

Addressing fuel recycling in solid oxide fuel cell systems fed by alternative fuels

Rokni, Masoud

Published in: Energy

Link to article, DOI: 10.1016/j.energy.2017.03.082

Publication date: 2017

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Link back to DTU Orbit

Citation (APA): Rokni, M. (2017). Addressing fuel recycling in solid oxide fuel cell systems fed by alternative fuels. *Energy*, *137*, 1013-1025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.03.082

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- · You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Addressing Fuel Recycling in Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Systems Fed by Alternative Fuels

M. Rokni Department of Mechanical Engineering Institution of Thermal Energy Systems, Copenhagen, Denmark e–mail: MR@mek.dtu.dk

7 8 9

3 4

5

6

10 ABSTRACT

11 An innovative study on anode recirculation in solid oxide fuel cell systems with alternative 12 fuels is carried out and investigated. Alternative fuels under study are ammonia, pure 13 hydrogen, methanol, ethanol, DME and biogas from biomass gasification. It is shown that the 14 amount of anode off-fuel recirculation depends strongly on type of the fuel used in the 15 system. Anode recycling combined with fuel cell utilization factors have an important impact 16 on plant efficiency, which will be analysed here. The current study may provide an in-depth understanding of reasons for using anode off-fuel recycling and its effect on plant efficiency. 17 18 For example, it is founded that anode recirculation is not needed when the plant is fed by 19 ammonia. Further, it is founded that when the system is fed by pure hydrogen then anode 20 recirculation should be about 20% of the off-fuel if fuel cell utilization factor is 80%. 21 Furthermore, it is founded that for the case with methanol, ethanol and DME then at high utilization factors, low anode recirculation is recommended while at low utilization factors, 22 23 high anode recirculation is recommended. If the plant is fed by biogas from biomass 24 gasification then for each utilization factor, there exist an optimum anode recirculation at 25 which plant efficiency maximizes.

26 Keywords

27 SOFC, fuel cell, alternative fuels, anode recirculation, methanol, ethanol, ammonia, biogas.

28 1. INTRODUCTION

With an ever increasing demand for more efficient power production and distribution, some main research and development for the electricity production is identified as efficiency enchantments and pollutant reduction, especially carbon dioxide among others. Alternative fuels have also been recognized as potential element in decreasing emissions locally such final at end users.

34 Solid Oxide Fuel Cells (SOFCs) are recognized as one of the most promising types of fuel cells, particularly in terms of energy production. Besides pure hydrogen they can be fed 35 36 variety of fuels such as Natural Gas (NG), ethanol, Di Methyl Ether (DME), methanol and 37 syngas from gasification of biomass or municipal waste. They are expected to produce clean 38 electrical energy at high conversion rates with low noise and low pollutant emissions [1]. 39 They can tolerate sulphur compounds at concentrations higher than those tolerated by other 40 types of fuel cells. Additionally, unlike in most fuel cells, carbon monoxide can be used as a fuel in SOFCs. Due to the above-mentioned advantages, SOFCs are considered to be a strong 41 candidate for either hybrid systems or integration into currently deployed technologies. 42 43 Therefore, SOFC plants have been the subject of many studies since the beginning of 90s. For

example [2] showed that electrical efficacy of a hybrid plant consisting SOFC, gas turbine
and steam turbine may reach about 70% which is encouraging to further investigate on such
plants.

47 Numerous studies on SOFC based systems have been considered in the literature among 48 them SOFC-gas turbines hybrid systems have extensively studied, for example the study of 49 [3] shows that plant efficiency reaches about 60% at full lad while its part-load (until 50%) efficiencies are also above 50%. In the study of [4], the net efficiency of a SOFC plant was 50 51 calculated to be about 28–29 % when it is fed by biogas from biomass gasification. A study 52 on biogas (assumed to be available in the gas grid without providing the source) fuelled SOFC micro-CPH in [5] showed that an overall CHP efficiency of about 80% is achievable 53 54 for single-family detached dwellings. In another study carried out in [6], it was concluded that a SOFC plant fed by biogas from organic wastes may reaches electrical efficiencies of about 55 34% at approximately 55% utilization factor. Biogas from wastewater treatment facilities was 56 57 used in the study of [7] to estimate electrical efficiency of a SOFC plant. The study showed 58 that plant efficiency would be about 41% if the utilization factor was selected to be 65%. A 59 study on syngas from municipal waste gasification carried out in [8] showed that plant 60 efficiency of such integrated gasification-SOFC plant approaches about 43% with utilization factor of about 80%. These are some examples of many that have been explored by 61 62 researchers for utilization of waste to energy in sustainable modern societies.

63 SOFC fed by different fuels have also studied by many researchers. In the study of [9], the net efficiency of a 2 kWel SOFC plant was calculated to be about 55% when the fuel was 64 methanol. If DME was used as fuel, then the study of [10] showed that the plant efficiency 65 66 will be about 50%. The study of [11] showed that plant net efficiency of about 53% is 67 achievable when the fuel of SOFC was bioethanol. In [12] an ammonia fed SOFC integrating 68 with gas turbine was studied and the results shown efficiencies close to 56%. Comparison performance of SOFC plants fed by alternative fuels have also been studied in [13] in which a 69 70 single general modelling approach was used for the investigation. This single modelling 71 approach with the same simulating code was also evaluated to ensure accuracy of the 72 modelling and methodology used in the present study as documented in [13].

73 Despite extensive studies on SOFC based power plants, investigations on anode recycle 74 SOFC systems fed by NG is comparably limited. Anode off-fuel recycling (anode gas 75 recycle) is essential in SOFC systems fed by NG in order to provide steam for the steam 76 reforming reactions in a pre-reformer prior to the SOFC cells. Exclusively all studies on anode recycling are about carbon formation and carbon deposition in the pre-reformer of a 77 78 natural gas (NG) feed SOFC stack. Most of these studies are on stack level and do not on 79 investigate the effect of anode recycling on system level and plant performances. For 80 example, the experimental studies of [14] showed that the limit for O/C ratio (oxygen-carbon ratio) to avoid carbon formation depends on the purity of gas. Their study showed that the 81 82 limit of O/C ratio for carbon formation for nickel catalyst was between 0.9 and 1.0 for 83 Russian natural gas and between 1.0 and 1.25 for Danish natural gas. If precious metal 84 catalyst used, then the limit was between 0.5–0.75 irrespectively of natural gas composition. The effects of SOFC anode recycle on catalytic diesel reforming and carbon formation was 85 also studied in [15] experimentally. This study showed that anode recycle is more effective 86 87 than reformer recycle when it comes to carbon formation in the reformer (off-fuel from 88 SOFC, not reformate gas out of reformer). Steam recycling for internal methane (and/or 89 natural gas) reforming in SOFCs to analyse the carbon deposition using computational fluid 90 dynamic was used in [16]. This study showed also that anode recycling is need to decreases 91 carbon formation when fuel is methane or natural gas. Electric power generation of 380W 92 SOFC stack fed by methane with and without and anode recycle was demonstrated in [17]. 93 Their study showed that anode recycle increases stack efficiency by about 10% when anode

94 recycle is used. It was reported in [18] that cell voltage could be improved by anode off-fuel 95 recycle in solid oxide fuel cell fed by pure methane. The study was on a cell level (not system 96 level) with distinguished conclusion. The study of [19] showed that anode recycling enables 97 the operation of a SOFC stack at low fuel utilizations without sacrificing the electrical 98 efficiency of the stack. The maximum electrical efficiency of 57% was reached at 60% fuel 99 utilization when the fraction of recycled fuel was 66%. If no anode gas recycling was applied 100 then the maximum electrical efficiency was about 53% with about 77.5 % fuel utilization.

