PERFORMANCE, EMISSIONS AND COMBUSTION CHARACTERIZATION OF BIODIESEL IN A GENERATOR ENGINE

Avinash Kumar Agarwal*, Atul Dhar
Engine Research Laboratory, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur-208016, India
*Corresponding Author's email: akag@iitk.ac.in

Alternative energy sources need to be developed in order to meet the increasing demand for fossil fuels. Furthermore, from environmental perspective, these new resources of energy must be environment friendly. Biomass, and particularly vegetable oils, fulfil these imperatives and is seen as a potential substitute for mineral diesel. Base catalysed transesterification is most acceptable process for biodiesel production. In this study, biodiesel produced from high free fatty acid Neem oil was characterised for its physical, chemical and thermal properties. Performance, emission and combustion characteristics of this biodiesel and its 20% blend were compared with mineral diesel in a direct injection (DI) engine. Brake specific fuel consumption for biodiesel and its blend was higher than mineral diesel but brake thermal efficiency of the biodiesel blends was found to be lower than mineral diesel. Brake specific CO and HC emissions for biodiesel fuelled engine operation were lower than mineral diesel but NO emissions were higher for biodiesel blends. Detailed combustion characterisation revealed that combustion starts earlier for biodiesel fuelled engine at all operating conditions but start of combustion was slightly delayed for 20% blend of biodiesel in comparison with mineral diesel. Combustion duration for biodiesel blends was shorter than mineral diesel.

Keywords: Biodiesel, Performance and Emission test, Combustion characterization.

Introduction

Depletion of fossil fuels and environmental awareness has developed the need to find alternatives to diesel fuels which plays a major role in the industry and the economy of any country. Biomass and especially vegetable oils are seen to be efficient solution on an international scale. This non-toxic resource could be produced at small scale, which could provide energy in decentralized manner. The carbon emissions produced during the combustion of these oils are the one which were fixed by the plant, therefore vegetable oils don't increase the global balance of CO_2.

Nowadays great progress has been made to improve the way vegetable oils are used. Use of vegetable oils in unmodified engines leads to many problems on the long term usage. Three major drawbacks of vegetable oils adversely affect the performance of the engine namely high viscosity, poor voltality and polyunsaturated character [1-4]. High viscosity of vegetable oils implies inefficient pumping and spray formation. Therefore, air and fuel are not optimally mixed and combustion is incomplete. Furthermore, low volatility of vegetable oils and their ability to polymerize (due to unsaturation) lead to lots of carbon deposits, injector coking and piston ring sticking.

To eliminate these issues, many different processes were developed to make these oils adapt modern engines. They allow the vegetable oils to attain properties very close to mineral diesel [5-7]. These processes include direct use by blending, micro-emulsion, pyrolysis, transesterification etc. Transesterification (alcoholysis) is a chemical reaction between triglycerides present in the vegetable oils and primary alcohols in the presence of a catalyst to produce mono-esters. The long and branched chain triglyceride molecules are transformed to monoesters and glycerine [8].

Several experimental investigations have been carried out by researchers around the world to evaluate the engine performance of different biodiesel blends. Generally a slight power loss, reduction in torque and increased bsfc were observed in case of biodiesel fuelled engines. Altin et al. [9] studied the effect of sunflower oil, cottonseed oil, soyabean oil and their methyl esters in a single cylinder, four stroke direct injection diesel engine. They observed slight reduction in the torque and power produced and increased bsfc in case of biodiesel fuelled engines. Similar results were reported by Kaufman and Ziejewski [10] and Antolin et al [11] for sunflower methyl ester; Clark et al. [12], Mcdonald et al. [13] for soybean esters; Petreson et al. [14] for rapeseed oil methyl ester etc.

Carraretto et al. [15] carried out investigations on six cylinders direct injection diesel engine. The increase of biodiesel percentage in the blend involves a slight decrease of both power and torque over the entire speed range. In particular, with pure biodiesel there was a reduction by about 3% maximum power and about 5% of maximum torque. Moreover, with pure biodiesel, the maximum torque was found to have reached at higher engine speed. However, Al-widyan et al reported slightly increased power and lower bsfc for waste oil biodiesel fuelled engines [16]. Raheman and Phadatre reported average 6% increased brake power output for a karanja oil biodiesel up to 40% blend (B40) and with a further increase in the biodiesel percentage in the blend, engine power reduced [17].

