

Biomass gasification for IC engine application: An experimental, economical, and optimization study



Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment

For the Award of Degree

Doctor of Philosophy


By

Reetu Raj

**DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
(BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY)
VARANASI – 221005, INDIA**

Roll No-20131515

2023



**DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
(BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY)
VARANASI – 221005, INDIA**

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the work contained in the thesis titled “**Biomass gasification for IC engine application: An experimental, economical, and optimization study**” by **Reetu Raj** has been carried out under our supervision and that this work is not submitted elsewhere for any degree.

It is further certified that the student has satisfactorily fulfilled all the requirements of Comprehensive examination, Candidacy and SOTA for the award of the Ph.D. degree.

Dr. Jeewan Vachan Tirkey

(Supervisor)

Associate Professor

Department of Mechanical Engineering

IIT(BHU) Varanasi



**DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
(BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY)
VARANASI – 221005, INDIA**

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

I, **Rectu Raj**, certify that the work embodied in this thesis is my own bonafide work carried out by me under the supervision of **Dr. Jeewan Vachan Tirkey** for a period of 2.10 years from Dec 2020 to October 2023 at IIT (BHU) Varanasi. The material contained in this thesis has not been submitted for the award of any other degree. I declare that I have faithfully acknowledged and given credits to the research workers wherever their works have been cited in my work in this thesis. I further declare that I have not willfully copied any others' work, paragraphs, text, data, results etc. reported in journals, books, magazines, reports, dissertations, thesis, etc. or available at websites and have not included them in this thesis and have not cited as my own work.

Date: 20-oct-2023

Place: Varanasi

Rectu Raj
Rectu Raj

CERTIFICATE BY THE SUPERVISOR

This is to certify that the above statement made by the candidate is correct to the best of our knowledge.

Dr. Jeewan Vachan Tirkey
Dr. Jeewan Vachan Tirkey
Supervisor

Head of the Department
Head of the Department

विभागाध्यक्ष / HEAD
यांत्रिक अभियान्त्रिकी विभाग / Deptt. of Mechanical Engg.
भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान / Indian Institute of Technology
(का०हि०वि० / B.H.U.)
वाराणसी-२२१००५ / Varanasi-221005

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER CERTIFICATE

Title of the Thesis: **Biomass gasification for IC engine application: An experimental, economical, and optimization study.**

Candidate's Name: **Reetu Raj**

Copyright Transfer

The undersigned hereby assigns to the Indian Institute of Technology (Banaras Hindu University) Varanasi all rights under copyright that may exist in and for the above thesis submitted for the award of degree "*Doctor of Philosophy*".

Date: 20-Oct-2023

Place: Varanasi

Reetu Raj
Reetu Raj

Note: However, the author may reproduce or authorize others to reproduce material extracted verbatim from the thesis or derivative of the thesis for author's personal use provided that the source and University's copyright notice are indicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I take this opportunity to express my deep sense of gratitude to my supervisor **Dr. Jeewan Vachan Tirkey** for his continuous guidance and whole-hearted cooperation in carrying out this work. His meticulous and valuable review and constructive criticism of the manuscript have greatly improved the quality of work. Sir, for your faith in me and the desire to live up to your expectations, has constantly pushed me to work harder.

My grateful appreciation also goes to **Dr. Amitesh Kumar and Dr. Tarun Verma** for serving on my research programme evaluation committee (RPEC). Thank you all for sparing your valuable time and assisting me throughout my research and completion of this thesis. I wish to extend my sincere thanks to **Prof. Santosh Kumar**, Head, Department of Mechanical Engineering for providing me the necessary resources to enable me to complete this research work. During my stay at IIT (BHU) Varanasi, I have met many people who have made this period of my life memorable and very pleasant. I want to thank my senior at IIT (BHU) Varanasi, especially to Dr. Deepak, my colleagues Mr. P Jena, Mr. Hemant, Mr. Ritesh Sonkar, for encouraging me to finish this work.

The experimental part of this thesis has been carried out at the Department of Mechanical Engineering IIT (BHU) Varanasi. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Mr. Surender Yadav, Mr. Shivlal Yadav for giving the valuable ideas while performing experiments and providing the measurement tools and instruments whenever needed for the research work without any hesitation.

