

EXERGO-ECONOMIC OPTIMIZATION FRAMEWORK FOR BIOGAS
FUELLED GAS TURBINE AT DESIGN POINT

HASAN BARZEGARAVVAL

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Philosophy

School of Mechanical Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

NOVEMBER 2021

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my father and mother.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In preparing this thesis, I was in contact with many people, researchers, academicians, and practitioners. They have contributed towards my understanding and thoughts. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my main supervisor, Professor Dr. Mazlan Abdul Wahid, for encouragement, support, guidance, critics, and friendship. I am also very thankful to my co-supervisor Dr Aminuddin Bin Saat for his guidance, advice, support, and motivation. In addition, I am grateful to Dr. Seyyed Ehsan Hosseini for all the support, guidance, and advice. Without their continued support and interest, this thesis would not have been the same as presented here.

My friends at HIREF should also be recognised for their support. My sincere appreciation also extends to all my colleagues and others who have aided me at various occasions. Their views and tips are useful indeed. Unfortunately, it is not possible to list all of them in this limited space. I am grateful to all my family members.

I am also grateful to Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) staffs for their helps and support.

ABSTRACT

Energy system optimization is the first step to address global warming, even for renewable sources like biogas. Optimization is necessary for efficient yet economic resource utilization, which has been a wide study area. However, no comprehensive general framework is proposed for optimization, mainly resolving the optimal point selection issue. This study aimed to provide a framework for exerting economic optimization of biogas fed systems and applying it to specific gas turbines. The proposed model in this research includes all steps from problem setup to final optimal point selection. A genetic algorithm was applied to obtain the Pareto front, and objective functions were evaluated by thermodynamic modeling of the system. A set of dimensionless parameters were introduced that smoothly defined the correlation between all design variables (decision variables) and optimal objectives (total cost and exergy efficiency). Then correlations between design parameters and optimal design variables were evaluated using meta functions of fourth-order. In this study, the design variables were compressor pressure ratio, gas turbine and compressor isentropic efficiencies, turbine inlet temperature, and preheater outlet temperature. Design parameters were cost of fuel, net power, and fuel methane content. To achieve a general optimal solution, a fuel costing approach based on the fuel exergy was proposed. The new costing approach allows disintegration and elimination of the fuel processing while accounting for the effect of the processing on the cost of fuel which allowed a general solution for the optimal gas turbine. A design problem was solved using the developed framework. Results of the design problem showed that the minimum cost ratio (cr) of 3.0 with minimum specific emission of 0.4962 kg/kWh. If cr increases to 3.5, the minimum specific emission will reduce to 0.4534 kg/kWh. The results demonstrate that the proposed framework is able to provide an optimal solution for a variety of CO₂ emission levels, cost, and financing considerations where this optimization was not possible to determine by the previous approach.

ABSTRAK

Pengoptimuman sistem tenaga ialah langkah pertama untuk menangani pemanasan global, walaupun untuk sumber boleh diperbaharui seperti biogas. Pengoptimuman adalah perlu untuk penggunaan sumber yang cekap lagi ekonomi, yang telah menjadi bidang pengajian yang luas. Walau bagaimanapun, tiada rangka kerja umum yang komprehensif dicadangkan untuk pengoptimuman, terutamanya menyelesaikan isu pemilihan titik optimum. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk menyediakan rangka kerja untuk melaksanakan pengoptimuman ekonomi bagi sistem suapan biogas dan mengaplikasikannya pada turbin gas tertentu. Model yang dicadangkan dalam penyelidikan ini merangkumi semua langkah dari persediaan masalah hingga pemilihan titik optimum akhir. Algoritma genetik telah digunakan untuk mendapatkan lengkung Pareto, dan fungsi objektif dinilai dengan pemodelan termodinamik bagi sistem. Satu set parameter tanpa dimensi telah diperkenalkan yang mentakrifkan dengan lancar korelasi antara semua pembolehubah reka bentuk (pembolehubah keputusan) dan objektif optimum (kos jumlah dan kecekapan eksergi). Kemudian korelasi antara parameter reka bentuk dan pembolehubah reka bentuk optimum dinilai menggunakan metafungsi tertib keempat. Dalam kajian ini, pembolehubah reka bentuk adalah nisbah tekanan pemampat, turbin gas dan kecekapan isentropik pemampat, suhu salur masuk turbin, dan suhu alur keluar prapemanas. Parameter reka bentuk adalah kos bahan api, kuasa bersih dan kandungan metana bahan api. Untuk mencapai penyelesaian optimum umum, pendekatan kos bahan api berdasarkan eksergi bahan api telah dicadangkan. Pendekatan kos baharu membolehkan pengasingan dan penyingkiran pemprosesan bahan api dengan mengambil kira kesan pemprosesan ke atas kos bahan api yang mana membolehkan penyelesaian umum untuk turbin gas optimum. Masalah reka bentuk telah diselesaikan menggunakan rangka kerja yang dibangunkan. Keputusan masalah reka bentuk menunjukkan nisbah kos minimum (cr) adalah 3.0 dengan pelepasan spesifik minimum 0.4962 kg/kWj. Jika cr meningkat kepada 3.5, pelepasan spesifik minimum akan berkurangan kepada 0.4534 kg/kWj. Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa rangka kerja yang dicadangkan mampu menyediakan penyelesaian yang optimum untuk pelbagai aras pelepasan CO₂, kos dan pertimbangan kewangan yang mana pengoptimuman ini tidak dapat ditentukan dengan pendekatan terdahulu.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	iii
	DEDICATION	iv
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
	ABSTRACT	vi
	ABSTRAK	vii
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
	LIST OF TABLES	xiii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvii
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xx
CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Problem background	1
1.2	Problem statement	2
1.2.1	Need for an optimization framework	3
1.3	Research goal	4
1.4	Research objectives	5
1.5	Scope of study	5
1.6	Significance of study	6
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1	Introduction	9
2.2	Potential of biogas energy worldwide	9
2.3	Plants fed by biogas	11
2.4	Economic analysis	13
2.5	Studies on off design and operation strategy	17
2.6	Exergy analysis	18

