



HAL
open science

Determination of heterogeneous reaction mechanisms: A key milestone in dust explosion modelling

Matteo Pietraccini, Eloise Delon, Audrey Santandrea, Stéphanie Pacault, Pierre-Alexandre Glaude, Anthony Dufour, Olivier Dufaud

► To cite this version:

Matteo Pietraccini, Eloise Delon, Audrey Santandrea, Stéphanie Pacault, Pierre-Alexandre Glaude, et al.. Determination of heterogeneous reaction mechanisms: A key milestone in dust explosion modelling. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, 2021, 73, pp.104589. 10.1016/j.jlp.2021.104589 . hal-03522913

HAL Id: hal-03522913

<https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-03522913v1>

Submitted on 2 Aug 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Determination of heterogeneous reaction mechanisms: a key milestone** 2 **in dust explosion modeling**

3
4 Matteo Pietraccini ^a, Eloise Delon ^a, Audrey Santandrea ^a, Stéphanie Pacault ^a,

5 Pierre-Alexandre Glaude ^a, Anthony Dufour ^a & Olivier Dufaud ^a

6 ^a Université de Lorraine, CNRS, LRGP, F-54000 Nancy, France

7 E-mail: olivier.dufaud@univ-lorraine.fr

8 9 **Abstract**

10 Reaction kinetics is fundamental for modelling the thermal oxidation of a solid phase, in processes
11 such as dust explosions, combustion or gasification. The methodology followed in this study
12 consists in i) the experimental identification of the reaction mechanisms involved in the explosion
13 of organic powders, ii) the proposal of simplified mechanisms of pyrolysis and oxidation, iii) the
14 implementation of the model to assess the explosion severity of organic dusts. Flash pyrolysis and
15 combustion experiments were carried out on starch (22 μm) and cellulose (53 μm) at temperatures
16 ranging from 973K to 1173K. The gases generated were collected and analyzed by gas
17 chromatography. In this paper, a semi-global pyrolysis model was developed for reactive systems
18 with low Damköhler number. It is in good agreement with the experimental data and shows that
19 both carbon monoxide and hydrogen are mainly generated during the pyrolysis of the solid, the
20 generation of the latter compound being greatly promoted at high temperature. A simplified
21 combustion model was also proposed by adding two oxidation reactions of the pyrolysis products.
22 In parallel, flame propagation tests were performed in a semi open tube in order to assess the
23 burning velocity of such compounds. The laminar burning velocity of cellulose was determined to
24 be 21 $\text{cm}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$. Finally, this model will be integrated to a predictive model of dust explosions and its
25 validation will be based on experimental data obtained using the 20 L explosion sphere. The

26 explosion severity of cellulose was determined and will be used to develop and adjust the predictive
27 model.

28 Keywords: *pyrolysis, combustion, dust explosion, organic powders, reaction mechanisms*

29

30 **1. Introduction**

31 The importance of merging process safety and engineering design together is well known; but if
32 inherent safety is essential (Rathnayaka et al., 2014), it is also compulsory to complement this
33 approach by the quantitative assessment of residual risks. However, for dust explosion as for other
34 risks, the industrial conditions are multiple, changing and can hardly be reproduced in a laboratory
35 by a series of experiments. Supporting the tests with a numerical model able to extrapolate their
36 results to operating conditions other than those defined by the international standards, would
37 obviously increase the relevance and scope of a normative approach.

38 Developing such a model is far from being easy as various steps have to be considered: for instance,
39 i) the dust dispersion and the potential variation of its particle size distribution, ii) the dust ignition,
40 which is by nature a discontinuous process, iii) the flame propagation and the
41 turbulence/combustion interactions. Among the essential bricks of this model, the chemical reaction
42 kinetics is probably the most central input. However, at present, the proposed reaction mechanisms
43 do not allow to represent the complexity of these phenomena. Indeed, predictive models of solid
44 combustion exist, but are almost always based on slow heating tests of powder deposits, such as
45 thermo-gravimetric analysis (Liu et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020). In such cases, both particle
46 heating rate and transport phenomena lead to models which cannot represent accurately neither the
47 heterogeneity of a dust cloud, nor its reaction limitations. Regarding the last point, some predictive
48 models were proposed assuming that the explosion severity of a dust is mainly related to the heat
49 transfer phenomena rate, which allows the development of kinetic-free models (Fumagalli et al.,
50 2018; Scotton et al., 2020). However, although they seem to give satisfactory results, they are
51 limited to large particles whose reactivity is limited by the external heat transfer. For small

52 particles, or powders with a large PSD including small particles, their explosion severity cannot be
53 dissociated from their combustion kinetics. In order to model a dust explosion phenomenon or/and a
54 gasification process it is thus compulsory to determine the rate-limiting mechanisms occurring
55 during the rapid heating of a dust cloud, followed by a flash pyrolysis and an oxidation step. In such
56 a way, not only a dust explosion could be mathematically described, but a more general predictive
57 model could be conceived, allowing the estimation of both operating conditions for gasification
58 processes and safety parameters.

