multi-bubble stage, the rupture of bubbles is a rate-controlled process, during which the volatile release is determined by the bubble rupture rate. When the cenospheric char structure is formed, single bubble model applies. During this stage, the bubble rupture is controlled by the wall stress, and the volatiles are released through both bubble ruptures and direct diffusions of volatiles to the particle surface. The sensitivity study has been carried out, based on which the parameters for the present modelling work have been determined. Comparisons of the model predictions with the experimental data show that the present model predicts the experimental trends of the coal swelling and char structure characteristics under different heating conditions. As an advancement of previous work, the model provides a complete description of the char structure evolution process of pf coal during pyrolysis. From the standard parent coal properties of density-fraction samples, the present model predicts the heterogeneity of the char structure in the same coal, and estimates the distribution of char types, i.e., the Group I, II and III chars. The model predicted results agree with the experimental measurements.

Overall, the experimental observations and model predictions from this study consistently reveal the heterogeneity of char characteristics owing to the heterogeneous nature of coal. In addition to the dominant role of coal macerals, the influence of ash level in coal on char formation is identified. In the meantime, heating conditions under which coal is heated have a significant impact on char formation. Smaller particle sizes tend to have a higher swelling under the present experimental conditions, while the

model predicts an increase in the swelling for large particle sizes. High heating rates increase the swelling ratio from both experimental observations and model prediction. Pressure plays a significant role in char formation, and favours the formation of foam char structures with a high porosity. An optimum pressure range has been predicted, which is consistent with the literature data.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. Major properties of coal as a function of rank after Berkowitz (Averitt, 1975; Berkowitz, 1985).....	6
Figure 2.2. Hydrogen content (<i>a</i>) and reflectance of macerals (<i>b</i>) as a function of coal rank (Van Krevelen, 1981; Berkowitz, 1985).....	8
Figure 2.3. Pyrolysis process of softening coal (after Solomon et al., 1988).....	16
Figure 2.4. Evolution rates and cumulative yields of Illinois No.6 coal during pyrolysis from TG-FTIR analysis (reproduced from (Solomon et al., 1992)).....	17
Figure 2.5. Effect of temperature on pyrolysis weight loss at different residence times (after Anthony et al., 1976).....	18
Figure 2.6. Product distributions from Pittsburgh Seam bituminous coal during pyrolysis heated to different peak temperatures (after Suuberg, 1977).....	21
Figure 2.7. Effect of heating rates on the devolatilization weight loss of a sub-bituminous coal (after Eddinger et al (Eddinger et al., 1966; Berkowitz, 1985)).....	21
Figure 2.8. Yields of volatile products vs. pressure during pyrolysis of Pittsburgh No.8 coal at 1000°C (after Suuberg, 1977).....	23
Figure 2.9. Volatile yields as a function of operating pressure (after Shan, 2000).....	23
Figure 2.10. Maximum Gieseler plasticity of vitrinites and exinites as functions of carbon content (3 °C/min) (after Van Krevelen, 1981).....	29
Figure 2.11. Fluidity of coal during plastic stage as a function of heating rates; (<i>a</i>) Low heating rates (after Van Krevelen, 1981); (<i>b</i>) High heating rates (after Fong et al., 1986).....	31
Figure 2.12. Gieseler fluidity as a function of pressure in N ₂ gas (after Khan et al., 1989) (Lancet et al., 1981).....	31
Figure 2.13. Volatile yields of maceral components as a function of coal rank (after Van Krevelen, 1981; van Krevelen, 1993).....	41
Figure 2.14. Porosity and swelling ratio as a function of heating rate (after Gale et al., 1993; Gale et al., 1995).....	43
Figure 2.15. Swelling ratio as a function of system pressure (after Khan et al., 1989).....	44
Figure 2.16. Macro-porosity of DTF char as a function of ambient pressure (after Wu et al., 2000).....	45
Figure 2.17. Typical swelling curve measured by dilatometer of a caking coal (after Berkowitz, 1985).....	47
Figure 2.18. Swelling of two bituminous coal as a function of heating rate (after Khan et al., 1989).....	48
Figure 2.19 Experimental data and model predictions on swelling ratio of Illinois No.6 coal against pressures (after Solomon and Fletcher (Solomon et al., 1994)).....	49
Figure 2.20. The multi-bubble mechanism for mass transport of plastic coal during devolatilization (after Oh, 1985; Oh et al., 1989).....	53
Figure 3.1. Density of coal maceral as a function of carbon content (after Van Krevelen et al (Van Krevelen, 1981)).....	60