2.7	Exergy and economic analysis	21
2.8	Specific studies on biogas fueled gas turbine	23
2.9	Biogas cost	24
2.10	Optimization results utilization	26
2.11	Research gap and the proposed work	28
CHAPTER 3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	33
3.1	Introduction	33
3.2	Thermodynamic properties	33
3.2.1	Ideal gas-ideal mixture model	34
3.2.2	Exergy as a state property	36
3.3	Thermodynamic modelling	38
3.3.1	Gas turbine plant modeling:	38
3.3.1.1	Compressor	39
3.3.1.2	Air preheater	40
3.3.1.3	Combustor and combustion	40
3.3.1.4	Combustion equation	41
3.3.1.5	Combustion solution algorithm	42
3.3.1.6	Gas turbine modeling:	42
3.3.1.7	System design parameters	43
3.4	Exergy analysis	45
3.4.1	Fuel and product concept	45
3.4.2	Components and systems exergy analysis	46
3.5	Economic analysis	47
3.5.1	Cash flows and time laps	48
3.5.2	Cost of production	48
3.5.3	Annualization of investment cost	49
3.5.4	Product cost estimation	50
3.5.5	Fuel and total cost rate	51
3.5.6	Components purchase cost estimation	52
3.5.6.1	Gas cycle cost functions	53
3.5.7	Application of presented costing	54

3.6	Exergo-economic analysis	55
3.6.1	Exergo-economic equations	56
3.7	System exergo economic equations	57
3.8	Optimization setup and approach	58
3.8.1	GA Multi-Objective Optimizer	59
3.8.1.1	Mutation function:	59
3.8.1.2	Crossover operation:	60
3.8.1.3	Multi-objective optimization and pareto frontier	60
3.9	Curve fitting	60
3.10	Design parameters and other necessary data	62
3.11	Summary	63
CHAPTER 4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	66
4.1	Overview of findings	66
4.2	Validation of the model	66
4.3	Fuel costing issue and solution	67
4.4	Exergy to energy ratio for biogas	68
4.5	Costing per unit of exergy	69
4.6	Comparative analysis of fuel costing (LHV vs Exergy costing)	71
4.6.1	Cost factors	72
4.6.2	Economic efficiency, losses, and destructions	77
4.7	Correlation between design variables and optimal cost	79
4.8	New optimization framework	83
4.8.1	Correlation function for pareto frontier	85
4.8.2	Design parameters and PECC	87
4.8.3	Evaluation of correlation functions (<i>f</i>)	89
4.9	Non dimensional emission parameter	92
4.10	Overall plant cost, efficiency, and emission	93
4.11	Implementation of the proposed model	96
4.11.1	Design problem	96
4.11.2	Emission Calculations	98

4.11.3	Design for certain product cost and emission	98
4.11.4	Fuel processing and cost	101
4.12	Chapter summary	102
CHAPTER 5	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	105
5.1	Research outcomes	105
5.2	Future work	106
	REFERENCES	108
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	121

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Table 2.1	Summery of analysis on energy systems working with biogas.	25
Table 2.1	Summery of point selection and optimization method in literature.	29
Table 3.1	Input parameters	43
Table 3.2	Fuel and product exergy for gas cycle	47
Table 3.3	Cost balance equations for GT cycle.	54
Table 3.4	Cost balance equations for GT cycle.	57
Table 3.5	Setting values for the multi-objective optimizer in MATLAB	61
Table 3.6	Table of property values and constants[77], [78].	62
Table 3.7	Upper and lower bounds of variables in optimization [81], [84].	62
Table 4.1	Cost of various turbine sizes from GTW handbook[87] .	66
Table 4.2	Thermodynamic validation result. Case study YAZD powerplant [80] power 106MW.	67
Table 4.3	Meta form coefficients for star design variables and minimum c_r .	90
Table 4.4	Meta form coefficient values for PECC.	92
Table 4.5	Fuel exergy and LHV values for the design problem.	97
Table 4.4	Optimal design variables obtained by the proposed method.	101