59 In this paper, the pyrolysis/oxidation mechanisms of simple organic dusts (starch, cellulose) were
60 studied using a Godbert-Greenwald furnace and by collecting and analyzing the gases generated at
61 different temperatures. As the determination of a simplified mechanism and of pyrolysis/oxidation
62 kinetics will also be useful to assess the burning velocity, tests were also performed in a flame
63 propagation tube in order to estimate a laminar flame velocity. Finally, as it is the ultimate goal of
64 this research project, whose global approach will be detailed in section 2.1., the dust explosion
65 severity of these powders were also determined. Once the combustion model elaborated and
66 validated for cellulosic compounds, it would be extended for instance to lignocellulosic residues
67 and food waste, for process safety purposes as well as for the optimization of gasification processes
68 or combustion of biomass.


69

70 **2. Materials and methods**

71 *2.1 Global approach*

72 Although this publication focuses on assessing the kinetics of pyrolysis and combustion of an
73 organic powder, it seems important to present the overall approach of the research project aiming to
74 model dust explosions and to propose optimized procedures for determining safety parameters.
75 Indeed, knowledge of reaction kinetics is, especially for fine powders, the basis of explosion
76 severity assessment.

77 By using a modified Godbert-Greenwald and by varying the dust concentration, the residence time,
 78 the carrier gas (air or inert gases) and the temperature, simplified pyrolysis/combustion kinetics of a
 79 dust cloud can be proposed. Such mechanisms can be introduced and adapted to already-existing
 80 flame propagation models (Torrado et al., 2018) aiming at estimating the laminar flame velocity
 81 S_{uL} . Moreover, these experiments also lead to the identification of the combustion gases generated
 82 during a dust explosion, piece of information that may be requested during a risk assessment study.
 83 The laminar flame velocity can also be approached by using various experimental set-ups as a flame
 84 propagation tube (Santandrea et al., 2020). Therefore, both numerical and experimental approaches
 85 will lead to S_{uL} . From this step, this intrinsic parameter can be used to assess the turbulent flame
 86 velocity S_{uT} of a flame propagating in industrial facility, provided that the hydrodynamic
 87 parameters, in particular the turbulence intensity v'_{rms} and scales, are known. Models relating S_{uL} to
 88 the explosion severity parameters (i.e. the maximum overpressure P_{max} and the maximum rate of
 89 pressure rise dP/dt_{max}) will be then tested and adapted to i) predict orders of magnitudes of Kst
 90 parameter, ii) propose a ‘tailor-made’ test protocol, alternative to standards ones, in order to
 91 determine the safety parameters more accurately.



92

93 *Figure 1. Descriptive diagram of the overall research project.*

94

95 2.2 *Powders*

96 Tests were performed on two powders: wheat starch (Sigma-Aldrich) and cellulose (Arbocel, JRS).
97 They both have the same monomer molecular formula ($C_6H_{10}O_5$, glucose), but show different
98 structures. Indeed, in a starch chain, glucose molecules are linked to each other by means of a $\alpha(1-$
99 4) and a $\alpha(16)$ glycosidic chemical bonds, which gives this biopolymer its characteristic branched
100 structure. On the other hand, in a cellulose chain, glucose molecules are kept together thanks to $\beta(1-$
101 4) glycosidic bond, which leads to a more linear molecule. The choice of these two powders was
102 dictated by the need to compare the combustion behavior of two different compounds having a
103 quite similar chemical formula but different physical properties. Other organic molecules will be
104 tested later, as well as mixtures of pure compounds in order to approach the phenomenon with
105 several levels of complexity.

106

107 *Table 1: Characteristics of the particle size distributions of starch and cellulose*


Sample	d_{10} (μm)	d_{50} (μm)	d_{90} (μm)	SMD (μm)
Starch	9.8	22.3	42.1	18.5
Cellulose	14.4	53.3	196.0	33.3

108

109 Starch powder was sieved, initially in order to test the influence of the mean diameter on the
110 combustion mechanism, but also to reduce its particle size distribution (PSD). In this paper, only
111 the finest fraction will be studied. Table 1 shows the PSD of both samples and in particular the
112 equivalent volume diameters d_{10} , d_{50} , d_{90} , and the Sauter mean diameter (SMD or $d_{3,2}$), i.e. the
113 diameter of a sphere having the same volume/surface area ratio. The measurements were carried out
114 by a laser diffraction sensor Helos (Sympatec) after dispersion of the dusts by an air-pulse in a
115 semi-open tube. The dispersion procedure was consistent with that applied to determine the
116 minimum ignition energy of a powder (ISO/IEC 80079-20-2). It should be noted that the PSD of
117 starch is unimodal, which is not the case of cellulose. In fact, the cellulose sample is formed by

118 fibers of different shapes, lengths and geometric configurations. Their length-to-width ratios,
119 estimated by optic microscopy, range from 6 to 10. A more thorough investigation of the time-
120 evolution of the PSD of cellulose was carried out and shows three main peaks, at about 25, 60 and
121 190 μm (Figure 2). Except for the first 50 ms (absence of large agglomerates), the PSD remains
122 stable for dispersion times up to 300 ms, which is noteworthy as ignition delay times ranging from
123 60 to 300 ms will be used to study the flame propagation.