Figure 3.2. Particle size distributions of the density fraction samples of both coals measured using the Malvern Sizer.....	63
Figure 3.3. SEM morphology of raw coal particles of density-fraction samples of both coals; A—F1.25; B—F1.30; C—F1.35; D—F1.50; E—S1.50.....	64
Figure 3.4. PSD (by volume) of raw coal samples of size fractions of both coals measured using the Malvern Sizer.....	65
Figure 3.5. Schematics of the single particle reactor.....	66
Figure 3.6. The schematic diagram of the DTF reactor, after Yan (Yan, 2000).....	67
Figure 3.7. The variation of measured char particle size through SEM image analysis as a function of the magnification.....	69
Figure 4.1. Burning time as a function of the maximum expansion rate (after Shen et al., 1994 ^a).....	72
Figure 4.2. Temperature history as a function of the power voltage.....	75
Figure 4.3. A video image frame recording particle pyrolysis process during experiments on the single particle reactor.....	76
Figure 4.4. Transient swelling behaviour of the observed particles from different density-fraction samples of coal A at the heating rate of 100 K/s; (a) F1.25, (b) S1.30-F1.35, (c) S1.35-F1.50, scale bar—130 μm	79
Figure 4.5. Transient swelling ratios of the observed particles from three density-fractions of coal A at the heating rate of 100 K/s.....	80
Figure 4.6. Transient swelling behaviour of the observed particles of coal B during pyrolysis at the heating rate of 100 K/s.	81
Figure 4.7. Transient swelling ratios of observed particles of coal B during pyrolysis at the heating rate of 100 K/s.	81
Figure 4.8. Transient swelling ratios of particles from density fraction F1.25 and F1.50 of coal A at the heating rate of 100 K/s.....	84
Figure 4.9. Transient morphology changes of particle P1 from the light density fraction sample, F1.25, of coal A at the heating rate of 100 K/s; (a) Elongation and compactness; (b) Roundness and shape index.....	85
Figure 4.10. Transient morphology changes of the particle P1 from the heavy density fraction, F1.50, of coal A at the heating rate of 100 K/s; (a) Elongation and roundness; (b) Compactness and shape index.....	86
Figure 4.11. The morphology distribution of residue chars of the coal A and B after heating (at the heating rate of 100 K/s).....	88
Figure 4.12. Transient pyrolysis behaviour of the observed particle from F1.25 density fraction of coal A heated at 200 K/s.....	89
Figure 4.13. Comparison of morphology of char residues of coal A after pyrolysis at different heating rates (■ – group A+B; ■ – group C+D+E+F).....	90
Figure 4.14. Transient swelling behaviour of coal particles at high heating rate; (a) Goonyella coal using laser heating (Gao et al., 1997), laser intensity = 2.22 MW/m ² , particle size 149 μm ; (b) Ens Dorf coal, gas flow reactor (Hackert et al., 1998; Hackert et al., 1999), particle size in μm as indicated.....	92