I would like to acknowledge **my parents, my elder brothers** for not engaging me in any other affairs during my research duration and handling all the matters by themselves. I thank my **Father-Mother** for assisting me financially whenever needed and motivating me for my work. Your sacrifices for allowing me to completely devote my attention to my research work are greatly acknowledged and appreciated. I would also like to give special thanks to Mrs. Deepa Tirkey & family for motivating and guided me always when I was feeling low during my Ph.D. tenure.

I would also like to thank **GOD** the Almighty for giving me the strength to remain on the path to success.

Date: 20-Oct-2023

Place: IIT (BHU) Varanasi

Reetu Raj

Reetu Raj

Research Scholar

Roll No. 20131515

Department of Mechanical Engineering

IIT (BHU), Varanasi

Table of Contents

Chapter	Content	Page No.
1.	Introduction	1-24
1.1	Background and motivation	1
1.2	Biomass to fuel conversion technology	3
1.3	Literature review	7
1.3.1	<i>Works on gasification</i>	7
1.3.2	<i>Works on co-gasification</i>	9
1.3.3	<i>Economic viability of waste biomass</i>	11
1.3.4	<i>Producer gas as a fuel in engine applications</i>	14
1.3.5	<i>Parametric optimization of gasifier-engine system</i>	18
1.4	Research gap	19
1.5	Research aims and objective	20
1.6	Outline of the thesis	22
2.	State of the art of the gasification-CI engine	25-47
2.1	Gasification	25
2.2	Chemistry of gasification	28
2.2.1	<i>Drying zone</i>	28
2.2.2	<i>Pyrolysis zone</i>	29
2.2.3	<i>Oxidation zone</i>	29
2.2.4	<i>Reduction zone</i>	29

2.3	Biomass feedstock for gasification	30
2.4	Post-gas treatment	37
2.5	Power generation through IC engine	39
2.6	Optimizations of gasifier-engine operating variables	43
2.7	Economic analysis of biomass briquette plant	45
2.8	Economic analysis of gasification-engine system	46
3.	Materials and Methodology	48-81
3.1	Experimental methodology	48
3.1.1	<i>Experimental setup</i>	48
3.1.2	<i>Experimental procedure</i>	55
3.2	Economic methodology	59
3.2.1	<i>Economic methodology of briquetting system</i>	59
3.2.2	<i>Economic methodology of gasification-engine system</i>	62
3.3	Numerical Simulation methodology	66
3.3.1	<i>Compression modelling</i>	67
3.3.2	<i>Combustion with two zones</i>	68
3.3.3	<i>Species formation</i>	75
3.3.4	<i>General performance parameters</i>	76
3.4	Optimization methodology	77
4.	Result and Discussions	82-299
4.1	Comparative performance and Optimization analysis of biomass	84

	gasification-CI engine	
4.1.1	Introduction	84
4.1.2	Properties and preparations of fuels	89
4.1.3	Experimental results using gasifier	91
4.1.4	Energy balance in the gasifier	94
4.1.5	Model analysis and Interpretation	96
4.1.6	Response surface investigation	101
4.1.6.1	<i>Brake-specific diesel consumption with engine CR and BP</i>	101
4.1.6.2	<i>BTE with engine CR and BP</i>	101
4.1.6.3	<i>Diesel saving with engine CR and BP</i>	103
4.1.6.4	<i>CO emissions with engine CR and BP</i>	105
4.1.6.5	<i>HC emissions with engine CR and BP</i>	106
4.1.6.6	<i>CO₂ emissions with engine CR and BP</i>	107
4.1.6.7	<i>NO_x emissions with engine CR and BP</i>	109
4.1.7	Optimisation	112
4.1.8	Desirability plots and validation	113
4.1.9	Conclusions	116
4.2	Co-gasification of low-grade coal with mahua biomass and dual-fuelled engine performance	118
4.2.1	Introduction	118
4.2.2	Experimental uncertainty	124

