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Abstract

A numerical model to capture the effect of H$_2$S impurities on the Solid Oxide Fuel Cell (SOFC) performance with Ni-based porous anode is developed. H$_2$S impurities can adversely affect the fuel cell performance, due to the sulfur poisoning of the Ni catalyst of the SOFC anode. The novelty of this work is the derivation of a Butler-Volmer type kinetic formulation that captures the effect of sulfur poisoning on the H$_2$ electro-oxidation reaction in the Ni-YSZ anode of SOFC. The novel kinetic model is then incorporated into a 2-dimensional porous anode model with gas-phase species transport, charged species transport and anode electrochemistry. The result is a performance model that can predict the effect of H$_2$S impurity on the polarization curves of the SOFC by taking into account the transport phenomena in addition to the electrochemistry formulations. Two types of kinetic models named as “coverage dependent kinetic model” and “coverage independent kinetic model”, differing in the coverage dependency of energy of H$_2$ and H$_2$S adsorption reactions are developed and incorporated in the 2D porous anode model. Loss in performance is predicted by both kinetic models and 2D performance models. Both kinetic models predictions show an increase in the current density loss with an increase in H$_2$S concentration. 2D performance models predictions with both coverage dependent and coverage independent models show an increasing trend in both the loss in the cell voltage and increase in the cell resistance upon the increase of the inlet H$_2$S content of the fuel. The 2D performance model with coverage-dependent kinetics predicts lower loss in the cell performance than the 2D performance model with coverage-independent kinetics. By comparing the performance model predictions with the experimental results, similar trends of increase in the sulfur poisoning effect by increase in H$_2$S content and smaller increase in the relative cell resistance at higher current densities can be recognized in both experimental results and the 2D model predictions. Coverage-dependent 2D performance model predictions are closer to the experimental results than the coverage-independent 2D performance model predictions.
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Nomenclature

\( A_{des} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Pre-exponential factor for the hydrogen desorption reaction from Nickel}

\( \text{ASR} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Average area specific resistance}

\( \text{D}_{ij} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Binary diffusion coefficient}

\( \text{D}_{ij}^{\text{eq}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Multicomponent Fick diffusivity of species } i \text{ in } j

\( \text{D}_{ij}^{\text{eff}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Effective binary diffusion coefficient in a porous medium}

\( d_j \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Diffusional driving force}

\( d_p \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Mean particle diameter}

\( E_a \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Difference between the potential of electronic phase and potential of ionic phase in anode}

\( E_a^{\text{eq}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Equilibrium potential difference between the electronic phase and the ionic phase in anode}

\( E_c \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Difference between the potential of electronic phase and potential of ionic phase in anode}

\( E_c^{\text{eq}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Equilibrium potential difference between the electronic phase and the ionic phase in anode}

\( E_{\text{cell}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Cell voltage}

\( E_{\text{ocv}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Open circuit voltage}

\( \Delta E_{\text{cell}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Relative loss in the cell voltage at constant current density}

\( E_{\text{cell}|H_2} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Cell voltage for fuel mixture without H}_2\text{S impurities}

\( E_{\text{cell}|H_2S} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Cell voltage or fuel mixture with H}_2\text{S impurities}

\( E_{\text{ion}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Activation energy of } O^{2-} \text{ conduction}

\( E_{\text{des}} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Activation energy for the hydrogen desorption reaction from Nickel}

\( E_{\text{el},i} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Electronic energy of species } i

\( E_{\text{ZPV},i} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Zero point vibrational energy of species } i

\( E_{\text{th},i} \) \hspace{1cm} \text{Thermal energy of species } i
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_H(0)$</td>
<td>Hydrogen adsorption energy at zero coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_S(0)$</td>
<td>Sulfur adsorption energy at zero coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>Faraday’s constant (96,487 C/mol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_i^0$</td>
<td>Standard state Gibbs free energy of species i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta G_{H_2,ads}^0$</td>
<td>Standard state Gibbs free energy of H$_2$ adsorption reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta G_{H_2S,ads}^0$</td>
<td>Standard state Gibbs free energy of H$_2$S adsorption reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_i^0$</td>
<td>Standard state Molar enthalpy of species i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>Planck constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{ed}$</td>
<td>Height of the electrode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{ch}$</td>
<td>Height of the fuel channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_0$</td>
<td>Exchange current density for hydrogen oxidation reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{H_2}^*$</td>
<td>Exchange current density factor for hydrogen oxidation reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{ref,H_2}^*$</td>
<td>Exchange current density factor for hydrogen oxidation reaction at reference temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_v$</td>
<td>Volumetric current density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{tar}$</td>
<td>Target current density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_i$</td>
<td>Ionic flux vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_e$</td>
<td>Electronic flux vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>Identity Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$j_i$</td>
<td>Diffusive flux of species i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_i$</td>
<td>Total flux of species i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_i$</td>
<td>Equilibrium constants of reaction i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{H_2}$</td>
<td>Equilibrium constant of H$_2$ adsorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{H_2S}$</td>
<td>Equilibrium constant of H$_2$S adsorption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_B$</td>
<td>Boltzmann constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{\text{TPB}}$</td>
<td>TPB length per unit volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l_{\text{ed,el}}$</td>
<td>TPB length per contact between electrode and electrolyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_i$</td>
<td>Molar weights of species $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\dot{n}_{\text{Fuel}}$</td>
<td>Molar flow rate of the inlet fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_{\text{tot}}$</td>
<td>Number of the particles of the composite anode per unit volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_i$</td>
<td>Partial pressure of the gas species $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>Pressure of the gas mixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{ed}}$</td>
<td>Probability of the electronic phase particle being present into a percolated cluster of its own phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{el}}$</td>
<td>Probability of the ionic phase particle fall into a percolated cluster of its own phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_a$</td>
<td>Rate of mass production in anode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_i$</td>
<td>Rate of production of species $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Ideal gas constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{\text{Ni}}$</td>
<td>Radius of the Ni particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{\text{YSZ}}$</td>
<td>Radius of the YSZ particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{\text{ed}}$</td>
<td>Radius of the electronic phase particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{\text{el}}$</td>
<td>Radius of the ionic phase particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_i^0$</td>
<td>Molar entropy of species $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Operating temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{\text{ref}}$</td>
<td>Reference temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_f$</td>
<td>Fuel utilization factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_i$</td>
<td>Molar diffusion volumes of species $i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{\text{fuel,inlet}}$</td>
<td>Mean inlet fuel velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v$</td>
<td>Velocity vector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\( w_i \) Mass fraction of species \( i \)

\( w_{ed} \) Width of the electrode

\( x_{H_2, in} \) Inlet \( H_2 \) molar fraction

\( x_{H_2O, in} \) Inlet \( H_2O \) molar fraction

\( x_{H_2S, in} \) Inlet \( H_2S \) molar fraction

\( x_j \) Mole fraction of species \( j \)

\( Z_{ed} \) Coordination number of the electronic phase composite electrode

\( Z_{el} \) Coordination number of the ionic conducting phase composite electrode

\( Z_{tot} \) Overall average coordination number

\( Z_{\alpha \beta} \) Average number of the \( \beta \) particles in contact with the \( \alpha \) particles

\textit{Greek letters}

\( \alpha_a \) Anodic charge transfer coefficients

\( \alpha_c \) Cathodic charge transfer coefficients

\( \alpha_H \) Self-interaction parameters for hydrogen

\( \alpha_S \) Self-interaction parameters for sulfur

\( \beta_a \) Anodic symmetric factors

\( \beta_c \) Cathodic symmetric factors

\( \beta_{HS} \) Binary interaction parameter between sulfur and hydrogen

\( \gamma_0 \) Sticking coefficient

\( \Gamma \) Surface site density

\( \epsilon \) Porosity

\( \zeta_{ed} \) Number fractions of electrode

\( \zeta_{el} \) Number fractions of electrolyte particles

\( \eta_a \) Local activation overpotential
\( \eta_{a,H2S} \) Effective anode overpotential for fuel mixture with H\(_2\)S impurities
\( \eta_{a,H2} \) Effective anode overpotential for fuel mixture without H\(_2\)S impurities
\( \Delta \eta_{a,R} \) The relative increase in the effective anode overpotential
\( \theta_H \) Hydrogen coverage
\( \theta_S \) Sulfur coverage
\( \theta_H(0) \) Hydrogen threshold coverage
\( \theta_S(0) \) Sulfur threshold coverage
\( \theta_H^* \) Effective coverage of hydrogen
\( \theta_S^* \) Effective coverage of sulfur
\( \kappa \) Permeability of the gas
\( \mu_{mix} \) Average viscosity for the mixture
\( \mu \) Viscosity of the gas mixture
\( \mu_j \) Chemical potential of species j
\( \mu_j^0 \) Standard state chemical potential of species j
\( \nu_{i,k} \) \( k^{th} \) vibrational frequency for species i
\( \rho_i \) Density of species i
\( \rho \) Density of gas mixture
\( \sigma_{el}^0 \) Conductivity of pure electronic conducting phase
\( \sigma_{ion} \) Ionic conductivity of electrolyte
\( \sigma_{el}^{eff} \) Effective electronic conductivity of anode
\( \sigma_{ion,an}^{eff} \) Effective ionic conductivity of anode
\( \sigma_{ion}^0 \) Conductivity of pure ionic conducting phase
\( \sigma_{0,ion} \) Pre factor of O\(^2-\) conduction
\( \sigma_i \) Collision diameter (in nm)
\( \tau \)  Tortuosity
\( \phi_{el} \)  Electronic phase potential in anode
\( \phi_{ion} \)  Ionic phase potentials
\( \phi_{ion(c)} \)  Ionic phase potential in cathode
\( \phi_{el(c)} \)  Electronic phase potential in cathode
\( \psi_{YSZ} \)  YSZ volume fraction
\( \psi_{Ni} \)  Ni volume fraction
\( \Omega_i^{2,2} \)  Collision integral
Chapter 1

Introduction

Energy is the key driver for the industrial development of nations. Energy had always been provided from the natural resources, mainly the fossil fuels (Landes 2003). Increase in global energy consumption driven by increasing world population and improving standard of living, limited reserves of fossil fuels, and environmental considerations are the key drivers for a change in the existing pattern of global energy consumption (Fedrigo and Hontelez, 2009). Both the efficient use of energy and the transition to renewable sources of energy are required to achieve this goal. Improving the energy efficiency both at the source and end-user level would help. Since higher efficiency for conversion results in lesser amount of fuel utilized for the same amount of useful work done, Solid Oxide Fuel Cell (SOFC) with high efficiency of energy conversion is considered as one of the sustainable energy technology systems.

1.1 Fuel Cells

Fuel cells are devices that convert the chemical energy of a fuel directly to electricity with heat as a byproduct. Fuel cells have higher efficiencies than the conventional combustion-based energy conversion systems. In addition to their higher efficiencies, they have the advantages of lower emission levels, modularity, reliability and zero noise pollution. The primary components of a fuel cell are an electrolyte for ion conduction, an anode where the oxidation reaction occurs and a cathode where the reduction reaction takes place (Haile, 2003). Fuel cells are generally categorized based on the type of the electrolyte used. Solid oxide Fuel Cell (SOFC) is a type of fuel cell with a solid-oxide (ceramic) electrolyte (S. C. Singhal and Kendall 2003).
1.1.1 Solid oxide fuel cell

Solid Oxide fuel cells work at high temperatures ranging 500ºC - 800ºC. Due to their high operating temperatures, they can be thermally integrated into gas turbines to cogenerate heat and power at combined efficiencies of around 85 % (S. C. Singhal and Kendall 2003). Figure 1-1 shows a schematic diagram of an SOFC. It is composed of cathode, electrolyte and anode. Air is supplied to the cathode while the fuel to the anode. The fuel for SOFCs can be hydrogen or hydrogen-rich reformate, a mixture of CO, CO₂, H₂, and H₂O. The oxygen in the air is reduced to oxygen ions that are conducted through the solid electrolyte towards the anode. Hydrogen electro-oxidation reaction with oxygen ions produces water, electrons and heat.

At the cathode, the overall oxygen reduction reaction can be written as follows:

\[
\frac{1}{2} O₂(g) + 2e^- \leftrightarrow O²^-
\]  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

For hydrogen-fuelled anode, oxidation reaction at the anode can be written as follows:

\[
H₂(g) + O²^- \leftrightarrow H₂O(g) + 2e^-
\]  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)

Figure 1-1: Schematic diagram of SOFC (Stambouli and Traversa, 2002)

Thus, if the fuel is pure hydrogen, water is the only chemical product of the anode reaction.

Each of the components of a fuel cell must meet certain functional requirements. Electrolyte of
the solid oxide fuel cells (SOFCs) must have high ionic conductivity and low electronic conductivity at the cell operating temperatures as well as must be dense to separate the fuel and oxidant streams from each other. To date, the most common electrolyte has been the Yittria-stabilized zirconia or YSZ. Cathode of SOFCs must have high electrical conductivity and good catalytic performance for oxygen reduction reaction. Composite of strontium-doped lanthanum manganite (LSM) and YSZ has been widely used as cathode for SOFCs. Anode of SOFCs should have high electronic conductivity and high catalytic activity for hydrogen oxidation reaction. Composites of Ni and YSZ are the most commonly used anodes in SOFCs (S. C. Singhal and Kendall, 2003). SOFC anode is a porous structure with ion-conducting phase, electron-conducting phase and pores (void phase). The overall electrochemical reactions in SOFC electrodes comprise of several steps such as gas adsorption, surface diffusion of the adsorbed species, the transport of the charged species, and the charge-transfer reaction (Janardhanan and Deutschmann, 2007). The involved species in the overall electrochemical reaction are electrons, ions and gaseous reactants (e.g. hydrogen and oxygen). Thus, the electrochemical reaction occurs at those sites where these three species can co-exist. These sites are called triple phase boundary (TPB) where the ionic conducting phase of YSZ, the electronic conduction of Ni and void phase transport the oxygen ions, electrons and gas species of H₂O and H₂. Only those TPBs that belong to a connected or percolated network can be counted as active sites for electrochemical reaction. The percolated network refers to a connected globally continuous path for ionic or electronic conduction. Increase in the TPB length is desirable for better SOFC performance. However maximizing the TPB might decrease the performance by decreasing the percolated phases (Kenney et al., 2009). Thus, TPB length is an important parameter in optimizing the cell electrochemical performance and it can be tuned by microstructural properties of the porous anode. (Farhad and Hamdullahpur, 2012).

Figure 1-2 shows the schematic diagram of SOFC porous anode with a close-up of triple phase
boundary (TPB).

Figure 1-2: Schematic diagram of SOFC porous anode with a close-up of TPB

1.1.2 Fuels and solid oxide fuel cells

Due to high operational temperatures of solid oxide fuel cells and their ability for internal reforming, they can use a variety of hydrocarbon fuels with a simple pre-reforming system or even without reforming. This improves the fuel efficiency and reduces the capital cost of the fuel cell system. However, fuel impurities in hydrocarbon fuels can cause degradation of cell performance (Haga et al., 2008). Natural gas being the most convenient hydrocarbon fuel for the SOFC can contain H$_2$S impurities ranging from 1 to 30 ppm. Coal syngas, the product of coal gasification can also contain high levels of H$_2$S ranging from 0.2 to 1.3 mole percent (Larminie and Dicks, 2003). The major impurity of the SOFC fuels is H$_2$S. Even at ppm levels, H$_2$S in fuel can adversely affect the performance of SOFC by poisoning the Ni catalyst in anode. Understanding the sulfur poisoning and its effect on the SOFC performance are crucial for the SOFC technology improvements and commercialization. (Sasaki et al., 2006)

Ni is one of the widely used catalysts in many important catalytic processes that can be poisoned by H$_2$S, a common sulfur-poisoning component in these processes. Therefore, sulfur poisoning of
the Ni catalyst by H₂S had been vastly studied. In addition to that, the effect of sulfur poisoning of Ni anode on the SOFC performance had also been studied.

1.1.3 Ni catalyst and Sulfur poisoning

In general, poisoning is the chemisorption of impurities on the active sites available for catalysis. In addition to the physically blocking of adsorption sites, adsorbed poisons may modify the electronic structure or the chemical nature of the surface and consequently affect the catalyst performance (Forzatti and Lietti, 1999). The relevant work on sulfur poisoning of Ni includes experimental studies, empirical models and density functional theory (DFT) based theoretical studies.

Experimental studies on Ni sulfur poisoning

The nature of chemisorption of sulfur on Ni had been studied by a variety of experimental techniques such as spectroscopy, volumetric, gravimetric, and magnetic measurements (Bartholomew et al., 1982). Different mechanisms suggesting different numbers of bonds of H₂S on Ni surface upon adsorption were proposed by these studies. Four site mechanism with one sulfur bonding to two Ni atoms and two hydrogen, each bonding to one Ni atom at temperature range of 273ºK - 393ºK were proposed by Den Besten and Selwood (1962) and three site mechanism with one sulfur bonding to one Ni atom and two hydrogen each bonding to one Ni atom at temperature range of 193 ºK -373 ºK were proposed by Saleh et al. (1961). Based on the aforementioned suggestions, the S/Ni ratio will be 0.25 and 0.33 for the four site and three site mechanisms, respectively. The discrepancy in the S/Ni ratio arises from different temperature and pressure ranges that the experiments were performed at and as a result, different sulfur coverage values were proposed. As the adsorption of H₂S on Ni is an exothermic reaction, it is dependent on the temperature. Higher operating temperature would result in lower sulfur coverage and S/Ni stoichiometry. Sulfur coverage is also dependent on the partial pressures of H₂S, H₂ and therefore
$P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ ratio. Sulfur coverage would increases with the increase in $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ ratio. Therefore, higher equilibrium sulfur coverage and S/Ni stoichiometry are reported at higher $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ (Calvin H. Bartholomew, 2001).

**Models for sulfur poisoning of Nickel by H$_2$S:**

Models such as Langmuir isotherm have been used to describe the H$_2$S adsorption on Ni surface. It relates the surface coverage (fraction of the surface covered by adsorbate species) to the partial pressure of gas species exposed to the surface. In such a model, it is assumed that the adsorption proceeds to a monolayer with an increase in concentration, all sites are equivalent and the adsorption is independent of the occupation of the neighbouring sites, meaning that adsorption is independent of the coverage. Langmuir isotherm is not applicable for the cases of having more than one species or having chemical reactions (Kee *et al.*, 2003). The first deficiency of the Langmuir isotherm is that it does not consider the dependency of the H$_2$S adsorption on the coverage. It was shown by some experimental studies that the H$_2$S heat of adsorption is dependent on coverage, (McCarty and Wise, 1980; Alstrup *et al.*, 1981)) confirming the dependency of H$_2$S adsorption on coverage. Here, heat of adsorption refers to the heat of adsorption per mole of H$_2$S adsorbed. Another deficiency of the Langmuir isotherm is that it does not consider the competitive adsorption of hydrogen on the Ni surface. In the experimental studies of the H$_2$S chemisorption on the Ni surface that were performed with a mixture of H$_2$ and H$_2$S feed, it was shown that the competitive adsorption of hydrogen on the Ni surface plays an important role on the sulfur coverage and S/Ni stoichiometry (Bartholomew *et al.*, 1982).

In another study, a Temkin-like isotherm was proposed by fitting the isotherm to the adsorption and desorption data. In this expression the equilibrium H$_2$S: H$_2$ ratios are correlated to entropy that is independent of coverage and enthalpy that is linearly dependent on coverage. This isotherm does consider the dependency of the adsorption on the coverage but it does not consider
the competitive adsorption of the hydrogen on the Ni surface (Alstrup et al., 1981).

**Density functional theory (DFT) studies on sulfur poisoning of Ni by H\textsubscript{2}S:**

There had also been numbers of theoretical studies that have employed density functional theory (DFT) for examination of the chemisorption of H\textsubscript{2}S on Ni surface. In a number of these studies, the adsorption energy was calculated as a function of coverage. However, these models have some deficiencies. In a DFT-based model of Wang and Liu (2007), the competitive adsorption of H\textsubscript{2} on Ni surface is ignored. In addition, the activity of adsorbed species, thermal corrections to the free energy and entropy of all surface species are not considered. In another DFT-based model from Galea et al. (2007), thermal corrections of the reaction enthalpy is ignored by assuming that the translational and rotational entropy of the gas species is lost on adsorption. In the DFT based model by Monder and Karan (2010) the competitive adsorption of H\textsubscript{2} on Ni surface was considered along with the activities and complete thermal corrections for adsorbate species calculated form vibrational analysis. The coverage dependent energetic (entropy and enthalpy) with thermal corrections are obtained from this model. One of the common limitations of these studies is that the computations are typically carried for a given crystal facet, e.g. Ni(111) and does not necessarily account for the distributions of various facets in a nanoparticle or the activity at the defect sites and at the edge.

**1.1.4 SOFC Performance and H\textsubscript{2}S Poisoning**

In a SOFC operation, sulfur from H\textsubscript{2}S in the fuel can be adsorbed on the Nickel surface in anode and cause sulfur poisoning. This would adversely affect the Ni performance as the electro-catalyst of SOFC and will eventually decrease the performance of SOFC. Studies on the effect of sulfur poisoning of Ni anode on the SOFC performance include the experimental, empirical and modeling studies.
Experimental studies on the SOFC performance and H₂S poisoning:

There have been many experimental works on the effect of the sulfur poisoning on the performance of the SOFC. All these experimental studies show that the loss in the SOFC performance increases by the increase in the H₂S concentration in the anode feed being a mixture of H₂ and H₂S. These experiments had been performed at different temperatures, feed mixtures with different components. Some feeds contained H₂O or N₂ in addition to H₂. The experiments were also performed on different samples such as bottom cells or stacks of solid oxide fuel cells.