Figure 5.1. Image analysis procedure for porosity measurements of individual char particles using cross-section SEM images; (A) grey scale image separated from whole cross-section SEM image; (B) binary image converted from picture A; (C) colour-reversed image converted from image B.....	98
Figure 5.2. Weight losses of density-fractions of coal A and B during pyrolysis at 1573 K; (a) coal A, (b) coal B.....	99
Figure 5.3. Particle size distributions (by volume) of DTF chars of coal A and B prepared at 1573 K, measured using the Malvern Laser Sizer; (a) Coal A, (b) Coal B.....	100
Figure 5.4. A comparison of PSD (by volume) of DTF chars of light and heavy density fractions of coal A and B; (a) F1.30 of coal A; (b) F1.50 of coal A; (c) F1.30 of coal B; (d) F1.50 of coal B.....	101
Figure 5.5. PSD (by volume) of the DTF char samples of coal A through SEM image analysis using size bin I as for Malvern Sizer measurements; (a) Cumulative, (b) Distribution.....	102
Figure 5.6. PSD (by volume) of the DTF char samples of coal A and B through SEM image analysis using size bin II; (a) Cumulative of coal A, (b) Distribution of coal A, (c) Cumulative of coal B, (d) Distribution of coal B. (I — peak I; II — peak II; III — peak III).....	104
Figure 5.7. Swelling ratios of DTF chars measured using Malvern Laser Sizer; (a) coal A, (b) coal B.....	105
Figure 5.8. Swelling ratios of DTF chars measured through SEM image analysis; (a) coal A, (b) coal B.....	105
Figure 5.9. SEM images of cross-sections of chars from density-fraction samples of coal A prepared in DTF at 1300°C; (a) F1.25, (b) S1.25—F1.30, (c) S1.35—F1.50;.....	107
Figure 5.10. SEM images of cross-sections of char samples of coal B prepared in DTF at 1300°C; (a) F1.25, (b) S1.30—F1.35, (c) S1.35—F1.50, (d) S1.50;.....	108
Figure 5.11. The porosity of DTF chars of the density fraction samples of both coals, measured through image analysis (char prepared at 1573 K)......	109
Figure 5.12. The char type distribution of the density fractions of coal A and B (1573 K); (a) coal A, (b) coal B.....	111
Figure 5.13. SEM morphology of char particles of coal A prepared in DTF at 1573 K; (a) F1.25, (b) S1.25—F1.30, (c) S1.30—F1.35, (d) S1.35—F1.50, (e) S1.50.....	113
Figure 5.14. SEM morphology of char particles of coal B prepared in DTF at 1573 K; (a) F1.25, (b) S1.25—F1.30, (c) S1.30—F1.35, (d) S1.35—F1.50, (e) S1.50.....	114
Figure 5.15. Comparisons of morphological parameters of DTF chars of coal A with raw coal, analysed through SEM image analysis; ◇--raw coal samples of density fractions, ×--DTF char samples of density fractions after pyrolysis at 1573 K; (a) elongation, (b) roundness.....	117
Figure 5.16. Comparisons of morphology of DTF chars of coal B with raw coal samples analysed through SEM image analysis; ◇--raw coal samples of density fractions, ×--DTF char samples of density fractions after pyrolysis at 1573 K; (a) elongation, (b) roundness.....	118
Figure 5.17. PSD of DTF chars of size fractions of coal A and B prepared at 1573K, measured using the Malvern Laser Sizer; (a) coal A, (b) coal B.....	119

Figure 5.18. Swelling ratios of DTF chars of size fractions of coal A and B measured using the Malvern Sizer.	119
Figure 5.19. Swelling ratios and roundness of DTF chars of size fractions of coal A measured through SEM image analysis; (a) swelling ratio, (b) roundness.	120
Figure 5.20. DTF Char SEM morphology and cross-section images of +75-90 size fraction of coal A; (a) char morphology, (b) cross-section; I—Group I char, II—Group II char, III—Group III char.	121
Figure 6.1. The simplified mechanism of char structure evolution during coal pyrolysis.	130
Figure 6.2. Flow diagram of the computer program for char structure model calculation, compiled using Fortran.	138
Figure 6.3 Devolatilization behaviour of coal B predicted using the present model; (a) Yields of volatiles; (b) Molecular weight of tars; (c) Viscosity and metaplast contents; (d) Diffusivity of volatiles; (e) Transient swelling ratio and porosity.	139
Figure 6.4. Model predicted char structure parameters as a function of initial bubble number density.	142
Figure 6.5. Calculated results of the surface tension of the coal melt during plastic stage.	144
Figure 7.1. Transient devolatilization behaviour of density-fraction samples of coal B predicted in the present study, (a) Volatile yields (db); (b) Tar yields (db); (c) Gas yields (db); (d) Metaplast contents; (e) Viscosity; (f) Swelling ratio (d/d_0). (Heating rate of 16,000 K/s, peak temperature of 1573 K and pressure at 0.1 MPa).	151
Figure 7.2. Comparison of present model predicted results with experimental data of DTF chars of density-separated samples of coal B. (a)—Weight loss; (b)—Swelling ratio of the density fractions; (c)—Porosity of the density fractions; (d)—Char type distribution of the whole coal.	156
Figure 7.3. Transient devolatilization behaviour of full coal B as a function of pyrolysis heating rate predicted in the present study; (a) tar yields; (b) gas yields; (c) total volatile yields; (d) average tar molecular weight; (e) metaplast content; (f) viscosity; (g) swelling ratios. (Heating rates as indicated, $\times 10^3$ K/s.).	160
Figure 7.4. Transient devolatilization behaviour of coal B as a function of ambient pressure predicted in the present study; (a) tar yields; (b) gas yields; (c) total volatile yields; (d) average tar molecular weight; (e) metaplast content; (f) viscosity; (g) transient swelling. (Heating rate, 1.6×10^4 K/s; peak temperature, 1573 K, particle size, 70 μm .).	165
Figure 8.1. Char characteristic of an Australian bituminous coal generated at different pressures (after Wu, 2000 ^b).	172
Figure 8.2. Percentages of Group I, II and III chars for inertinite-concentration coal sample as a function of the system pressure (prepared at 1573 K in a PDTF) (after Benfell, 2001).	173
Figure 8.3. Proposed mechanism of the evolution of a highly porous foam char structure under pressurized conditions during pf coal devolatilization (after Wu, 2000 ^b).	173
Figure 8.4. SEM image of a typical char particle which has a foam internal structure, prepared in PDTF furnace (after Wu, 2000 ^b).	174