4.2.3	Engine performance parameters	125
4.2.3.1	<i>Brake thermal efficiency</i>	125
4.2.3.2	<i>Diesel saving</i>	127
4.2.4	Engine emission parameters	129
4.2.4.1	<i>NO_x emission</i>	129
4.2.4.2	<i>CO₂ emission</i>	131
4.2.4.3	<i>Unburnt hydrocarbon (UHC) emission</i>	133
4.2.4.4	<i>CO emission</i>	134
4.2.5	RSM optimisation plot	136
4.2.6	Conclusions	139
4.3	Co-gasification of mahua biomass- saw dust briquette and dual- fuelled engine performance	140
4.3.1	Introduction	140
4.3.2	Properties of feed-materials	144
4.3.3	RSM normal probability plots and pareto chart	146
4.3.3.1	<i>Normal probability and pareto curve for performance responses</i>	147
4.3.3.2	<i>Normal probability and pareto curve for emission response</i>	148
4.3.4	RSM regression analysis	152
4.3.5	Performance parameter	153
4.3.5.1	<i>Brake-specific fuel consumption</i>	153
4.3.5.2	<i>Brake thermal efficiency</i>	153
4.3.5.3	<i>Diesel replacement</i>	156

4.3.5.4	<i>Sound intensity</i>	159
4.3.6	Emission analysis	160
4.3.6.1	<i>CO emission</i>	160
4.3.6.2	<i>HC emission</i>	162
4.3.6.3	<i>CO₂ emission</i>	163
4.3.6.4	<i>NO_x emission</i>	164
4.3.7	Energy balance in the gasifier	166
4.3.8	Analysis of variance	168
4.3.9	Response optimizer	169
4.3.10	Validation of RSM engine responses	171
4.3.11	Uncertainty analysis	171
4.3.12	Conclusions	172
4.4	Co-gasification of triple feed materials and dual-fuelled engine performance	173
4.4.1	Introductions	173
4.4.2	Chemical properties of feed-material	176
4.4.3	Gasifier performance	177
4.4.4	Model fitting and adequacy checking	178
4.4.5	Surface and contour plots of the developed models	187
4.4.5.1	<i>Engine performance</i>	187
4.4.5.2	<i>Engine emission characteristics</i>	192
4.4.6	Engine sound and Diesel savings	197
4.4.7	Response optimizer	199

4.4.8	Uncertainty analysis	202
4.4.9	Conclusions	202
4.5	Comparative analysis of gasification/co-gasification on CI engine performance	204
4.5.1	Introduction	204
4.5.2	Characteristics of feedstocks	209
4.5.3	Gasification performance	213
4.5.4	Engine performance and emissions	217
4.5.4.1	<i>BTE with engine load at different GER</i>	217
4.5.4.2	<i>Diesel saving with engine load at different GER</i>	219
4.5.4.3	<i>CO emissions with engine load at different GER</i>	221
4.5.4.4	<i>HC emissions with engine load at different GER</i>	223
4.5.4.5	<i>CO₂ emissions with engine load at different GER</i>	225
4.5.4.6	<i>NO_x emissions with engine load at different GER</i>	227
4.5.5	Optimisation approach	229
4.5.6	Conclusions	237
4.6	Economic analysis of sugarcane bagasse pith briquette production and its application in gasifier-engine system	238
4.6.1	Introduction	238
4.6.2	Properties of sugarcane bagasse pith briquette	242
4.6.3	Costs analysis	244
4.6.3.1	<i>Costs associated with briquette production system</i>	244
4.6.3.2	<i>Costs associated with gasification-engine system</i>	246

4.6.4	Economic sensitive Analysis	247
4.6.5	Gasification energy balance	253
4.6.6	Combustion analysis	254
4.6.7	Performance analysis	258
4.6.7.1	<i>Brake thermal efficiency</i>	258
4.6.7.2	<i>Diesel saving</i>	258
4.6.7.3	<i>Exhaust gas temperature</i>	259
4.6.7.4	<i>Engine sound intensity</i>	261
4.6.8	Emission analysis	263
4.6.8.1	<i>CO emission</i>	263
4.6.8.2	<i>HC emission</i>	263
4.6.8.3	<i>CO₂ emission</i>	264
4.6.8.4	<i>NO_x emissions</i>	266
4.6.9	Optimum performance and emission results	268
4.6.10	Comparison of performance and emission characteristics	269
4.6.11	Conclusions	272
4.7	Performance simulation and optimization of SI engine using Peach biomass producer gas and propane blend	273
4.7.1	Introduction	273
4.7.2	Model validation	278
4.7.3	RSM approach	279