In some experimental studies the effect of temperature have also been examined. The experiments had been performed on different feed mixtures with different components such as H₂O or N₂ in addition to H₂. The experiments were also performed on different samples such as button cells or stacks. The results show that the performance of the SOFC degrades when H₂S is added to the H₂ containing fuel due to the sulfur poisoning effect. Table 1-1 shows the different experimental studies on the SOFC at different test conditions, geometries and anode composition with the corresponding loss in performance due to the sulfur poisoning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample/Cell type</th>
<th>Anode Composition</th>
<th>Measuring conditions</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>H₂S concentration (ppm)</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feduska and Isenberg (1983)</td>
<td>7-cell stack</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Constant current of 150 (mA/cm²)</td>
<td>1000 ºC</td>
<td>10%CO, 5%H₂, 85%CO₂</td>
<td>50 ppm</td>
<td>5% loss in cell voltage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haga et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Button cell-electrolyte support</td>
<td>Ni–ScSZ cermet anode</td>
<td>Constant current density of 0.2 (A/cm²)</td>
<td>800, 900, 1000</td>
<td>97% H₂, 3% H₂O</td>
<td>5 ppm</td>
<td>Voltage drop of 80, 35, and 15 (mV) from the initial voltage of 1000 mV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsuzaki and Yasuda (2000)</td>
<td>Button cell-Ni–YSZ cermet electrode and a YSZ electrolyte</td>
<td>Porosity: 40 % YSZ: 10 % (wt)</td>
<td>Constant current density of 0.3 (A/cm²)</td>
<td>750, 900, 1000</td>
<td>79% H₂, 21% H₂O</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>Increase of the overvoltage for 2 (mV) at C(H₂S) of 2 ppm, and 74 (mV) at C(H₂S) of 15 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zha, Cheng, and Liu (2007)</td>
<td>Button cell-electrolyte supported</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Constant voltage of 0.3 (V), 0.6(V), 0.7(V), 0.8 (V)</td>
<td>800, 700, 900</td>
<td>50% H₂, 1.5% H₂O, 48.5 N₂</td>
<td>2-50</td>
<td>15.5%, 18.5 % and 32.2 % drop in current density at 0.3(V), 0.6 (V) and 0.8 (V), at C (H₂S) of 50 ppm.15.5 % drop in current density at 0.7 (V), at C (H₂S) of 2 ppm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-1: List of some sulfur poisoning experimental studies on SOFC with Ni/YSZ anode
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (Cheng, Zha, and Liu 2007)</th>
<th>Sample/Cell type</th>
<th>Anode Composition</th>
<th>Measuring conditions</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>H₂S concentration (ppm)</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Button cell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Constant current density of 241 (mA/cm²) and 409 (mA/cm²) and constant voltage of 0.535(V) and 0.7 (V)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>50% H₂, 1.5% H₂O, 48.5 N₂</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>14% and 8% drop in cell power at 0.409 mA/cm² and 241 (mA/cm²) at C (H₂S) of 10 ppm. 15% and 13% drop in cell power at 0.535(V) and 0.7 (V) at C (H₂S) of 10 ppm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasmussen and Hagen (2009)</td>
<td>1-cell stack</td>
<td>Ni/YSZ anode support-active Ni/YSZ anode</td>
<td>Constant current density of 1000 (mA/cm²) and</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>4% H₂O, 96 H₂</td>
<td>2-100</td>
<td>Initial cell voltage drop of 13.5 % and 14.5 % at C(H₂S)=10 ppm and C(H₂S)=100 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sasaki et al. (2006))</td>
<td>Button cells_ electrolyte based Ni-YSZ anode. Electrode thickness: 30 Micro meter</td>
<td>Constant current density of 200 (mA/cm²)</td>
<td>1000, 900, 850</td>
<td>Various H₂/ H₂O, N₂</td>
<td>1,2,3, 5,10, 20</td>
<td>0.18 (V) and 0.5 (V) Voltage drops at 200 (mA/cm²), at C(H₂S)=5 at 1000 °C and 850 °C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Sample/Cell type</td>
<td>Anode Composition</td>
<td>Measuring conditions</td>
<td>Temperature (ºC)</td>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>H₂S concentration (ppm)</td>
<td>Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li and Wang (2011)</td>
<td>Anode supported planar</td>
<td>Anode, Anode support layer and electrolyte thickness: 10,400,10 μm</td>
<td>250 (mA/cm²) and 500 (mA/cm²)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.18 (V) and 0.287 (V)</td>
<td>Voltage drops at 250 (mA/cm²) and 500 (mA/cm²)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Empirical models for SOFC performance and H$_2$S poisoning:

Some empirical models had been proposed to predict the loss in the SOFC performance as a result of sulfur poisoning of Nickel anode catalyst. In an empirical model proposed by Hansen (2008), the loss in cell performance is correlated to the sulfur coverage. In this model, the Temkin-like isotherm proposed by Alstrup et al., (1981) and the experimental data of the loss in SOFC performance by Zha et al. (2007) were used to derive this correlation. The main deficiency of this model is that it is based on the Temkin like isotherm that does not consider the competitive adsorption of the H$_2$ on Ni surface. Another problem with this model is that it calculates the loss in the performance based on experimental results at a constant cell voltage of 0.7 (V), which makes their derived correlation valid only for this voltage. At different cell voltages, the concentration profiles of the H$_2$ and H$_2$S in SOFC anode will be different. Therefore, sulfur coverage profile will be different. The validity of this correlation was not verified at different cell voltages. Another empirical model is the damage model for degradation of the SOFC anode. This degradation model investigates the effects of sulfur poisoning on the performance loss. It is developed based on applying a damage factor to the TPB length in anode as the TPB length is considered as the most appropriate parameter presenting the degradation due to the sulfur poisoning (Ryan et al., 2012). The experimental data of Zha et al. (2007) were used to develop a damage factor as a function of H$_2$S concentration and Temperature.

1.1.5 Anode models with H$_2$S poisoning effect on the SOFC performance

A number of models for porous anode have been reported including those by Yakabe et al. (2000), Zhu and Kee (2008) and Hussain et al. (2007). These models have examined the effects of anode structure and microstructure as well as the operating conditions. However, none of the models have considered the effect of sulfur poisoning kinetics while coupling the transport effects. One model that has considered localized transport effects is the “near triple-phase boundary region model for H$_2$S poisoning of SOFC anodes” (Monder and Karan, 2011). It is a one-dimensional anode model for patterned Ni-YSZ anode that considers the H$_2$S dissociative adsorption reaction on the surface, in addition to the all gas-surface and
electrochemical reactions. This model only considers the surface transport of the adsorbed species and ignores the gas species transport effects by assuming that the fuel composition is uniform over the model domain. The DFT-based thermodynamic results of the competitive adsorption of H$_2$S on Ni surface (Monder and Karan, 2010) is adopted for the kinetic formulation of this model. The effect of the sulfur poising on the SOFC performance is presented by polarization curve at different H$_2$S concentrations and relative performance loss at different PH$_2$S/PH$_2$ values. There are no distributed porous anode models in the literature to evaluate the effect of sulfur poisoning on the SOFC performance. Once the modified kinetics of the anode electrochemical reaction in the presence of H$_2$S is established, it can be implemented in a porous anode model to evaluate the effect of sulfur poisoning on the SOFC performance.

1.1.6 Motivation and Objective

The goal of this thesis is to model the effect of sulfur poisoning on the electrochemical performance of the SOFC with Ni-YSZ porous anode. To achieve this goal, the objective of this thesis is to develop a numerical, two-dimensional kinetic-transport with distributed charge transport model of a SOFC cell with Ni-YSZ porous anode that can predict the electrochemical performance of the cell exposed to a H$_2$ rich fuel with H$_2$S impurities. This objective is fulfilled in 2 steps:

- In the first step, a kinetic formulation that takes into account the reaction of H$_2$S with Ni catalyst (sulfur poisoning) in addition to the H$_2$ electro-oxidation reaction is derived. This new formulation captures the effect of sulfur poisoning on the SOFC performance by incorporating the PH$_2$S (partial pressure of the H$_2$S) in a Butler-Volmer type formulation.

- In the second step, the new Butler-Volmer type equation is incorporated in a two-dimensional transport half-cell model with porous Ni-YSZ anode. This two-dimensional model considers the gas species gradients as well as the electric potential, ionic potential, pressure and velocity gradients. With the help of this model, the effect of transport phenomena on the kinetics of electrochemical reaction of the SOFC can be investigated.
1.2 Layout of the thesis

In chapter 2, the development of the novel kinetic formulation of \( \text{H}_2 \) electro oxidation reaction in the presence of \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) is presented. The new Butler-Volmer type formulation is further extended to take into account the coverage dependency of the energetics of the reactions.

Chapter 3 presents the development of the multiphysics electrochemical performance model including the description of model equations for all the transport phenomena and detailed electrochemistry. The novel kinetic formulation developed in Chapter 2 is implemented in the multiphysics model and the results are compared with some experimental studies.

Chapter 4 gives a summary of the results and some recommendation for future works.
Chapter 2

Kinetic model for hydrogen electro-oxidation of Ni/YSZ-anodes accounting for sulfur poisoning

Chapter two presents the derivation of the kinetic formulation for the H\textsubscript{2} electro-oxidation in the Ni-based anodes of SOFC in the presence of H\textsubscript{2}S. The kinetic model is derived considering elementary kinetic modeling that considers several elementary reaction steps. A modified Butler-Volmer type expression is obtained that captures the effect of the sulfur poisoning on the H\textsubscript{2} electro-oxidation. Two types of kinetic models, differing in the coverage dependency of energy of adsorption, are reported. The first model is based on a Langmuir-type adsorption isotherm for both H\textsubscript{2}S and H\textsubscript{2} adsorption reactions. Thus, in this model the energetics of the adsorption reactions is independent of the coverage of adsorbed species and it is named as “coverage independent Butler-Volmer type kinetic model with sulfur poisoning”. The second model considers the dependency of the adsorption energetics on the surface coverage of the adsorbed species. This kinetic model is called “coverage-dependent Butler-Volmer type kinetic model with sulfur poisoning”. For each kinetic model a thermodynamic section to derive the corresponding equilibrium constants of H\textsubscript{2}S and H\textsubscript{2} adsorption reactions are also considered. In the last section, coverage dependent and coverage independent kinetic models are compared in terms of predicted reduction in current density. Figure 2-1 summarizes the kinetic models that are presented in this chapter:
2.1 Introduction

Different approaches have been developed to model the hydrogen electrochemical reactions in the Ni-based SOFC anodes. These range from nanoscopic scale (quantum chemistry, molecular dynamics) to mesoscopic scale (elementary kinetics) to macroscopic scale (empirical global kinetics) models. In nanoscopic scale model, density-functional theory (DFT) is used for \textit{ab initio} thermodynamics calculation.
such as studying the hydrogen spillover (Shishkin and Ziegler, 2009). *Ab initio* refers to the result obtained from DFT as it does not rely on empirical or fitted parameters. Elementary kinetics describes the chemical reaction by the elementary reaction steps. The mass action law is used for the rate of each reaction step (Vogler et al., 2009). Mass action law in chemical kinetics defines the rate of a chemical reaction to be proportional to the product of the reactants. Elementary kinetic models can be coupled to macro-scale kinetic and transport models. Butler–Volmer type global kinetic expression is generally used for macroscopic modeling of SOFC electrode kinetics. This expression lumps all nanoscopic-scale and microscopic-scale reactions and some of the surface transport processes (Zhu et al., 2005). For such Butler-Volmer type formulation, the current density is expressed as a function of overpotential and is parameterized by fitting to experimental data (Bessler et al., 2010).

### 2.2 Methodology

The detailed analysis proposed by Zhu et al. (2005) is adopted to derive a Butler-Volmer formulation from the elementary steps of hydrogen oxidation reaction in the Ni-YSZ three-phase region. The H₂ oxidation reaction include five elementary reactions and had been previously proposed by Boer (1998). The effect of sulfur poisoning is considered by adding the H₂S adsorption reaction as an elementary reaction to the H₂ elementary step reactions. A Langmuir-type isotherm in which the adsorption energetics is independent of the surface coverage is considered for both H₂ and H₂S adsorption reactions. In the next step, the derived Butler-Volmer type kinetic formulation is further modified to a “coverage-dependent Butler-Volmer type kinetic model” by considering the dependency of the H₂ and H₂S adsorption reaction energetics on the coverage of the adsorbed H and S surface species on Ni surface. Coverage-independent equilibrium constants are obtained from Zhu et al. (2005) approach and DFT calculated energetics by Monder and Karan (2010). Coverage-dependent equilibrium constants are obtained from DFT calculated energetics by Monder and Karan (2013).
2.2.1 Anode electrochemistry with the presence of H\textsubscript{2}S

The overall hydrogen oxidation reaction can be expressed as:

\[ H_2(g) + \frac{1}{2} O_2(g) \rightleftharpoons H_2O(g) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

For SOFCs, the global half-cell anode reaction can be written as follows:

\[ H_2(g) + O^\text{ysz}_o \rightleftharpoons H_2O(g) + V_0(YSZ) + 2e^-(Ni) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

The above reaction consists of several elementary steps. In this work, a mechanism comprising five elementary reactions is considered for the hydrogen oxidation in the Ni/YSZ three phase regions (Boer 1998) as reported below.

**Adsorption/desorption of hydrogen on Ni surface**

\[ H_2(g) + 2(Ni) \rightleftharpoons 2H(Ni) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

**Charge transfer reactions at the TPB region**

\[ H(Ni) + O^{2-}(YSZ) \rightleftharpoons (Ni) + O^-(YSZ) + e^-(Ni) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

\[ H(Ni) + OH^-(YSZ) \rightleftharpoons (Ni) + H_2O(YSZ) + e^-(Ni) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

**Adsorption/desorption on the YSZ surface**

\[ H_2O(YSZ) \rightleftharpoons (YSZ) + H_2O(g) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

**Transfer of oxygen ions between the surface and the bulk YSZ**

\[ O^\text{ysz}_o(YSZ) + (YSZ) \rightleftharpoons O^{2-}(YSZ) + V_0(YSZ) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.7)

Here, \( H(Ni) \), \( (Ni) \) and \( e^-(Ni) \) are the adsorbed atomic hydrogen, the Ni empty site and the electron within the Ni anode, respectively and \( O^\text{ysz}_o(YSZ), V_0(YSZ), O^{2-}(YSZ), OH^-(YSZ) \) and \( H_2O(YSZ) \) are the lattice Oxygen, Oxygen vacancy within the YSZ, oxygen ion, hydroxide ion and absorbed water molecule on YSZ surface, respectively.

In the presence of H\textsubscript{2}S, an additional reaction considering sulfur adsorption on the Ni surface is included:

\[ H_2S + (Ni) \rightleftharpoons S(Ni) + H_2(g) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.8)

Hydrogen and sulfur atoms adsorb only on the nickel surface, H\textsubscript{2}O and OH\textsuperscript{-} adsorb on YSZ surface. None of the steps are limited by diffusion or migration of species. That is, all steps are considered to be in
equilibrium and the reaction rate set to zero. To derive the overall reaction rate expression, the pseudo-
steady state hypothesis for all steps except the rate-limiting step is considered.

*Derivation of the coverage-independent Butler-Volmer type Kinetic model with sulfur poisoning:*

The hydrogen oxidation elementary reactions (2.3 through 2.7), in addition to the H₂S adsorption reaction (2.8), are considered for kinetic expression derivation. In this set of reactions, seven surface species and three gas species are involved. By definition, the sum of site fractions on the Ni and YSZ surfaces should be unity:

\[ \theta_H + \theta_{Ni} + \theta_S = 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.9)

\[ \theta_O + \theta_{OH} + \theta_{H_2O} + \theta_{YSZ} = 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.10)

The site fractions of the surface species are defined as follows: \( \theta_H \) is the adsorbed atomic hydrogen on the Ni surface, \( \theta_{Ni} \) is an empty site on the Ni; \( \theta_S \) is the adsorbed atomic sulfur on the Ni surface. \( \theta_O, \theta_{OH}, \theta_{H_2O} \) and \( \theta_{YSZ} \) represent the \( O^{2-}(YSZ) \), \( OH^-(YSZ) \), \( H_2O(YSZ) \) and an empty site on the YSZ surface. Following the approach of Zhu et al. (2005), the second step of the charge transfer reaction (reaction 2.5) is considered rate limiting. Other fast reactions are in pseudo-equilibrium and the species activities can be obtained from the equilibrium constants of fast reactions and reaction rate constant of reaction 2.5. In the following relations, and \( K_1, K_2, K_4, K_5 \) and \( K_6 \) correspond to the equilibrium constants of reactions 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8. Adsorption of \( H_2 \) and \( H_2S \) are described by the Langmuir-type isotherm with the reaction energetics being independent of the surface coverage.

\[ \frac{\theta_H^2}{\theta_{Ni}^2 P_{H_2}} = K_1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.11)

\[ \frac{\theta_{Ni} \theta_{OH}}{\theta_H \theta_O} = K_2 \exp \left( \frac{F F_a}{R T} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.12)

\[ \frac{\theta_{YSZ} P_{H_2O}}{\theta_{H_2O}} = K_4 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)

\[ \frac{\theta_O}{\theta_{YSZ}} = K_5 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.14)

\[ \frac{P_{H_2} \theta_S}{\theta_{Ni} P_{H_2S}} = K_6 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)
Reaction 2.4 is a charge-transfer reaction considered to be in equilibrium. Therefore, $E_a$ representing the difference between the electric potential ($\Phi_{el}$) and ionic potential ($\Phi_{ion}$) of electrode appears in its relation.

The rate of the charge-transfer reaction can be expressed in terms of rate of electrons generated or current. Flux of charge-transfer or the current density of the rate limiting reaction (2.5) can be written as follows:

$$i = l_{TPB} F\left( k_{3,a} \theta_H \theta_{OH} \exp\left( \frac{\beta_{3,a} F E_a}{RT} \right) - k_{3,c} \theta_{H2O} \theta_{Ni} \exp\left( \frac{-\beta_{3,c} F E_a}{RT} \right) \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.16)

with $k_{3,a}$ and $k_{3,c}$ being the anodic and cathodic thermal rate constants (functions of temperature) $\beta_{3,a}$ and $\beta_{3,c}$ are the anodic and cathodic symmetry factors. $l_{TPB}$ is the TPB length in anode.