101 Despite many studies on anode recycling and carbon formation, studies on anode off-fuel 102 recycling on plant efficiency are very limited and exclusively all are about natural gas (and/or 103 methane) fed fuel. No study on of-fuel recycling with alternative fuels is found in the open 104 literature, which makes the basis of the current study. The effect of anode recycling on plant 105 efficiency using different types of fuels is investigated here which is completely novel and has 106 not been studies elsewhere. A single study with similar conditions and prerequisites will thus 107 reveal the importance of off-fuel recirculation on plant performance when the fuel is an 108 alternative fuel. The findings in the current study may help SOFC system developer on 109 boosting their plant efficiencies when alternative fuels are used. All foundlings are new and 110 have not been reported elsewhere.

111 2. PLANT LAYOUT AND MODELLING METHODOLOGY

112 Figure 1 displays a typical SOFC plant with natural gas and/or methane as fuel. A similar 113 layout can also be seen in e.g. [1], [5] and [20]. Air is compressed and preheated in a cathode 114 preheater (CP) before entering the cathode side of the fuel cell. Natural gas (and/or pure 115 methane) is firstly reformed and then preheated in an anode preheater (AP) before entering the 116 anode side of the fuel cell. Depending on the utilization factor, a portion of the feed fuel will 117 leave the anode side without reacting inside the fuel cells. The remaining fuel (off-fuel) and air 118 (off-air) is then sent to a burner for further combustion. The off-gases after the burner is used to 119 preheat both incoming air and fuel into the fuel cell. In order to provide steam for the reformer 120 some of the off-fuel is recycled which calls for anode recirculation (or off-fuel recirculation). 121 Even though the main purpose of the off-fuel recirculation is to provide steam for the steam 122 reforming but it will also improve stack efficiency since more fuel is reacted inside the cells and 123 therefore more power will be generated (see e.g. [19]). On the other hand, since no external 124 steam is provided to the steam reformer (during normal operation) then it will be important that 125 steam-carbon-ratio (S/C-ratio) is approximately above 1.8 to avoid carbon deposition, which 126 has a significant effect on the reformer performance and lifetime, see e.g. [5]. However, most of 127 the researchers assumes the value of 2 to be on the safe side, such as in [5], [6], [21] and [22]. 128 Note that it is generally believed that carbon deposition can be determined by S/C ratio but the 129 experimental study of e.g. [23] shows that not only S/C but also the extent of equilibrium in the 130 gas mixtures should be taken into account to control the carbon deposition (O/C ratio). 131 However, as shown in the study of [24] carbon deposition is not an issue in SOFC fed by wood 132 gas from biomass gasification.

- 133 134
- 135

Figure 1. General fuel cell plant with anode off-fuel recirculation. CP: Cathode Preheater, AP: 136 Anode Preheater. 137

138 However, when changing the fuel into alternative fuels such as ammonia, pure hydrogen, 139 methanol and ethanol then there is no problem on limiting the S/C (or O/C) ratio if a pre-140 reformer is used (see e.g. the C-H-O ternary diagram in [5]). If biogas (from biomass 141 gasification) is used, then there will be enough steam in the gas and such problem does neither 142 exist, as discussed in [24]. For such alternative fuels the question will be if off-fuel recirculation

is needed or not and if it is needed then how it will effect on plant performance. This is the basisof the present study, which is entirely new and not been studied elsewhere.

145 In this study, the thermodynamic results are obtained using the Dynamic Network Analysis 146 (DNA) simulation tool (see, e.g., [25]), established at DTU since 1983. The program has 147 continuously been developed to be generally applicable for different energy systems. It 148 includes a component library, thermodynamic state models for fluids and standard numerical 149 solvers for differential and algebraic equation systems. The component library contents 150 models for heat exchangers, burners, turbo machinery, decanters, energy storages, valves and 151 controllers, among many others. Figure 2 illustrates the calculation procedure used in the 152 program.

- 153
- 154 155

Figure 2. Calculation procedure.

156 DNA is a component-based simulation tool, meaning that the model is formulated by 157 connecting components together with nodes and adding operating conditions to create a 158 system. The equations include mass and energy conservation for all components and nodes 159 together with the relations for the thermodynamic properties of the fluids in the system. The 160 total mass balance and energy balance for the entire system is also included to account for 161 heat loss and heat exchange between different components. The program is written in 162 FORTRAN, and users can implement additional components and thermodynamic state 163 models to the libraries as well.

- 164 The main assumption within the calculations are
- 165 No heat losses to the surroundings
- 166 No resistance in the electrodes
- 167 Constant utilization factor within all cells
- 168 Constant current density for all cells
- 169 Each cell is treated as a single point (eat and fluid flow is not calculated).

170 In reality, there exists some heat losses to the surrounding even though the stacks are well 171 insulted. However, heat losses after insulation are very small and therefore negligible, although 172 they can be accounted in the simulation. Resistance through the electrodes depends on the 173 selection of material and one can select the material for the electrodes so that their resistance is 174 very small and minor. Utilization may slightly varies from cell to cell, sometimes higher and 175 sometimes lower, and therefore the assumption of constant utilization factor may be eligible. 176 The same is true for the current density. The main limit of the modelling here is that the flow 177 dynamic in the cells is not accounted, since the focus is on the plant level with all components. 178 However, such technique is widely applicable/used for programs dealing with system level 179 rather than component level.

180 3. MODELLING

181 **3.1 Modelling of SOFC**

The SOFC model proposed in a previous study [26],[27] is adopted in this investigation and has been validated with experimental data on planar SOFCs. In the development of such models, one must distinguish between electrochemical modelling (to obtain cell voltage and cell efficiency), calculation of cell and stack power (via number of stacks and their connections) and finally the species compositions at the cell outlet. Each of these is explained below in details.

187 **3.1.1 Electrochemical Modelling**

First, one needs to calculate the cell voltage of SOFC, which can theoretically be expressed by Nernst equation. However, in reality there exist losses, which decreases the theoretical cell

190 voltage. These losses are mainly activation loss (cell voltage decreases as soon as current starts 191 drawn from the cell), ohmic loss (cell voltage decreases when current is increased; linear 192 dependency) and concentration loss (the current is so high that further increase in current causes 193 drop in cell voltage significantly). These losses must be calculated in detail, which are 194 expressed below. The SOFC model proposed in a previous study [26],[27] is adopted in this 195 investigation. For electrochemical modelling, the operational voltage (E_{cell}) is represented by 196 equation 1.

197

$$E_{cell} = E_{Nernst} - \Delta E_{act} - \Delta E_{ohm} - \Delta E_{conc}$$
(1)

199

where E_{Nernst} , ΔE_{act} , ΔE_{ohm} , and ΔE_{conc} are the Nernst ideal reversible voltage, activation polarization, ohmic polarization, and concentration polarization, respectively. Assuming that only H₂ is electrochemically converted the Nernst equation can be written as shown in equations 2 and 3.

204
$$E_{Nernst} = \frac{-\Delta g_{f}^{0}}{n_{e}F} + \frac{RT}{n_{e}F} \ln \left(\frac{P_{H_{2},tot}\sqrt{P_{O_{2}}}}{p_{H_{2}O}}\right)$$
(2)

205
$$p_{\rm H2,tot} = p_{\rm H2} + p_{\rm CO} + 4p_{\rm CH4}$$
 (3)

where Δg_f^{0} is the Gibbs free energy (for H₂ reaction) at standard temperature and pressure. The water-gas shift reaction is very fast and therefore the assumption that H₂ is the only species to be electrochemically converted is justified [28], [29]. In the above equations, p_{H2} and p_{H20} are the partial pressures for H₂ and H₂O, respectively. It should be noted that the steam reforming and the associated water gas shift reactions are efficiently modelled in the calculations.