4.7.4	Analysis of variance for response model	286
4.7.5	Performance analysis using 3-D surface plot	288
4.7.6	Emission analysis using 3-D surface plot	293
4.7.7	Response optimization	296
4.7.8	Conclusions	299
5.	Conclusion and Future work	300-315
5.1	Experimental work conclusion	301
5.1.1	Comparative performance and optimization analysis of biomass gasification-CI engine	301
5.1.2	Co-gasification of low-grade coal with mahua biomass and dual-fuelled engine performance	303
5.1.3	Co-gasification of mahua biomass- saw dust briquette and dual-fuelled engine performance	304
5.1.4	Co-gasification of triple feed materials and dual-fuelled engine performance	305
5.1.5	Comparative analysis of gasification/co-gasification on CI engine performance	307
5.1.6	Economic analysis of sugarcane bagasse pith briquette production and its application in gasifier-engine system	309
5.2	Numerical simulation work conclusion	312
5.3	Scope for future work	314
	List of Publications	316
	References	318
	Appendix	335

List of Figures

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 1.1	Trends of energy demand, electricity demand and CO ₂ emission with years	3
Figure 1.2	Biomass to fuel conversion routes	4
Figure 1.3	Outline of the thesis	24
Figure 2.1.1	Schematic of gasification to product application	27
Figure 2.1.2	Schematic of the principal steps in co-gasification of coal-biomass wastes	28
Figure 2.3.1	Flow line diagram of Updraft, Downdraft, and Crossdraft gasifier	34
Figure 2.5.1	VCR engine with a procedure to change CR	42
Figure 3.1.1	Block diagram representation of downdraft gasifier coupled with VCR engine	51
Figure 3.1.2	Gasifier with distinct integrated components for downdraft operation	52
Figure 3.1.3	VCR – CI engine with integrated accessories and (air + PG) mixing point	52
Figure 3.1.4	Photograph of Sound level meter placed at the engine exhaust	53
Figure 3.1.5	Experimental setup of downdraft gasifier integrated CI engine	58
Figure 3.2.1	Flow chart involving economic analysis of briquetting system	61
Figure 3.2.2	Flow chart involving economic analysis of gasification-engine system	63
Figure 3.3.1	The Layout of the engine simulation and optimization process	69
Figure 3.3.2	Combustion chamber (Quasi-dimensional) for engine simulation	71
Figure 3.4.1	Flow chart of steps during RSM	80
Figure 3.4.2	Flow chart of RSM-optimization	81
Figure 4.1.1	Schematic diagram of an air-downdraft fixed bed gasification system	86

Figure 4.1.2	Properties of feed materials used in experimentation in terms of wt% dry basis	90
Figure 4.1.3	Temperature profile at the inner surface of gasifier shell for different biomass feedstock	92
Figure 4.1.4.	Sankey diagram representing energy distribution in gasifier using (a) Briquette (b) Mahua wood (c) Coconut shell as a feed-material	95
Figure 4.1.5	Variation of BSDC with engine CR and Brake power using (a) Briquette (b) Mahua wood (c) Coconut shell as a feed-material	102
Figure 4.1.6	Variation of BTE with engine CR and Brake power using (a) Briquette, (b) Mahua wood, (c) Coconut shell as a feed-material	103
Figure 4.1.7	Variation of Diesel saving with engine CR and Brake power using (a) Briquette, (b) Mahua wood, (c) Coconut shell as a feed-material	104
Figure 4.1.8	Variation of CO emissions with engine CR and Brake power using (a) Briquette, (b) Mahua wood, (c) Coconut shell as a feed-material.	106
Figure 4.1.9	Variation of HC emissions with engine CR and Brake power using (a) Briquette (b) Mahua wood (c) Coconut shell as a feed-material.	108
Figure 4.1.10	Variation of CO ₂ emissions with engine CR and Brake power using (a) Briquette, (b) Mahua wood, (c) Coconut shell as a feed-material	110
Figure 4.1.11	Variation of NO _x emissions with engine CR and Brake power using (a) Briquette, (b) Mahua wood, (c) Coconut shell as a feed-material	111
Figure 4.1.12	Cumulative Optimisation plots for (a) Briquette, (b) Mahua, (c) Coconut shell	113
Figure 4.1.13	Desirability plots of input and output parameters for (a) Briquette, (b) Mahua wood, (c) Coconut shell	117
Figure 4.2.1	Picture of feedstock, before and after gasification	123
Figure 4.2.2	Variation of (a) GER, (b) CR, and (c) Load on BTE	126