By considering the constraint that the sum of surface coverages is equal to one and after some algebraic manipulations, species site fractions on the YSZ surface can be derived in terms of gaseous partial pressures and surface coverages of Ni and hydrogen ($\theta_H, \theta_{Ni}$). Site fraction of species on the YSZ surface ($\theta_{H2O}, \theta_{YSZ}, \theta_{O}$ and $\theta_{OH}$) in terms of $\theta_H$ and $\theta_{Ni}$ are presented as below.

$$\theta_{H2O} = \frac{P_{H2O}}{P_{H2O} + k_4 + k_5 + \left( \frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} \right) K_2 \exp(\frac{F E_a}{RT}) K_4 / K_5}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.17)

$$\theta_{YSZ} = \frac{K_4}{P_{H2O} + k_4 + k_5 + \left( \frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} \right) K_2 \exp(\frac{F E_a}{RT}) K_4 / K_5}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.18)

$$\theta_{O} = \frac{K_4 / K_5}{P_{H2O} + k_4 + k_5 + \left( \frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} \right) K_2 \exp(\frac{F E_a}{RT}) K_4 / K_5}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.19)

$$\theta_{OH} = \frac{\left( \frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} \right) K_2 \exp(\frac{F E_a}{RT}) K_4 / K_5}{P_{H2O} + k_4 + k_5 + \left( \frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} \right) K_2 \exp(\frac{F E_a}{RT}) K_4 / K_5}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.20)

By substituting the surface coverages in the current density expression (equation 2.16) and further algebraic manipulation, an expression for current density in terms of the equilibrium constants (2.11 – 2.15) is obtained. The anodic and cathodic parts of the current density can be written as:

$$i_a = l_{TPB} F(k_{3,a} \theta_H \left( \frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} \right) K_2 \exp(\frac{F E_a}{RT}) K_4 / K_5 \exp\left( \frac{\beta_{3,a} F E_a}{RT} \right))$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.21)

$$i_c = l_{TPB} F(k_{3,a} / K_3 \theta_{Ni} P_{H2O} + k_4 + k_5 + \left( \frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} \right) K_2 \exp(\frac{F E_a}{RT}) K_4 / K_5 \exp\left( \frac{-\beta_{3,a} F E_a}{RT} \right))$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.22)
By assuming that the YSZ surface is fully covered with adsorbed oxygen ions we have $\theta_O \approx 1$, the current density expression can be simplified to:

$$i_a = I_{TPB}P \frac{k_3k_2 \theta_H}{k_5} \exp\left(\frac{F E_a}{RT}\right) \exp\left(\frac{\beta_3aFE_a}{RT}\right) \frac{\theta_{Ni}}{\theta_{Ni'}} \left(\frac{\theta_{H}/\theta_{Ni}}{\theta_{H}/\theta_{Ni'}}\right) \exp\left(\frac{\beta_3aFE_a}{RT}\right)$$

(2.23)

$$i_c = I_{TPB}P \frac{k_3a \theta_{Ni}}{k_3} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_3cFE_a}{RT}\right) \frac{P_{H2O}}{K_4/K_5}$$

(2.24)

Further, by substituting the term $\theta_H$ from equation 2.11, combining the exponential terms in the numerator and some further algebraic manipulations, the relations shown below are obtained:

$$i_a = I_{TPB}Pk_3aK_1K_2P_{H2} \theta_{Ni} \exp\left(\frac{(\beta_3a+1)FE_a}{RT}\right)$$

(2.25)

$$i_c = I_{TPB}P \frac{k_3a \theta_{Ni}}{k_3} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_3cFE_a}{RT}\right) \frac{P_{H2O}}{K_4/K_5}$$

(2.26)

$$i = I_{TPB}FK_3a \theta_{Ni} \left[K_1K_2P_{H2} \exp\left(\frac{(\beta_3a+1)FE_a}{RT}\right) - \frac{P_{H2O}}{K_3(K_4/K_5)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_3cFE_a}{RT}\right)\right]$$

(2.27)

The next step is arranging the current density in the form of Butler-Volmer equation expressed by equation (2.28).

$$i = i_0[\exp\left(\frac{(\beta_3a+1)\eta}{RT}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_3c\eta}{RT}\right)]$$

(2.28)

Activation overpotential ($\eta_a$) represents the difference between $E_a$ (local difference between the potential of electronic phase and potential of ionic phase) and $E_a^{eq}$ (local equilibrium potential difference between the electronic phase and the ionic phase).

$$\eta_a = E_a - E_a^{eq}$$

(2.29)

In order to arrange the current density in the form of Butler-Volmer equation, $E_a^{eq}$ should be found. By setting the current density ($i$) from equation (2.27) to zero and some further algebraic manipulations, $E_a^{eq}$ can be calculated.

$$E_a^{eq} = \frac{-RT}{2F} \ln\left(\frac{K_3K_2K_4}{K_5} \frac{P_{H2}}{P_{H2O}}\right)$$

(2.30)
By assuming that $\beta_{3,a} + \beta_{3,c} = 1$, further restriction of $\beta_{3,c} = 0.5$ (Zhu et al. 2005), and more algebraic manipulations, the current density expression formulated in Butler-Volmer form is found as:

$$i = i_{TPB}Fk_{3,c}(K_3K_2K_1)^{1/4}(\frac{K_3}{K_4})^{3/2}(\theta_{Ni})P_{H2O}^3P_{H2}^{1/4}[\exp\left(\frac{(\beta_{3,a}+1)\eta}{RT}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_{3,c}\eta}{RT}\right)]$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.31)

In the above expression, the terms outside the square brackets are lumped together to define exchange current density ($i_0$) as follows:

$$i_0 = i_{TPB}Fk_{3,c}(K_3K_2K_1)^{1/4}(\frac{K_3}{K_4})^{3/2}(\theta_{Ni})P_{H2O}^3P_{H2}^{1/4}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.32)

Deriving an expression for $\theta_{Ni}$ from equilibrium constants and surface coverage constraint on Ni and substituting into equation above yields the final relation for $i_0$:

$$\frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} + 1 + \frac{\theta_S}{\theta_{Ni}} = \frac{1}{\theta_{Ni}}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.33)

$$\frac{\theta_H}{\theta_{Ni}} = P_{H2}^{1/2}K_{1}^{1/2}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.34)

$$\frac{\theta_S}{\theta_{Ni}} = \frac{K_6P_{H2S}}{P_{H2}}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.35)

$$P_{H2}^{1/2}K_{1}^{1/2} + 1 + \frac{K_6P_{H2S}}{P_{H2}} = \frac{1}{\theta_{Ni}}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.36)

$$i_0 = i_{TPB}Fk_{3,c}(K_3K_2K_1)^{1/4}(\frac{K_3}{K_4})^{3/2} \left( \frac{1}{P_{H2}^{1/2}K_{1}^{1/2}+1} + \frac{K_6P_{H2S}}{P_{H2}} \right) P_{H2O}^3P_{H2}^{1/4}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.37)

$$i_0 = i_{TPB}Fk_{3,c}(K_3K_2)^{1/4}(\frac{K_3}{K_4})^{3/2} \left( \frac{P_{H2O}^3}{P_{H2}^{1/2}K_{1}^{1/2}+1} + \frac{K_6P_{H2S}}{P_{H2}} \right)$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.38)

Since there are two charge-transfer reactions, the overall current density is twice the current density and is obtained as indicated below:

$$i_0 = 2i_{TPB}Fk_{3,c}(K_3K_2)^{1/4}(\frac{K_3}{K_4})^{3/2} P_0^3 \left( \frac{P_{H2O}^3}{P_{H2}^{1/2}K_{1}^{1/2}+1} + \frac{K_6P_{H2S}}{P_{H2}} \right)$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (2.39)
With all the constants and equilibrium constants lumped into \( i_{H2}^* \) parameter, the exchange current density can be written as follows:

\[
i_{H2}^* = 2l_{TPB} F k_3 c (K_3 K_2)^{1/4} \left( \frac{K_3}{K_4} \right)^{3/4} \frac{p_0^{3/4}}{K_5 K_4^{3/4}}
\]

(2.40)

\[
i_0 = i_{H2}^* \left( \frac{\left( \frac{p_{H2O}}{p_0} \right)^{3/4} \frac{p_{H2}^{1/4} K_1^{1/4}}{p_{H2}^{1/2} K_1^{1/2 + 1/4} K_6 p_{H2S}}}{p_{H2}} \right)
\]

(2.41)

The volumetric exchange current density \( (i_0) \) is a function of \( i_{H2}^* \) (exchange current factor), local adsorption equilibrium constants, local partial pressure of gas species and local surface coverage.

Exchange current factor is a function of TPB length, rate and equilibrium constant of the elementary steps of the hydrogen oxidation reaction. \( K_1 \) (also referred as \( \text{K}_{H2} \)) is the equilibrium constant of the \( H_2 \) adsorption. \( K_6 \) (also referred as \( \text{K}_{H2S} \)) is the equilibrium constant of \( H_2S \) adsorption. In the coverage-independent model \( \text{K}_{H2} \) and \( \text{K}_{H2S} \) vary with temperature but are independent of the species coverage. Calculations of these constants are shown in next section of thermodynamics of \( H_2 \) and \( H_2S \) adsorption with coverage-independent energies.

**Calculation of exchange current density factor:**

Exchange current density factor is often treated as an empirical parameter that can be adjusted to fit the measured cell performance. Its dependency on the temperature can be expressed as:

\[
i_{H2}^* = i_{ref,H2}^* \exp \left[ - \frac{E_{a,H2}^*}{R} \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_{ref}} \right) \right]
\]

(2.42)

The empirically obtained value reported by Zhu and Kee (2008) at \( T_{ref} = 800 \, ^{\circ}C \) is used as reference exchange current density factor \( (i_{ref,H2}^*) \) to calculate \( i_{H2}^* \) at other temperatures. \( E_{a,H2} \) is an activation energy. \( i_{ref,H2}^* \) can be normalized with respect to the reference TPB length (calculated from Zhu and Kee, 2008) to be only a function of rate and equilibrium constants. The normalized \( i_{ref,H2}^* \) can then be multiplied by the TPB length per unit volume to obtain the \( i_{ref,H2}^* \) corresponding to our model. TPB length is calculated from the coordination theory with the details explained in Appendix A. The calculated...
TPB length from Zhu and Kee (2008) and TPB length from our model have the same value. Therefore, $i_{ref,H2}^*$ of our model is also equal to $i_{ref,H2}^*$ of Zhu and Kee (2008).

### 2.2.2 Thermodynamics of H$_2$ and H$_2$S adsorption on Ni: Coverage-independent energies

The equilibrium constant for adsorption of gases or liquids on solid surfaces are not readily available or computed, e.g. via the use of tabulated Gibbs energy. The reason is that energies of the adsorbed species are not available or easily computed. In this work, the coverage-independent kinetic model requires the calculation of $K_{H2}$ and $K_{H2S}$. The equilibrium constant of H$_2$ adsorption reaction is calculated based on two different approaches. The first approach is based on the formulation/expression reported by Zhu et al. (2005), which is reported below:

$$
K_{H2} = \gamma_0 \frac{A_{des} \Gamma_2 \sqrt{2 \pi R T \gamma_0}}{\exp \left( \frac{E_{des}}{RT} \right)}
$$

(2.43)

With $E_{des}, A_{des}, \gamma_0$ and $\Gamma$ being the activation energy for the H$_2$ desorption reaction, pre-exponential factor, sticking coefficient and the surface site density. The calculated value of $K_{H2}$ at $T=700$ °C is $1.409 \times 10^{-5}$ $\text{Pa}^{-1}$. The second approach is to obtain the equilibrium constants of H$_2$ and H$_2$S adsorption from DFT based calculations proposed by Monder and Karan (2010). DFT based estimation of $K_{H2}$ and $K_{H2S}$ are presented in the next section.

**DFT based estimation of equilibrium constants for H$_2$S and H$_2$ adsorption reactions:**

The equilibrium constant of the H$_2$S and H$_2$ adsorption reactions are calculated from *ab initio* adsorption thermodynamics of H$_2$ and H$_2$S on Ni (111) (Monder and Karan 2010). The model considered a unit cell of Ni (111) with 2 atom by 2 atom surface denoted as C. Each surface species is a combination of hydrogen and sulfur atoms on C. In the work of Monder and Karan (2010), seven reactions with eight different surface species ($C, C_H, C_{2H}, C_{4H}, C_S, C_{2S}, C_{2H,S}, C_{2H,2S}$) are considered for the adsorption thermodynamics of H$_2$ and H$_2$S on this unit cell C. Each of the seven reactions has a different free energy due to the different surface species involved in the reaction. Therefore, it could be inferred that the
thermodynamics of the H₂ and H₂S adsorption is implicitly coverage dependent. For this study, among the seven reactions, two reactions were chosen to describe the H₂S adsorption, and one reaction was chosen to present the H₂ adsorption reaction and calculate the K_{H₂S} and K_{H₂}.

K_{H₂S} can be estimated by considering the following reactions on Ni (111) surface:

\[ H₂S(g) + C ⇌ C₂H₅S \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.44)

\[ C₂H₅S ⇌ H₂ + C₅ \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.45)

K_{H₂} can be estimated by considering the following reaction on Ni (111) surface:

\[ \frac{1}{2} H₂(g) + C ⇌ C₅ \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.46)

The surface coverage of H and S adsorbed species (θ_H and θ_S) are defined as:

\[ θ_H = \frac{1}{4} \theta'_{C₂H₅S} + \frac{1}{2} θ'_{2H₅S} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.47)

\[ θ_S = \frac{1}{4} \theta'_{C₅} + \frac{1}{4} θ'_{2H₅S} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.48)

θ'_{2H₅S} , θ'_{C₅} and θ'_{C₂H₅S} are the surface coverage of C₂H₅S, C₅ and C_H species.

Because of the difference in the surface coverage species on the unit cell C and the H and S coverages, and also not considering all the seven reactions, the calculated K_{H₂S} and K_{H₂} would be different from the ab initio thermodynamics results (Monder and Karan 2010). The data from ab initio thermodynamics model (Monder and Karan 2010) at 700°C is used to calculate the free energy of these reactions. The calculated enthalpies include the DFT calculated electronic energy (E_{el,i}), zero point vibrational energy (E_{ZPV,i}) and thermal corrections (E_{th,i}).

\[ G_i^0 = H_i^0 - TS_i^0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.49)

\[ H_i^0 = E_{el,i} + E_{ZPV,i} + E_{th,i} + PV_{mi} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.50)

K_{H₂S} can be calculated from the energetics of reactions 2.44 and 2.45. \( \Delta G_{1,H₂S,ads}^0 \) and \( \Delta G_{2,H₂S,ads}^0 \) represent the standard Gibbs free energy of the reactions 2.44 and 2.45. \( \Delta G_{1,H₂S,ads}^0 = -0.14 \) eV and \( \Delta G_{2,H₂S,ads}^0 = -1.22 \) eV. The summation of these two reactions can be used to calculate the free energy for the H₂S adsorption reaction and thereby the associated equilibrium constant, K_{H₂S}.
\[ H_2S(g) + C \rightleftharpoons H_2 + CS \]  

(2.51)

\[ \Delta G_{H2S,ads}^0 = \Delta G_{1,H2S,ads}^0 + \Delta G_{2,H2S,ads}^0 = -1.36 \text{ (eV)} = -13121.9 \frac{J}{mol} \]  

(2.52)

Here, the activity \( a_i \) of surface species and gas species is defined as:

\[ a_i = \frac{\theta_i}{c_T} \]  

(2.53)

\[ a_i = \frac{p_i}{p_T} \]  

(2.54)

\[ K_{H2S} \] can be written as follows:

\[ K_{H2S} = \frac{\theta_s P_{H2}}{\theta_v P_{H2S}} = \frac{\theta_s P_{H2}}{\theta_v P_{H2S}} = \exp \left( - \frac{\Delta G_{H2S,ads}^0}{RT} \right) \]  

(2.55)

By substituting \( \Delta G_{H2S,ads}^0 \), T and R values in the relation above, the value of the \( K_{H2S} \) is calculated to be \( 1.1083 \times 10^7 \). Similarly, \( K_{H2} \) can be calculated from the energetics of reaction 2.46. \( \Delta G_{H2,ads}^0 \) represents the Gibbs free energy of reaction 2.46 and is equal to 0.14 eV or 13507.94 \( J_mol \). Accordingly, the equilibrium constant of reaction 2.46 (\( K_{H2} \)) at T=700ºC is calculated to be:

\[ K'_{H2} = \frac{\theta_{H2}}{(P_{H2} \theta_v)^{0.5}} \exp \left( - \frac{\Delta G_{H2,ads}^0}{RT} \right) = 0.188 \]  

(2.56)

The \( K_{H2} \) that we have considered in the derivation of our kinetic model is \( K_{H2} = \frac{\theta_{H2}^2}{P_{H2} \theta_v^2} \), therefore:

\[ K_{H2} = \left( \frac{K'_{H2}}{P_0} \right)^2 = \frac{\theta_{H2}^2}{P_{H2} \theta_v^2} = \frac{0.188 \times 2}{101325} = 3.48 \times 10^{-7} \left( \frac{1}{Pa} \right) \]  

(2.57)

The DFT-based \( H_2 \) and \( H_2S \) adsorption equilibrium constants were calculated at 700ºC from the \textit{ab initio} thermodynamics model. For calculation of \( K_{H2} \) and \( K_{H2S} \) at other temperatures the readers are referred to Monder and Karan (2010).
Calculation of hydrogen and sulfur coverages:

The hydrogen and sulfur coverages are calculated for two cases. In the first case, H coverage is calculated for only H$_2$ adsorption reaction. In the second case, both H and S coverages are calculated considering the competing H$_2$ and H$_2$S adsorption reactions.

1) Hydrogen coverage on Ni in the presence of pure hydrogen gas

The H coverage is calculated by using the DFT based $K_{H2}$ at 700 ºC ($K_{H2}=3.48 \times 10^{-7} \frac{1}{Pa}$) considering Langmuir isotherm and that $\theta_V = 1 - \theta_H$ as follows:

$$\theta_H = \frac{(P_{H2}K_{H2})^{0.5}}{(P_{H2}K_{H2})^{0.5} + 1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.58)

From the above expression, it is expected that an increase in $P_{H2}$ and $K_{H2}$ will increase the H coverage.

Figure 2-2 shows the changes of hydrogen coverage as a function of hydrogen partial pressure.

![Figure 2-2: Hydrogen coverage as a function of hydrogen partial pressure with pure H$_2$ adsorption (coverage-independent kinetic model), [T=700 ºC]](image)

It is predicted that the hydrogen coverage changes from 0.0562 to 0.158 by changing the $P_{H2}$ from 0.1 atm to 1 atm.
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2) Hydrogen and sulfur coverages from adsorption of a mixture of $H_2$ and $H_2S$

The H and S coverages are calculated by using the DFT based estimates of $K_{H2}$ and $K_{H2S}$ at 700 °C by solving chemical potential equilibrium equations. The results are based on considering the competitive adsorption of $H_2$ and $H_2S$ on Ni surface. By using the $K_{H2}$ and $K_{H2S}$ formulation and taking the $\theta_V = 1 - \theta_H - \theta_S$, the hydrogen and sulfur coverages can be calculated by solving equations 2.59 and 2.60 simultaneously:

$$K_{H2} = \left(\frac{\theta_H}{1-\theta_H-\theta_S}\right)^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.59)

$$K_{H2S} = \frac{\theta_S}{1-\theta_H-\theta_S} \frac{P_{H2}}{P_{H2S}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.60)

Surface coverages of H and S are calculated at different values of $P_{H2S}/P_{H2}$ for two different total pressures of 0.97 atm and 0.2 atm. Figure 2-3 shows the calculated H and S coverages as a function of $P_{H2S}/P_{H2}$ at $P_{H2} + P_{H2S} = 0.91 \text{ atm}$ and $P_{H2} + P_{H2S} = 0.2 \text{ atm}$.

![Figure 2-3: Hydrogen and sulfur coverage as a function of $P_{H2S}/P_{H2}$ (coverage-independent kinetic model), $[P_{H2S}+ P_{H2}= 0.2 \text{ atm and } P_{H2S}+ P_{H2}= 0.97 \text{ atm; } T=700 \degree \text{C} ]$](image)
By comparing the H and S coverage values in these two figures, we see that for identical $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$, the H coverage is higher at $P_{H_2}$~0.97 atm than at $P_{H_2}$~0.2 atm, whereas the S coverage is lower at $P_{H_2}$~0.97 atm than at $P_{H_2}$~0.2 atm. This shows the dependency of poisoning on both $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$ and $P_{H_2}$ parameters. The key point to take away is that the coverage of electro-active species (H) is significantly affected by both the total pressure and by the typically ascribed parameter, $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$.

**Effect of sulfur poisoning on the coverage-independent Butler-Volmer equation:**

The effect of the sulfur poisoning on the kinetics of $H_2$ oxidation is studied by comparing the Butler-Volmer expression for the two cases: pure $H_2$ and $H_2S$ contaminated $H_2$. The current density from Butler-Volmer expression for pure $H_2$ electro-oxidation is calculated by equation (2.31) with the exchange current density ($i_0$) and $i_{H2}^*$ calculated by the equations (2.41) and (2.42). By considering that the anode activation overpotential, $\eta_a$ is equal in all cases, the effect of $H_2S$ can be investigated by only comparing the exchange current density. Here, $i_{0,H2}$ and $i_{0,H2S}$ represent the exchange current density for hydrogen electro-oxidation reaction in absence and presence of $H_2S$, respectively. The reduction in the exchange current density caused by sulfur poisoning can be calculated by the following expression:

$$\frac{i_{0,H2} - i_{0,H2S}}{i_{0,H2}} = 1 - \frac{\left(\frac{P_{H_2O}}{P_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} K_{H_2}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left(\frac{P_{H_2O}}{P_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} K_{H_2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{K_{H_2S}P_{H_2S}}{P_{H_2}}} = 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{P_{H_2}} K_{H_2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1}{\frac{1}{P_{H_2}} K_{H_2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1 + \frac{K_{H_2S}P_{H_2S}}{P_{H_2}}} = \left(\frac{P_{H_2}}{P_{H_2}}\right)$$

(2.61)

The exchange current density effectively decreases with an increase in $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$ ratio. Figure 2-4 shows the reduction in exchange current density plotted as a function of $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$.
The effect of sulfur poisoning on the exchange current density is not only dependent on $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ but also on the partial pressure of the hydrogen and the equilibrium constants of $\text{H}_2$ and $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ adsorption reactions. Figure 2-5 shows the effect of $P_{\text{H}_2}$ on the extent of reduction in exchange current density at 0.1 ppm $\text{H}_2\text{S}$. The DFT-based calculated $K_{\text{H}_2}$ and $K_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}$ values are used for calculations. The total pressure is the sum of $P_{\text{H}_2}$ and $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}$. 