The activation polarization can be evaluated using the Butler–Volmer equation [30]. The activation polarization term is isolated from the other polarization terms, to determine the charge transfer coefficients and the exchange current density from the experiments by the curve fitting technique. The activation polarization is expressed by equation 4.

216
$$\Delta E_{act} = \frac{RT}{(0.001698T - 1.254)F} \sinh^{-1} \left[\frac{i_d}{2(13.087T - 1.096 \times 10^4)} \right], \tag{4}$$

217

where R, T, F, and i_d are the universal gas constant, operating temperature, Faraday constant, and current density, respectively.

The ohmic polarization [31] depends on the electrical conductivity of the electrodes as well as the ionic conductivity of the electrolyte. This is also validated with experimental data for a cell with a specified anode thickness (t_{an}), electrolyte thickness (t_{el}), and cathode thickness (t_{ca}). The ohmic polarization is given as follows.

224
$$\Delta E_{ohm} = \left(\frac{t_{an}}{\sigma_{an}} + \frac{t_{el}}{\sigma_{el}} + \frac{t_{ca}}{\sigma_{ca}}\right) i_d, \qquad (5)$$

225

where $t_{an} = 600 \ \mu\text{m}$, $t_{el} = 50 \ \mu\text{m}$, and $t_{ca} = 10 \ \mu\text{m}$. σ_{an} , σ_{el} , and σ_{ca} are the conductivities of the anode, electrolyte, and cathode, respectively, and may be expressed as follows.

228
$$\sigma_{an} = 10^5, \quad \sigma_{ca} = \frac{5.760 \times 10^7}{T} \exp\left(-\frac{0.117}{8.617 \times 10^{-5}T}\right)$$
 (6)

229
$$\sigma_{el} = 8.588 \times 10^{-8} T^3 - 1.101 \times 10^{-4} T^2 + 0.04679 T - 6.54$$
 (7)

The concentration polarization is dominant at high current densities for anode-supported SOFCs, wherein insufficient amounts of reactants are transported to the electrodes and consequently, the voltage is reduced significantly. As in the previous case, the concentration polarization was validated with experimental data by introducing the anode limiting current, [32], in which the anode porosity and tortuosity were considered among other parameters. The concentration polarization is modelled as shown in equation 8.

237
$$\Delta E_{conc} = B \left(\ln \left(1 + \frac{p_{H2} i_d}{p_{H20} i_{as}} \right) - \ln \left(1 - \frac{i_d}{i_{as}} \right) \right), \tag{8}$$

238

239 where *B* is the diffusion coefficient, which is determined using a calibration technique as

240
$$\mathbf{B} = \left(0.008039 \mathbf{X}_{H2}^{-1} - 0.007272\right) \frac{T}{T_{ref}}$$
(9)

241 T_{ref} is the reference temperature (1023 K), and the anode limiting current is defined as 242

243
$$i_{as} = \frac{2F p_{H2} D_{bin} V_{an}}{R T t_{an} \tau_{an}},$$
(10)

244

where V_{an} and τ_{an} are the porosity (30%) and tortuosity (2.5 µm) of the anode, respectively. The binary diffusion coefficient is given by

247
$$D_{bin} = \left(-4.107 \times 10^{-5} X_{H2} + 8.704 \times 10^{-5}\right) \left(\frac{T}{T_{ref}}\right)^{1.75} \frac{p_{ref}}{p},$$
(11)

248

which is also calibrated against the experimental data. p_{ref} is the reference pressure (1.013 bar), and X_{H2} is the mass reaction rate of H₂. Lastly, the current density i_d is directly proportional to the amount of reacting H₂ according to Faraday's law (equation 12).

252
$$i_d = \frac{n_{H2} \, 2F}{A},$$
 (12)

where n_{H2} is the molar reaction rate of H₂. The area A is a physical property of the cell and was 144 cm² in this study.

The SOFC model in this study aims at representing the performance of the second generation SOFC stacks developed by Topsoe Fuel Cell A/S (TOFC) and the Fuel Cells and Solid State Chemistry Division at Ris ϕ – DTU (Technical University of Denmark). This SOFC type is anode supported, with a Ni/YSZ¹ anode, a YSZ electrolyte, and an LSM²/YSZ cathode [33].

259 **3.1.2 Stack Power and Related Calculations**

260 Once the cell voltage is calculated then the stack power the power production from the 261 SOFCs (*P*_{SOFC}) can be decided using the equation (13). As shown, it depends on the amount of 262 chemical energy fed to the anode, the reversible efficiency (η_{rev}), the voltage efficiency (η_v), 263 and the fuel utilization factor (U_F). It is defined in the mathematical form as.

264 265

$$P_{SOFC} = \left(\text{LHV}_{H_2} \dot{n}_{H_2,in} + \text{LHV}_{CO} \dot{n}_{CO,in} + \text{LHV}_{CH_4} \dot{n}_{CH_4,in} \right) \eta_{rev} \eta_v U_F$$
(13)

266

267 where U_F is a constant and η_v is defined as follows.

¹ Yttria-stabilized zirconia.

² Lanthanum strontium manganite.

268
$$\eta_{\rm v} = \frac{\Delta E_{\rm cell}}{E_{Nernst}}.$$
 (14)

269

Note that the utilization factor in SOFCs can be defined as the amount of O_2 consumed, because O_2 ions are the carriers. The reversible efficiency is the maximum possible efficiency, which is defined as the relationship between the maximum electrical energy available (change in Gibbs free energy) and the LHV (lower heating value) of the fuels, as shown below [34].

274
$$\eta_{rev} = \frac{\left(\Delta \overline{g}_{f}\right)_{fuel}}{\text{LHV}_{fuel}}$$

$$\left(\Delta \overline{g}_{f}\right)_{fuel} = \left|\left(\overline{g}_{f}\right)_{H,0} - \left(\overline{g}_{f}\right)_{H,0} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\overline{g}_{f}\right)_{O}\right| y_{H_{2},in}$$
(15)

275

279

$$\begin{aligned} g_{f} f_{fuel} &= \left[\left(g_{f} \right)_{H_{2O}} - \left(g_{f} \right)_{H_{2}} - \frac{1}{2} \left(g_{f} \right)_{O_{2}} \right] y_{H_{2},in} \\ &+ \left[\left(\overline{g}_{f} \right)_{CO_{2}} - \left(\overline{g}_{f} \right)_{CO} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\overline{g}_{f} \right)_{O_{2}} \right] y_{CO,in} \\ &+ \left[\left(\overline{g}_{f} \right)_{CO_{2}} + 2 \left(\overline{g}_{f} \right)_{H_{2O}} - \left(\overline{g}_{f} \right)_{CH_{4}} - 2 \left(\overline{g}_{f} \right)_{O_{2}} \right] y_{CH_{4},in} \end{aligned}$$

(16)

where $\Delta \overline{g}$ is the average Gibbs free energy from the inlet to the outlet and y is the mole fraction. The partial pressures are assumed to be the average pressures between the inlet and the outlet.

$$\overline{p}_{j} = \left(\frac{y_{j,\text{out}} + y_{j,\text{in}}}{2}\right) \overline{p} \qquad j = \{H_{2}, \text{CO}, \text{CH}_{4}, \text{CO}_{2}, H_{2}\text{O}, N_{2}\}$$

$$\overline{p}_{\text{O}_{2}} = \left(\frac{y_{\text{O}_{2},\text{out}} + y_{\text{O}_{2},\text{in}}}{2}\right) \overline{p}_{c} \qquad (17)$$

280 **3.1.3 Fuel Composition**

281 Finally, one needs to calculate the fuel composition at outlet of the cells. The compositions at 282 outlets is calculated using the Gibbs minimization method [35]. First the unreacted fuels at 283 outlet is decided by fuel cell utilization factor, then equilibrium at the anode outlet temperature 284 and pressure is assumed for H₂, CO, CO₂, H₂O, CH₄, and N₂. Finally, the Gibbs minimization 285 method is used to calculate the compositions of these species at the outlet by minimizing their 286 Gibbs energy. Gibbs minimization method facilities calculating of the composition without 287 taking into account the chemical reaction paths. The reason is that all the chemical reactions 288 tends to undergo in a way that the Gibbs energy will be minimum, as explained in [35]. Similar 289 calculations can also be carried out for the cathode side.