124



125

126 *Figure 2. Time evolution of the PSD of cellulose for times ranging from 50 to 200 ms.*

127

128 2.3 Analysis of the pyrolysis and combustion gases


129 Flash-pyrolysis and combustion experiments were carried out using a modified Godbert-Greenwald
130 furnace, similar to the one used by Dufaud et al. (2012a).

131 The Godbert-Greenwald furnace is usually operated for the determination of the Minimum Ignition
132 Temperature (MIT) of a dust cloud (ISO/IEC 80079-20-2). Due to its rather simple structure,
133 bringing both benefits and drawbacks of standard procedures (Eckhoff, 2019), this apparatus is

134 versatile and suitable for other purposes (Azam et al., 2019; Bu et al., 2020; Tan et al., 2020). For
135 instance, in this work, it is used as simple plug flow reactor. Because of its simple operating mode
136 and its adaptability, this furnace provide the opportunity to study, among other things, the dynamics
137 of a dust cloud generation, ignition phenomenon, particle heating process and consequent pyrolysis
138 with generation of combustible gases.

139 As shown in Figure 3, the powder is dispersed into the vertical tubular furnace by a gas pulse (air
140 for combustion and argon for pyrolysis). The emitted gases are then collected in a collapsible
141 Tedlar bag situated at the bottom of the device and are analyzed with a micro gas chromatograph
142 (μ GC, Varian, CP 4900). Tests were performed thrice to obtain results with a good reproducibility
143 degree.

144



145

146

147 *Figure 3. Scheme of the experimental setup used for the combustion and pyrolysis experiments*

148

149 The pyrolysis and combustion products were determined at temperatures of 973 K, 1073 K and
150 1173 K, with masses of the samples varying between 0.1 g and 0.4 g and with an estimated
151 residence time of 200-250 ms. This time was determined by visualizing the powder entering and
152 exiting the furnace thanks to a high-speed video camera. For this study, the amount of powder was
153 set at 0.2 g, corresponding to a dust concentration in the Godbert-Greenwald furnace of
154 approximately 600 g.m^{-3} (by considering a homogeneous dispersion of the dust in the oven
155 volume). It is much greater than both the minimum explosive concentration (approximately 60 g.m^{-3}
156 ³) (BGIA, 1997) and the stoichiometric concentration, as it leads to a theoretical fuel equivalence
157 ratio of 2.5. However, decreasing the dust weight will increase experimental uncertainties and
158 would not allow sufficient gas to be collected.

159 During the pyrolysis of organic powders, permanent gases, tar and char are generated (Nowakowska
160 et al., 2018). It should be underlined that, as the quantities of char and tar collected on small grids
161 placed at the bottom of the tube were very small with regard to the experimental reproducibility, no
162 reliable information could be obtained from such measurements. As a consequence, both
163 proportions will be deduced from a mass balance. An alternative design is under construction to
164 remedy such issues.

165

166 2.4 *Determination of the unstretched flame velocity*

167 Flame propagation tests were carried out in a modified Hartmann tube, which is a semi-open tube of
168 1 m long, with a square section of $7 \times 7 \text{ cm}^2$ (Cuervo, 2015; Cuervo et al., 2017). The powder is
169 dispersed with a 7 bar compressed air pulse and then ignited with a 1 J electric spark. The
170 electrodes are 9 cm above the dispersion nozzle. The ignition delay time t_v , i.e. the time between the
171 dispersion and the ignition was set at 180 ms. This value results from a compromise between a high
172 t_v which ensures a weak turbulence of the dust cloud and a low t_v which avoids the segregation of
173 the particles (Figure 2). Tests were performed with 1 g of powder.

174 Flame propagation was recorded using a high-speed video camera (MotionBlitz EoSens mini2) and
175 a Matlab code developed by Cuervo (2015) was used to identify both the flame front position and

176 flame surface area. Then, assuming a linear relationship between the flame spatial velocity and the
177 stretching factor (Karlovitz factor) (Clavin, 1985; Markstein, 1964), the unstretched ‘laminar’
178 burning velocity can be estimated (Cuervo et al., 2017).

179

180 2.5 *Dust explosion severity*

181 Experiments were performed using a standard 20L spherical vessel, equipped with a rebound
182 nozzle. Two 5 kJ chemical igniters were used as ignition sources in accordance with international
183 standards (EN 14034-1, 2004; EN 14034-2, 2006). The sphere was externally cooled with water at a
184 temperature ranging between 20 and 30°C. The maximum pressure P_m and maximum rate of
185 pressure rise, dP/dt_m , were determined for each test. The maxima of these parameters over a wide
186 range of concentration will be called P_{max} and dP/dt_{max} . Applying the ‘cube-root law’, the K_{st} index
187 will be deduced (Bartknecht, 1989).