Figure 2-4: Reduction in exchange current density as a function of $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ (Coverage-independent kinetic model), $[P_{\text{H}_2} + P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}} = 0.97 \text{ atm}; T=700 \ ^\circ\text{C}]$
Figure 2-5: Reduction in exchange current density as a function of $P_{H2}$ (coverage-independent kinetic model), [T=700 °C]

This figure shows that an increase in the hydrogen partial pressure ($P_{H2}$) decreases the reduction in current density. Figure 2-6 shows the effect of $K_{H2S}$ and $K_{H2}$ on the extent of reduction in exchange current density caused by sulfur poisoning for $H_2S$ concentration of 0.1 ppm. The DFT calculated $K_{H2}$ and $K_{H2S}$ values are used in the calculation of reduction in current density at $P_{H2} + P_{H2S} = 0.97 \text{ atm}$. As expected, an increase in $K_{H2}$ results in a decrease in the reduction in current density whereas an increase in $K_{H2S}$ increases the reduction in current density.
As expected, it can be observed from figure 2-6, $K_{H_2}$ and $K_{H_2S}$ values have a great impact on the extent of the sulfur poisoning effect on the current density. The simplifying assumptions of having a constant and coverage-independent $K_{H_2S}$ and $K_{H_2}$ values would cause errors in calculating the current density. Therefore, the dependency of $K_{H_2S}$ and $K_{H_2}$ on the surface coverage should be considered. There have been only a few studies that have considered the coverage-dependent adsorption energies for the chemisorption of H$_2$S on Ni. However, these models have some deficiencies as discussed in Monder and Karan (2010). For example, in a DFT-based model of Wang and Liu (2007), the competitive adsorption of H$_2$ on Ni surface is ignored. In addition to that, species activity, thermal corrections and entropy of all surface species are not considered. In another DFT-based model by Galea et al, (2007), thermal corrections of the reaction enthalpy is ignored by assuming that the translational and rotational entropy of the gas species is lost on adsorption.
2.2.3 Coverage-dependent thermodynamics of H₂ and H₂S adsorption on Ni

Prior to deriving a coverage-dependent Butler-Volmer type kinetic expression, the thermodynamics of coverage-dependent H₂ and H₂S adsorption on Ni surface will be discussed. In section 2.2.2, in the derivation of the Butler–Volmer type expression with H₂S impurities, a Langmuir-type adsorption was assumed for H₂ and H₂S adsorption reactions in which the adsorption energy is not dependent on the adsorbate coverages. In this section, the dependency of the H₂ and H₂S adsorption reactions on the adsorbate coverages are considered by using a coverage-dependent thermodynamics for H₂S and H₂ adsorption reactions developed by Monder and Karan (2013). The following are presented in this section: a brief presentation of the DFT-derived coverage-dependent energetics; the derivation of the H₂ and H₂S adsorption equilibrium constants; and the calculation of H and S coverages at equilibrium conditions for adsorption of pure H₂ and for adsorption of H₂/H₂S mixture.

Brief presentation of the DFT-derived coverage-dependent energetics:

The dependency of the adsorption energetics on the surface coverage is captured by directly calculating the chemical potential of surface species from the chemical potential of the H and S surface species by the relations (2.62) and (2.63), following the reference of Monder and Karan (2013).

\[
\mu_H = E_H(0) + 2\alpha_H \{\theta_H - \theta_H(0)\} + \beta_{HS}\theta_S^* + k_B T \ln \left( \frac{\theta_H}{(1 - \theta_S - \theta_H) \Pi \left( \frac{\exp\left(\frac{-\mu_H}{k_B T}\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{-\mu_H}{k_B T}\right)} \right)} \right) \tag{2.62}
\]

\[
\mu_S = E_S(0) + 2\alpha_S \{\theta_S - \theta_S(0)\} + \beta_{HS}\theta_H^* + k_B T \ln \left( \frac{\theta_S}{(1 - \theta_S - \theta_H) \Pi \left( \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{-\mu_S}{k_B T}\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{-\mu_S}{k_B T}\right)} \right)} \right) \tag{2.63}
\]

The first three terms account for the Electronic energy change. E_H(0) and E_S(0) are the zero coverage adsorption energies; \(\theta_H(0)\) and \(\theta_S(0)\) are the threshold coverages below which there is no dependency on coverage; \(\alpha_H\) and \(\alpha_S\) are the self-interaction parameters and \(\beta_{HS}\) is the binary interaction parameter. The
last term considers the vibrational energy.

\[ q_{i,k}(\text{vib}) = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{h\nu_{i,k}}{2k_BT}\right)}{1-\exp\left(-\frac{h\nu_{i,k}}{k_BT}\right)} \]  

(2.64)

\( \Pi(q_{i,k}(\text{vib})) \) is the product over the number of vibrational modes for adsorbed species i. \( \nu_{i,k} \) is the kth vibrational frequency for species i, \( h \) and \( k_B \) are the Planck and Boltzmann constants. Details of the calculation of the chemical potential of the surface species are presented in Appendix B. The reader is also referred to the Monder and Karan (2013) for more details. Chemical potential of the \( \text{H}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) gas species as an ideal gas are calculated from the following relation:

\[ \mu_j = \mu_j^0 + RT\ln(P_i) \]  

(2.65)

\( \mu_j^0 \) is the standard state chemical potential and \( P_i \) is the partial pressure of the gas species. By substituting the chemical potential of gas and surface species in the two equilibrium equations of \( \text{H}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) adsorption reactions, two equations with two unknowns of \( \theta_H \) and \( \theta_S \) are obtained and can be solved.

**\( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) and \( \text{H}_2 \) adsorption reaction equilibrium constants**

The equilibrium constants for the \( \text{H}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) adsorption reactions are calculated by a series of algebraic manipulations on the chemical equilibrium equations. Starting from \( K_{\text{H}_2} \) formulation defined as \( \frac{\theta_H^2}{\theta_{\text{Ni}^2}\text{PH}_2} \) and by deriving an expression for \( P_{\text{H}_2} \) obtained from chemical equilibrium equation, one would get an expression for \( K_{\text{H}_2} \) in terms of vibrational, electronic and standards chemical potential of gaseous species.

\[ \text{H}_2(g) + 2(\text{Ni}) \rightleftharpoons 2\text{H} (\text{Ni}) \]  

(2.66)

At equilibrium,

\[ 2\mu_H - \mu_{\text{H}_2} = 0 \]  

(2.67)

Here, \( \mu_H \) is the chemical potential difference of bare Ni and H-covered Ni.

\[ 2\mu_H - \mu_{\text{H}_2}^0 = RT\ln\left(\frac{P_{\text{H}_2}}{P_0}\right) \]  

(2.68)

\[ P_{\text{H}_2} = P_0 \exp\left(\frac{2\mu_H}{RT}\right) \cdot \exp\left(-\mu_{\text{H}_2}^0\right) \]  

(2.69)
By substituting the chemical potential of H with the units of \((J/mol)\) and using the notations of \(E_H\) and \(\Pi(q_{H,k})\) for the electronic and vibrational energies, we have:

\[
\mu_H = F(E_H) + RT \log \left\{ \frac{\theta_H}{(1-\theta_S-\theta_H)\Pi(q_{H,k})} \right\} \quad (2.70)
\]

\[
P_{H^2} = P_0 \exp \left( \frac{2FE_H}{RT} + 2\log \left\{ \frac{\theta_H}{(1-\theta_S-\theta_H)\Pi(q_{H,k})} \right\} \right) \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_H^0}{RT} \right) \quad (2.71)
\]

\[
P_{H^2} = P_0 \exp \left( \frac{2FE_H}{RT} \right) \left( \frac{\theta_H}{(1-\theta_S-\theta_H)\Pi(q_{H,k})} \right)^2 \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_H^0}{RT} \right) \quad (2.72)
\]

By substituting the derived expression for \(P_{H^2}\) in equilibrium constant, the desired expression for \(K_{H^2}\) is derived:

\[
K_{H^2} = \frac{P_{H^2}^2}{P_0} \exp \left( -\frac{2FE_H}{RT} \right) \exp \left( \frac{\mu_H^0}{RT} \right) \quad (2.73)
\]

Following the same procedure for \(K_{H^2S}\) defined as \(P_{H^2}/P_{H^2S}\), finding \(P_{H^2}/P_{H^2S}\) as a function of H and S coverages and substituting in the \(K_{H^2S}\) expression would result in an expression for \(K_{H^2S}\).

\[
\mu_S + \mu_{H^2} - \mu_{H^2S} = 0 \quad (2.74)
\]

\[
0 = \mu_S + \mu_{H^2}^0 + RT \ln \left( \frac{P_{H^2}}{P_0} \right) - \mu_{H^2S}^0 - RT \ln \left( \frac{P_{H^2S}}{P_0} \right) \quad (2.75)
\]

\[
-\frac{\mu_S}{RT} \cdot \frac{\mu_{H^2}^0 - \mu_{H^2S}^0}{RT} = \ln \left( \frac{P_{H^2}}{P_{H^2S}} \right) \quad (2.76)
\]

\[
\frac{P_{H^2}}{P_{H^2S}} = \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_S}{RT} \right) \cdot \exp \left( \frac{\mu_{H^2}^0 - \mu_{H^2S}^0}{RT} \right) \quad (2.77)
\]

By substituting the chemical potential of S with the units of \((J/mol)\) and using the notations of \(E_S\) and \(\Pi(q_{S,k})\) for the electronic and vibrational energies, we have:

\[
\mu_S = F(E_S) + RT \log \left\{ \frac{\theta_S}{(1-\theta_S-\theta_H)\Pi(q_{S,k})} \right\} \quad (2.78)
\]

\[
P_{H^2}/P_{H^2S} = \exp \left( -\frac{FE_S}{RT} \right) \left( \frac{\theta_S}{(1-\theta_S-\theta_H)\Pi(q_{S,k})} \right)^{-1} \exp \left( \frac{\mu_{H^2S}^0 - \mu_{H^2}^0}{RT} \right) \quad (2.79)
\]

By substituting the derived expression for \(P_{H^2}/P_{H^2S}\) in \(K_{H^2S}\), the desired expression is derived:

\[
K_{H^2S} = \exp \left( -\frac{FE_S}{RT} \right) \cdot \Pi(q_{S,k}) \cdot \exp \left( \frac{\mu_{H^2S}^0 - \mu_{H^2}^0}{RT} \right) \quad (2.80)
\]
Both derived expressions for the equilibrium constants of \( H_2 \) and \( H_2S \) adsorptions reactions in coverage-dependent thermodynamics are functions of adsorbed H and S atoms on Ni surface. By calculating the equilibrium constant for \( H_2 \) adsorption, it could be realized that in the case for adsorption from a pure \( H_2 \) stream, \( E_E \) is constant for \( \theta_H < \theta_H(0) \). \( E_E \) increases with an increase in \( P_{H2} \) and hydrogen coverage for \( \theta_H > \theta_H(0) \), \( \theta_H(0) = 0.511 \). Therefore, it is expected to have a decrease in the \( K_{H2} \) for \( \theta_H > \theta_H(0) \) with increase in \( P_{H2} \) or \( \theta_H \). Another point to mention is that, logically, one would expect the convergence of coverage-dependent DFT-based equilibrium constants and coverage-independent DFT-based equilibrium constants at low H and S coverages. However, it can be predicted that these equilibrium constants do not converge at low coverages. In other words, coverage-dependent DFT-based calculated \( K_{H2} \) and coverage-independent DFT-based calculated \( K_{H2} \) do not converge at low H coverage or low \( P_{H2} \). Similarly, coverage-dependent DFT-based calculated \( K_{H2S} \) and coverage-independent DFT-based calculated \( K_{H2S} \) do not converge at low S coverage or low \( P_{H2S}/P_{H2} \). As mentioned earlier in subsection 2.2.2 the reasons for this behavior are not accounting for all the reactions as considered in Monder and Karan (2010), and difference in the surface coverage species on the unit cell C and the H and S coverages.

**Calculation of hydrogen and sulfur coverages:**

Sulfur and hydrogen coverages can be calculated at equilibrium conditions for H and S adsorption from \( H_2 \) and \( H_2S \) mixtures. Due to our assumptions of chemical equilibrium condition, the coverage-dependent Gibbs free energy of the adsorption reactions can be set to zero at a constant temperature and pressure. For known pressure, temperature and gas phase composition and by substituting the chemical potential of the gas and surface species in the equilibrium equations, two equations with two unknowns of sulfur and hydrogen coverages are obtained. Solving for the unknowns, the surface coverages of hydrogen and sulfur on the Ni surface are obtained.

*Sulfur coverage from adsorption of a mixture of \( H_2 \) and \( H_2S \)*

The calculated \( \theta_S \) as a function of \( P_{H2S}/P_{H2} \) is shown and compared for both coverage-dependent and
coverage-independent kinetic models in figure 2-7. The computed S coverage from coverage-independent model is considerably higher than that from the coverage-dependent model at higher $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ values. This behavior can be interpreted by examining the $K_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}$ behavior. As shown in figure 2-8, $K_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}$ of coverage-dependent model decreases with increase in $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ and becomes lesser than the $K_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}$ of coverage-independent model at high $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ values. That is the reason to observe higher S coverage in coverage-independent model than in the coverage-dependent model at high $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ values.
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Figure 2-7: Equilibrium sulfur coverage as a function of $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ predicted by coverage-independent and coverage-dependent kinetic model [P$_{\text{H}_2}$+ P$_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}$= 0.97 atm; T=700 °C]
2.2.4 Derivation of the “coverage dependent Butler-Volmer type” kinetic model with sulfur poisoning:

In order to derive a coverage dependent Butler-Volmer (B.V.) kinetic expression, the reaction energetics of the previously derived Butler-Volmer equation must be modified to include dependency on surface coverages. This can be achieved by implementing the coverage-dependent thermodynamics of H₂ and H₂S adsorption in the kinetic expression. The exchange current density of the derived Butler-Volmer type equation in the presence of H₂S was defined by equation (2.41). The coverage dependent kinetic formulation can be achieved by implementing the coverage dependent $K_{H₂S}$ and $K_{H₂}$ from equations (2.73) and (2.80) into equation (2.41). The expression can also be simplified by expressing the exchange current density in terms of H and S coverage as well:

$$i_0 = i_{H₂}^* \left( \frac{P_{H₂O}}{P_0} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \frac{\theta_H^{0.5}}{\theta_{Ni}^{0.5}} = i_{H₂}^* \left( \frac{P_{H₂O}}{P_0} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \theta_H^{0.5} \theta_{Ni}^{0.5} \tag{2.81}$$

Figure 2-8: H₂S adsorption equilibrium constant as a function of $P_{H₂S}/P_{H₂}$ [$P_{H₂} + P_{H₂S} = 0.97$ atm; $T=700$ ºC]
At any temperature, pressure and gas phase composition, the equilibrium surface coverages can be calculated and implemented in the coverage-dependent Butler-Volmer expression. In the next section, the effect of the sulfur poisoning on the exchange current density for both coverage-dependent and coverage-independent Butler-Volmer type kinetic models is examined.

2.2.5 Effect of H$_2$S on the kinetics of H$_2$ oxidation

In this section, the effect of H$_2$S poisoning of Nickel computed from both coverage-independent and coverage-dependent Butler-Volmer equations are studied by comparing the corresponding exchange current density. Six different kinetic models are presented as demonstrated in Figure 2-1.

- The kinetic model with only H$_2$ adsorption (without H$_2$S) is presented for three cases with the following H$_2$ adsorption equilibrium constants: $K_{H2,Zhu et al}$ from Zhu et al. (2005) approach; $K_{H2,DFT}$ from coverage-independent DFT calculated energetics (Monder and Karan, 2010), and $K_{H2,DFT}$ from coverage-dependent DFT calculated energetics (Monder and Karan, 2013). The DFT results are for hydrogen adsorption on Ni (111) surface.

- The kinetic model with both H$_2$ and H$_2$S adsorption reactions are presented for the three cases with the following sets of adsorption equilibrium constants: $K_{H2,Zhu et al}$ and $K_{H2S,DFT}$; $K_{H2,DFT}$ and $K_{H2S,DFT}$ from coverage-independent DFT calculated energetics, and $K_{H2,DFT}$ and $K_{H2S,DFT}$ from coverage-dependent DFT calculated energetics. The parameters used in the Butler-Volmer equations are listed in Table 2-1 below.
Table 2-1: Kinetic models parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>101325 Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 mole fraction</td>
<td>0.97- n_H2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2O mole fraction</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2S mole fraction</td>
<td>1×10^{-10} to 1×10^{-1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n_H2S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i_{ref,H2}</td>
<td>4.8×10^9 \frac{A}{m^3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i_{H2}</td>
<td>1.205×10^9 \frac{A}{m^3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{H2,DFT}</td>
<td>3.48×10^{-7} \frac{1}{Pa}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{H2,Zhu et al}</td>
<td>1.409×10^{-5} \frac{1}{Pa}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{H2S,DFT}</td>
<td>1.1×10^{-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>700 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_{ref}</td>
<td>800 °C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2-9 shows the changes of i_0 in aforementioned 6 models at different P_{H2S}/P_{H2}. Concerning the models without H2S, following behaviors can be observed: The exchange current density remains constant. Exchange current density (i_0) of the coverage-independent model with K_{H2,Zhu et al} is higher than the i_0 of the coverage independent model with K_{H2,DFT} due to higher value of K_{H2,Zhu et al} than K_{H2,DFT}. The i_0 of the coverage-dependent model is slightly higher than the coverage-independent model with K_{H2,DFT} due to its higher equilibrium constant as it is shown in figure 2-10 that coverage-dependent K_{H2} is higher than the coverage-independent K_{H2,DFT} at low P_{H2S}/P_{H2} of 1×10^{-10}. Concerning the models with H2S
poisoning, the $i_0$ decreases with an increase in $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$. Exchange current density of the coverage-independent models with $K_{H_2,DFT}$ and $K_{H_2,Zhu \ et \ al}$ at low $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$ matches the $i_0$ of the coverage independent models without $H_2S$ with $K_{H_2,DFT}$ and $K_{H_2,Zhu \ et \ al}$ respectively. Reduction in $i_0$, at high $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$ is less abrupt in coverage-dependent model than in coverage-independent with $K_{H_2,DFT}$, that is due to lower $K_{H_2S}$ values of coverage-dependent model than coverage-independent model ($K_{H_2,DFT}$) at high $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$ (referring to figure 2-8).

**Figure 2-9:** Exchange current density as a function of $P_{H_2S}/P_{H_2}$ for conditions in Table 2.1
Figure 2-10: Hydrogen adsorption equilibrium constant as a function of $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$

**Predicted reduction in exchange current density by coverage-dependent and independent models:**

In this section, the reduction in HOR exchange current density due to sulfur adsorption from H$_2$S is compared for the two different kinetic models, i.e. coverage-dependent and coverage-independent kinetic models. Figure 2-11 shows the relative reduction in exchange current density due to sulfur poisoning for coverage dependent and independent kinetic models.
Figure 2-11: Reduction in exchange current density for coverage-dependent and coverage-independent kinetic models [T=700°C]

For coverage-independent model, the reduction in exchange current density predicted by the coverage-independent model changes abruptly from about 10% to more than 90% over a small range of $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ approximately from $1\times10^{-8}$ to $1\times10^{-6}$. The model predicts a reduction in exchange current density of almost 100% for $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ greater than $1\times10^{-5}$. Reduction in exchange current predicted by coverage-independent model is different than the coverage-dependent model in terms of the total reduction over the $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ range and the slope of the curve. Reduction in exchange current density predicted by coverage-dependent model increase steadily from about 10% to more than 80% over a broad range of $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$ approximately from $1\times10^{-8}$ to $1\times10^{-1}$. Predicted reduction in exchange current density in coverage-dependent model is lower than the coverage-independent model at higher $P_{\text{H}_2\text{S}}/P_{\text{H}_2}$.
2.3 Conclusion

A new kinetic model in the form of modified Butler-Volmer expression was developed that captures the effect of the presence of H₂S impurities and sulfur poisoning on the H₂ electrochemical reaction in the Ni-based anodes of SOFCs. The $K_{H_2}$ and $K_{H_2S}$ being the equilibrium constants of the H₂ and H₂S adsorption reactions, appear in the kinetic formulation. The kinetic model can be divided into two groups: coverage dependent and coverage independent models based on the dependency of the $K_{H_2}$ and $K_{H_2S}$ on the S and H coverages on Ni surface. In the coverage-independent kinetic model, $K_{H_2}$ and $K_{H_2S}$ are constant values that do not change by the change of S and H coverages. In the coverage dependent kinetic model $K_{H_2}$ and $K_{H_2S}$ are functions of the S and H coverages. For both models, an increase in H₂S concentration results in a greater reduction in the exchange current density. The relative reduction in exchange current density predicted by coverage independent model is more dramatic than the predicted reduction by coverage dependent model. Much of the reduction in the exchange current density predicted by coverage independent model occurs from H₂S concentration of 0.01 ppm to 1 ppm and it almost remains constant for H₂S concentration higher than 1 ppm. The relative reduction in the exchange current density predicted by coverage dependent model increases gradually with an increase in the H₂S concentration. The predicted reduction in this model is almost 50 % for 1ppm H₂S concentration.
Chapter 3

Multiphysics electrochemical performance model of anode half-cell SOFC with the sulfur poisoning effect

This Chapter presents the development of a multiphysics electrochemical performance model for anode half-cell in the presence of H$_2$S. The model is called multiphysics electrochemical performance as it predicts the effect of the H$_2$S poisoning on the electrochemical performance of the cell by considering the involved key physical phenomena. The model considers a two-dimensional (2D) geometry consisting of a fuel gas channel, a porous anode and an electrolyte. The model couples all the key transport phenomena including momentum, mass and charge transport with the electrode kinetics, derived in Chapter two. The multiphysics electrochemical performance model is categorized based on the type of the Butler-Volmer kinetic expression used as kinetic model.