290 3.1.4 Validation

A comparison between the SOFC model developed here and the experimental data is shown in Fig. 3, in terms of current density and cell voltage (IV curve). As seen from the figure, the model captures the experimental data very well at different fuel compositions with a standard error of less than 0.01 unless for 10% H₂ which was 0.05. Different stack operating temperatures were used when developing the model. However, only the data for 750C is shown here. 97% H₂ with 3% water vapour is shown in Fig. 3. four different cell operating temperatures from 650 °C to 800 °C

298 299

Figure 3. Cell voltage versus current density and a comparison between the modelling results and experimental data at 750 $^{\circ}$ C with different fuel compositions.

300 301

302 **3.1.5 Additional Considerations**

Additionally, equations for conservation of mass (with molar flows), conservation of energy, and conservation of momentum were also included in the model. Table 1 displays the main

305 parameters for the SOFC stacks used in this study. Operating temperature of the fuel cell is 306 based on the experimental data presented in [33]. A temperature difference of 130 °C to 180 °C 307 is applied to avoid thermal stresses in the cells, see e.g. [26]. The assumption of pressure drops 308 is based on a simple calculation for heat exchangers via friction factor and Reynold number 309 (see, e.g. [36]). Number of cells in one stack is assumed so that each stack generates about 1.2 310 kW. The assumption of DC/AC convertor efficiency is somewhat low due to small size of the 311 plant. Note that stack power is set to 10.2 kW which is achieved by varying fuel inlet mass 312 flow. Thus plant can generate about 10 kW net powers after auxiliary power consumption. The 313 sensitivity analysis of these values have already been widely discussed in previous publications, 314 such as in [13], [26] and [37] and therefore there is no need to repeat them here.

- 315 316
- 317

Table 1. The main SOFC parameters used in this study [13], [8].

318 **3.2 Modelling of Methanator**

319 A simple Gibbs reactor, where the total Gibbs free energy is minimized upon reaching 320 chemical equilibrium, is implemented to calculate the gas composition at a specified 321 temperature and pressure without considering the reaction pathways [35]. The Gibbs free 322 energy of a gas (which is assumed to be a mixture of k perfect gases) can be written as 323

324
$$\dot{G} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \dot{n}_i \left[g_i^0 + RT \ln(n_i p) \right]$$
 (18)

325

where g^0 , R, and T are the specific Gibbs free energy, universal gas constant, and gas 326 temperature respectively. Each element in the inlet gas is in balance with the outlet gas 327 328 composition, implying that the flow of each constituent has to be conserved. For N elements, 329 this balance is expressed by equation 19.

330

331
$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \dot{n}_{i,in} \mathbf{A}_{ij} = \sum_{m=1}^{w} \dot{n}_{m,out} \mathbf{A}_{mj} \qquad \text{for } j = 1, N$$
332 (19)

The N elements correspond to H₂, O₂, N₂, CO, NO, CO₂, steam, NH₃, CH₄, C, NO₂, HCN 333 334 (hydrogen cyanide) and Ar, and in the methanation process. A_{mj} is the number of atoms of 335 element j (H, C, O, and N) in each molecule of the entering compound i (H₂, CH₄, CO, CO₂, 336 H_2O , O_2 , N_2 , and Ar), whereas A_{ij} is the number of atoms of element j in each molecule of the 337 leaving compound m (H₂, O₂, N₂, CO, NO, CO₂, steam, NH₃, CH₄, C, NO₂, HCN and Ar). The 338 minimization of the Gibbs free energy can be mathematically formulated by introducing a 339 Lagrange multiplier (μ) for each of the N constraints. After adding the constraints, the 340 expression to be minimized is given by

341

342
$$\phi = \dot{G}_{tot,out} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mu_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \dot{n}_{i,out} A_{ij} - \sum_{m=1}^{w} \dot{n}_{m,in} A_{mj} \right)$$
(20)

343

By setting the partial derivative of this equation with respect to $n_{i,out}$ to zero, the function ϕ 344 345 can be minimized as

347
$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \dot{n}_{i,out}} = \frac{\partial \dot{G}_{tot,out}}{\partial \dot{n}_{i,out}} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mu_j \mathbf{A}_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, k$$
(21a)

348
$$\Rightarrow g_{i,out}^0 + RT \ln(n_{i,out} p_{out}) + \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j \mathbf{A}_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, k$$
(21b)

Thus, a set of k equations are defined for each chemical compound leaving the system. Solving these equations gives the composition leaving the methanator.

351 **3.3 Modelling of Other Components**

The power consumption of the pumps was calculated as in equation 22.

354
$$W_{pump} = \left[\frac{i}{mv_{in}(p_{out} - p_{in})}{\eta}\right]_{pump}$$
(22)

where m, p, v and η are the mass flow, pressure, specific volume (m³/kg) and efficiency of the pump, respectively. The pump efficiency is defined as shown below.

The power consumption of the compressors was modeled based on the definitions of isentropic and mechanical efficiencies (given values) in equations 23 and 24.

359

$$360 \qquad \eta_{is} = \left[\frac{h_{out,Sin} - h_{in}}{h_{out} - h_{in}}\right]_{compressor} \tag{23}$$

(24)

361
$$\eta_m = \left[\frac{\dot{m}(h_{out} - h_{in})}{W}\right]_{compressor}$$

362 where *h* is the enthalpy. h_S is the enthalpy when the entropy is constant. The subscripts *in* and 363 *out* refer to the inlet and outlet of the component.

364 In modeling the heat exchanger, it was assumed that all energy from one side is transferred 365 to the other side by neglecting the heat losses. Depending on the type of heat exchanger used, 366 both the LMTD (logarithmic mean temperature difference) and ϵ -NTU (effectiveness-number 367 of transferred unit) methods were used (see [36]).

368 369

370

Table 2. The main parameters for the accessory components [13], [26].

The desulfurizer unit is a simple model in which the sulfur content is removed. The compositions are re-calculated after sulfur removal. The main parameters for the accessory components are presented in Table 2. The pressure drops for all heat exchangers are assumed to be 0.001 bar at the fuel side and 0.005 bar at the air side. Because the system is designed for low-scale power, the fuel and air mass flows tend to be small, resulting in lower efficiencies of the turbomachines. Therefore, the compressor isentropic efficiency and mechanical efficiency are assumed to be 0.6 and 0.95, respectively.

378 4. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Different alternative fuels will be used in this investigation and the results of plant design as well as anode recirculation (fuel recirculation) will be discussed for each fuel. Fuels under attention are ammonia, pure hydrogen, ethanol, methanol, DME and natural gas. Depending on the fuel the plant design will be altered as discussed below. If needed a methanator is

included into the plant design to enhance plant performance. It shall be noted that the performance of a methanator is different from a pre-reformer and therefore the carbon decomposition will not be sever in as in the case with natural gas. As mentioned above, studies on anode off-fuel recycling on plant efficiency are very limited and which makes the basis of this study. Different types of fuels are used to investigate the effect of anode recycling on plant efficiency, which may provide an in-depth understanding of why anode recycle shall be used and how it effect on plant efficiency.