188

189 **3. Results and discussion**


190 Two models were developed based on the experiments carried out on the Godbert-Greenwald
191 furnace: one representing the pyrolysis mechanisms, the other one, the combustion reactions, i.e.
192 the pyrolysis of the powder and the subsequent oxidation of the pyrolysis gases. They will be
193 described in this section, as well as the results of flame propagation and explosion tests performed
194 on cellulose.

195

196 3.1 *Model development for the pyrolysis of organic powders*

197 As previously said, during an organic dust explosion, the combustion of the powder occurs
198 following three main steps: first, the particle heating, then the pyrolysis/devolatilization and finally
199 the oxidation of the gases that have been produced by the pyrolysis. At this point, it is then
200 interesting to introduce the Damköhler number Da , which represents the ratio of the characteristic

201 diffusion time of the pyrolysis products (from the particle surface to the bulk of the gas phase) over
 202 the pyrolysis reaction time. The rate-limiting step of the process depends notably on the particle
 203 size distribution of the powder. In fact, the bigger the particles, the longer it will take for the two
 204 first steps to occur. When the oxidation in gaseous phase is very fast, three limitations can be
 205 considered as a function of the particle diameter and the external temperature. In Figure 4, four
 206 different pyrolysis kinetics have been considered (Chan et al., 1985; Di Blasi & Branca, 2001; Font
 207 et al., 1990; Wagenaar et al., 1993), but it should be stressed that they were usually obtained from
 208 thermogravimetric analyses or fluidized bed experiments (Cuervo, 2015). Therefore, it should be
 209 seen more as a qualitative approach than as a quantitative assessment of characteristic times.
 210 Considering the mean particle diameter of cellulose and starch powders used in this work and a
 211 temperature range of 973 to 1173 K, it can be seen that the pyrolysis mechanism is supposed to be
 212 mainly ‘reaction-limited’. For very small particles, the oxidation can be the slowest step of the
 213 process. In this case, all the pyrolysis gases are emitted very quickly and will then react with
 214 oxygen to form the combustion products: the gas combustion is controlling the dust explosion (Di
 215 Benedetto et al., 2010).



216



217 *Figure 4. Regime limits as a function of the particle diameter d_p and the external temperature T_∞*

218

219 It has been shown by Dufaud et al. (2012b) that, during a dust explosion, the critical particle size
220 corresponding to an intermediate regime ($Da \approx 1$) for wheat starch is around 30 μm . Given the
221 significant influence of the pyrolysis step, two models were developed: a first one to predict the
222 pyrolysis products of organic compounds, which would then be implemented in a second model to
223 represent the distribution of their combustion products.

224 3.1.1 Approach and assumptions

225 A simplified model for the pyrolysis of organic compound was developed, whose aim is to predict
226 the proportions of the different species emitted during this process. The model was based on the
227 first experimental results carried out on starch dispersed in the furnace with argon, and is inspired
228 by the mechanisms of biomass pyrolysis developed by Ranzi et al. (2017). For simplicity purposes,
229 only three main reactions were considered to represent the emission of the pyrolysis products
230 (Equations 1- 3).



234 It should be underlined that the purpose of this model was not to represent thoroughly the pyrolysis
235 phenomenon with all the gases potentially generated, but to present a simple alternative route based
236 on a few reactions which will be easily integrated in a more global model.

237 In this model, the two first equations represent the emission of the main pyrolysis gases as well as
238 water and acetaldehyde (C_2H_4O). This compound should be considered as a surrogate for the tars
239 and other permanent gases not considered here, rather than as acetaldehyde itself. Equations 1 and 2
240 are similar in their structure; but introducing this set of reactions in the model was necessary to
241 explain the evolution of the different gas concentrations as a function of temperature. Indeed,
242 experiments have shown that gas concentrations can either increase or decrease with temperature.
243 Considering a single equation and strictly positive activation energies, as proposed by Ranzi et al.

244 (2017), would only uniformly increase the gas concentration with temperature, which is inadequate.
245 Equation 3 has been introduced to represent the formation of char (indicated as C in the reaction).
246 In addition to the simplification made on acetaldehyde generation, this model is based on the
247 following assumptions: i) the pyrolysis takes place in an inert atmosphere (this has been verified as
248 the amount of N₂, which would attest an air leak, was also analyzed by micro gas-chromatography),
249 ii) both starch and cellulose are represented by the chemical formula C₆H₁₀O₅ and no impurity is
250 present, iii) the powders are dried so there is no water inlet, iv) the reaction rate i can be written as:

$$251 \quad r_i = k_i [C_6H_{10}O_5] \quad (4)$$

252

253 3.1.2 Solving method

254 A system of equations, based on the carbon, hydrogen and oxygen balances, was developed in order
255 to determine the coefficients n_i , m_i and of the reaction rate constants k_i . It should be noted that the
256 coefficients k_i are expressed using the Arrhenius law and depend on a pre-exponential factor A_i and
257 an activation energy E_i . Rather than solving the system with the A_i and E_i as unknowns, which
258 would introduce exponential functions, the coefficients n_i , m_i and k_i were determined for different
259 temperatures. Then, the evolution of k_i as a function of the temperature allows the determination of
260 A_i and E_i .