3.1 Introduction

In development of the multiphysics electrochemical performance model, the kinetic model for the hydrogen electrochemistry considering the effect of sulfur poisoning, derived in previous chapter, is implemented into the 2-dimensional porous anode model. The 2-dimensional porous anode model considers the multi-component transport of gases in the porous anode and in the fuel channel, the ionic and electronic species transport in the porous anode, and the ionic species transport in the electrolyte layer. In addition to predicting the effect of H$_2$S on the electrochemical performance (current-voltage curves), the distributions of species concentration, pressure and electrical potential are examined. The effects of different kinetic formulations, discussed in Chapter 2, on anode performance are explored. It may be recalled that the kinetic models differ in the manner in which the H$_2$ and H$_2$S adsorption reactions are treated, i.e. whether the equilibrium constants (K$_{H_2}$ and K$_{H_2S}$) are considered to be coverage-
independent or coverage-dependent. The multiphysics electrochemical performance models are divided and named based on the type of kinetic model (derived in Chapter 2) being implemented in model.

Figure 3-1 summarizes the multiphysics electrochemical performance models presented in Chapter 3.

**Figure 3-1: Multiphysics electrochemical performance models reported in this thesis**

In the following sections, the model geometry, the computational domains and the transport phenomena equations considered in each model domain are explained. The main features of the model, the electrochemical performance of each model and the relative loss in the performance due to the sulfur poisoning will be shown. The results will also be compared to the experimental data.
3.1.1 Anode Electrochemistry

Anode electrochemistry formulations consist of general Butler-Volmer type expression used for the hydrogen electro-oxidation in addition to the derived formulations in Chapter 2 that captures the effect of the sulfur poisoning. General form of the Butler–Volmer equation is expressed by following equations:

\[ i = i_0 \left[ \exp \left( \frac{α_a F \eta_a}{RT} \right) - \exp \left( \frac{α_c F \eta_a}{RT} \right) \right] \]  
(3.1)

\[ i_0 = i^*_H \left( \frac{\left( \frac{P_{H_2O}}{P_a} \right)^{3/2} P_{H_2}^{1/4} K_{1/4}}{P_{H_2}^{1/2} K_1^{1/2} + 1 + \frac{K_a P_{H_2S}}{P_{H_2}}} \right) \]  
(3.2)

Exchange current density is calculated by equation (3.2) in the absence of sulfur poisoning effect and is calculated by equation (2.41) or (2.81) in the presence of H₂S in the fuel mixture to capture the sulfur poisoning effect. \( \eta_a \) is the local activation overpotential and is defined as:

\[ \eta_a = \phi_{el} - \phi_{ion} - E^0_a \]  
(3.3)

\( \phi_{el} \) and \( \phi_{ion} \) represent the electronic and ionic phase potentials. \( E^0_a \) is the local equilibrium phase potential difference and is calculated as follows:

\[ E^0_a = \frac{ΔG^0}{2F} + \frac{RT}{2F} \ln \frac{P_{H_2O}}{P_{H_2}} \]  
(3.4)

\[ ΔG^0 = \mu_{H_2O}^0 - \mu_{H_2}^0 \]  
(3.5)

\( \mu_{H_2O}^0 \) and \( \mu_{H_2}^0 \) are the standard chemical potentials of the H₂O and H₂ species.

3.2 Model domains

The geometry that is considered for our two-dimensional model consists of a fuel channel, a porous anode with Ni-YSZ composite matrix, a YSZ electrolyte and an ideal cathode boundary as it is shown in figure 3-2 below. An ideal cathode boundary at the cathode electrolyte interface implies that ohmic and activation losses are zero for the cathode. The fuel channel is 1.5 cm long with 1 mm height. The thickness of the Ni-YSZ anode and electrolyte layers are 550 µm and 20 µm respectively with 1 cm length. Figure 3-2 shows the model geometry.
A reactant mixture consisting of hydrogen and water vapor enters the fuel channel from the left side in the figure 3-2. For cases where H₂S is considered in the model, the feed mixture will also contain H₂S in addition to H₂ and H₂O. The hydrogen in the fuel mixture in the gas channel is transported through the pores of anode domain. During the transport in the porous anode, these species interact with the Ni and YSZ surfaces. Oxygen ions being transported through the electrolyte (YSZ) react with adsorbed hydrogen at the TPB. Water and electrons are the products of the electrochemical reaction and are transported through the pores of the porous anode to the gas channel and through the Ni phase to the external circuit, respectively as shown in figure 1-2. The fully coupled multi-physics model considers the transport of mass, momentum and charged species in the following domains:

- Multicomponent gas species transport in the gas channel.
- Multicomponent gas species transport in the porous anode.
- Momentum transport in the gas channels.
- Momentum transport in the porous anode.
- Charge transport (electrons and oxygen ions) in the porous composite anode.
- Charge transport (oxygen ions) in the electrolyte.

These transport phenomena expressed in terms of PDE (partial differential equations) in each domain with necessary boundary conditions for each PDE will be discussed later. Microstructural effects of anode porous layer are accounted for through effective properties. In calculating the effective properties, the
average size and volume fractions of each phase in addition to the percolation effects are considered. The electrochemical reaction of hydrogen is captured by Butler-Volmer type kinetic expression in the anode domain. In the presence of the H$_2$S in the H$_2$ feed, sulfur is also adsorbed on the Ni surface. The competitive adsorption of the H$_2$S and H$_2$ that is captured in our kinetic formulations is dependent on the partial pressure of H$_2$ and H$_2$S and the energetics of the reaction. In the coverage-dependent kinetic model in which the energetics of H$_2$ and H$_2$S adsorption reactions are dependent on coverage, the distributed sulfur and hydrogen surface coverage in the anode domain is calculated by adding a module to solve the chemical equilibrium of H$_2$ and H$_2$S adsorption reactions. This module that is called the “Coverage module” is solved simultaneously with the PDEs of the transport model. The next section will address the anode electrochemistry models implemented in the 2D porous anode model.

3.3 Transport model

3.3.1 Mass transport for multicomponent gas species mixture:

The general form of mass conservation can be expressed as:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho_i) = -\nabla \cdot [j_i + w_i \rho v] + r_i$$

(3.6)

$\rho_i$, $j_i$, $w_i$, $v$, $\rho$ represent the density of species $i$, diffusive flux of species $i$ due to the concentration gradient, mass fraction of species $i$, mass average velocity and density of the gas mixture, respectively. $w_i \rho u$ is the convective flux for species $i$ and $r_i$ is the rate of production or consumption of species $i$. The steady state mass transport in the electrode and in the gas channel can be described by the convective-diffusion mass transport equation:

$$\nabla \cdot [j_i + w_i \rho v] = r_i$$

(3.7)

In the multicomponent species transport, the Maxwell-Stefan equation is used for diffusive flux formulation. Based on this formulation, diffusive flux is proportional to the diffusional driving force and is expressed by:
\[ \dot{i}_i = -\rho w_i \sum_{j=1}^{n} D_{ij} d_j \quad (3.8) \]

\( \bar{D}_{ij} \) is the multicomponent Fick diffusivity of species \( i \) in \( j \). \( d_j \) is the diffusional driving force.

\[ d_j = \nabla x_j + (x_j - w_j) \frac{v_p}{p} \quad (3.9) \]

\( x_j \) is the mole fraction of species \( j \). By substituting the diffusive flux in the convective-diffusion mass transport equation, the final equation for multicomponent species transport is obtained:

\[ \nabla \cdot \left[ -\rho w_i \sum_{i \neq j}^{n} \bar{D}_{ij} (\nabla x_j + (x_j - w_j) \frac{v_p}{p}) + (w_i \rho v) \right] = r_i \quad (3.10) \]

The multicomponent Fick diffusivity \( \bar{D}_{ij} \) is related to the binary diffusion coefficients \( D_{ij} \) by:

\[ \bar{D}_{ii} = -\frac{w_j^2}{x_i x_j} D_{ij} \quad (3.11) \]

\[ \bar{D}_{jj} = -\frac{w_i^2}{x_i x_j} D_{ij} \quad (3.12) \]

\[ \bar{D}_{ij} = \bar{D}_{ji} = -\frac{w_i w_j}{x_i x_j} D_{ij} \quad (3.13) \]

**Mass transport of multicomponent gas mixture in gas channel:**

In the gas channel, there is no reaction and \( r_i \) is zero, therefore, the mass transport equation in the gas channel reduces to the following:

\[ \nabla \cdot \left[ -\rho w_i \sum_{i \neq j}^{n} \bar{D}_{ij} (\nabla x_j + (x_j - w_j) \frac{v_p}{p}) + (w_i \rho v) \right] = 0 \quad (3.14) \]

**Mass transport of multicomponent gas mixture in porous anode:**

The mass transport equation in the porous anode is:

\[ \nabla \cdot \left[ -\rho w_i \sum_{i \neq j}^{n} \bar{D}_{eff,ij} (\nabla x_j + (x_j - w_j) \frac{v_p}{p}) + (w_i \rho v) \right] = r_i \quad (3.15) \]

Effective binary diffusion coefficient \( \bar{D}_{eff,ij} \) takes into account the effect of porosity \( (\varepsilon) \) and the tortuosity \( (\tau) \) of the porous media.

\[ D_{ij}^{eff} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} D_{ij} \quad (3.16) \]

Reaction rate \( (r_i) \) for the \( \text{H}_2 \) being produced is calculated by:
\[ \eta = \frac{i_V M_{H_2}}{2F} \]  

(3.17)

With F being the Faraday's constant, \( i_V \) being the volumetric current density \( (A/m^3) \), and \( M_{H_2} \) being the molecular weight of the hydrogen.

### 3.3.2 Momentum transport

Navier-Stokes equation coupled to the continuity equation is used to model the flow in the channel. Temperature and composition-dependent viscosity and density are used for momentum transport modeling in the fuel channel.

\[
\rho (v \nabla v) - \nabla \left[ \mu (\nabla v + (\nabla v)^T) - \left( \frac{2}{3} \mu \right) (\nabla v)I \right] - \nabla P = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\rho v)
\]

(3.18)

\( \mu, \rho, v \) and \( P \) are the viscosity, density, velocity vector and the pressure of the gas mixture. \( I \) is the identity matrix. This generalized equation can be adopted for both gas channel and the porous media.

**Momentum transport in the gas channel**

Momentum conservation equation in the gas channel, without reaction and at steady state is solved with continuity equation in this domain:

\[
\rho (v \nabla v) - \nabla \left[ \mu (\nabla v + (\nabla v)^T) - \left( \frac{2}{3} \mu \right) (\nabla v)I \right] - \nabla P = 0
\]

(3.19)

\[ \nabla (\rho v) = 0 \]  

(3.20)

**Momentum transport in the porous media**

The Navier-Stokes equation can be further modified to include the Darcy’s term and is solved with the continuity equation in this domain.

\[
\left( \frac{\mu}{\kappa} + R_a \right) v = \nabla \left[ -P I + \frac{\mu}{\epsilon} (\nabla v + (\nabla v)^T) - \frac{2}{3} \mu (\nabla v)I \right]
\]

(3.21)

\[ \nabla (\rho v) = R_a \]  

(3.22)

\( \epsilon \) is the porosity or void fraction of the electrode. \( \kappa \) is the permeability of the gas. \( R_a \) is the net rate of mass production in anode.

\[ R_a = \frac{i_V (M_{H_2O} - M_{H_2})}{2F} \]  

(3.23)
3.3.3 Electronic and ionic charge transport

Electric and ionic potential fields are related to the rate of production of the charged species as the result of electrochemical reaction. The Ohm’s law is used to express the ionic and electronic potential fields in anode and electrolyte domains. The electronic charge transport in anode, ionic charge transport in the electrolyte and anode domains are expressed by the following equations respectively:

\[ \nabla (- \sigma_{el}^{eff} \nabla \phi_{el}) = i_V \] (3.24)

\[ \nabla (- \sigma_{ion} \nabla \phi_{ion}) = 0 \] (3.25)

\[ \nabla (- \sigma_{ion,an}^{eff} \nabla \phi_{ion,an}) = -i_V \] (3.26)

\( \sigma_{el}^{eff}, \sigma_{ion} \) and \( \sigma_{ion,an}^{eff} \) are the effective electronic conductivity of anode, ionic conductivity of electrolyte and effective ionic conductivity of anode respectively. \( \nabla \phi_{el}, \nabla \phi_{ion} \) and \( \nabla \phi_{ion,an} \) are the electric phase potential for anode, ionic phase potential for electrolyte and anode respectively. \( i_V \) is the volumetric current density calculated by Butler-Volmer equation as in equation (3.1).

3.3.4 Governing equations and Boundary conditions

In this section the governing equations and the boundary conditions of each domain are presented.

-Mass transport of multicomponent gas mixture in gas channel:

\[ \nabla \left[ - \rho \sum_{j=1}^{n} D_{ij} (\nabla x_j + (x_j - w_j) \frac{\nabla p}{p}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w_i \rho V) \right] = 0 \] (3.27)

**Boundary conditions:**

Mass fraction of the inlet chemical species that are H\(_2\), H\(_2\)O and H\(_2\)S is defined in the fuel inlet channel.

\[ w_{H2}|_{\partial \Omega_{fuel,inlet}} = w_{H2,in} \] (3.28)

\[ w_{H2O}|_{\partial \Omega_{fuel,inlet}} = w_{H2O,in} \] (3.29)

\[ w_{H2S}|_{\partial \Omega_{fuel,inlet}} = w_{H2S,in} \] (3.30)

Continuity of the fluxes is set at the anode/electrolyte interface.

\[ J_{|\partial \Omega_{channel/anode}} = J_{|\partial \Omega_{anode|channel}} \] (3.31)
\( \mathbf{J}_i \) is the total flux.

Convective flux boundary is set at the fuel outlet channel.

\[
\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{J}_i|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{fuel, outlet}}} = \mathbf{n} \cdot w_i \rho \mathbf{v} 
\]

No flux condition is set at the walls of fuel channel.

\[
\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{J}_i|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{wall}}} = 0 
\]

-Mass transport of multicomponent gas mixture in porous anode:

\[
\nabla \left[ - \rho w_i \sum_{\substack{j=1 \atop i \neq j}}^n \tilde{D}_{ij} \left( \nabla x_j + \left( x_j - w_j \right) \frac{\nabla p}{p} \right) + (w_i \rho \mathbf{v}) \right] = r_i 
\]

Boundary conditions:

No flux condition is set at the walls of the anode.

\[
\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{J}_i|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{wall}}} = 0 
\]

Continuity of the fluxes in set at the anode/electrolyte interface.

\[
\mathbf{J}_i|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/anode}}} = \mathbf{J}_i|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{anode/channel}}} 
\]

Momentum transport in gas channel:

\[
\rho (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}) - \nabla \left[ \mu (\nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T) - \left( \frac{2}{3} \mu \right) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{I} \right] - \nabla P = 0
\]

\[
\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0 
\]

Boundary conditions:

Fully developed, Laminar flow is set at the fuel inlet.

Atmospheric pressure normal to the outlet of the fuel channel is set at the outlet of the fuel channel.

\[
p_{\text{channel}}|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{wall}}} = p_{\text{atm}} 
\]

Continuity boundary condition is set at the channel/porous anode interface.

\[
p_{\text{channel}}|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}} = p_{\text{electrode}}|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}}
\]

\[
\mathbf{v}_{\text{channel}}|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}} = \mathbf{v}_{\text{electrode}}|_{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}}
\]

No slip boundary at the walls of the channel.
\( \mathbf{v} \mid _{\partial \Omega_{\text{wall}}} = 0 \) \hspace{1cm} (3.42)

**Momentum transport in porous anode:**
\[
\left( \frac{\mu}{K} + R_a \right) \mathbf{v} = \nabla \left[ -P I + \frac{\mu}{\varepsilon} (\nabla \mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T) - \frac{2}{3} \mu (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) I \right] \hspace{1cm} (3.43)
\]
\( \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = R_a \hspace{1cm} (3.44) \)

**Boundary conditions**
Continuity boundary condition is set at the channel/porous anode interface.
\[
\mathbf{v}_{\text{electrode}} \mid _{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}} = \mathbf{v}_{\text{channel}} \mid _{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}} \hspace{1cm} (3.45)
\]
\[
P_{\text{electrode}} \mid _{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}} = P_{\text{channel}} \mid _{\partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}} \hspace{1cm} (3.46)
\]
No slip boundary at the walls of porous anode.
\( \mathbf{v} \mid _{\partial \Omega_{\text{wall}}} = 0 \) \hspace{1cm} (3.47)

**Ion and electron transport in porous anode and electrolyte:**

**Ion transport in electrolyte:**
\[
\nabla \cdot (\sigma_{\text{ion}} \nabla \Phi_{\text{ion}}) = 0 \hspace{1cm} (3.48)
\]

**Boundary condition:**
Zero ionic flux (\( i_i \)) is implemented at the walls of electrolyte:
\[
\mathbf{n} \cdot i_i \mid _{\partial \Omega_{\text{wall}}} = 0 \hspace{1cm} (3.49)
\]
An ideal cathode boundary condition at the electrolyte/cathode interface which neglects all the losses of the cathode.
\[
E_c = \Phi_{\text{el(c)}} - \Phi_{\text{ion(c)}} = E_{eq} \hspace{1cm} (3.50)
\]
\[
\Phi_{\text{ion(c)}} \mid _{\partial \Omega_{\text{cathode/electrolyte}}} = \Phi_{\text{el(c)}} - E_{eq} \hspace{1cm} (3.51)
\]
\( E_c, E_{eq}, \Phi_{\text{ion(c)}} \) and \( \Phi_{\text{el(c)}} \) are the potential of the cathode (difference between the potential of electronic phase and potential of ionic phase in cathode), equilibrium potential of cathode(equilibrium potential difference between the electronic phase and the ionic phase), and ionic potential of the cathode and electrical potential of cathode at the cathode/channel interface.
Continuity of ionic flux is set at the electrolyte/porous anode interface.

\[ i_{i}|\partial \Omega_{\text{electrolyte/anode}} = i_{i}|\partial \Omega_{\text{anode/electrolyte}} \]  

(3.52)

**Ion transport in porous anode:**

\[ \nabla \cdot (-\sigma_{ion\_an}^{\text{eff}} \nabla \phi_{ion\_an}) = -i_{V} \]  

(3.53)

**Boundary condition:**

Zero ionic flux \( (i_{i}) \) is implemented at the walls of the electrode and at the electrode/channel interface.

\[ \mathbf{n} \cdot i_{i}|\partial \Omega_{\text{wall}} = 0 \]  

(3.54)

\[ \mathbf{n} \cdot i_{i}|\partial \Omega_{\text{anode/channel}} = 0 \]  

(3.55)

Continuity of ionic flux is set at the porous anode/electrolyte interface.

\[ \nabla \cdot (-\sigma_{el}^{\text{eff}} \nabla \phi_{el}) = i_{V} \]  

(3.56)

\[ i_{i}|\partial \Omega_{\text{electrolyte/anode}} = i_{i}|\partial \Omega_{\text{anode/electrolyte}} \]  

(3.57)

**Electron transport in porous anode:**

An anode reference potential is set at the gas channel/porous anode interface.

\[ \phi_{el(a)}|\partial \Omega_{\text{anode/channel}} = 0 \]  

(3.58)

Electrical insulation i.e. zero electronic flux \( (i_{e}) \) is implemented at the walls of the anode and at the anode/electrolyte interface.

\[ \mathbf{n} \cdot i_{e}|\partial \Omega_{\text{wall}} = 0 \]  

(3.59)

\[ \mathbf{n} \cdot i_{e}|\partial \Omega_{\text{anode/electrolyte}} = 0 \]  

(3.60)