390 4.1 Ammonia

391 The first fuel to be studied is ammonia for which the plant design is shown in Fig. 4a. Air 392 is preheated in a cathode preheater (CP) before entering the cathode side of the fuel cell. On 393 the other side, fuel is preheated in an anode preheater (AP) prior to the anode side of the fuel 394 cell. The plant efficiency and power are calculated to be about 51.0% and 10.2 kW 395 respectively, with 8 stacks of 74 cells per stack and pressure drops defined above. The fuel 396 after the anode contains mainly of 60% steam, 25% N₂ and 15% H₂ (molar fraction). Some traces of CO, CO₂ and NH₃ can also be found as, 8.84 $\times 10^{-5}$, 4.12 $\times 10^{-4}$ and 1.26 $\times 10^{-3}$ 397 respectively. Since the fuel amount after the anode (off-fuel) is extremely low then having 398 399 anode recycle will not be necessary at all in such system, see Fig. 4b. Any anode off-fuel 400 recycling decreases pant performance as shown in Fig. 4b.

- 401
- 402 403

Figure 4. a) SOFC plant design fed by ammonia and b) effect of recycle ratio.

404 Decreasing SOFC utilization factor allows more fuel to be available in the off-fuel and 405 therefore it might be of interest to investigate if it has any impact on plant performance. Fig. 5 406 shows that regardless of utilization factor, no anode recycling is necessarily.

- 407
- 408 409

Figure 5. Effect SOFC fuel utilization factor on plant efficiency, fed by ammonia.

410 **4.2 Pure Hydrogen**

411 The second fuel to be studied is hydrogen for which the plant design will be the same in 412 Fig. 4. Plant power and efficiency are calculated as 10.0 and 45.5% respectively. The off-fuel 413 after the anode-exit contains mainly of 20% H₂ and 80% steam (again molar basis). Traces of 414 CO, CO₂ and CH₄ can also be found which are very small to be discussed. Since the off-fuel 415 contains of about 20% hydrogen then it would be necessarily to discuss an alternative plant 416 design including anode recirculation as shown in Fig. 6. Fuel is preheated in a two steps heat 417 exchangers; fuel preheater (FP) and anode preheater (AP) and in between these heat 418 exchangers an ejector is placed (see. e.g. [38]). Note that inserting a pump instead of an 419 ejector is very crucial due to high temperature of the off-fuel (780 °C). A pump running on such high temperature must be costume made and thus extremely expensive. 420

- 421
- 422 423

Figure 6. Plant design fed by hydrogen, alternative design.

The recycling ratio of an ejector cannot be regulated and depends entire on the pressure difference between the ejector mail flow (fuel) and secondary flow (off-fuel to be recycled). Neglecting this issue the effect of off-fuel recirculation on plant efficiency is shown in Fig. 7a. As can be seen increasing recycling decreases plant efficiency (LHV) even though it can be found that there exist a certain amount of recycling for which the plant efficiency is maximum (about 12% recycle). Below this value the efficiency does not change significantly. The reason is the interplay between fuel fraction (hydrogen molar fraction into the anode),

fuel mass flow (to keep stack power constant at 10.2 kW) and compressor excess power
 consumption (to keep stack temperature at 780 °C in addition to the oxygen needed).

- 434
- 435 436

Figure 7. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by hydrogen, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.7$.

437 Decreasing the fuel utilization changes the picture completely as demonstrated in Fig. 7b. For 438 the case of $U_f = 0.7$, plant efficiency increases by increasing anode recycle. The reason is that 439 more fuel will be available in the anode off-fuel when utilization factor is decreased resulting in 440 favour for plant efficiency by recycling. Thus the general conclusion is that at high utilization 441 factors (more than about 0.8) increasing anode recycle decreases plant efficiency while at low 442 utilization factors (less than about 0.8) increasing SOFC fuel utilization will in favour for plant 443 efficiency. This is also revealed in Fig. 8.

For example plant efficiency increases significantly sharper for the case with 0.6 utilization factor when anode recycle is applied, while the increase in plant efficiency is less pronounced for the case with 0.7 utilization factor with increasing anode recycle. Foe the case with $U_f = 0.7$ the anode recycle needs to be about 40% to reach same efficiency as the case with $U_f = 0.8$ and 20% off-fuel recycle. The anode recycle must be much more than 50% for the case with $U_f = 0.6$ to reach the same efficiency as in the case with $U_f = 0.8$ and 20% off-fuel recycle.

450 451 452

Figure 8. Effect SOFC fuel utilization factor on plant efficiency, fed by hydrogen.

453 An alternative plant design for pure hydrogen may be designed as shown in Fig. 4a, in which 454 fuel preheater is removed and instead the anode preheater may also work as fuel preheater. Thus, 455 plant design is similar as in the case with pure ammonia. The duty of the anode preheater (or fuel 456 preheater) is increased and some saving in investment cost can be achieved. The disadvantage of 457 such design is that pressure drop along the off-fuel will be higher than the previous case and 458 therefore less pressure drop for the ejector between main flow and secondary flow, which in turn 459 makes the ejector not be able to recycle the off-fuel as efficient as the previous case. On the other 460 hand, in such design, the temperature of the fuel entering the anode side of the fuel cell increases 461 with increasing recycle ratio and at some point fuel temperature will reach to the limit and 462 therefore additional recycling will not be feasible.

Plant performance of such design is presented in Fig. 9. As shown, similar conclusion as the original design can also be drawn here. Plant performance increases with increasing recycle ratio at low utilization factors while at high utilization factor (e.g. $U_f = 0.8$) this is not true. In fact, at $U_f = 0.8$ plant performance remains almost constant although a maxima can be found which is around 12% recirculation.

- 468
- 469

Figure 9. Effect of anode recycle for alternative plant design for hydrogen.

470 **4.3 Methanol, Ethanol and DME**

471 The next fuels to be considered are methanol, ethanol and DME for which the plant design 472 will be the same in Fig. 10. A methanator is included to reform the fuel into methane, 473 hydrogen and carbon monoxide which in turn are considered to be fuel for solid oxide fuels. 474 Then an ejector is placed prior to the methanator to mix the fuel with off-fuel out of the anode 475 side of the fuel cell. Two plant configurations are considered here; one with anode preheater and one without anode preheater. In the case of anode preheater the fuel is preheated to a 476 477 lower temperature such as 280 °C which is well above the minimum temperature (250 °C) for 478 complete reforming of the fuel in the presence of a catalyst (see e.g. [11]). In fact any values 479 between 250 °C and 400 °C can be used without altering the plant performances. Due to

480 endothermic nature of the reforming process the outlet temperature of the methanator will be481 much higher than its inlet.

- 482
- 483 484

Figure 10. Plant design fed by methanol, ethanol and DME.

The reforming process within the methanator need steam which is available after the anode side of the fuel cell, the so called off-fuel. Plant performance depends on how much off-fuel can be recycled through the ejector, which in turn depends on the pressure difference from the main flow to the secondary flow (injection). Both steam and unreacted fuel in the off-fuel can thus be recycled back into the anode side of the fuel cell, see Fig. 10.

490 As mentioned above, steam is needed for operating the methanator and therefore some off-491 fuel shall be recycled. With respect to the plant efficiency, recycling 20% of the anode off-fuel 492 would be suitable when $U_f = 0.8$. With 20% anode recycling then enough steam is available in 493 the fuel for fuel decomposition and water gas shift reaction (in the presence of a catalyst such as 494 copper supported on zinc oxide) which are the essential reactions associated with a methanator. 495 Increasing the recycling ratio decreases plant efficiency and the reason is that for such high 496 utilization factor the amount of steam is much more than the fuel in the off-fuel. Therefore, by 497 increasing the recycling ratio more steam will be recycled which would have negative impact on 498 the plant performance. Cell voltage decreases and current density increases to keep the output 499 power at 10.2 kW, see Fig. 11a through Fig. 13a.