261 The concentrations of the following gases can be obtained directly through chromatographic
262 measurements: carbon monoxide, hydrogen, carbon dioxide, methane and ethylene. By considering
263 the furnace as a stirred tank reactor (or a succession of CSTR) and expressing the products
264 concentration as a function of the carbon monoxide content, five ratios can be expressed as, for
265 instance:

$$266 \quad \frac{[H_2]}{[CO]} = \frac{n_1 k_1 + m_1 k_2}{n_2 k_1 + m_2 k_2} \quad (5)$$

267 It was unfortunately impossible to quantify precisely the amount of char and tar ; such metrology is
268 currently developed. However, estimated values of two remaining ratios can be obtained by


269 applying atomic balances (C, H and O) to the experimental results, knowing the inlet dust
270 concentration.

271 The system was solved using Matlab® with the function 'lsqnonlin', which is based on the
272 resolution of a non-linear system of equations by the least square fitting. Lower boundaries were set
273 to zero for the stoichiometric coefficients and the reaction rate constants. With regard to the results
274 obtained by Ranzi et al. (2017), an upper limit of 10^{10} was set for the reaction rate constants.

275 *3.1.3 Results of the pyrolysis tests*

276 The results of the pyrolysis tests are presented in Table 2 for starch and cellulose for 973 and
277 1173 K. It should be noticed that carbon monoxide and hydrogen are the main gases (in molar
278 proportions) produce by the pyrolysis, which is consistent with the literature (Commandre et al.,
279 2011). Even if the orders of magnitude are close, differences are noticeable between the two
280 products, especially at 973 K. For both powders, the CO/CO₂ ratio, hydrogen, ethylene and methane
281 contents increase with the temperature. These trends are consistent with the shift of the C/CO₂
282 equilibrium towards CO when temperature increases. Moreover, the significant growth of hydrogen
283 content for cellulose is not compensate by a decrease of methane, as methane conversion to
284 hydrogen is made difficult by steam reforming (Commandre et al., 2011). Therefore, the evolution
285 of hydrogen molar fraction is certainly due to water reaction. More generally, it should be noted
286 that, even if they share the same monomer molecular formula, starch and cellulose do not show the
287 same temperature-evolution of the pyrolysis gases.

288



289

290 *Figure 5. Permanent gases generated by pyrolysis of starch or cellulose (0.2 g) dispersed in argon*
 291 *at 973 and 1173 K*



292

293 By applying atomic balances to the experimental results, the concentrations of ‘char’ (carbon), ‘tar’
 294 (represented here by acetaldehyde) and water can be determined. For instance, for both starch and
 295 cellulose, the acetaldehyde concentration is approximately divided by 2 when the temperature
 296 increases from 973 to 1173 K: for starch, from 1.08 to 0.6 for the ratio $[C_2H_4O]/[CO]$. This trend is
 297 consistent with the fact that, at high temperatures, the final amount of tar is lower as it transforms
 298 into char and secondary gases. The water concentration seems to be rather constant for starch, but
 299 significantly decreases with temperature for cellulose, which can be coupled with the hydrogen
 300 production shown in Figure 5.

301

302 3.1.4 Results of the pyrolysis model

303 Using the resolution method previously described, the coefficients of the equations 1 and 3 have
 304 been determined as follows (Equations 6-7), for instance for wheat starch:




308 The activation energies and pre-exponential factors of the three reaction rate constants k_i are shown
 309 in Table 3. These values are in good agreement with those determined by Ranzi et al. (2017). It is
 310 thus possible to predict the distribution of the pyrolysis products for any given temperature between
 311 973 K and 1173 K. A verification has been performed by running the program at 1073K and
 312 comparing the results with an additional set of experimental values. The composition of the
 313 pyrolysis products calculated with the program can be seen in Figure 6. The gas concentrations
 314 show a satisfactory match between the model and the experimental results, which tends to validate
 315 the model, even if a deviation of nearly 30% can be observed for hydrogen.

316

317 *Table 3. Parameters of the reaction rate constants k_i determined for starch pyrolysis*

Reaction rate constants	Pre-exponential factor (s ⁻¹)	Activation energy (kJ.mol ⁻¹)
k_1	1.2×10^{17}	318.6
k_2	8.8×10^{17}	41.0
k_3	2.8×10^5	72.6

318



319


320 *Figure 6. Comparison between experimental and calculated gas molar fractions for starch at*

321 *1073 K*

322

323 The same development has been done for cellulose powder. Figure 7 shows the evolution of water
 324 vapor, tar (represented by acetaldehyde), char and permanent gases for cellulose powder. As
 325 observed for starch, the molar fraction of permanent gases increases with the temperature, whereas
 326 both water and char contents globally decrease.

327



328

329 *Figure 7. Evolution of the global composition of the pyrolysis products of cellulose from 973 to*
 330 *1173 K*

331






332 3.2 Model development for the combustion of organic powders

333 A similar approach has been used to model the combustion step. The results of combustion
 334 experiments performed in the Godbert-Greenwald furnace with air were used to fit two additional
 335 oxidation reactions (Eq. 8 and 9) complementing the global reaction mechanism.