Figure 4.2.3	Variation of (a) GER, (b) CR, and (c) Load on NO _x emission	130
Figure 4.2.4	Variation of (a) GER, (b) CR, and (c) Load on CO ₂ emission	132
Figure 4.2.5	Variation of (a) GER, (b) CR, and (c) Load on UHC emission	134
Figure 4.2.6	Variation of (a) GER, (b) CR, and (c) Load on CO emission	135
Figure 4.2.7	RSM optimisation plot for (A) 0 % mahua blending, (B) 25 % mahua blending	137
Figure 4.2.8	RSM optimisation plot for (C) 50 % mahua blending, (D) 75 % mahua blending, and (E) 100 % mahua blending	138
Figure 4.3.1	Briquette & Mahua wood feedstock: (a) Before gasification (b) After gasification	145
Figure 4.3.2	Flow chart of the gasification-engine study with RSM	149
Figure 4.3.3	Normal probability plot and Pareto chart of engine responses: (a) BSFC, (b) BTE, and (c) Sound	150
Figure 4.3.4	Normal probability plot and Pareto chart of emission responses: (a) CO, (b) HC, (c) CO ₂ , (d) NO _x	151
Figure 4.3.5	3D Surface plots of (a) BSFC (kg/kWh) and (b) BTE (%)	155
Figure 4.3.6	3D Surface plots of (a) Diesel replacement (%) and (b) Sound (db)	158
Figure 4.3.7	3D Surface plots of (a) CO (% vol.) and (b) HC (ppm)	161
Figure 4.3.8	Engine emissions at diesel-mode and Dual-mode	162
Figure 4.3.9	3D Surface plot of (a) CO ₂ (% vol.) and (b) NO _x (ppm)	165
Figure 4.3.10	Sankey diagram representing energy distribution across gasifier	167
Figure 4.3.11	Optimization results by RSM	170
Figure 4.4.1	Chemical properties of feed-materials	177
Figure 4.4.2	Sankey diagram for gasifier	178
Figure 4.4.3	Pareto chart of engine performances for (a) BP, (b) BTE, (c) BSEC, and (d) GSR	184
Figure 4.4.4	Pareto chart of engine emissions for (a) CO, (b) HC, (c) CO ₂ , (d) NO _x , and (e) Sound	185

Figure 4.4.5	Experimental and RSM predicted models of Engine performances for (a) BTE, (b) GSR, (c) Sound	186
Figure 4.4.6	Experimental and RSM predicted models of Engine Emissions for (a) NO _x , (b) HC, (c) CO, and (d) CO ₂	187
Figure 4.4.7	Surface & Contour plots of engine performance parameter (a) BP (b) BSEC	190
Figure 4.4.7	Surface & Contour plots of engine performance parameter (c) BTE (d) GSR	191
Figure 4.4.8	Comparison of diesel and dual mode engine performances for (a) BTE, (b) Sound, (c) fuel consumption	192
Figure 4.4.9	Surface & Contour plots of engine emission parameters (a) CO, (b) HC, (c) CO ₂	195
Figure 4.4.9	Surface & Contour plots of engine emission parameters (d) NO _x	196
Figure 4.4.10	Comparison of diesel mode and dual mode emissions for (a) CO, (b) HC, (c) CO ₂ , and (d) NO _x	196
Figure 4.4.11	Surface & Contour plots of (a) Sound intensity and (b) Diesel saving	199
Figure 4.4.12	Desirability ‘d’ value of engine response variables	200
Figure 4.4.13	RSM generated optimisation plot	203
Figure 4.5.1	Proximate-Ultimate and PG composition of fuels used during experimentation	211
Figure 4.5.2	Block diagram of gasification/co-gasification experimentations performed	212
Figure 4.5.3	Temperature profile at different thermocouple position of the downdraft gasifier for different biomass feed-materials	215
Figure 4.5.4	Carbon conversion and Cold gas efficiency for different feedstocks of downdraft gasifier	216
Figure 4.5.5	Sankey diagram for energy balance of different feedstocks in downdraft gasifier	216