However, for the case with lower utilization factor (for example $U_f = 0.7$) then the situation is changed. Increasing anode recycle increases plant efficiency to a certain point as shown in Fig. 11b though 13b. The reason is that now more fuel will be available in the off-fuel, which would be in favour of cell performance up to a certain amount. Further increase in recycling ratio changes the ratio between the fuel and steam in the off-fuel and therefore it will decrease cell performance. Plant efficiency is maximized when anode recycle is about 43%, 41% and 43% for ethanol, methanol and DME, respectively.

507 As demonstrated, at high utilization factors (about 0.8) anode recycle should be kept as low 508 as possible so that the amount of steam is enough for the methanator while at low utilization 509 factors higher anode recycle is recommended.

510

511

- 512 513
- 513
- 515 516
- Figure 13. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by DME, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.7$.

Figure 11. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by ethanol, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.7$.

Figure 12. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by methanol, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.7$.

517 Again, similar conclusion as in the case with pure hydrogen can be drawn here, low anode 518 recirculation for high utilization factors (about 0.8) and high anode recycle for low utilization 519 factors, see also Fig. 14 for better comparison. Note that anode recycle is essential for fuels with 520 methanator, which is due to available steam in the off-fuel required for methanation process. 521 Thus, approximately 20% of anode recycle for high utilization factors (such as 80%) and about 522 40% anode recycle for low utilization factors (about 70%). Further decrease in utilization, 523 requires higher anode recycling to compensate plant efficiency drop caused by low utilization 524 factors.

525 As it is displayed in Fig.14a, for the case with $U_f = 0.8$, plant efficiency (LHV) decreases as 526 anode recycle is increased, this is more distinct when anode off-fuel recycling is more than about 527 25%. Lowering utilization factor to 0.7, then there is exist an optimum for which plant efficiency 528 maximizes, see Fig. 14b.

530 Figure 14. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by methanol, ethanol and DME, a) $U_f = 0.8$ 531 and b) $U_f = 0.7$

532 4.4 Biogas

533 Biogas investigated in this study has its origin from the biomass gasification considered in 534 [37]. The composition of the biogas (syngas) is assumed to be

538 $CO_2 = 0.1159$,

539 H_2O (steam) = 0.1578,

540 $CH_4 = 0.0102$ and

541 Ar = 0.0034,

542 which is based on the study of [37]. Since the quality of the fuel is substantially lower 543 compared to the other fuels, the number of stacks is increased to 20 to compensate the plant 544 performance, which otherwise this case cannot be studied throughout and in line with other 545 fuels. Plant design is the same as the case for methanol, ethanol and DME, meaning that the 546 fuel side includes a fuel preheater (FP), methanator and anode preheater (AP) while the 547 cathode side includes a cathode preheater (CP) prior to the stack. Both off-fuel and off-air are 548 send to a burner to combust the remaining fuel. Again, the recycle device is placed as far 549 away as from the fuel to allow more pressure drop, which facilitates the use of an ejector.

550 As revealed in Fig. 15a, increasing off-fuel recycling decreases stack voltage and therefore 551 current density must be increased to reach the imposed stack power at 10.2 kW. At such high 552 utilization factor ($U_f = 0.8$) the off-fuel after the anode side of the stack contains mostly of water 553 and recycling the off-fuel results in mostly water recirculation which has a negative impact on 554 the cell voltage. Decreasing utilization factor to $U_f = 0.6$, results in higher amount of fuel 555 available in the off-fuel after the anode side and therefore anode fuel recirculation will be in 556 favour and plant efficiency increases as a consequent, (see Fig. 15c). When utilization factor is 557 0.7 ($U_f = 0.7$), then plant performance does not change significantly (because of composition of 558 the fuel after mixing) and therefore off-fuel recycling would not be necessary (see Fig. 15b).

559

562

560 Figure 15. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by biogas from biomass gasification, a) $U_f =$ 561 $0.8, b) U_f = 0.7$ and c) $U_f = 0.6$.

Again, at high utilization factor fuel recycling is not necessarily while at low utilization it is recommended, which is also demonstrated in Fig. 16. For the case with $U_f = 0.8$ plant efficiency decreases sharply from 36.2% to 29.4% when anode off-fuel recycling is increased from 0 to 20%.

568 Figure 16. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by biogas from biomass gasification, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.6$.

570 571

572

573

574

575

567

If utilization factor is decreased to 0.7, then there would be more fuel available in the off-fuel and therefore plant efficiency increases slightly when anode recycling is increased. Such increase is small, from 37.4% to 37.9% when anode recycling reaches to 20%. Further decrease in utilization factor results in sharper increase in plant performance. For the case with $U_f = 0.6$, plant efficiency increases from 34.3% to 36.1%, as off-fuel recycling is increases from 0 to 20%.

576 As mentioned above, the number of stacks was increased to compensate fuel quality of the 577 biogas and have a throughout comparison with other fuels. However, it is also possible to 578 decrease the number of stacks to 8 as it was the case for the other fuels mentioned above.

579 Consequently, plant performance will decrease from about 36% to about 33% if fuel cell 580 utilization factor is decreased significantly (not more than about 0.6), as seen in Fig. 17. Here 581 again, at high utilization factor (comparably when $U_f = 0.7$), then there is no need for off-fuel 582 recirculation while at lower utilization factors there exist a point for which plant efficiency is 583 maximizes. The optimum recirculation is 65%, 45% and 20% when utilization factor is 0.4, 0.5 584 and 0.6 respectively. Note also that when $U_f = 0.7$ then plant performance decreases suddenly 585 with any fuel recirculation; see the line in the bottom left corner.

Another important point is that the optimum recirculation increases when utilization factor decreases, allowing more off-fuel to be recycled to compensate fuel utilization in the stacks. The sudden decrease in plant performance after the optimum point is that the mixed fuel and off-fuel consists of too much amount of nitrogen and steam (more than 50%), which have negative effect on stack voltage. It should also be mentioned that practically an ejector cannot recycle more than 50% of its incoming fuel (main flow).

592

Figure 17. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by biogas from biomass gasification when number of stacks is 8.

595

596 **5. CONCLUSION**

A new study on anode recirculation in SOFC plants with alternative fuels is presented. Fuels
under study are ammonia, pure hydrogen, methanol, ethanol, DME and biogas from biomass.
Some of the founding are;

600 - No anode recycling is needed when the plant is fed by ammonia.

When the system is fed by pure hydrogen and utilization factor is 80%, then the anode
recirculation should be about 20%. Further, plant fed by pure hydrogen has the lowest plant
efficiency, which is due to endothermic nature of reactions inside the cells and therefore
excessive air is needed to cool down the stacks and keep their temperature at the desired level.

- Anode recycle has a significant effect on plant efficiency when the SOFC plant is fed by
hydrogen, ethanol, methanol and DME. At low SOFC fuel utilization factors, it is desirable to
increase anode recycle to compensate for low utilization factors. However, at high SOFC fuel
utilization factors less anode recycle is needed which otherwise decreases plant efficiency with
increasing anode recycle.

610 - If the plant is fed by biogas from biomass then for each utilization factor, there exist an
611 optimum anode recirculation, which maximizes plant efficiency. For example, the optimum
612 recirculation is 65%, 45% and 20% when utilization factor is 0.4, 0.5 and 0.6 respectively.

- 612 recirculation is 65%, 45% and 20% when utilization factor is 0.4, 0.5 and 0.6 respect
 613 Plant efficiency of about 45% can be achieved if it is fed by pure hydrogen.
- Plant efficiency of about 45% can be achieved if it is led by pure hydrog
- 614 Fed by Methanol and DME, the plant efficiency is about 51%.
- 615 Plant fed by Ethanol has the highest efficiency, which is about 55%.
- 616 Due to low quality fuel of biogas, plant efficiency will not be more than about 33%.
- 617 In addition, plant designs for different fuels than natural gas is presented/analysed such as

ammonia, pure hydrogen, methanol, ethanol and DME and biogass. The simplest plant design is
associated with ammonia while in the plants fed by ethanol, methanol, DME and biogas (from
biomass) a methanator is included to enhance plant performance.