336

337 3.2.1 Approach and assumptions

338 This model keeps all the reaction rate constants and coefficients calculated before and extends the
 339 two first pyrolysis equations into two supplementary equations with the addition of dioxygen to the
 340 pyrolysis products.





346 In addition to the assumptions done in section 3.1.1, this model is based on the following
347 hypotheses:

348 i) the acetaldehyde produced during the pyrolysis reacts to form secondary gases; ii) all the char
349 produced during the pyrolysis is a final product; iii) the char and water produced by the reaction (3)
350 do not react with oxygen. Contrary to equations (1) and (2), (8) and (9) are not symmetric. Indeed,
351 during the first stages of model validation, it appears that some stoichiometric coefficients were
352 clearly negligible, allowing a simplification of reaction (9). To determine the new stoichiometric
353 coefficients n' , m' and the two reaction rate constants k'_1 and k'_2 , the equation system has been
354 solved using a method similar to that described in section 3.1.2.

355


356 3.2.2 Preliminary results of the combustion model

357 The stoichiometric coefficients are shown in equations 10 and 11. The values of the pre-exponential
358 factors and activation energies are $(1.2 \cdot 10^{17}, 318.6 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1})$ and $(8.8 \cdot 10^4, 41.0 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1})$ for k'_1 and
359 k'_2 respectively.



362 The comparison between the model developed for the combustion of starch and the experimental
363 results at 973 K, 1073 K and 1173 K can be observed in Figure 8. It shows a satisfactory agreement
364 between the experimental data and the model, even if the differences are slightly larger at 973 K
365 with a maximum deviation of 3%. It may also be noticed that the distribution of the gases varies less
366 with temperature than during the pyrolysis step. Moreover, as expected, the concentration of carbon
367 dioxide produced during the combustion (molar fractions of approximately 0.5) exceeds largely the
368 amounts created during pyrolysis. Finally, the concentration of carbon monoxide is far from being
369 negligible, which can be explained by the relatively high fuel equivalence ratio.

370




371

372 *Figure 8. Comparison between model and experimental data for starch combustion at 973 K,*
 373 *1073 K and 1173 K.*

374

375 3.3 Towards the determination of the burning velocity

376 As said in section 2.1 and presented in Figure 1, such simplified mechanisms of a few lumped
 377 reactions can be used to assess a laminar burning velocity (Torrado et al., 2018; Santandrea et al.,
 378 2020). Therefore, the flame propagation of starch and cellulose in a semi-open tube was then
 379 studied in order to determine a spatial flame velocity and estimate the laminar flame velocity. For
 380 instance, Figure 9 illustrates the flame propagation of a cellulose dust cloud ignited by a 1 J spark.



381

382

383 *Figure 9. Flame propagation of a cellulose dust cloud. Ignition energy : 1 J, ignition delay time t_v :*

384 *180 ms, mass of powder : 1 g*

385

386 Following the approach developed by Cuervo et al. (2017), the flame velocity can be plotted as a
 387 function of the Karlovitz stretch factor K , representing the time evolution of the flame surface area.

388 K is defined as $(1/A).(dA/dt)$, where A is the flame surface. Figure 10 shows that a linear trend can

389 be observed for low stretching factors, the intercept corresponding theoretically to the laminar

390 flame velocity of this cellulose/air mixture. A laminar flame velocity of 21.5 cm.s^{-1} is obtained for


391 the cellulose, which is in good agreement with the laminar burning velocity of nanocellulose

392 determined by Santandrea et al. (2020), i.e. 21 cm.s^{-1} . Further tests should be performed to cover a

393 wide range of conditions and the choice of a linear or non-linear regression to determine the

394 intercept, and thus the laminar flame velocity, should be debated (Halter et al., 2010).

395



396

397 Figure 10. *Flame velocity versus stretching factor for a cellulose explosion. Ignition energy : 1 J,*


398 *ignition delay time t_v : 180 ms, mass of powder : 1 g, $d_{50} = 53 \mu m$*

399

400 3.4 Explosion severity of organic powders

401 As notably shown by Figure 1, the final objective of proposing a simplified mechanism for the
 402 combustion of organic dusts is to model the explosion severity, especially the safety parameters
 403 usually determined under standard conditions in a 20L vessel. Preliminary tests were carried out to
 404 assess the maximum explosion pressure and maximum rate of pressure rise of cellulose (Figure 11).
 405 By considering the average values of three tests series, P_{max} reaches 6.8 bar, whereas $(dP/dt)_{max}$ is
 406 287 bar.s^{-1} , which corresponds to a deflagration index K_{St} of 78 bar.m.s^{-1} . This latter parameter is
 407 consistent with the literature data for cellulose powder with a mean diameter ranging from 30 to
 408 $51 \mu m$ (BGIA, 1997) and with the value obtained for microcrystalline cellulose ($d_{50} = 108 \mu m$), i.e.
 409 86 bar.m.s^{-1} (Santandrea et al., 2020). However, if P_{max} is slightly lower than the literature values
 410 for similar diameters, the whole PSD has to be considered (Figure 2) and additional tests should be
 411 performed between 500 and 1000 g.m^{-3} . This variation notably stresses the importance of taking
 412 into account all the operating parameters in order to determine safety parameters. Indeed, it seems

413 possible to optimize the test procedures (turbulence/ignition delay time-injection pressure, fuel
414 equivalence ratio, ignition energy...) as a function of the powders characteristics.