Summary of key governing equations and the boundary conditions are summarized in table 3-1.
Table 3-1: Governing equations and the boundary conditions of the transport model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multicomponent species transport</th>
<th>Gas channel</th>
<th>Anode</th>
<th>Electrolyte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governing equation:</strong></td>
<td>( \nabla \left[ -\rho w_i \sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{D}_{ij} (\nabla x_j) \right. )</td>
<td>( \nabla \left[ -\rho w_i \sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{D}_{ij} (\nabla x_j) \right. )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( + \left( x_j - w_j \right) \frac{\nabla p}{p} )</td>
<td>( + \left( x_j - w_j \right) \frac{\nabla p}{p} )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( + \left( w_i \rho v \right) )</td>
<td>( + \left( w_i \rho v \right) = r_i )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary conditions:</strong></td>
<td>( w_{H2O}\mid_{\partial \Omega_{fuel,inlet}} = w_{H2O,in} )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( w_{H2O}\mid_{\partial \Omega_{fuel,inlet}} = w_{H2O,in} )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( w_{H2S}\mid_{\partial \Omega_{fuel,inlet}} = w_{H2S,in} )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( J_i\mid_{\partial \Omega_{channel/anode}} = J_i\mid_{\partial \Omega_{anode</td>
<td>channel}} )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n \cdot J_i\mid_{\partial \Omega_{fuel,outlet}} = n \cdot w_i \rho v )</td>
<td>( n \cdot J_i\mid_{\partial \Omega_{wall}} = 0 )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n \cdot J_i\mid_{\partial \Omega_{wall}} = 0 )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas channel</td>
<td>Anode</td>
<td>Electrolyte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Momentum transport</strong></td>
<td>Governing equation:</td>
<td>Governing equation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla) - \nabla \left[ \mu \mathbf{v} (\mathbf{v} + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T) \right.$</td>
<td>$\left( \frac{\mu}{K} + R_a \right) \mathbf{v} = \nabla \left[ -\mathbf{P} \right.$</td>
<td>$\left. + \frac{\mu}{\varepsilon} (\mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T) \right.$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\left. - \frac{2}{3} \mu (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \right] \mathbf{I} \right.$</td>
<td>$\left. - \frac{\mu}{3} \frac{\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{I}} \right] \right.$</td>
<td>$\left. - \frac{\mu}{3} (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \right]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P} = 0$</td>
<td>$\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = R_a$</td>
<td>$\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0$</td>
<td>Boundary conditions:</td>
<td>Boundary conditions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully developed, Laminar flow at the fuel inlet</td>
<td>$\mathbf{v}<em>{\text{electrode}} \mid \partial \Omega</em>{\text{channel/electrolyte}} = \mathbf{v}<em>{\text{channel}} \mid \partial \Omega</em>{\text{channel/electrolyte}}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{v}<em>{\text{electrode}} \mid \partial \Omega</em>{\text{channel/electrolyte}} = \mathbf{v}<em>{\text{channel}} \mid \partial \Omega</em>{\text{channel/electrolyte}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{\text{channel}} \mid \partial \Omega_{\text{wall}} = p_{\text{atm}}$</td>
<td>$p_{\text{channel}} \mid \partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}} = p_{\text{electrode}} \mid \partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}$</td>
<td>$p_{\text{electrode}} \mid \partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}} = p_{\text{channel}} \mid \partial \Omega_{\text{channel/electrolyte}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbf{v}<em>{\text{channel}} \mid \partial \Omega</em>{\text{channel/electrolyte}} = \mathbf{v}<em>{\text{electrode}} \mid \partial \Omega</em>{\text{channel/electrolyte}}$</td>
<td>Boundary conditions:</td>
<td>$\mathbf{v} \mid \partial \Omega_{\text{wall}} = 0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gas channel</td>
<td>Anode</td>
<td>Electrolyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic charge transport</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing equation:</td>
<td>$\nabla \cdot (-\sigma_{el}^{eff} \nabla \phi_{el}) = i_V$</td>
<td>$\nabla \cdot (-\sigma_{el}^{eff} \nabla \phi_{el}) = i_V$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary conditions:</td>
<td>$\phi_{el}(a)</td>
<td><em>{\partial \Omega</em>{anode/channel}} = 0$</td>
<td>$\phi_{el}(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n \cdot i_e</td>
<td><em>{\partial \Omega</em>{wall}} = 0$</td>
<td>$n \cdot i_e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n \cdot i_e</td>
<td><em>{\partial \Omega</em>{anode/electrolyte}} = 0$</td>
<td>$n \cdot i_e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ionic charge transport</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing equation:</td>
<td>$\nabla \cdot (-\sigma_{ion,an}^{eff} \nabla \phi_{ion,an}) = -i_V$</td>
<td>$\nabla \cdot (-\sigma_{ion,an}^{eff} \nabla \phi_{ion,an}) = -i_V$</td>
<td>$\nabla \cdot (-\sigma_{ion}^{eff} \nabla \phi_{ion}) = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary conditions:</td>
<td>$n \cdot i_i</td>
<td><em>{\partial \Omega</em>{wall}} = 0$</td>
<td>$n \cdot i_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n \cdot i_i</td>
<td><em>{\partial \Omega</em>{electrode/channel}} = 0$</td>
<td>$n \cdot i_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_i</td>
<td><em>{\partial \Omega</em>{electrolyte/anode}} = i_i</td>
<td><em>{\partial \Omega</em>{anode/electrolyte}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Input Parameters

In this section, all the input parameters that had been used in the governing equations of transport model and in the anode electrochemistry including kinetic model parameters are summarized. In addition to these parameters, geometric and microstructural parameters needed to calculate the TPB length are tabulated. The gas phase thermodynamic properties are calculated as a function of temperature and using the JANAF thermochemical tables.

3.4.1 Transport model parameters

The governing equations of the transport model contain physically meaningful parameters. Density, viscosity and permeability are the parameters needed for the momentum transport equation. Gas density, at a given pressure and temperature can be calculated by the ideal gas equation:

$$\rho = \frac{pM_g}{RT}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.61)

where $p$, $M_g$, $R$ and $T$ are the pressure, molecular weight, gas constant and temperature respectively. Viscosity of gases at low pressure can be calculated using the Chapman-Enskog relation:

$$\mu = 26.69 \times 10^{-8} \sqrt{\frac{pM_i}{\sigma_i^2 \Omega_i^{2,2}(T^\ast)}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.62)

$\sigma_i$ is the collision diameter (in nm) and $\Omega_i^{2,2}$ is a collision integral and is a function of reduced temperature (Brodkey and Hershey 1988). Reader is referred to Brodkey and Hershey (1988) for the values of these parameters. An average viscosity for the mixture can be calculated by the following expression:

$$\mu_{\text{mix}} = 0.5 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\text{species}} x_i \mu_i + \frac{1}{\Sigma_{i=1}^{\text{species}} x_i \mu_i} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.63)

$\kappa$ is the permeability of the gas and is calculated by the Carman-Kozeny relation:
\[ k = \frac{d_p^2}{72\tau} \frac{\varepsilon_g^3}{(1-\varepsilon_g)^2} \]  

(3.64)

\( d_p \), \( \tau \) and \( \varepsilon_g \) are the average particle diameter, tortuosity and the porosity respectively.

Binary diffusion coefficient and density are the parameters needed for the species transport. The binary diffusion coefficient, \( D_{ij} \) can be calculated from the Fuller-Schettler-Giddings Correlation (Reid, Prausnitz, and Poling 1987):

\[ D_{ij} = \frac{3.16 \times 10^{-8} T^{1.75}}{p} \left( \frac{1}{M_i} + \frac{1}{M_j} \right)^{0.5} \]  

(3.65)

\( M_i \) and \( M_j \) are the molar weights and \( v_i \) and \( v_j \) are the molar diffusion volumes of species i and j.

Effective binary diffusion coefficient is calculated by:

\[ D_{ij}^{eff} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\tau} D_{ij} \]  

(3.66)

Effective ionic and electronic conductivity are the parameters needed for the ionic and electronic charge transport. Ionic conductivity of electrolyte \( \sigma_{ion} \) is equal to the conductivity of pure ionic conducting phase \( (\sigma_{ion}^0) \) and is calculated as:

\[ \sigma_{ion}^0 = \frac{\sigma_{0,ion}}{T} \exp\left( -\frac{E_{ion}}{RT} \right) \]  

(3.67)

\( E_{ion} \) and \( \sigma_{0,ion} \) are the activation energy of \( O^2- \) conduction and Pre factor of \( O^2- \) conduction.

Conductivity of pure electronic conducting phase \( \sigma_{el}^0 \) is calculate by:

\[ \sigma_{el}^0 = 3.27 \times 10^4 - 10.653T \]  

(3.68)

Calculation of the effective conductivities of the porous anode based on percolation and coordination-number theory and using the pure solid phase conductivities is shown in Appendix A. Table 3-2 summarizes the transport model parameters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description/formula</th>
<th>Numerical value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>Tortuosity</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Zhu et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>Gas permeability</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{-16} \text{m}^2$</td>
<td>Zhu et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon$</td>
<td>Porosity of the porous electrode</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_i$</td>
<td>Molar diffusion volume of species</td>
<td>$v_{H_2O} = 12.7 \times 10^{-6}$, $v_{H_2} = 7.07 \times 10^{-6}$, $v_{H_2S} = 20.96 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>Taylor and Krishna (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{ion}$</td>
<td>Ionic conductivity of electrolyte</td>
<td>$2.67 \text{S/m}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{0, ion}$</td>
<td>Pre factor of $\text{O}_2^-$ conduction</td>
<td>$8.855 \times 10^{-7} \text{S/K m}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{ion}$</td>
<td>Activation energy of $\text{O}_2^-$ conduction</td>
<td>$9000 \text{J/mol}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{eff}^{el}$</td>
<td>Effective electronic conductivity of anode</td>
<td>$2680 \text{S/m}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{eff}^{ion, an}$</td>
<td>Effective ionic conductivity of anode</td>
<td>$0.127 \text{S/m}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 Kinetic model parameters

The parameters and constants that are needed to calculate the volumetric current density including the parameters required for $K_{H2}$ and $i^*_{H2}$ are listed in table 3-3 with their corresponding values. $K_{H2}$ (based on Zhu et al. formulations) and $i^*_{H2}$ are calculated by the following expressions:

$$K_{H2} = \frac{\gamma_0}{A_{des} \Gamma^2 \sqrt{2\pi RT W_{H2}}} \exp\left(\frac{E_{des}}{RT}\right)$$

(3.69)

$$i^*_{H2} = i^*_{ref, H2} \exp\left[-\frac{E_{a,H2}}{R} \left(\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_{ref}}\right)\right]$$

(3.70)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description/formula</th>
<th>Numerical value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_{des}$</td>
<td>Activation energy for the $H_2$ desorption reaction</td>
<td>$88.12 \text{ kj mol}^{-1}$</td>
<td>Zhu et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{des}$</td>
<td>Pre-exponential factor for the $H_2$ desorption reaction</td>
<td>$5.59 \times 10^{19} \text{ s.cm}^{2} \text{mol}^{-1}$</td>
<td>Zhu et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma$</td>
<td>Surface site density of Ni</td>
<td>$2.6 \times 10^{9} \text{mol} \text{cm}^{-2}$</td>
<td>Zhu et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_0$</td>
<td>Sticking coefficient</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Zhu et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{H2}$</td>
<td>Equilibrium constant of $H_2$ adsorption</td>
<td>$1.409 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Pa}^{-1}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{a,H2}$</td>
<td>Activation energy</td>
<td>$120 \text{ kj mol}^{-1}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{ref}$</td>
<td>Reference temperature</td>
<td>800 ºC</td>
<td>Zhu et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Description/formula</td>
<td>Numerical value</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{ref,H2}^*$</td>
<td>Reference exchange current density factor</td>
<td>$4.8 \times 10^9 \frac{A}{m^3}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{H2}^*$</td>
<td>Exchange current density factor</td>
<td>$1.205 \times 10^9 \frac{A}{m^3}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{H2,DFT}$</td>
<td>DFT based calculated H$_2$ adsorption equilibrium constant</td>
<td>$3.48 \times 10^{-7} \frac{1}{Pa}$</td>
<td>Monder and Karan (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{H2S,DFT}$</td>
<td>DFT based calculated H$_2$S adsorption equilibrium constant</td>
<td>$1.1083 \times 10^{7} \frac{1}{Pa}$</td>
<td>Monder and Karan (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{TPB,ref}$</td>
<td>Reference TPB length per unit volume</td>
<td>$8.8 \times 10^{-11} \frac{1}{m^2}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{TPB}$</td>
<td>Calculated TPB length per unit volume</td>
<td>$8.8 \times 10^{-11} \frac{1}{m^2}$</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_a$</td>
<td>Anodic charge transfer coefficient</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_c$</td>
<td>Cathodic charge transfer coefficient</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Zhu and Kee (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.3 Geometrical Parameters

The geometrical parameters include the dimensions of the half-cell anode model and the microstructural parameters needed to calculate the effective properties and TPB length and are listed in table 3-4.
Table 3-4: Geometric and microstructural parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Numerical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d_p$</td>
<td>Mean particle diameter</td>
<td>1 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$d_p = \frac{1}{\psi_{Ni} \frac{1}{2R_{Ni}} + \psi_{YSZ} \frac{1}{2R_{YSZ}}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
<td>Porosity of the porous electrode</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_{YSZ}$</td>
<td>YSZ volume fraction</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_{Ni}$</td>
<td>Ni volume fraction</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{Ni}$</td>
<td>Radius of the Ni particles</td>
<td>0.5 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{YSZ}$</td>
<td>Radius of the YSZ particles</td>
<td>0.5 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{anode}$</td>
<td>Anode thickness</td>
<td>500 µm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{electrolyte}$</td>
<td>Electrolyte thickness</td>
<td>20 µm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating conditions are listed in table 3-5:

Table 3-5: Operating conditions considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Numerical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_{H2,in}$</td>
<td>Inlet H$_2$ molar fraction</td>
<td>$0.97 - x_{H2S,in}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{H2O,in}$</td>
<td>Inlet H$_2$O molar fraction</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Numerical value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_{H2S,in}$</td>
<td>Inlet H$_2$S molar fraction</td>
<td>Varying from 0.0001 ppm to 1000 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{fuel,inlet}$</td>
<td>Mean inlet fuel velocity</td>
<td>700 ºC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Operating temperature</td>
<td>700 ºC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The detailed calculation of the inlet fuel velocity is given in Appendix C.

In the early stages of the work, a low permeability of $1 \times 10^{-16}$ m$^2$ calculated from Carman-Kozeny relation was employed in the model. For this permeability, the model predicted a high pressure built-up across the anode (from the anode/gas channel interface to the anode/electrolyte interface). At this permeability the pressure built-up across the anode is in the range of $1.8 \times 10^5$ Pa to $7 \times 10^5$ Pa for the cell voltage changing from 0.91V to 0.41V. Change of pressure across the anode was tested for permeability ranging from $1 \times 10^{-16}$ m$^2$ to $1 \times 10^{-12}$ m$^2$. Pressure built-up across the anode at permeability of $1 \times 10^{-12}$ m$^2$ is in the range of 90 Pa to 810 Pa for the cell voltage changing form 0.91V to 0.41V. In addition to the simulations at the calculated permeability value of $1 \times 10^{-16}$ m$^2$, the simulations were also tested for permeability of $1 \times 10^{-12}$ m$^2$. The Base Case performance model is the 2D multiphysics performance model with reported parameters in table 3-2 to table 3-5, with the permeability value of $1 \times 10^{-12}$ m$^2$. Base Case performance model will be the basis for our simulation in the following sections.
3.5 Solution method

All half-cell porous anode models were solved using COMSOL Multiphysics. COMSOL Multiphysics is a modeling package that uses finite element method and solves partial differential equations or ordinary differential equations describing any physical process. It has a graphic user interface for all the modeling steps of geometry generation, meshing, setting the differential equations and boundary conditions, solving and post-processing the results. The PARDISO direct solver package was used to solve all the governing equations of the model described by PDEs. For the meshing, a quadrilateral mesh that is controlled by setting the number of grid points at the boundaries of the electrode was used. The mesh generated for the 2D half-cell model has 28160 quadrilateral elements. A finer mesh is applied for the electrode/electrolyte interface because of the electrochemical reaction occurring at the interface and therefore the higher gradients. Number of nodes on different edges varies depending on the dimensions of the edges. For example the number of nodes on the length of the gas channel was chosen as 200. Grid independence was tested by comparing current density result of performance model (with overage dependent kinetic) against a mesh 1.5 times denser at cell voltage of 0.91V. The relative error in the current density was of the order of $1 \times 10^{-6}$ between the mesh used in this work with 28160 elements and the finer mesh with 43800 elements. The hydrogen concentrations were also compared for the two different meshes at the outlet of the gas channel. The relative difference is of the order of $1 \times 10^{-6}$. Figure 3-3 shows the cross section in the gas channel at which the H$_2$ mole fractions are compared. Figure 3-4 shows the H$_2$ mole fraction in the outlet of the gas channel cross-section for both mesh sizes.
Figure 3-3: Schematic figure of half-cell and the cross section in gas channel at x=0.0135 m

Figure 3-4: H₂ mole fraction in gas channel for different meshes at x=0.0135

Each simulation of the half-cell model presented in this chapter was verified for the mass and species conservation. Conservation of mass implies that sum of the mass flux entering the fuel channel and the mass flux added through the electrolyte should be equal to the mass flux leaving the gas channel. Conservation of species implies that the inlet molar flux should equal the outlet molar flux and the molar flux consumed/generated in the reaction.
3.6 Results and discussion

The multiphysics electrochemical performance is completed by implementing the kinetic models (that were developed in Chapter two) into the 2-dimentional multiphysics porous anode model. Different multiphysics electrochemical performance models are presented in figure 3-1.

The following subsections will be discussed in the results and discussion section:

- General features of the results from multiphysics performance model are presented with the Base Case parameters in
- Cell performance predictions for feed mixture without H₂S impurities are presented for both coverage-dependent and coverage-independent performance models.
- Cell performance predictions for feed mixture containing H₂S impurities are presented. Relative loss in the cell performance and relative increase in the cell resistance due to the sulfur poisoning are calculated and compared to the experimental results.

3.6.1 General features of the results from multiphysics performance model

In this section, the general features of the results generated by multiphysics performance model such as, the pressure, velocity, concentration, and potential gradients as well as the rate of reaction in the model domains are examined for the base case parameters and a coverage-dependent kinetic model.

Pressure profile:

The pressure profile in domains of the anode and gas channel is shown in figure 3-5 at zero H₂S content and cell voltage of 0.91 V.
Figure 3-5: Pressure profile in the anode and gas channel domains

The pressure in the gas channel remains almost constant. The pressure drop along the gas channel (inlet to outlet) is negligibly small and approximately 10 Pa. The pressure in the anode porous domain increases from $1.0133 \times 10^5$ Pa to $1.0142 \times 10^5$ Pa, from the channel/electrode interface to the electrode/electrolyte interface, i.e. an increase of 90 Pa. This behavior may be counterintuitive unless one realizes that there is a net mass production in the active region of the porous anode. As per the overall, HOR stoichiometry for every 2g of gaseous hydrogen consumed, 18g of water is produced. That is, there is a net increase in the gas-phase mass flow rate, which comes from the oxygen ion present in the electrolyte phase, i.e. the solid phase. Addition of the mass to the porous anode domain changes the momentum balance. Momentum transport equation in the anode domain is the Brinkman equation that takes into account the changes in momentum balance due to mass production via the term $R_a \nu$. Increase in the pressure profile that is calculated by this equation shows the effect of increase in momentum due to the mass production. Reaction rate increases in the anode from the channel/electrode interface to the electrode/electrolyte interface.
The effect of H$_2$S and sulfur poisoning is examined on the pressure profile in a cross sectional slice in the middle of the anode (from the anode/fuel channel interface to anode/electrolyte interface), as it is shown in figure 3-6. Figure 3-7 shows the pressure line profiles in this cross section at zero, 0.1 and 10 ppm H$_2$S and at cell voltage of 0.91 V.

**Figure 3-6:** Schematic figure of the half-cell and the cross-sectional slice in the middle of anode

**Figure 3-7:** Pressure line profiles across the depth of the anode at x=0.075 (m) and y=570 (μm) to y= 20 (μm) for feed mixture containing three H$_2$S concentrations
Due to higher rate of reaction and H₂O production at lower H₂S concentration, the increase of pressure is higher at lower H₂S concentration.

**Velocity field profile:**

The velocity field for feed mixture containing zero H₂S at cell voltage of 0.91 V is shown in figure 3-8. The velocity distribution in the gas channel shows the viscous effect of the wall on the fuel.

**Figure 3-8: Velocity field in anode and gas channel domains for the base case condition.**

**Species partial pressure and concentration profiles:**

The concentration and partial pressure profiles of the species H₂ and H₂O at the cell voltage of 0.91 V and zero H₂S concentration are shown in figure 3-9, 3-10, 3-11 and 3-12, respectively. H₂ mole fraction and partial pressure decrease along the gas channel and across the anode (from
anode/gas channel interface to anode/electrolyte interface) due to H₂ consumption. H₂O mole fraction and partial pressure increase along the gas channel and across the anode due to H₂O production.

Figure 3-9: H₂ mole fraction profile in anode and gas channel domains for the base case condition
Figure 3-10: H$_2$O mole fraction profile in anode and gas channel domains for the base case condition

Figure 3-11: H$_2$ partial pressure profile in anode and gas channel domains for the base case condition
In order to observe the effect of sulfur poisoning, H₂ and H₂O concentration line profiles are presented at different H₂S concentrations. H₂S concentration and partial pressure line profiles are also examined for 10ppm inlet H₂S concentration. Figures 3-13 and 3-14 show the line profiles of H₂ and H₂O mole fraction for feed mixture containing zero and 10 ppm H₂S in the middle of anode, (as depicted in figure 3-6). Due to the effect of sulfur poisoning and lower rate of H₂ consumption, decrease of the H₂ mole fraction at 10 ppm H₂S inlet concentration is less than the decrease of H₂ mole fraction at zero H₂S inlet concentration. Lower increase in the H₂O mole fraction is observed for feed mixtures with 10 ppm H₂S than that with zero H₂S inlet concentration. This behavior is due to the lower rate of reaction and H₂O production as the result of sulfur poisoning.
Figure 3-13: H₂ mole fraction distribution across the depth of the anode at x=0.075 m and y=570 µm to y= 20 µm for feed mixture containing zero and 10 ppm H₂S at cell voltage of 0.91 V.

Figure 3-14: H₂O mole fraction distribution across the depth of the anode at x=0.075 m and y=570 µm to y= 20 µm for feed mixture containing zero and 10 ppm H₂S at cell voltage of 0.91 V.
Figure 3-15 and 3-16 show the H₂S mole fraction and partial pressure line profiles for feed mixture containing 10 ppm H₂S in the middle of anode, (as depicted in figure 3-6). The H₂S mole fraction and partial pressure decrease in the anode domain in the middle of anode. A gradient in H₂S concentration is observed in the anode domain, in spite the fact that H₂S is not getting consumed or generated. This behavior can be explained by considering the net mass flux in the anode domain from electrolyte towards the gas channel due to the net mass production in the anode. This causes a convective flux of H₂S from the electrolyte towards the gas channel. As H₂S is not being consumed or generated, the total H₂S flux should remain zero. Having the convective flux of H₂S towards the gas channel causes the H₂S diffusive flux to be towards the electrolyte, resulting in a decreasing H₂S gradient in the anode domain.