621

622 **6. REFERENCES**

623 1. Calise F, Dentice d'Accadia M, Palombo A, Vanoli L. Simulation and exergy analysis of a
624 hybrid solid oxide fuel cell (SOFC)–Gas turbine system. *Energy* 2006;31:3278–99.

- 625 2. Rokni M, Introduction of a fuel cell into combined cycle: a competitive choice for future
 626 cogeneration, *ASME Cogen Turbo IGTI* 1993; 8: 255–261.
- 627 3. Komatsu Y, Kimijima S and Szmyd JS. Performance analysis for the part-load operation of a
 628 solid oxide fuel cell-micro gas turbine hybrid system. *Energy* 2010; 35: 982–988.
- 4. Jia J, Abudula A, Wei L, Sun B, Shi Y. Thermodynamic modeling of an integrated biomass
 gasification and solid oxide fuel cell system. *Renewable Energy* 2015;81:400–410.
- 5. Farhad S, Hamdullahpur F, Yoo Y. Performance evaluation of different configurations of
 biogas-fuelled SOFC micro-CHP systems for residential applications. *Hydrogen Energy*2010;35:3758–3768.
- 6. Papurello D, Lanzini A, Tognana L, Silvestri S, Santarelli M. Waste to energy: Exploitation
 of biogas from organic waste in a 500 W_{el} solid oxide fuel cell (SOFC) stack. *Energy*2015;85:145–158.
- 637 7. Gandiglio M, Lanzini A, Santarelli M, Leone P. Design and balance-of-plant of a
 638 demonstration plant with a solid oxide fuel cell fed by biogas from waste-water and exhaust
 639 carbon recycling for algae growth. *Fuel Cell Science and Technology* 2014;11:31003.
- 8. Bellomare F, Rokni M. Integration of a municipal solid waste gasification plant with solid
 oxide fuel cell and gas turbine. *Renewable Energy* 2013;55:490–500.
- 642 9. Leone P, Lanzini A, Ortigoza-Villalba GA and Borchiellini R. Operation of a solid oxide fuel
 643 cell under direct internal reforming of liquid fuels. *Chemical Engineering* 2012;191:349-355.
- 644 10.Cocco D and Tola V. Externally reformed solid oxide fuel cell-micro-gas turbine (SOFC645 MGT) hybrid systems fueled by methanol and di-methyl-ether (DME). *Energy* 2009;34:
 646 2124-2130.
- 647 11.Jamsak W, Assabumrungrat S, Douglas PL, Croiset E, Laosiripojana N, Suwanwarangkul R
 648 and Charojrochkul S. Performance. Assessment of Bioethanol-Fed Solid Oxide Fuel Cell
 649 System Integrated with Distillation Column. *ECS Transactions* 2007; 7(1): 1475-1482.
- 12.Baniasadi E and Dincer I. Energy and exergy analyses of a combined ammonia-fed solid
 oxide fuel cell system for vehicular applications. *Hydrogen Energy* 2011; 36: 11128-11136.
- 13.Rokni M. Thermodynamic analysis of SOFC (solid oxide fuel cell) Stirling hybrid plants
 using alternative fuels. *Energy* 2013;61:87–97.
- 14.Kihlman J, Sucipto J, Kaisalo N, Simell P, Lehtonen J. Carbon formation in catalytic steam
 reforming of natural gas with SOFC anode off-gas. *Hydrogen Energy* 2015;40:1548–1558.
- 15.Shekhawat D, Berry DA, Gardner TH, Haynes DJ, Spivey JJ. Effects of fuel cell anode
 recycle on catalytic fuel reforming. *Power Sources* 2007;168:477–483.
- 16.Eveloy V. Anode fuel and steam recycling for internal methane reforming SOFCs: analysis of
 carbon deposition. *Fuel Cell Science and Technology* 2011;8: 0110061–0110068.
- 17.Watanabe K, Yokoo M, Hayashi K, Arai H. Demonstration of principle of electrical power
 generation at high fuel utilization efficiency by an SOFC system with an anode recycle line. *ECS Transactions* 2011;30 (1):151–155.
- 18.Tanaka Y, Momma A, Sato K, Kato T. Improvement of electrical efficiency of solid oxide
 fuel cells by anode gas recycle. *ECS Transactions* 2011;30 (1):145–150.
- 19.Noponen M, Halinen M, Saarinen J, Kiviaho J. Experimental Study of Anode Gas Recycling
 on Efficiency of SOFC. *ECS Transactions* 2007;5(1):545–551.
- Braun RJ, Klein SA, Reindl DT. Evaluation of system configurations for solid oxide fuel
 cell-based micro-combined heat and power generators in residential applications. *Power Sources* 2006;158:1290–1305.
- 670 21. Schluckner C, Subotic V, Lawlor V, Hochenauer C. Carbon Deposition Simulation in Porous
 671 SOFC Anodes: A Detailed Numerical Analysis of Major Carbon Precursors, ASME Fuel Cell
 672 Science and Technology 2015;12:051007:1–12.
- 673 22. Girona K, Laurencin J, Fouletier J, F. Lefebvre-Joud F. Carbon deposition in CH₄/CO₂
 674 operated SOFC: Simulation and experimentation studies. *Power Sources* 2012;210:381–391.

- 23. Yashiro K, Takase M, Sato K, Kawada T. Carbon deposition and electrochemical reaction of
 anode for SOFC in methane containing atmosphere. *ECS Transactions* 2009;16(51):213–218.
- 24.Hofmann PH, Schweiger A, Fryda L, Panopoulos KD, Hohenwarter U, Bentzen JD,
 Ouweltjes JP, Ahrenfeldt J, Henriksen U, Kakaras E High temperature electrolyte supported
 Ni-GDC/YSZ/LSM SOFC operation on two-stage Viking gasifier product gas. *Power Sources* 2007;173:357–366.
- 681 25. Elmegaard B, Houbak N. DNA–a general energy system simulation tool. Proceeding of
 682 SIMS, Trondheim, Norway; 2005.
- 683 26.Rokni M. Thermodynamic investigation of an integrated gasification plant with solid oxide
 684 fuel cell and steam cycles. *Green* 2012;2:71–86.
- 685 27.Rokni M. Thermodynamic analyses of municipal solid waste gasification plant integrated 686 with solid oxide fuel cell and Stirling hybrid system. *Hydrogen Energy* 2015;40:7855–7869.
- 28.Holtappels P, DeHaart LGJ, Stimming U, Vinke IC, Mogensen M. Reaction of CO/CO2 gas
 mixtures on Ni-YSZ cermet electrode. *Applied Electrochemistry* 1999;29:561-68.
- 29.Matsuzaki Y Yasuda I. Electrochemical oxidation of H2 and CO in a H2-H2O-CO-CO2
 system at the interface of a Ni-YSZ cermet electrode and YSZ electrolyte. *Electrochemical Society* 2000;147(5):1630–35.
- 30.Keegan KM, Khaleel M, Chick LA, Recknagle K, Simner SP, Diebler J. Analysis of a planar
 solid oxide fuel cell based automotive auxiliary power unit. *SAE Technical Paper Series*2002;No. 2002-01-0413.
- 31.Zhu H, Kee RJ. A general mathematical model for analyzing the performance of fuel-cell
 membrane-electrode assemblies. *Power Sources* 2003;117:61–74.
- 697 32.Costamagna P, Selimovic A, Del Borghi M, Agnew G. Electrochemical model of the
 698 integrated planar solid oxide fuel cell (IP-SOFC). *Chemical Engineering* 2004;102(1):61–69.
- 33.Christiansen N, Hansen JB, Holm-Larsen H, Linderoth S, Larsen PH, Hendriksen PV, Hagen
 A. Solid oxide fuel cell development at Topsoe fuel cell and Risø. *Electrochemical Society*2007;7(1):31–38.
- 702 34. Winnick J. 1997. *Chemical engineering thermodynamics*. John Wiley & Sons, New Yourk.
- 35.Smith JM, Van Ness HC, Abbott MM. Introduction to Chemical Engineering
 Thermodynamics, 7th edition, Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2005.
- 36.Incropera FP, DeWitt DP, Bergman TL and Lavine AS. *Introduction to Heat Transfer*, 5th
 edition, Wiley 2006, ISBN 978-0471457275.
- 37.Rokni, M. Biomass Gasification Integrated with a Solid Oxide Fuel Cell and Stirling Engine.
 Energy 2014;77:6–18.
- 38.Baba S, Kobayashi N, Takahashi S. Development of anode gas recycle system using ejector
- for 1 kW solid oxide fuel cell. *Engineering for Gas Turbines and Power* 2015;137:021504-1.
- 712