Raheman et al. evaluated the performance of biodiesel blends at different compression ratio and injection timings of the engine [18]. For the same operating conditions, performance of the engine reduced with increase in biodiesel percentage in the blend. However, with increase in compression ratio and advance in injection timing this difference was reduced and the engine performance became comparable to diesel. Nabi et al. investigated the performance and emission characteristics of Neem oil biodiesel blends in a DI engine and reported reduction in emissions including smoke and CO, while NOx emission was increased with diesel-NOME blends in comparison to conventional diesel fuel. With EGR 15% NOME-diesel blend showed better BTE and lower NOx in comparison to mineral diesel [19].

Characterisation of Biodiesel

Important properties of Neem oil biodiesel blends used in the study are compared with mineral diesel in Table 1. Viscosity of 20% Neem oil biodiesel blend is within specified ASTM limit but viscosity of neat biodiesel was higher than specified ASTM limit of 5 cST at 40^{o}C. Calorific value of biodiesel and blend is lower than mineral diesel. Density of biodiesel and blend is close to mineral diesel.

Table 1– Fuel Properties

Blend Composition (v/v)	Viscosity (cSt at 40^{o}C)	Density (g/ml)	Calorific Value (MJ/kg)

Diesel	2.71	0.837	46.35
NB20	3.21	0.848	44.98
NB100	6.17	0.891	39.87

Experimental Setup

Four-stroke, single cylinder, constant-speed, water-cooled, direct injection diesel engine (Make: Kirloskar Oil Engines Ltd. India; Model: DM-10) was used to study the effect of Neem oil biodiesel blends on performance and emissions of the engine. The detailed specifications of the engine are given in Table 2. The engine operated at a constant speed of 1500 rpm. The inlet valve opens 4.5° before TDC and closes 35.5° after BDC. The exhaust valve opens 35.5° before BDC and closes 4.5° after TDC. The fuel injection pressure recommended by the manufacturer is in the range of 200-205 bars. This engine consists of gravity-fed fuelling system with efficient paper element filter, force-feed lubrication for main bearing, large-end bearings and camshaft bush; run-through or thermo-siphon cooling system (Figure 1).

A piezoelectric pressure transducer (Make: Kistler Instruments, Switzerland; Model: 6613CQ09-01) was installed in the engine cylinder head to acquire the combustion pressure–crank angle history. Machining for installation of pressure transducer was done in cylinder head and the engine main shaft was coupled with a precision shaft encoder (Make: Encoder India Limited, Faridabad). Signals from the pressure transducer were amplified using a charge amplifier. The high-precision shaft encoder was used for delivering signals of crank angle with a resolution of 0.5° crank angle. A TDC marker was used to locate the top dead center position in every cycle of the engine. The signals from the charge amplifier, TDC marker and shaft encoder were acquired using a high-speed data acquisition system (Make: Hi-Techniques, USA; Model: meDAQ). Engine tests are done at 1500±3 RPM, for 200 bar fuel injector pressure for diesel, 100% Neem oil biodiesel (NB100) and 20% blend of Neem oil biodiesel with mineral diesel (NB20).



Figure 1: Schematic of Experimental Setup

Table 2 - Specifications of the engine used

Manufacturer	Kirloskar Oil Engine Ltd., India
Engine type	Vertical, 4-stroke, single cylinder, constant speed, direct injection, water cooled, compression ignition engine Model DM-10
Rated power	7.4 kW at 1500 rpm
Bore/stroke	102/ 116 (mm)
Displacementvolume	0.948 L
Compressionratio	17.5
Start of fuelinjection	26° BTDC
Nozzle openingpressure	200– 205 bar
BMEP at1500 rpm	6.34 bar

The cylinder pressure data were acquired for 50 consecutive cycles and then averaged in order to eliminate the effect of cycle-to-cycle variations. All tests were carried out after thermal stabilization of the engine.

Exhaust gas opacity was measured using smoke opacimeter (Make: AVL Austria, Model: 437). The exhaust gas composition was measured using exhaust gas analyzer (Make: AVL India, Model: DIGAS 444). It measures CO_2, CO, HC, NO and O_2 concentrations in the exhaust gas.