415
416

417 *Fig. 11. Explosion severity of cellulose ($d_{50} = 53 \mu\text{m}$) determined with various series of experiments*
418 *(the dotted line corresponds to an average trend).*

419

420 4. Conclusions

421 During the explosion of organic powders, the particles undergo a pyrolysis process, emitting
422 pyrolysis gases in quantities varying with the temperature. When mixed with oxygen, the oxidation
423 reaction leads to heat generation and a flame propagation. Adapted to reactive systems with low
424 Damköhler numbers, a semi-global mechanism has been developed to represent the pyrolysis of
425 organic dust clouds. The model elaborated seems adequate to estimate the concentration of the
426 different species considered, especially the permanent gases. Moreover, the molecule representing
427 tar -i.e. acetaldehyde- has proven to be a satisfactory surrogate for modelling the cellulose
428 pyrolysis. This model will be refined by better taking into account the 'char' generation, the
429 influence of water and by studying the impact of the particle size distribution.

430 A second model, based on the oxidation reactions of tar and gases generated during the pyrolysis
431 phase, has been proposed to represent reactive systems limited by the oxidation phase, i.e. for
432 powders with small diameters. Although the first results are encouraging, the influence of the
433 oxygen concentration or fuel equivalence ratio need to be further considered.

434 This study illustrates the predominance of particle structure over chemical formula and
435 demonstrates that predictive dust explosion models must be adapted to the powder (and not only
436 monomer) specificities. Once validated for starch, cellulose and mixtures of both products, the
437 reaction mechanisms will be integrated in another existing model (Torrado et al, 2018) to estimate
438 the laminar flame velocity of organic powders and, in a second time, to predict their maximum rate
439 of pressure rise in a 20L sphere.

440

441 **References**

- 442 Azam, S., Mishra D. P. (2019). Effects of particle size, dust concentration and dust-dispersion-
443 airpressure on rock dust inertant requirement for coal dust explosion suppression in
444 underground coal mines, *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, 126: 35-43.
445 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2019.03.030>
- 446 Bartknecht, W. (1989). *Dust-explosions: Course, Prevention, Protection*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- 447 BGIA (1997). *Combustion and explosion characteristics of dusts*. BIA-Report 13/97 and Gestis
448 Database, HVBG, Sankt Augustin, Germany.
- 449 Bu, Y., Yuan, Y., Xue, S., Amyotte, P., Li, C., Yuan, W., Ma, Z., Yuan, C., Li, G. (2020). Effect of
450 admixed silica on dispersibility of combustible dust clouds in a Godbert-Greenwald furnace,
451 *Powder Technol.* 374: 496-506. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2020.07.071>
- 452 Chan, W.C.R., Kelbon, M. & Krieger, B.B. (1985). Modelling and experimental verification of
453 physical and chemical processes during pyrolysis of a large biomass particle, *Fuel*, 64(11):1505–
454 1513. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-2361\(85\)90364-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-2361(85)90364-3)
- 455 Clavin, P. (1985). Dynamic behavior of premixed flame fronts in laminar and turbulent flows. *Prog.*
456 *Energy Combust. Sci.*, 11: 1–59. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0360-1285\(85\)90012-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0360-1285(85)90012-7)

457 Commandre, J.M., Lahmidi, H., Salvador, S. & Dupassieux, N. (2011). Pyrolysis of wood at high
458 temperature: The influence of experimental parameters on gaseous products. *Fuel Process.*
459 *Technol.*, 92(5):837 - 844. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuproc.2010.07.009>

460 Cuervo, N. (2015). Influences of turbulence and combustion regimes on explosions of gas-dust
461 hybrid mixtures (PhD Thesis). The University of Lorraine, France (in English).

462 Cuervo, N., Dufaud, O. & Perrin, L. (2017). Determination of the burning velocity of gas/dust
463 hybrid mixtures. *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, 109: 704–715.
464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2017.06.009>

465 Di Benedetto, A., Russo, P., Amyotte, A., Marchand, N. (2010). Modelling the effect of particle
466 size on dust explosions. *Chem. En. Sci.*, 65:772–779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2009.09.029>

467 Di Blasi, C. & Branca, C. (2001). Kinetics of primary product formation from wood pyrolysis. *Ind.*
468 *Eng. Chem.*, 40(23): 5547–5556. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie000997e>

469 Dufaud, O., Poupeau, M., Khalili, I., Cuervo, N., Christodoulou, M., Olcese, R., Dufour, A. &
470 Perrin, L. (2012a). Comparing pyrolysis gases and dusts explosivities: a clue to understanding
471 hybrid mixtures explosions? *Ind. Eng. Chem.*, 51(22): 7656–7662.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie201646s>

473 Dufaud, O., Khalili, I., Cuervo, N., Olcese, R., Dufour, A., Perrin, L. & Laurent, A. (2012b).
474 Highlighting the importance of the pyrolysis step on dusts explosions, *Chem. Eng. Trans.*,
475 2012062, 369–374. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3303/CET1226062>

476 Eckhoff, R. K. (2019). Origin and development of the Godbert-Greenwald furnace for measuring
477 minimum ignition temperatures of dust clouds, *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, 129: 17-24.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2019.06.012>

479 EN 14034-1, 2004. Determination of explosion characteristics of dust clouds — Part 1:
480 Determination of the maximum explosion pressure P_{max} of dust clouds.