Figure 4.5.6	Variation of BTE with engine load at (a) GER 0.43, (b) GER 0.36, (c) GER 0.24, (d) GER 0.12	218
Figure 4.5.7	Variation of DS with engine load at (a) GER 0.43, (b) GER 0.36, (c) GER 0.24, (d) GER 0.12	220
Figure 4.5.8	Variation of CO with engine load at (a) GER 0.43, (b) GER 0.36, (c) GER 0.24, (d) GER 0.12	222
Figure 4.5.9	Variation of HC with engine load at (a) GER 0.43, (b) GER 0.36, (c) GER 0.24, (d) GER 0.12	224
Figure 4.5.10	Variation of CO ₂ with engine load at (a) GER 0.43, (b) GER 0.36, (c) GER 0.24, (d) GER 0.12	226
Figure 4.5.11	Variation of NO _x with engine load at (a) GER 0.43, (b) GER 0.36, (c) GER 0.24, (d) GER 0.12	228
Figure 4.5.12	Response Optimisation plots for (a) Coal, (b) Briquette, (c) Coal + Briquette	231
Figure 4.5.13	Response Optimisation plots for (a) Coconut shell (b) Coal + Coconut shell (c) Mahua wood	232
Figure 4.5.14	Response Optimisation plots for (a) Coal + Mahua wood (b) Briquette + Mahua wood (c) Coal+ Briquette + Mahua (d) Mahua wood + B20 Biodiesel	233
Figure 4.6.1	Processing and respective product from sugarcane-pith briquette to gasification	240
Figure 4.6.2	Briquette feed-material: (a) Before gasification (b) After gasification	242
Figure 4.6.3	Properties of Sugarcane bagasse pith-Briquette	243
Figure 4.6.4	Contribution of different costs of SBP briquette production plant (0-20 years)	245
Figure 4.6.5	Evolvement of unit costs of SBP briquette	246
Figure 4.6.6	Relationship between NPV with (a) discount% (b) briquette unit market price (c) years	250
Figure 4.6.7	Relationship between NPV with (a) discount%, (b) capital cost of	253

	gasification-engine system	
Figure 4.6.8	Sankey diagram for briquette gasification process	254
Figure 4.6.9	Variation of max P-theta with 10 number of cycles for different engine CR	256
Figure 4.6.10	Variation of (a) P-theta and (b) P-V with maximum engine load at different CR & GER	257
Figure 4.6.11	Variation of (a) BTE %, and (b) Diesel saving % with engine load at different CR & GER	260
Figure 4.6.12	Variation of (a) EGT °C, and (b) Sound level db with engine load at different CR & GER	262
Figure 4.6.13	Variation of (a) CO % vol., and (b) HC ppm emissions with engine load at different CR & GER	265
Figure 4.6.14	Variation of (a) CO ₂ % vol., and (b) NO _x ppm emissions with engine load at different CR & GER	267
Figure 4.6.15	RSM optimization plot (a) Economic analysis (b) Performance analysis	270
Figure 4.6.16	Validation test for optimized and experimental results with % error values for (a) Economic analysis, (b) Performance analysis	271
Figure 4.7.1	Validation of simulation result with experiment.	279
Figure 4.7.2	RSM diagnostic illustration representing the graph between predicted vs actual for response variable (a) BP (b) BSFC (c) BTE (d) CO (e) NO	285
Figure 4.7.3	Simultaneous impact of ER, Propane blend in peach PG, and SOI on (a) BP (b) BSFC	291
Figure 4.7.3	Simultaneous impact of ER, Propane blend in peach PG, and SOI on (c) BTE	292
Figure 4.7.4	Simultaneous impact of ER, Propane blend with PG, and SOI on (a) CO (b) NO	295

Figure 4.7.5	Composite desirabilities of numeric and response factors	297
Figure 4.7.6	Optimum values of independent and response parameters	298
Figure 4.7.7	Desirability of performance and emission parameters	299