Figure 8.5. PSD (by volume) of PEFR chars prepared at the wall temperature of 1373 K and pressure of 2.0 MPa; (a) coal A, measured through SEM image analysis, (b) coal B, measured using the Malvern Sizer.....	176
Figure 8.6. SEM images of PEFR chars morphology of coal A and coal B prepared at wall temperature 1373 K and pressure 2.0 MPa; (a) low magnification, coal A, (b) high magnification, coal A, (c) low magnification, coal B, (d) high magnification, coal B.....	177
Figure 8.7. Cross-section SEM images of PEFR char samples prepared at the wall temperature of 1373 K and the pressure of 2.0 MPa; (a) coal A, (b) coal B.....	179
Figure 8.8. Macro-porosity and char type distribution of coal A and B measured through image analysis, sample prepared at the wall temperature of 1373 K and the pressure of 2.0 MPa; (a) porosity of coal A, (b) char type distribution of coal A, (c) porosity of coal B, (d) char type distribution of coal B.....	180
Figure 8.9. Morphology and cross-section image of chars of coal A prepared in ordinary drop tube furnace (1573 K, N ₂ gas, 0.1 MPa, feed coal particle size, +90-105 μm); (a) char morphology, (b) cross-sections.....	181
Figure 8.10. Morphology and cross-section image of chars of coal B prepared in ordinary drop tube furnace (1573 K, N ₂ gas, 0.1 MPa, feed coal particle size, +90-105 μm); (a) char morphology, (b) cross-sections.....	182
Figure 8.11. Morphology of PEFR chars of coal B prepared at wall temperature of 1673 K, pressure of 2.0 MPa. (left—low magnification; right—high magnification).....	183
Figure 8.12. Swelling ratio and final bubble number of char as a function of ambient pressure at the heating rate of 1.6×10^4 K/s and peak temperature of 1573 K; (a) swelling ratio of char (prediction and experimental data), (b) final/initial bubble number (prediction).....	185
Figure 8.13. Comparison of surface textures of the PEFR char with the DTF char prepared in this study (coal B); (a) PEFR char particle, (b) DTF char particle.....	186

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Summary of various char morphology classification systems, after Benfell (Clove et al., 1994 ^a ; Benfell, 2001).....	37
Table 2.2. Summary of the three-fold char classification system by Bailey and Benfell (Bailey et al., 1990; Benfell et al., 1998), after Benfell (Benfell, 2001) and Liu(Liu, 1999 ^a).....	38
Table 3.1. Properties of raw coal samples.....	59
Table 3.2. Sample fractional mass yield from the sink-float density-separation.....	61
Table 3.3. Physical properties of raw coal samples of density fractions of coal A and B measured using mercury porosimetry.....	61
Table 3.4. Properties of density-separated coal samples.....	63
Table 4.1. The magnification as a function of the work distance (lens with 2×DL tube).....	75
Table 4.2. Classification of char particle morphology in regards to swelling (after Littlejohn, 1967).	87
Table 5.1. Gas flow rates used in the experiments.....	95
Table 5.2. Two types of particle size bins used in the SEM image analysis.....	96
Table 5.3. Number of particles analysed for each char sample during image analysis.	97
Table 5.4. Comparisons of calculated Group I char populations from density fractions of coal A and B with experimental measurements.....	111
Table 5.5. Typical morphology of DTF char particles under SEM.....	116
Table 5.6. A comparison of swellings of DTF chars prepared at different pyrolysis temperatures as indicated, measured using the Malvern Sizer.....	121
Table 6.1. Correlations and coefficients used in the calculation.....	139
Table 6.2. Some results of the model prediction for coal B.....	140
Table 6.3. Model predicted results as a function of initial bubble number density.....	142
Table 6.4. Model calculated results of char structure parameters using different surface tension models (full coal B, initial bubble number density, $1.87 \times 10^{12} \text{ g}^{-1}$ coal, critical viscosity value, $4.0 \times 10^4 \text{ Pa.s}$, other parameters as shown in Table 6.1).....	145
Table 6.5. Parameters and correlations used for the present modelling work.....	146
Table 6.6. Effect of particle size on char formation predicted by the present char structure model, with input data in Table 6.1 and Table 6.5 (coal properties in Table 3.1).....	147
Table 7.1. Predicted coal swelling and char structure of density-fraction samples of coal B using the present model under the conditions as indicated (heating rate, 16,000 K/s; ambient pressure, 0.1 MPa; peak temperature, 1573 K; particle size, 70 μm).....	153