Results and Discussions

Performance Tests



Figure 2: Comparison of engine performance parameters with load (a) fuel consumption, (b) thermal efficiency, and (c) exhaust gas temperature

Experiments were conducted at 200 bars fuel injection pressure to compare the performance of 20% and 100% biodiesel blends with mineral diesel. BSFC for NB100 and NB 20 is higher than mineral diesel (Figure 2(a)). BSFC was observed to be increased with increasing proportion of biodiesel in the fuel. Brake thermal efficiency of pure biodiesel was highest among the fuels used. All the blends showed higher thermal efficiency than mineral diesel (Figure 2(b)).

Exhaust gas temperature for biodiesel blends is lower than mineral diesel (Figure 2(c)). But depression in exhaust gas temperature is not proportional to quantity of biodiesel in the fuel. Lower exhaust gas temperature is caused by better thermal efficiency.

Engine Emissions

The emissions of CO increase with increasing load (Figure 3 (a)). Higher the load, richer fuel–air mixture is burned, and thus more CO is produced due to lack of oxygen. At lower loads, CO emissions for biodiesel blends are close to mineral diesel. At higher load the biodiesel blends show significant reduction in CO emission. All the biodiesel blends exhibit lower HC emissions compared to mineral diesel (Figure 3(b)). This may be due to better combustion of biodiesel blends due to presence of oxygen. Increase in the emission of NO was observed in comparison with mineral diesel for the biodiesel fueled engines (Figure 3(c)). The smoke opacity for biodiesel blend fueled engines was lower than mineral diesel at all loads (Figure 3(d)).



(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)

Figure 3: Comparison of brake specific mass emission parameters with load for (a) CO, (b) HC, (c) NO emissions, and (d) Smoke opacity

Combustion Characteristics

In cylinder pressure vs. crank angle diagram

The variations in the in-cylinder pressure with crank angle for 20% and 100% biodiesel blends at different engine operating conditions with a baseline data of mineral diesel are shown in figures 4(a)-(c). From these figures, it can be noticed that at higher engine loads, pressure trends are almost similar for all the fuels. 20% biodiesel blend shows delayed pressure rise w.r.t. mineral diesel at lower loads. For 100% biodiesel start of pressure rise is comparable with mineral diesel. At all engine loads, combustion starts earlier for 100% biodiesel than mineral diesel while for 20% biodiesel blend, start of combustion is delayed w.r.t. to mineral diesel. Ignition delay for all fuels decreases as the engine load increases because the gas temperature inside the cylinder is higher at high engine loads, thus it reduces the physical ignition delay. The start of combustion reflects the variation in ignition delay because fuel pump and injector settings were kept identical for all fuels.
Figure 5(a) shows the maximum cylinder pressure at different loads for different blends. It shows that, at all engine loads, the peak pressure for 20% biodiesel blend is higher than mineral diesel. The peak pressure for 20% biodiesel is higher because of the shorter ignition delay and fast burning of accumulated

fuel. Figure 5(b) shows the crank angle, at which the peak cylinder pressure is attained for all fuels at different engine operating conditions. It can be observed that with increasing engine load, peak cylinder pressure shifts away from TDC (Figure 5(b)).



Figure 4: Comparison of in-cylinder pressure at: (a) 0, (b) 3, (c) 6 bar BMEP



(a) (b)

Figure 5: Variation of (a) Maximum cylinder pressure and, (b) Max pressure crank angle for rated load

Crank angle for mass fraction burn



(a) (b)



(c)

Figure 6: Crank Angle for (a) 5%, (b) 50% and, (c) 90% mass fraction burn

Figure 6(a) shows the crank angle for 5 percent mass fraction burned. This figure shows that 5 percent fuel burns earlier for 100% biodiesel. This is due to the earlier start of combustion for biodiesel, as suggested earlier. 20% biodiesel blend shows delayed start of combustion w.r.t. to mineral diesel which indicates delay in the start of combustion due to higher viscosity of biodiesel. For 100% biodiesel delay due to higher viscosity is compensated by higher cetane number of biodiesel. Figure 6(b) shows the crank angle degree for 50 percent mass fraction burned at different engine load conditions. Biodiesel blends takes less time for 50% combustion as compared to mineral diesel. Figure 6(c) shows the crank angle degree for 90 percent mass fraction burned at different engine load conditions. Biodiesel blends takes less time for 90% combustion as compared to mineral diesel.