713 Nomenclature

- 714 A Area, m^2
- 715 $\mathbf{A}_{i,j}$ Matrix
- 716 B Diffusion coefficient
- 717 *D*_{bin} Binary diffusion coefficient
- 718 D_{cell} Cell diameter, m
- 719 \vec{E} Exergy flow rate, kW
- 720 E_{FC} Electricity from fuel cell, V
- 721 *E_{Nernst}* Nernst ideal reversible voltage, V
- 722 *F* Faradays constant, C/mol
- 723 g^0 Standard Gibbs free energy, J/mol

724	g f	Gibbs free energy, J/mol
725	h	Enthalpy, J/kg
726	h_{f}	Enthalpy of formation, J/mol
727	Icomp	Purchase cost of component k
728	i_{as}	Anode limiting current, mA/cm ²
729	i_d	Current density, mA/cm ²
730	L_{cell}	Cell length, m
731	\dot{n}_{H2}	Molar reaction rate of H ₂ , mol/s
732	P	Power, W
733	D	Pressure. bar
734	г DH2	Partial pressure for H_2 , bar
735	рн20	Partial pressure for H ₂ O, bar
736	0	Heat. J/s
737	$\tilde{\tilde{T}}$	Operating temperature, K
738	t	Thickness. m
739	R	Universal gas constant, J/mol K
740	U_F	Fuel utilization factor
741	V	Volume, m ³
742	Van	Anode porosity
743	W	Work, W
744	Хн?	Mass reaction rate of H ₂
745	Y	Molar fraction
746		
747	Greek	symbols
748	ΔE_{act}	Activation polarization, V
749	ΔE_{conc}	Concentration polarization, V
750	ΔE_{offset}	Offset polarization. V
751	ΔE_{ohm}	Ohmic polarization, V
752	ΔT_{ml}	Logarithmic mean temperature difference.
753	£	Effectiveness
754	n	Reversible efficiency
755	n	Voltage efficiency
756	n n	Mechanical efficiency
750	T _{mec}	Efficiency of nump
151	1 [pump _	Enclency of pullip
750	0	Conductivity, S/cm
/59	$ au_{an}$	Anode tortuosity, m
/60	υ	specific volume, m ² /kg
/61	C 1	. ,
762	Subscr	1pt
/63	an	Anode
/64	ca	Cathode
/65	el	Electrolyte
/00	ref	Kelerence
/0/	4 1. 1	
/08	ADDrev	viations
/09 770	AP	Anode pre-neater
//0		Catnode air pre-neater
//1	DME	Di-Metnyi Etner
112	DNA	Dynamic network analysis

Κ

- 773 FP Fuel Preheater774 LHV Lower heating value
- 775 NG Natural Gas
- 776 O/C Oxygen-Carbon ratio
- 777 S/C Steam-Carbon ratio
- 778 SOFC Solid oxide fuel cell
- 779
- 780

781	List of Figure Captions
782	
783	<i>Figure 1. General fuel cell plant with anode off-fuel recirculation. CP: Cathode Preheater, AP:</i>
784	Anode Preheater.
785	Figure 2. Calculation procedure.
786	Figure 3. Cell voltage versus current density and a comparison between the modelling results
787	and experimental data at 750 $^{\circ}$ C with different fuel compositions.
788	Figure 4. a) SOFC plant design fed by ammonia and b) effect of recycle ratio.
789	Figure 5. Effect SOFC fuel utilization factor on plant efficiency, fed by ammonia.
790	Figure 6. Plant design fed by hydrogen, alternative design.
791	Figure 7. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by hydrogen, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.7$.
792	Figure 8. Effect SOFC fuel utilization factor on plant efficiency, fed by hydrogen.
793	Figure 9. Effect of anode recycle for alternative plant design for hydrogen.
794	Figure 10. Plant design fed by methanol, ethanol and DME.
795	Figure 11. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by ethanol, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.7$.
796	Figure 12. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by methanol, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.7$.
797	Figure 13. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by DME, a) $U_f = 0.8$ and b) $U_f = 0.7$.
798	Figure 14. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by methanol, ethanol and DME, a) $U_f = 0.8$
799	and b) $U_f = 0.7$
800	Figure 15. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by biogas from biomass gasification, a) $U_f =$
801	0.8, b) $U_f = 0.7$ and c) $U_f = 0.6$.
802	Figure 16. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by biogas from biomass gasification, a) $U_f =$
803	0.8 and b) $U_f = 0.6$.
804	Figure 17. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by biogas from biomass gasification when
805	number of stacks is 8.

- 805 m
- 807

808	
809	

Table Captions

- 810 Table 1. The main SOFC parameters used in this study [13], [8].
- 811 Table 2. The main parameters for the accessory components [13], [26].

812





Figure 2. Calculation procedure.







Figure 5. Effect SOFC fuel utilization factor on plant efficiency, fed by ammonia.











Figure 8. Effect SOFC fuel utilization factor on plant efficiency, fed by hydrogen.



Figure 9. Effect of anode recycle for alternative plant design for hydrogen.

914 SOFC Methanator Fuel FP AP СР Burner ł Air 915 916 917 918 919 920 Figure 10. Plant design fed by methanol, ethanol and DME. 921 922 923













- 10121013Figure 16. Effect of recycling on a SOFC plant fed by biogas from biomass gasification, a) $U_f =$ 10140.8 and b) $U_f = 0.6$.



1028		
1029	Table 1. The main SOFC parameters used	l in this study [13], [8].
1030		
1031		
1032		
1033		
1034		
	Parameter	Value
	Fuel utilization factor	0.8
	Number of cells in stack	74
	Number of stacks	8

Stack electricity production (kW)

Cathode pressure drop ratio (bar)

Anode pressure drop ratio (bar)

Cathode inlet temperature (°C)

Anode inlet temperature (°C)

DC/AC convertor efficiency

Outlet temperatures (°C)

10.2

0.005

0.001

600

650

780

0.95

1035 1036 1037

25

0.97

40

1038 1039	Table 2. The main parameters for the accessory co	omponents [13], [26].
1040	1 2	1 1 1 1
1041		
1042		
1043		
1044		
	Parameter	Value
	Compressor isentropic efficiency	0.6
	Compressor mechanical efficiency	0.95
	Fuel side heat exchangers Δp (bar)	0.001
	Air/Gas side heat exchangers Δp (bar)	0.005
	Desulfurizer temperature (°C)	200

Fuel inlet temperature (°C)

Depleted air temperature (°C)

Burner efficiency