Table 7.2. Model predicted results of coal swelling and char structure under different heating rates as indicated.....	161
Table 7.3. Model predicted results of coal swelling and char structure as a function of the ambient pressure (heating rate, 1.6×10^4 K/s; peak temperature, 1573 K)	166
Table 8.1. Operation conditions for PEFR char preparations in this study.....	175
Table 8.2. Comparison of experimental conditions of the three reactors for the char production.....	175
Table 8.3. Properties of PEFR chars of coal B prepared at different wall temperatures at the pressure of 2.0 MPa.....	176
Table 8.4. Comparisons of average char porosity and char type distribution of PEFR char and DTF char from coal A and B measured through image analysis (PEFR char sample prepared at the wall temperature of 1373 K and pressure of 2.0 MPa).	183

NOMENCLATURE

C_b	Molar concentration of volatiles inside the bubble, mol/m^3
D_e	Effective diffusivity of volatiles through the porous liquid shell, m^2/s
D_L, D_g	Diffusivity in liquid phase and in gas phase, m^2/s
E_b	Bubble escaping rate, <i>bubble/s</i>
ϕ_m	Metaplast content in coal mass, %
MW_v	Molar weight of volatile, kg/mol
n_b	Total number of bubbles inside of the particle
n_m	Molar mass inside bubbles, <i>mole</i>
P_0	The ambient pressure, MPa
P_b	Internal pressure of bubbles, MPa
R	Gas constant, $8.314N\cdot m/g\cdot mole\cdot K$
ρ_0	The true density of the coal particle, kg/m^3
r_b	Bubble radius, m
R_p, R_{p0}	Particle radius and initial particle radius, m
Rt	Devolatilization rate, calculated from CPD, $wt\%/s$
σ, σ_0	The surface tension of the coal melt, N/m
Sw, Swc	Wall stress (MPa)
t, dt	Time, s
T, T_c	Temperature, critical temperature, K
Ts, Td	Softening temperature and re-solidification temperature (K)
W_{p0}	Particle weight, g
y_v	Cumulative yield of the volatile, $\%wt$
δn_b	Bubble number ruptured at the particle surface
$\varepsilon, \varepsilon_0$	Porosity of the coal particle, $\%v$
μ, μ_c	The viscosity of coal melt, $Pa\cdot s$

ACRONYMS

a.d.	Air dry basis
C	Cenosphere
CCSD	Cooperative Research Centre for Coal in Sustainable Development, Australia
CPD	Chemical Percolation Model for Devolatilization
d.a.f.	Dry ash free basis
d.b	Dry basis
DTF	Drop tube furnace
F	Foam char structure
FG-DVC	Functional Group-Depolymerization, Vaporization, and Cross-linking
IGCC	Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle
L, V, I	Liptinite, vitrinite and inertinite, respectively
MIP	Mercury intrusion porosimetry
MMMF	Moisture mineral matter free basis
NMR	Nuclear Magnetic Resonance
PEFR	Pressurized entrain flow reactor
pf	Pulverized fuel
PFBC	Pressurized Fluidized Bed Combustion
PSD	Particle size distribution
SEM	Scanning electronic microscope
SPR	Single particle reactor
TGA	Thermogravimetry
VM	Volatile matter
WMR	Wire-mesh reactor (also referred to as heated grid, or heating screen)
XRD	X-ray diffraction