![Graph showing H₂S mole fraction distribution across the depth of the anode at x=0.075 m and y=570μm to y= 20 μm for feed mixture containing 10 ppm H₂S at cell voltage of 0.91 V.]

Figure 3-15: H₂S mole fraction distribution across the depth of the anode at x=0.075 m and y=570μm to y= 20 μm for feed mixture containing 10 ppm H₂S at cell voltage of 0.91 V.
Figure 3-16: H$_2$S partial pressure distribution across the depth of the anode at $x=0.075$ m and $y=570 \mu m$ to $y= 20 \mu m$ for feed mixture containing 10 ppm H$_2$S at cell voltage of 0.91 V.

Potential distribution profile:

The distribution of electrical potential arises from the transport of charges. This results in a distributed activation overpotential, which then can result in a distributed reaction rates. It may be recalled that the overpotential in this work is defined as the difference between equilibrium phase potential difference and the local phase potential difference. The phase potential difference here refers to the difference between the ion-conducting (YSZ) and the electron-conducting (Ni) material phases. Zero overpotential implies that no electrochemical driving force exists and
would result in a zero current generation. The activation overpotential for base case parameters at cell voltage of 0.91 V is shown in figure 3-17.

![Figure 3-17: The activation overpotential for base case parameters at cell voltage of 0.91 V](image)

For a better observation of the anode overpotential distribution in the model domain, the line profile of the anode overpotential across the depth of the anode for three H₂S concentrations is shown in figure 3-18.
Figure 3-18: Anode activation overpotential line profiles in depth of anode, at $x=0.075$ m and $y=570 \mu m$ to $y=20 \mu m$, for base case parameters at cell voltage of 0.91 V

It can be noted that for the same cell potential of 0.91 V, in the case of higher H$_2$S in the reaction feed mixture, higher activation overpotential is observed. This would mislead a reader in interpreting that higher current is being generated in the case of feed with H$_2$S. However, the exchange current density is also diminished significantly in the presence of H$_2$S. The net result is that although the activation overpotential is higher for the case of feed with higher H$_2$S, a reduced exchange current density effects a lower current generation.

Reaction rate profile:

The rates of mass production per volume (kg/m$^3$.s) are compared for a rectangular area in the middle of anode as presented in figure 3-19. The rate of mass production profiles for base case parameters at three inlet H$_2$S concentrations of zero, 0.1 and 10 ppm at cell voltage of 0.91 V are shown in figure 3-20.
Figure 3-19: Schematic half-cell with rectangular area in the middle of anode

Rate of gas-phase mass generation.

The rate of mass production or the rate of reaction is higher for lower H₂S concentrations. Furthermore, most of the reaction occurs in a 10 microns thin region near the electrolyte/electrode interface.

Figure 3-20: Mass production rate profiles for three inlet H₂S concentrations in the center of the porous anode region indicated in Figure 3-19. The zoomed view of the H₂S distribution in a 10-micron thin region near the electrode/electrolyte interface is shown.
3.6.2 Polarization behavior predicted by multiphysics performance model with pure H₂ feed mixture

The polarization behavior (i-V curves) predicted from three multiphysics performance models varying in the kinetic model formulation are shown in Figure 3-21 for the Base Case parameters and for feed mixture without H₂S impurities. The set of results are presented to examine how the differences in the kinetic formulations affect the polarization behavior under conditions where transport effects are also important.

Figure 3-21: Polarization behavior (i-V curve) predicted by multiphysics performance model for reaction mixture without H₂S for Base Case parameters

The result from the coverage-independent model with $K_{H₂,\text{DFT}}$ is closer to the result from the coverage-dependent model. As expected, at any given cell potential, the kinetic model with highest exchange current density shows the highest current density.
3.6.3 Anode model predictions for feed mixtures containing H\textsubscript{2}S

The polarization curves, relative loss in cell performance as a function of H\textsubscript{2}S concentration and the relative increase in the anode activation overpotential are presented in the following subsections. The loss in cell performance can be compared for either galvanostatic (constant current) or potentiostatic (constant cell voltage) condition. In galvanostatic mode, the relative loss in a cell performance is considered as the loss in cell voltage at each H\textsubscript{2}S concentration relative to zero H\textsubscript{2}S concentration at a constant current density. Comparison of change in current density upon sulfur poisoning at potentiostatic mode introduces difficulty because the change in current also affects changes in ohmic and cathodic losses. On the other hand, by comparison at constant current density, the ohmic and cathode losses remain constant and any changes in cell potential upon changing H\textsubscript{2}S content in the feed mixture arises from the change of anode performance due to sulfur poisoning only. In this work, simulations were performed at constant cell potentials to generate polarization curves. In order to calculate the loss in cell performance in galvanostatic mode, the polarization data at three H\textsubscript{2}S concentration and zero H\textsubscript{2}S concentration were fitted to an expression derived from Tafel approximation using linear least square regression method. The cell voltage and the loss in cell voltage at constant current density can be calculated using the fitted expression.

Tafel approximation derived expression is:

\[
E_{cell} = E_{ocv} - i \cdot ASR - \ln(i) \frac{RT}{(\beta+1)F} + \ln(i_0) \frac{RT}{(\beta+1)F}
\] (3.71)

In half-cell porous anode model the cathode overpotential is set to zero due to the assumption of ideal cathode boundary.

\[
E_{cell} = E_{ocv} - \eta_{an} - \nabla V_{ohm}
\] (3.72)
Ohmic loss can be expressed as:

$$\nabla V_{ohm} = i \cdot ASR$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.73)

By estimating the activation overpotential via the Tafel equation and rearranging the equation, the anode activation overpotential can be expressed as:

$$i = i_0 (\exp(\beta + 1) \frac{RT}{(\beta + 1)F})$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.74)

$$\eta_{an} = \frac{(\ln(i) - \ln(i_0))\frac{RT}{(\beta + 1)F}}{\ln(i_0)} - \frac{RT}{(\beta + 1)F}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.75)

Therefore, the cell voltage can be written as:

$$E_{cell} = E_{ocv} - i \cdot ASR - \ln(i) \frac{RT}{(\beta + 1)F} + \ln(i_0) \frac{RT}{(\beta + 1)F}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.76)

In order to calculate the cell voltage and the cell voltage drop at each current density, i-V curves are fitted to this expression. In addition to calculating the relative loss in the cell performance, the relative increase in the anode activation overpotential can also be calculated. The anode activation overpotential for each H$_2$S concentration and current density is calculated based on the fitting results using the corresponding expression:

$$\eta_{an} = \frac{(\ln(i) - \ln(i_0))\frac{RT}{(\beta + 1)F}}{\ln(i_0)} - \frac{RT}{(\beta + 1)F}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.77)

Two points should be mentioned here: (i) The anode overpotential that is being calculated here, is an average or effective anode overpotential accounting for the anode overpotential gradient in the anode domain; (ii) As the concentration losses are not considered in the fitted expression, ASR and $\eta_{an}$ values obtained from fitting results, are affected by this simplifying assumption. Therefore their values do not represent the exact average area specific resistance and the average anode overpotential of the cell due to ignoring the concentration losses in the fitted expression.

The loss in cell performance and increase in the cell resistance are compared with the experimental data as well.
Polarization behavior predicted by multiphysics electrochemical performance model with coverage-independent kinetic model

In this multiphysics performance model, both $K_{H_2}$ and $K_{H_2S}$ used in the kinetic formulation were calculated from the DFT calculations. The polarization curve results with Base Case parameters and reaction mixture with $H_2S$ concentrations of zero, 0.1 ppm, 1 ppm and 10 ppm are shown in figure 3-22:

![Figure 3-22: i-V curves of performance model using coverage independent kinetics, $T=700^\circ C$ and other Base Case parameters.](image)

As expected, for a given current density, the cell voltage decreases with an increase in the $H_2S$ concentration. In order to calculate the loss in the cell voltage at a constant current density, i-V
curves are fitted to equation (3.76) by least square fitting method. The i-V curves of the 2-Dimensional multiphysics performance model with coverage-independent kinetic and their fitted curves are presented in Appendix D. The relative loss in the cell voltage at constant current density $i_1$ is calculated by the following expression:

$$\Delta E_{cell,R} = \frac{\Delta E_{cell}}{E_{cell}}$$ (3.78)

$$\Delta E_{cell} = E_{cell|H2} - E_{cell|H2S}$$ (3.79)

$E_{cell|H2}$ and $E_{cell|H2S}$ represent calculated voltage from the fitting result at current density $i_1$, for fuel mixture without H$_2$S and fuel mixture with H$_2$S content.

Figure 3-23 shows the relative loss in the cell voltage at three inlet H$_2$S concentrations of 0.1 ppm, 1 ppm and 10 ppm, at constant current density of 0.241 A/cm$^2$, 0.409 A/cm$^2$ and 2 A/cm$^2$ relative to cell voltage at zero inlet H$_2$S concentration. At constant current density, the losses in cathode and electrolyte remain unchanged and only the anode losses change due to change in H$_2$S content in the feed. Thus, the representation of this anode loss in terms of percentage loss in cell voltage is useful but can be skewed if the ohmic and cathodic losses dominate. Thus, the change in anode overpotential is a better and direct metric for comparison. The relative increase in the anode overpotential due to sulfur poisoning is a measure of the increase in the cell resistance at constant current density ($i_1$) and is calculated by the following expression:

$$\Delta \eta_{a,R} = \frac{\Delta \eta_a}{\eta_a}$$ (3.80)

$$\Delta \eta_a = \eta_{a|H2S} - \eta_{a|H2}$$ (3.81)

In the above equations, $\eta_{a|H2S}$ and $\eta_{a|H2}$ represent the effective anode overpotential calculated at current density ($i_1$) from the i-V curve fitting results of 2D performance model for fuel mixture with H$_2$S impurities and fuel mixture without H$_2$S impurities, respectively.
Figure 3-24 shows the relative increase in the anode activation overpotential at three inlet H$_2$S concentrations of 0.1 ppm, 1 ppm and 10 ppm, at constant current densities of 0.241 A/cm$^2$, 0.409 A/cm$^2$ and 2 A/cm$^2$ relative to cell voltage at zero inlet H$_2$S concentration.

Figure 3-23: Relative loss in voltage at constant current predicted by coverage-independent performance model, T=700°C with Base Case parameters
Figure 3-24: Relative increase in the anode activation overpotential predicted by coverage-independent performance model, $T=700^\circ$C with Base Case parameters

Polarization behavior predicted by multiphysics performance model with coverage-dependent kinetic

The polarization curve result of multiphysics performance model with coverage-dependent kinetic and Base Case parameters for reaction mixtures with $H_2S$ concentrations of zero, 0.1 ppm, 1 ppm and 10 ppm are shown in figure 3-25:
As mentioned above, loss in the cell voltage is calculated by fitting i-V curves to the equation (3.76). The results of the fitting are presented in Appendix D. Figure 3-26 shows the relative loss in the cell voltage at three inlet H₂S concentrations of 0.1 ppm, 1 ppm and 10 ppm, at constant current densities of 0.241 A/cm², 0.409 A/cm² and 2 A/cm² relative to cell voltage at zero inlet H₂S concentration. Figure 3-27 shows the relative increase in the anode activation overpotential computed for three inlet H₂S concentrations of 0.1 ppm, 1 ppm and 10 ppm, at constant current density of 0.241 A/cm², 0.409 A/cm² and 2 A/cm² relative to cell voltage at zero inlet H₂S concentration.
Figure 3-26: Relative loss in cell voltage at constant current predicted by coverage-dependent performance model, T=700°C with Base Case parameters.
Figure 3-27: Relative increase in the anode activation overpotential predicted by coverage-dependent performance model, $T=700^\circ$C with Base Case parameters.

For both coverage-dependent and coverage-independent performance models following trends could be observed: As expected, the poisoning increases with an increase in $H_2S$ content of the fuel. Both relative loss in the cell performance and relative increase in the cell resistance predicted by performance models increase with increasing $H_2S$ content of the fuel mixture. Also, both the relative loss in the cell performance and the relative increase in the cell resistance show a sharp increase at lower $H_2S$ content, followed by a gentle increase at higher $H_2S$ concentration.

The 2D performance model with coverage-dependent kinetics predictions for loss in the cell performance is lower than the 2D performance model with coverage-independent kinetics, which is the same trends observed in Chapter two for kinetic models.
In both performance models at constant H\textsubscript{2}S concentration, relative loss in cell performance is smaller at lower current densities, while the relative increase in the cell resistance is smaller at higher current densities. This behavior might appear contradictory, as it is not clear whether it is better to work at higher current densities or lower current densities to decrease the sulfur poisoning effect. To better understand the behavior, two points should be mentioned here. First, a decrease in the cell voltage (\(\Delta E\text{cell}\)) is equal to the increase in the anode overpotential (\(\Delta \eta_a\)) due to the galvanostatic condition and zero cathode losses in our model.

\[
E_{cell|H2} = E_{OCV} - i \cdot ASR - \eta_{a|H2} \quad (3.82)
\]

\[
E_{cell|H2S} = E_{OCV} - i \cdot ASR - \eta_{a|H2S} \quad (3.83)
\]

\[
\Delta E_{cell} = \eta_{a|H2S} - \eta_{a|H2} \quad (3.84)
\]

\[
\Delta E_{cell} = \Delta \eta_a \quad (3.85)
\]

At constant current density, \(\Delta \eta_a\) has a slight increase with the increase in the current density referring to the figures E1 and E1 in Appendix E. However, the relative loss in the cell voltage and relative increase in anode overpotential show different values as they are calculated relative to the initial cell voltage (\(E_{cell|H2}\)) and initial anode overpotential (\(\eta_{a|H2}\)) at zero H\textsubscript{2}S content of fuel mixture, respectively:

\[
\Delta E_{cell,R} = \frac{\Delta E_{cell}}{E_{cell|H2}} \quad (3.86)
\]

\[
\Delta \eta_{a,R} = \frac{\Delta \eta_a}{\eta_{a|H2}} \quad (3.87)
\]

The reason of observing opposite trends in the \(\Delta E_{cell,R}\) and \(\Delta \eta_{a,R}\) upon the change of current density at constant H\textsubscript{2}S content of fuel mixture is that the initial cell voltage (\(E_{cell|H2}\)) and initial anode overpotential (\(\eta_{a|H2}\)) have opposite behavior upon the change of current density. \(E_{cell|H2}\)
is higher at lower current density, while $\eta_{a|H_2}$ is smaller at lower current density, making $\Delta E_{\text{cell}}$ and $\Delta \eta_{a,R}$ decrease and increase with decrease of current density respectively.

As mentioned earlier, the representation of the anode performance losses in terms of percentage loss in cell voltage can be skewed if the ohmic and cathodic losses dominate. Although in our model the cathode losses are zero, the ohmic losses are still considered in the calculation of the percentage loss in cell voltage. Therefore, the relative increase in the anode overpotential is a better metric for the cell performance evaluation.

Similar trends for the relative loss in cell performance and relative increase in cell resistance have been noted in experimental studies of Cheng et al. (Cheng, Zha, and Liu 2007) at 800ºC as it is presented in the next subsection. Again, the loss in the cell performance here is defined as the loss in the cell voltage at constant current density. Because of the galvanostatic condition and zero cathode losses of the model, the loss in the cell voltage is equal to the increase in the anode overpotential.

### 3.6.4 Comparing the relative loss in cell performance and relative increase in anode overpotential with experimental results

Cheng et al. has reported experimental data for relative loss in the cell voltage and relative increase in cell resistance at constant current density. In their work, an increase in the internal cell resistance ($\Delta R|_{H_2S}$) due to sulfur poisoning is defined by the following expressions:

$$E_{\text{cell}|H_2} = E_{OCV} - i. (R|_{H_2})$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.88)

$$E_{\text{cell}|H_2S} = E_{OCV} - i. (R|_{H_2} + \Delta R|_{H_2S})$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.89)

$$\Delta R_R = \frac{\Delta R|_{H_2S}}{R|_{H_2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.90)

$R|_{H_2}$, $\Delta R|_{H_2S}$ and $\Delta R_R$ represent the total cell resistance before sulfur poisoning, increase in total
cell resistance after sulfur poisoning and relative increase in the total cell resistance, respectively. The $\Delta R_R$ can be compared to the relative increase in the anode overpotential ($\Delta \eta_{a,R}$) calculated from our model. $\Delta R_a$ and ($\Delta \eta_{a,R}$) formulations are compared in Appendix F.

Figures 3-28 and 3-29 show the relative loss in cell performance at two current densities of 0.409 A/cm$^2$ and 0.241 A/cm$^2$ and relative increase in cell resistance at two current densities of 0.409 A/cm$^2$ and 0.241 A/cm$^2$ reported by Cheng et al. T=800ºC.

Figure 3-28: Relative loss in performance reported by experimental study (Cheng, Zha, and Liu, 2007), T=800ºC
Figure 3-29: Relative increase in cell resistance reported by experimental study (Cheng, Zha, and Liu, 2007), T=800°C

Similar trends in the experimental results and the performance model results can be observed:
- Increase in relative loss in cell performance and relative increase in the cell resistance by increase in the poisoning can be observed for both the experimental and performance model results.
- Smaller relative loss in cell performance at lower current densities and smaller relative increases in the cell resistance at higher current densities can be observed for both the experimental and performance model results.

Coverage-dependent 2D performance model predictions are closer to the experimental results than the Coverage-independent 2D performance model predictions.
The purpose of the comparison is mainly to demonstrate that the model predictions have the similar trends as in experimental results.

### 3.7 Conclusion

A two-dimensional (2D) performance model that captures the effect of transport phenomena in addition to the kinetics of anode reaction in presence of H$_2$S was developed. The performance model is a 2D multiphysics model with porous anode domain that captures the gas-phase species transport, charged species transport and anode electrochemistry in addition to the kinetics of the H$_2$ electro-oxidation reaction in the presence of the S poisoning (coverage-dependent and coverage-independent kinetic models). The results of the 2D performance model indicates that the spatial distribution of the potential and species plays an important role in the performance predictions, due to the difference in the 2D performance model and kinetic model prediction. The cell performance diminution due to sulfur poisoning was evaluated by the 2D performance model predictions in terms of loss in the cell voltage and increase in the cell resistance at galvanostatic mode. The predictions shows an increasing trend in both the loss in the cell voltage and increase in the cell resistance upon the increase of the inlet H$_2$S content of the fuel. The predictions also indicate that for a constant inlet H$_2$S content, increase in the relative cell resistance is smaller at higher current densities. The 2D performance model with coverage-dependent kinetics predicts lower loss in the cell performance than the 2D performance model with coverage-independent kinetics, that is the same trends observed in chapter two for kinetic models.

The 2D model predictions when compared with experimental data in the literature showed similar trends of increase in the sulfur poisoning effect by increase in H$_2$S content and smaller increase in the relative cell resistance at higher current densities. Coverage-dependent 2D performance model
predictions are closer to the experimental results than the Coverage-independent 2D performance model predictions.
Chapter 4

Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

A new kinetic model in the form of modified Butler-Volmer expression was derived to consider the effect of sulfur poisoning (caused by H₂S impurities) on the H₂ electro-oxidation in Ni-YSZ anodes of SOFCs. The new formulation is derived by adding the H₂S adsorption reaction on Ni to the set of elementary reactions for hydrogen oxidation reaction on Ni-YSZ three-phase region, previously proposed by Boer (1998). The H₂S adsorption reaction is modeled as an equilibrium reaction along with the equilibrium adsorption of H₂ on Ni. Two kinetic models for H₂S and H₂ adsorption were considered differing in the dependency of adsorption energies on sulfur and hydrogen surface coverages. Expectedly, both kinetic models predict a reduction in the current density with an increase in the H₂S concentration.

The kinetic model was implemented into a two-dimensional half-cell model with geometry comprising the anode gas channel, the porous anode and the electrolyte to study various transport effects on the sulfur poisoning effect. The 2D performance model captures the gas-phase species transport, charged species transport and anode electrochemistry with sulfur poisoning effects (coverage-dependent and coverage-independent kinetic models). Model shows that large gradients in overpotential exist over the anode thickness. In addition to that, gradients in the gas species concentration and surface coverage in the anode domain determine the local poisoning effect and the rate of electrochemical reaction. Local effect of sulfur poisoning on the rate of HOR reaction can be well explained by considering the mixed effect of local distribution of water vapour pressure, sulfur coverage and anode overpotential in the anode domain. Consistent with
the kinetic model, the 2D performance model shows that the loss in cell performance increases with an increase in \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) content of the fuel. However, 2D performance model predicts lower relative loss in the current density than the kinetic model for the same \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) content. Another ability of the 2D performance model is that it can predict the loss in cell performance at different anode overpotentials, while kinetic model predictions do not change at different anode overpotentials.

By comparing the 2D model predictions with the experimental results, similar trends of increase in the sulfur poisoning effect by increase in \( \text{H}_2\text{S} \) content and smaller increase in the relative cell resistance at higher current densities can be observed. Also, coverage-dependent 2D performance model predictions are closer to the experimental results than the coverage-independent 2D performance model predictions.