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table. 1.1	Comparison of coal, biomass, and co-gasification	6
Table 1.2	Effect of biomass-coal based co-gasification	11
Table 2.3.1	Proximate and Ultimate analysis of different feedstocks	31
Table 2.3.2	Advantages and disadvantages of different types of gasifiers	35
Table 3.1.1a	Technical details of biomass gasifier	53
Table 3.1.1b	Gasifier integrations	54
Table 3.1.2	VCR engine descriptions	54
Table 3.1.3	Specifications of Digital Sound Level Meter	54
Table 3.2.1	Economic parameters of briquette plant	62
Table 3.3.1	Specification of SI Engine	70
Table 3.3.2	Value of constants	72
Table 4.1.1	Comparison between previous and present work.	89
Table 4.1.2	Physical and chemical properties of tested fuels	90
Table 4.1.3	Experimental results of gas composition and gasification characteristics	93
Table 4.1.4	ANOVA and fit statistics of performance responses	98
Table 4.1.5	ANOVA and fit statistics of emission responses	99
Table 4.1.6	Uncertainties of output parameters	115
Table 4.1.7	Validation between RSM based result and respective experiment	116
Table 4.2.1	Particular Mahua tree (<i>Madhuca longifolia</i>)	122
Table. 4.2.2	Chemical property of fuel- coal	123
Table 4.2.3	Instrument descriptions and their accompanying uncertainties	124
Table 4.2.4	Comparison of diesel saving at different mahua blending percentage	128
Table 4.2.5	Optimised results for different mahua wood + coal blending	139
Table 4.3.1	Comparative previous work and the present study	144

Table 4.3.2	Properties of feedstocks	146
Table 4.3.3	Investigation of Diesel-mode and Dual-mode diesel saving	157
Table 4.3.4	Validation of engine responses	171
Table 4.3.5	Uncertainties of variables	172
Table 4.4.1	Comparative previous work and the present study	176
Table 4.4.2	Analysis of variance for engine performance	182
Table 4.4.3	Analysis of variance for engine emissions	183
Table 4.4.4	Comparison of diesel and dual mode diesel saving	198
Table 4.4.5	Confirmatory test of a predicted optimum set of operation	200
Table 4.4.6	Validation tests for optimized and experimental values	201
Table 4.4.7	Uncertainties of variables	202
Table 4.5.1	Comparison between prior research and current study	208
Table 4.5.2	Key findings and Validation tests for RSM optimized and experimental results	234
Table 4.6.1	Comparative previous literature and the current study	241
Table 4.6.2	Economic parameters of gasification-engine system	246
Table 4.6.3	Economic evaluation indicators	248
Table 4.6.4	Cost analysis of gasification-engine system	252
Table 4.6.5	Comparison of experimental findings with the current study	272
Table 4.7.1	Thermochemical property analysis of Peach fruit, Gasoline, and Propane test fuels	276
Table 4.7.2	Previous study vs. Present investigation	277
Table 4.7.3	Data on the performance of blended fueled for RSM optimization.	281
Table 4.7.4	ANOVA for quartic degree response model	286
Table 4.7.5	Optimum operating condition and confirmation assessment with error %.	298

Nomenclatures

AFR	Air fuel ratio
B.P.	Brake power
BSFC	Brake specific fuel combustion
BTE	Brake thermal efficiency
C.A.S	Crank angle sensor
CI	Compression Ignition
CO	Carbon monoxide
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CR	Compression ratio
CV	Calorific value
DFM	Dual fuel mode
DS	Diesel saving
EL	Engine load
GER	Gasification Equivalence Ratio
FC	Fixed carbon
LHV	Lower Heating Value
ppm	parts per million
PG	Producer gas
UHC	Unburned hydrocarbon
VCR	Variable compression ratio
VM	Volatile matter

Symbols

α, θ	Crank angle
a_c	Crank length
C_p	Specific heat at constant pressure
f	Fraction (0-1)
Φ	Fuel-air equivalence ratio
ρ_u	Density of unburned charge
K_{If}	Forward rate constant
K_{Ib}	Backward rate constant
C_v	Specific heat at constant volume
L	Connecting rod length
m	Mass (kg)
m, u	Mixture of fresh charge, unburnt
p	Product
R	Gas constant
R_j	Rate constant
S_p	Mean piston speed
T	turbulent
u'	Turbulent flame intensity
$V\%$	Percentage by volume
V	Volume (m ³)

Symbols not listed are defined as they appear in text.