481 EN 14034-2, 2006. Determination of explosion characteristics of dust clouds — Part 2:
482 Determination of the maximum rate of explosion pressure rise $(dp/dt)_{max}$ of dust clouds.

483 Font, R., Marcilla, A., Verdu, E. & Devesa, J. (1990). Kinetics of the pyrolysis of almond shells and
484 almond shells impregnated with cobalt dichloride in a fluidized bed reactor and in a pyroprobe
485 100. *Ind. Eng. Chem.*, 29(9): 1846–1855. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie00105a016>

486 Fumagalli, A., Derudi, M., Rota, R., Snoeys, J., Copelli, S. (2018). A kinetic free mathematical
487 model for the prediction of the K_{St} reduction with the particle size increase, *J. Loss Prev.*
488 *Process Ind.*, 52: 93-98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2018.02.002>

489 Halter, F., Tahtouh, T., Mounaïm-Rousselle, C., 2010. Nonlinear effects of stretch on the flame
490 front propagation. *Combust. Flame* 157, 1825–1832. [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.combustflame.2010.05.013)
491 [10.1016/j.combustflame.2010.05.013](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.combustflame.2010.05.013).

492 ISO/IEC 80079-20-2, 2016. Explosive atmospheres — Part 20-2: Material characteristics —
493 Combustible dusts test methods.

494 Liu, A., Chen, J., Huang, X., Lin, J., Zhang, X., Xu, W. (2019). Explosion parameters and
495 combustion kinetics of biomass dust, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 294: 122168.
496 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2019.122168>

497 Markstein, G.H., (1964). *Non-Steady Flame Propagation*. Pergamon, New York.

498 Nowakowska, M., Herbinet, O., Dufour, A. & Glaude, P.A. (2018). Kinetic study of the pyrolysis
499 and oxidation of guaiacol. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 122 (39): 7894-7909.
500 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpca.8b06301>

501 Ranzi, E., Debiagi, P.E.A. & Frassoldati, A. (2017). Mathematical modeling of fast biomass
502 pyrolysis and bio-oil formation. Note I: kinetic mechanism of biomass pyrolysis. *ACS Sustain.*
503 *Chem. Eng.*, 5(4): 2867–2881. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.6b03096>

504 Rathnayaka, S., Khan, F. & Amyotte, P. (2014). Risk-based process plant design considering
505 inherent safety. *Saf. Sci.*, 70:438-464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2014.06.004>

506 Santandrea, A., Gavard, M., Pacault, S., Vignes, A., Perrin, L. & Dufaud, O. (2020). ‘Knock on
507 nanocellulose’: Approaching the laminar burning velocity of powder-air flames. *Process Saf.*
508 *Environ. Prot.*, 134: 247–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2019.12.018>

509 Scotton, M. S., Barozzi, M., Derudi, M., Rota, R., Copelli, S. (2020). Kinetic free mathematical
510 model for the prediction of K_{St} values for organic dusts with arbitrary particle size distribution,
511 *J. Loss Prev. Process Ind.*, 67: 104218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2020.104218>

512 Tan, X., Schmidt, M., Zhao, P., Wei, A., Huang, W., Qian, X., Wu, D. (2020). Minimum ignition
513 temperature of carbonaceous dust clouds in air with $CH_4/H_2/CO$ below the gas lower explosion
514 limit, *Fuel*, 264: 116811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2019.116811>

515 Torrado, D., Pinilla, A., Amin, M., Murillo, C., Munoz, F., Glaude, P.-A. & Dufaud, O. (2018).
516 Numerical study of the influence of particle reaction and radiative heat transfer on the flame
517 velocity of gas/nanoparticles hybrid mixtures. *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, 118: 211-226.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2018.06.042>

519 Wagenaar, B. M., Prins, W. & van Swaaij W.P.M. (1993). Flash pyrolysis kinetics of pine wood.
520 *Fuel Process. Technol.*, Third international Rolduc symposium on coal science and technology
521 and related processes, 36(1): 291– 298. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3820\(93\)90039-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3820(93)90039-7)

522 Zhang, G., Zhang, Y., Huang, X., Gao, W., Zhang, X. (2020). Effect of pyrolysis and oxidation
523 characteristics on lauric acid and stearic acid dust explosion hazards, *J. Loss Prev. Process Ind.*,
524 63: 104039. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2019.104039>.