### 4.2 Recommendations

To improve the 2D model predictions, it is recommended that the Knudsen diffusion is added to the multicomponent gas species mass transport model. For better validation of the performance model predictions, the 2D performance model should employ experiment specific anode characteristics including the geometry, the anode microstructure and composition, and fuel composition. Experimental measurements wherein the anode losses can be isolated would be important for model validation. Such measurements can be performed using three-electrode setup with a reference electrode. The adsorption energies for the kinetic model were based on DFT studies on Ni (111) surface neglecting the effects of edge sites and other surface orientation in an actual Ni particle in the SOFC anode. Characterization of the Ni surface and determination of the adsorption energy accounting for these effects/features will improve the model.
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Appendix A

Triple phase boundary (TPB) and effective conductivity calculations

Percolation theory and particle coordination number theory are used to estimate the effective TPB length and effective ionic and electronic conductivities. It is assumed that the ionic and electronic conducting phases are composed of spherical particle overlapping with a contact angle of $\theta$ (Zhu and Kee, 2008). TPB length per unit volume is calculated by:

$$\lambda^V_{TPB} = l_{ed,el} n_{tot} \zeta_{ed} \zeta_{el} P_{el} P_{ed} \frac{Z_{el} Z_{ed}}{Z_{tot}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.1)

$l_{ed,el}$ is the TPB length per contact between electrode and electrolyte. $n_{tot}$ is the number of the particles of the composite anode per unit volume. $\zeta_{ed}$ and $\zeta_{el}$ are the number fractions of electrode and electrolyte particles. $P_{ed}$ and $P_{el}$ are the probability of the electronic phase particle and ionic phase particle to fall into a percolated cluster of its own phase, respectively. $Z_{el}$ and $Z_{ed}$ are the coordination number of the electronic phase and ionic conducting phase composite electrode. $Z_{tot}$ is the overall average coordination number.

$$n_{tot} = \frac{1-\varphi_d}{\left(\frac{4}{3}\pi(\zeta_{ed}r_{ed}^3 + \zeta_{el}r_{el}^3)\right)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.2)

$$\zeta_{ed} = \frac{\psi_{ed} r_{ed}^3}{\psi_{ed} r_{ed}^3 + \psi_{el} r_{el}^3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.3)

$$\zeta_{el} = \frac{\psi_{el} r_{el}^3}{\psi_{ed} r_{ed}^3 + \psi_{el} r_{el}^3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.4)

$$\psi_{el} = \frac{\varphi_{el}}{\varphi_{el} + \varphi_{ed}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.5)

$$\psi_{ed} = \frac{\varphi_{ed}}{\varphi_{el} + \varphi_{ed}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.6)
\[ Z_{ed} = 3 + \frac{(Z_{tot} - 3)r_{ed}^2}{\zeta_{ed}r_{ed}^2 + \zeta_{el}r_{el}^2} \] (A.7)

\[ Z_{el} = 3 + \frac{(Z_{tot} - 3)r_{el}^2}{\zeta_{ed}r_{ed}^2 + \zeta_{el}r_{el}^2} \] (A.8)

\( r_{ed} \) and \( r_{el} \) are the radius of the electronic and ionic phases. The probability of the \( \alpha \) particles, \( P_\alpha \) is calculated by:

\[ P_\alpha = \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{4.236 - Z_{\alpha \alpha}}{2.471} \right) \right]^{0.4} \] (A.9)

Coordination number of the \( \alpha \) particles with \( \beta \) particles, \( Z_{\alpha \beta} \) is the average number of the \( \beta \) particles in contact with the \( \alpha \) particles and is calculated by:

\[ Z_{\alpha \beta} = \zeta_{\beta} Z_{\alpha} Z_{\beta}\ ] (A.10)

The effective conductivity of the composite anode can also be calculated using the percolation theory:

\[ \sigma_{\alpha}^{eff} = \sigma_{\alpha}^0 \left[ (1 - \phi_{\beta})\psi_{\alpha} P_\alpha \right]^\gamma \] (A.11)

\( \sigma_{\alpha}^0 \) is the conductivity of the pure electronic or ionic phase.
Appendix B

Details of the Coverage-dependent thermodynamic

The standard Gibbs free energy of species $i$, is calculated from equations:

$$G_i^0 = H_i^0 - TS_i^0$$  \hspace{1cm} (B.1)

$$H_i^0 = E_{el,i} + E_{ZPV,i} + E_{th,i} + PV_{m,i}$$  \hspace{1cm} (B.2)

In these equations, $H_i^0$ and $S_i^0$ are the molar enthalpy and entropy of species $i$, $E_{el,i}$ is the electronic energy at 0ºK , $E_{ZPV,i}$ is the zero point vibrational energy, $E_{th,i}$ is the thermodynamic thermal corrections including the rotational, vibrational and translational terms due to elevated temperature. The electronic energy is calculated from DFT calculation. Zero point vibrational energy, thermodynamic thermal correction and molar entropy are calculated form the statistical thermodynamics. For surface adsorbed species, $PV_{m,i}$ is ignored due to the negligible molar volume of surface species. If surface species are strongly adsorbed and fully dissociated, the surface translational and rotational modes can be ignored (Monder and Karan, 2010). The partition function for species $i$ ($q_i$) that include all energy levels available to $i$ on the surface can be calculated by:

$$q_i = q_i(elec)q_i(vib) = q_i(elec)\Pi(q_{i,k}(vib))$$  \hspace{1cm} (B.3)

$q_i(elec)$ and $q_i(vib)$ are the electronic and vibrational partition functions. $\Pi(q_{i,k}(vib))$ is the product over the number of vibrational modes for adsorbed species $i$. The electronic and vibrational partition functions are defined as:

$$q_i(elec) = \exp(-\frac{E_i}{k_BT})$$  \hspace{1cm} (B.4)
\[ q_{i,k}^\text{(vib)} = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{-\hbar \nu_{i,k}}{2k_B T}\right)}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{-\hbar \nu_{i,k}}{k_B T}\right)} \] (B.5)

\( E_i \) is the electronic energy of adsorption for species i and is defined as a function of coverage of adsorbed molecules of all the species on the surface. \( \nu_{i,k} \) is the \( k^{th} \) vibrational frequency for species i. \( \hbar \) and \( k_B \) are the Planck and Boltzmann constants. According to the derivation of chemical potential from partition function in statistical thermodynamics and by assuming that the vibrational frequencies are coverage independent, the chemical potential of adsorbed species is defined as (Monder and Karan, 2013)

\[ \mu_i = \frac{\partial (\sum (E_i \theta_i))}{\partial \theta_i} + k_B T \ln(\theta_i/(\theta_v q_i^\text{(vib)})) \] (B.6)

\( \theta_v \) is the fraction of sites on the surface that are vacant.

\[ \theta_v = 1 - \sum (\theta_i) \] (B.7)

The electronic energy change on adsorption is given by this equation with i being the adsorbed species, \( n_i \) being the number of adsorbate atoms. \( N^* \) is the number of surface sites.

\[ E_{\text{ads},i} = \left\{ E_{n_i, \text{ads} + \text{slab}(N^*)} - n_i E_{i, \text{gas}} - E_{\text{slab}(N^*)} \right\} / n_i \] (B.8)

\( E_{n_i \text{ads} + \text{slab}(N^*)} \) represents the total electronic energy of the slab with \( N^* \) surface sites and \( N_i \) adsorbates, \( E_{i, \text{gas}} \) represent the gas phase electronic energy of the adsorbed species and \( E_{\text{slab}(N^*)} \) represents the total electronic energy of the clean slab with \( N^* \) surface sites. In order to calculate the electronic energy of adsorption, \( \sum (E_i \theta_i) \), Monder and Karan (2013) calculated \( E_{\text{ads},i} \) at different surface coverages with DFT methods and fitted a function that was previously
developed by (Grabow et al, 2010) to the calculated values of \( E_{\text{ads}} \) at different surface coverages.

\[
\sum (E_i \theta_i) = E_H \theta_H + E_S \theta_S = E_H(0) \theta_H + E_S(0) \theta_S + \alpha_H \{ \theta_H - \theta_H(0) \}^2 + \alpha_S \{ \theta_S - \theta_S(0) \}^2 + \beta_{HS} \theta_H^* \theta_S^*
\]  \hspace{1cm} (B.9)

\( E_H(0) \) and \( E_S(0) \) are the zero coverage adsorption energies; \( \theta_H(0) \) and \( \theta_S(0) \) are the threshold coverages; \( \alpha_H \) and \( \alpha_S \) are the self-interaction parameters and \( \beta_{HS} \) is the binary interaction parameter. The values of these parameters are obtained by fitting the function to the DFT based calculated values of \( E_{\text{ads},i} \). \( \theta_H^* \) and \( \theta_S^* \) are the effective coverage of hydrogen and sulfur. For H and S coverages lower than \( \theta_H(0) \) and \( \theta_S(0) \), it is assumed that no adsorbate–adsorbate interactions are present. For any H coverage higher than \( \theta_H(0) \), the H-H and H-S interactions are considered and for any S coverage higher than \( \theta_S(0) \), the S-S and H-S interactions are considered. Therefore, the self-interaction terms of \( \alpha_H \{ \theta_H - \theta_H(0) \}^2 \) and \( \alpha_S \{ \theta_S - \theta_S(0) \}^2 \) are considered only if \( \theta_H > \theta_H(0) \) and \( \theta_S > \theta_S(0) \) respectively. The variables \( \theta_H^* \) and \( \theta_S^* \) are the notations for effective coverage of hydrogen and sulfur and are used to calculate the energy contributions of hydrogen and sulfur interactions. \( \theta_H^* \) and \( \theta_S^* \) are zero in the low coverage region ( \( \theta_H < \theta_H(0) \) and \( \theta_S < \theta_S(0) \)). The term \( \theta_H^* \theta_S^* \) is equal to \( \theta_H \theta_S \) for \( \theta_H > \theta_H(0) \) and \( \theta_S > \theta_S(0) \). (Grabow, Hvolbæk, and Nørskov 2010). For other conditions, the detailed calculations of \( \theta_H^* \theta_S^* \) are presented in Grabow (2010). Using the relation for electronic energy, the first term in the surface species chemical potential can be developed for hydrogen and sulfur species:

\[
\frac{\partial (\sum (E_i \theta_i))}{\partial \theta_H} = E_H(0) + 2\alpha_H \{ \theta_H - \theta_H(0) \} + \beta_{HS} \theta_S^*
\]  \hspace{1cm} (B.10)

\[
\frac{\partial (\sum (E_i \theta_i))}{\partial \theta_S} = E_S(0) + 2\alpha_S \{ \theta_S - \theta_S(0) \} + \beta_{HS} \theta_H^*
\]  \hspace{1cm} (B.11)
The term $2\alpha_H \{\theta_H - \theta_H(0)\}$ is included if $\theta_H > \theta_H(0)$ and $\beta_{H2}\theta_S^*$ is included if $\theta_S^* > 0$. The term $2\alpha_S \{\theta_S - \theta_S(0)\}$ is included if $\theta_S > \theta_S(0)$ and $\beta_{H2} \theta_H^*$ is included if $\theta_H^* > 0$.

The chemical potential of surface species are calculated by substituting the electronic energy and vibrational energy terms into the equation (B.6). Chemical potential of the H and S surface species are calculated by the relations (B.12) and (B.13):

$$
\mu_H = E_H(0) + 2\alpha_H \{\theta_H - \theta_H(0)\} + \beta_{HS} \theta_S^* + k_B T \ln \left( \frac{\theta_H}{(1-\theta_S-\theta_H) \Pi} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\nu_{H2}}{k_B T}\right)}{1-\exp\left(-\frac{\nu_{H2}}{k_B T}\right)} \right) \tag{B.12}
$$

$$
\mu_S = E_S(0) + 2\alpha_S \{\theta_S - \theta_S(0)\} + \beta_{HS} \theta_H^* + k_B T \ln \left( \frac{\theta_S}{(1-\theta_S-\theta_H) \Pi} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\nu_{H2}}{k_B T}\right)}{1-\exp\left(-\frac{\nu_{H2}}{k_B T}\right)} \right) \tag{B.13}
$$
Appendix C

Inlet velocity calculations

The mean velocity of fuel is calculated based on the desired or target current density and the fuel utilization factor \( (U_f) \) to be considered as 50%. The desired current density value of 2500 A/cm\(^3\) is considered as the target current density value \( (i_t) \). The molar flow rate of the inlet fuel can be calculated as:

\[
\hat{n}_{Fuel} = \frac{i_t \cdot \omega_{ed} \cdot l_{ed} \cdot H_{ed}}{2FU_f \cdot n_{H2}} \tag{C.1}
\]

\( n_{H2} \) is the inlet \( H_2 \) concentration. \( \omega_{ed}, l_{ed} \) and \( H_{ed} \) are the width, length and the height of the electrode.

Inlet fuel velocity can be calculated by:

\[
U_{fuel} = \frac{\hat{n}_{Fuel} \cdot RT}{A \cdot P} \tag{C.2}
\]

\( A = \omega_{ed} \cdot H_{ch} \) \tag{C.3}

\( P \) and \( A \) are the pressure and the channel inlet area. \( H_{ch} \) is the height of the fuel channel.

\[
U_{fuel} = \frac{i_t \cdot \omega_{ed} \cdot l_{ed} \cdot H_{ed} \cdot RT}{2FU_f \cdot n_{H2} \cdot w_{ed} \cdot H_{ch} \cdot P} = \frac{i_t}{2FU_f \cdot n_{H2}} \cdot \frac{RT}{P} \cdot \frac{l_{ed} \cdot H_{ed}}{H_{ch}} \tag{C.4}
\]
Appendix D

i-V curves fitting results of 2D performance model

The results of fitting the i-V curves of the coverage-independent performance model to equation (3.76) by linear least square method with their R-square values are shown in figure D-1, D-2, D-3 and D-4 for 0, 0.1, 1 and 10 ppm H₂S respectively.

D-1: i-V curve fitting results of coverage-independent performance model for zero inlet H₂S concentration
D-2: i-V curve fitting results of coverage-independent performance model for 0.1 ppm inlet H$_2$S concentration

D-3: i-V curve fitting results of coverage-independent performance model for 1 ppm inlet H$_2$S concentration
D-4: i-V curve fitting results of coverage-independent performance model for 10ppm inlet H$_2$S concentration

The results of fitting the i-V curves of the coverage-dependent performance model to equation (3.76) by linear least square method with their R-square values are shown in figure D-5, D-6, D-7 and D-8 for 0, 0.1, 1 and 10 ppm H$_2$S respectively.

D-5: i-V curve fitting results of coverage-dependent performance model for zero inlet H$_2$S concentration
D-6: i-V curve fitting results of coverage-dependent performance model for 0.1 ppm inlet H₂S concentration

D-7: i-V curve fitting results of coverage-dependent performance model for 1 ppm inlet H₂S concentration
D-8: i-V curve fitting results of coverage-dependent performance model for 10 ppm inlet H₂S concentration
Appendix E

Change of anode activation overpotential as a function of current density with the effect of sulfur poisoning

In galvanostatic mode, relative loss in the cell voltage at a constant H$_2$S concentration increases by increase in the current density. Due to the assumptions of ideal cathode boundary, the loss in the cell voltage ($\Delta E_{\text{cell},i}$) at constant current of $i_1$ is equal to the difference in the anode activation overpotential ($\Delta \eta_a$) due to sulfur poisoning.

\[ \Delta E_{\text{cell},i_1} = E_{\text{cell}|H2} - E_{\text{cell}|H2S} \quad (E.1) \]

\[ E_{\text{cell}|H2} = E_{\text{OCV}} - i_1 \cdot \text{ASR} - \eta_{a|H2,i_1} \quad (E.2) \]

\[ E_{\text{cell}|H2S} = E_{\text{OCV}} - i_1 \cdot \text{ASR} - \eta_{a|H2S,i_1} \quad (E.3) \]

\[ E_{\text{cell}|H2} - E_{\text{cell}|H2S} = \eta_{a|H2S,i_1} - \eta_{a|H2,i_1} \quad (E.4) \]

\[ \Delta E_{\text{cell},i_1} = \Delta \eta_a \quad (E.5) \]

Therefore, the relative loss in cell voltage at current density $i_1$ is equal to the increase in the anode activation overpotential divided by the initial cell voltage (at zero H$_2$S concentration).

\[ \Delta E_{\text{cell},i_1,R} = \frac{\Delta E_{\text{cell},i_1}}{E_{\text{cell}|H2}} = \frac{\eta_{a|H2S,i_1} - \eta_{a|H2,i_1}}{E_{\text{cell},i_1}|H2} \quad (E.6) \]

Similarly, the relative cell voltage drop at current density $i_2$ is calculated by:

\[ \Delta E_{\text{cell},i_2,R} = \frac{\Delta E_{\text{cell},i_2}}{E_{\text{cell}|H2}} = \frac{\eta_{a|H2S,i_2} - \eta_{a|H2,i_2}}{E_{\text{cell},i_2}|H2} \quad (E.7) \]

To compare the relative loss in cell voltage at two different current densities of $i_1$ and $i_2$ exposed to the same H$_2$S concentration, the anode activation overpotential as a function of current density should be studied.
\[ \eta_{an} = \ln(i) \frac{RT}{(\beta+1)F} - \ln(i_0) \frac{RT}{(\beta+1)F} \]  

(E.8)

Figures E-1 and E-2 show anode activation overpotential as a function of current density at different \( H_2S \) concentrations for coverage-independent and coverage-dependent models respectively.

Figure E-1: Anode overpotential as a function of current density for coverage-independent performance model, \( T=700^\circ C \) with Base Case parameters.
Figure E-2: Anode overpotential as a function of current density for coverage-dependent performance model, T=700°C with Base Case parameters.

As it is shown the anode overpotential increases at a constant current by increase in the H₂S concentrations. Also by the increase in the current density the overpotential curves at each H₂S concentration deviate from the curve at zero H₂S concentration. And the slope of curves increases by increase in H₂S concentration. This behavior cannot be justified from the \( \eta_{an} = \frac{\ln(i)}{R \frac{T}{F}} - \frac{\ln(i_0)}{R \frac{T}{F}} \) equation. Since this equation implies that by the increase in the H₂S concentration and decrease of \( i_0 \), only the intercept of the equation \( -\ln(i_0) R \frac{T}{F} \) is being
affected. Meaning that by increase in H₂S content, intercept of the new curves increase without any change in the slope of the curves. Therefore, based on the fitted expression ($\eta_{an} = \ln(i) \frac{RT}{(\beta+1)F} - \ln(i_0) \frac{RT}{(\beta+1)F}$), the difference between the anode overpotential caused upon sulfur poisoning remains constant by changing the current density. However, it should be noted that the transportation effect is not considered in this formulation. Not having considered the loss due to the transportation limitation, the slope of the anode overpotential curves is affected by the increase of the current density accounting for the concentration losses at higher current density. Therefore, diverging anode overpotential curves at higher current density are observed as in this figure, resulting in higher $\Delta \eta_a$ and $\Delta E_{cell}$ at higher current densities.
Appendix F

Loss in cell performance formulations

In this appendix the formulations of the relative increase in the anode overpotential ($\Delta \eta_R$) defined in our model and the relative increase in the cell resistance ($\Delta R_R$) defined by Cheng et al. at galvanostatic mode are presented and compared.

Relative increase in the anode overpotential ($\Delta \eta_R$) is defined as:

$$\Delta \eta_{a,R} = \frac{\Delta \eta_a}{\eta_a|_{H_2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.1)

$$\Delta \eta_a = \eta_a|_{H_2 S} - \eta_a|_{H_2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.2)

$$\eta_a|_{H_2} = E_{OCV} - E_{cell|H_2} - i.ASR$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.3)

$$\eta_a|_{H_2 S} = E_{OCV} - E_{cell|H_2 S} - i.ASR$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.4)

$$\Delta \eta_a = E_{cell|H_2} - E_{cell|H_2 S} = \Delta E_{cell}$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.5)

$$\Delta \eta_R = \frac{\Delta E_{cell}}{\eta_a|_{H_2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.6)

$$\Delta \eta_R = \frac{\Delta E_{cell}}{E_{OCV} - E_{cell|H_2 S} - i.ASR}$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.7)

The relative increase in the cell resistance defined by Cheng et al. is defined as:

$$\Delta R_R = \frac{\Delta R|_{H_2 S}}{R|_{H_2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.8)

$$E_{cell|H_2} = E_{OCV} - i.(R|_{H_2})$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.9)

$$E_{cell|H_2 S} = E_{OCV} - i.(R|_{H_2} + \Delta R|_{H_2 S})$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.10)

$$\Delta R|_{H_2 S} = \frac{E_{cell|H_2} - E_{cell|H_2 S}}{i} = \frac{\Delta E_{cell}}{i}$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.11)

$$\Delta R_R = \frac{\Delta E_{cell}}{iR|_{H_2}} = \frac{\Delta E_{cell}}{E_{OCV} - E_{cell|H_2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (F.12)
By comparing the $\Delta \eta_{a,R}$ and $\Delta R_R$ formulations, it can be inferred that both expressions measure the relative increase in the resistance. However, in the definition of the cell resistance by Cheng et al., both the ohmic and activation losses are considered, making the initial cell resistance equal to $E_{OCV} - E_{cell|H_2}$ and higher than initial resistance of our model ($E_{OCV} - E_{cell|H_2} - i.ASR$), in which the ohmic resistance is excluded.