Abstract

Energy and environmental conservation are today's major national requirements. Therefore, alternative fuels are gaining importance due to potential of diminishing fossil fuel resources and associated environmental issues. Globally, 860 million people lack electricity access, with coal-fired generation dominating 38% of primary energy. Renewable resources like residual forest activities and agricultural waste biomass can support small industries in rural areas. Efficient waste-to-energy conversion can reduce pollution and reliance on traditional fuel. Worldwide, biomass is available in abundant quantities. India generates around 500 million tonnes of agro-crop residues annually, and out of it, only 12.2% is used for energy production, and the remaining is unexploited. Thus, this unexploited agriculture waste biomass could be bio-transformed to fuels. The primary technologies for the biomass conversion process are direct combustion, thermochemical, biochemical, and agrochemical. Among these, thermochemical gasification-derived producer gas fuel is a promising technology, but challenges like seasonal biomass availability hinder year-round energy production. Therefore, co-gasification, combining two or more biomass or carbonaceous residues, offers economic and environmental benefits. However, research in biomass gasification has focused on limited conditions, where the challenges in feedstock availability affecting the power generation stability. Moreover, literature shows that that there is research gap exists in exploring the economic viability of small-scale briquette production for waste-to-fuel conversion. Thus, research into novel energy-efficient technologies, alternative biomass usage, and blending must be conducted in order to improve the feasibility and sustainability of co-gasification. Also, the comparative study is further needed to recommend suitable feedstocks blend for economic viability, and power generation through

engine integration. So far previous research is concerned, lack of research has been found on the performance and emission characteristics of gasifier-dual fuelled engines for the gasification of feedstocks like Mahua wood waste, coconut shell, briquette and their blends with low-grade coal. Further, to the best of our knowledge, there is no comprehensive study has been conducted to assess the cumulative effect of gasifier operating variables and engine input variables to optimize between maximum engine power, minimum exhaust emissions, and fuel consumption. Concerning above mentioned requirement and relative research gap and, the present study has attempted to resolve this obvious gap.

In respect to the literature review, existing perspectives, and research gap, the present thesis work comprises with two main parts: (1) Conducting experiments and respective analysis, and (2) Optimizing of operating variable setting for the best response of power deliverance and exhaust emission of an engine. In respect to the novelty, the first part includes an experimental investigation on individual feedstock (coal, mahua tree, coconut shell, and briquette) gasification to make producer gas (PG) and utilized as secondary fuel with diesel/biodiesel in the compression ignition (CI) engine. Thereafter, co-gasification of these feed materials was conducted with a 50:50 ratio of biomass and coal, and generated PG was utilized in a dual mode CI engine. In both conditions, gasifier-engine performance (power and emission) was experimentally investigated with varying operating settings as gasification equivalence ratio, engine load, and compression ratio. Thus, the novelty is to optimize the trade-off between power and emission in relation to operating variables, a Response surface methodology (RSM) optimizer and ANOVA sensitivity test was conducted to achieve control strategies for the best gasifier engine performance response. ANOVA analysis revealed that gasification equivalence ratio (GER), compression ratio (CR), engine load were the important parameters for describing

the output responses. And, the RSM results showed that optimum input setting of gasification-CI engine was GER 0.1-0.4, CR 16-17, and engine load 80-100%. Also, the works on the economic feasibility of waste biomass through briquette production plant and gasification-engine system was analysed. In conjunction with the experimental investigation as first part, the second part of the thesis comprise of a numerical simulation study of a spark ignition (SI) engine performance and emission through a comprehensive quasi-dimensional thermodynamic model. Thereafter, parametric optimization has been performed to improve the performance of SI engines fueled with peach-based producer gas and propane blend. In this regard RSM optimization and ANOVA based simulation has been conducted. In this work, the novelty is to determine the optimum operating variables (blend percentage, equivalence ratio, and spark timing) for the best response of performance of dual-fuelled SI.

In light of the aforementioned contemplations, the current thesis is divided into five chapters, which includes the motivation to emphasize and resolve various issues related to the possibilities and problems. The results of experimental and economic study shows that Gasifier-Engine integration system is successful for further utilization. Further, this thesis provides the data for the prospects of utilizing gasification technique in better way, so that the renewable energy can be promoted and subsequently problems of fuel oil scarcity and environment degradation could be squarely met.