Conclusions

Neem oil biodiesel and its blends were characterized by measuring its density, viscosity and calorific value.Performance, emission and combustion characteristics of this biodiesel and its blends were measured in a constant speed direct injection engine. Brake specific fuel consumption for biodiesel and its blends was higher than mineral diesel but brake thermal efficiency of all the biodiesel blends was lower than mineral diesel. Brake specific CO_2, CO and Hydrocarbon emissions for biodiesel fuelled engine operation were lower than mineral diesel but NO emissions were higher for biodiesel blends. Combustion started earlier for higher biodiesel blend fuelled operating conditions but start of combustion was slightly delayed for lower blends of biodiesel in comparison with mineral diesel. Combustion duration for biodiesel blends was shorter than mineral diesel.

References

1. Agarwal, AK. Biofuels (alcohols and biodiesel) applications as fuels for internal combustion engines. Progress in Energy and Combustion Science 2007 ; 33 : 233–271.
2. Peterson, CL, Auld, DL. Technical overview of vegetable oil as a transportation fuel. Solid fuel conversion for the transportation sector, Fact.; 12:45-54.
3. Velluguth, G. Performance of vegetable oils and their monoesters as fuels for Diesel engine. SAE 831358.
4. Peterson, CL, Wagner, GL, Auld, DL. Vegetable oil substitution for Diesel fuel, Trans ASAE 1983; 26:322–327.
5. Staat, F, Gateau, P. The effects of rapeseed oil methyl ester on diesel engine performance exhaust emissions and long-term behavior – a summary of three years of experimentation. SAE 950053.
6. Desantes, JM, Arregle, J, Ruiz, S, Delage, A. Characterization of the injection–combustion process in a D.I. diesel engine running with rape oil methyl ester. SAE 1999-01-1497.
7. Altõn, R, Cetinkaya, S, Yucesu, HS. The potential of using vegetable oil fuels as fuel for diesel engines. Energy Convers Manage 2001; 42: 529–38.
8. Ma, F, Milford, AH. Biodiesel production: a review. BioresourTechnol 1999 ; 70 :1–15.
9. Altin, R, Cetinkaya, S, Yucesu, HS, The potential of using vegetable oil fuels as fuel for diesel engine, Energy conversion and management 1991; 42:529-538.
10. Kaufman, KR, Ziejewski, M. Sunflower Methyl Esters for Direct Injected Diesel Engines. Transactions of the ASAE 1984; 27 (6): 1626-1633.
11. Antolin, G. Optimisation of Biodiesel production by Sunflower oil transesterification. Bioresource Technology 2002; 83:111-114.
12. Clark, SJ, Wagner, L, Schrock, MD, Piennaar, PG. Methyl and ethyl soybean esters as renewable fuels for diesel engines. JAOCS 1984; 61(10): 1632-1638.
13. Mcdonald, JF, Purcell, DL, McClure, BT, Kittelson, DB. Emission characteristics of Soy methyl ester fuels in an IDI compression Ignition engine. Transactions of SAE 1995; SAE 950400.
14. Peterson, CLD, Reece, L, Thompson, JC, Beck, SM, Chases, C. Ethyl ester of rapeseed used as a biodiesel fuel-a case study. Biomass and Bioenergy 1996; 10(5/6): 331-336.

15. Carraretto, C, Macor, A, Mirandola, A, Stoppato, A, Tonon, S. Biodiesel as alternative fuel: Experimental analysis and energetic evaluations. Energy 2004; 29:2195–2211.
16. Al-Widyan, MI, Tashtoush, G, Abu-Qudais, M. Utilization of ethyl ester of waste vegetable oils as fuel in diesel engines. Fuel Processing Technology 2002; 76 : 91– 103.
17. Raheman, H, Phadatare, AG, Diesel engine emissions and performance from blends of karanja methyl ester and diesel. Biomass and Bioenergy 2004; 27:393 – 397.
18. Raheman, H, Ghadge, SV. Performance of diesel engine with biodiesel at varying compression ratio and ignition timing. Fuel 2008; 87: 2659-2666.
19. Nabi, MN, Akhter,MS, Shahadat, MMZ. Improvement of engine emissions with conventional diesel fuel and diesel–biodiesel blends. Bioresource Technology 2006; 97:372–378.