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Figure 2.1:	Share of different sectors in biogas potential in Malaysia [9].	10
Figure 2.2:	Livestock biogas potential in main regions of Malaysia [9].	11
Figure 2.3:	Biogas-Gasifier integrated system coupled with SOFC [13].	12
Figure 2.4:	SOFC-Micro GT CHP system working with biogas [14].	13
Figure 2.5:	Net Present Value (NPV) and Net Present Value Ratio (NPVR) for an IC engine CHP plant fuelled by biogas [15].	14
Figure 2.6:	Payback Period (PB) for IC engine CHP system for different economic and fuel processing scenarios [17].	15
Figure 2.7:	Four plant configurations for biogas applications. PAD is pressurized digestion system and AD is atmospheric digestion system [18].	16
Figure 2.8:	Economic comparison between four scenarios under different economic conditions [18].	16
Figure 2.9:	Net Present Value (NPV) as a function of cycle operation life for different plants [20].	17
Figure 2.10:	Plant process diagram for solar coupled biogas CCHP system [24].	19
Figure 2.11:	Exergy destruction share of total for three configurations of SOFC-CHP system [25].	20
Figure 2.12:	Micro-CHP system subjected to exergy analysis [26].	21
Figure 2.13:	Internal rate of Return (IRR) for different biogas-generator plans [27].	22
Figure 2.14:	Experimental setup for biogas fuelled gas turbine with preheater [30].	23
Figure 2.15:	Single point selection method [51].	26
Figure 2.16:	Problem of scattered points for decision variable vs objective functions on optimal pareto frontier [2].	27
Figure 3.1	The compressibility factor for air in gas turbine working range[76].	34
Figure 3.1	A gas turbine cycle schematic.	39
Figure 3.2	Combustion solution algorithm.	44

Figure 3.3	Flowchart of the methodology.	65
Figure 4.1	Biogas LHV and exergy to LHV ratios as functions of CO ₂ molar content in biogas	69
Figure 4.2	Market Fuel Price and Model Fuel Price.	70
Figure 4.3	Fuel to air ratio and mass factor variations. Biogas CO ₂ content increases from 0.05 to 0.4	73
Figure 4.4	η_{ex} and C_{tot} for the plant. This figure shows considering fuel physical exergy has significant impact on cost and exergetic performance.	74
Figure 4.5	Cost factor α_z for different fuel price and net power output. Contour values are system size in MW.	74
Figure 4.6	Cost factor α_0 for different fuel price and net power output. Contour values are system size in MW.	76
Figure 4.7	Cost factor α_1 for different fuel price and net power output. Contour values are system size in MW.	76
Figure 4.8	Cost of electricity for different fuel price and net power output. And system size. Costing based on LHV underestimate the electricity cost in all cases.	77
Figure 4.9	Cost of electricity for different fuel price and net power output. And system size. Costing based on LHV underestimate the electricity cost in all cases.	78
Figure 4.10	Optimal cost-efficiency pareto front for pure methane and $i=0.05$.	80
Figure 4.11	Optimal values for TIT corresponding to pareto front optimal points in Figure 4.10.	80
Figure 4.12	Optimal cost-efficiency pareto front for pure methane and $i=0.05$.	83
Figure 4.13	Optimization process in most common single point method (up) and the current study approach (down).	85
Figure 4.14	Pareto frontier is converted to c_r -CR graph.	86
Figure 4.15	Effects of design parameters on PECC.	87
Figure 4.16	Influences of design parameters on optimal TIT* curve.	88
Figure 4.17	Emission parameter for optimal PECC curve.	94
Figure 4.18	Emission parameter for optimal PECC curves at various design parameters.	95
Figure 4.19	The Optimal c_r -CR chart and e_p for the design problem.	100

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AD	-	Anaerobic Digestion
AP	-	Air Preheater
BM	-	Bio Methane
BNS	-	Bio Methane No Supporting intensive
BS	-	Bio Methane with Supporting intensive
CC	-	Combustion Chamber
CCHP	-	Combined Cooling Heating and Power
CHP	-	Combined Heat and Power
CMP	-	Carbon Mitigation Pricing
DOE	-	Department Of Energy (USA)
GA	-	Genetic Algorithm
GHG	-	Green House Gas
GT	-	Gas Turbine (cycle or component)
IC	-	Internal Combustion (engine)
IRR	-	Internal Rate of Return
LHV	-	Lower Heating Value
MGT	-	Micro Gas Turbine
NCMP	-	No Carbon Mitigation Pricing
NPV	-	Net Present Value
NPVR	-	Net Present Value Ratio
NRCS	-	National Renewable Cost Survey
NREL	-	National Renewable Energy Lab (USA)
O&M	-	Operation and Maintenance
ORC	-	Organic Rankine Cycle
PAD	-	Pressurized Anaerobic Digestion
PECC	-	Plant Exergo-economic Characteristic Curve
ROI	-	Return Of Investment
SOFC	-	Solid Oxide Fuel Cell
TIT	-	Turbine Inlet Temperature

LIST OF SYMBOLS

a	-	Constants
A	-	Area(m ²) or equation constants
AV	-	Annualize value
b	-	Cost functions' constants
\dot{C}	-	Cost rate(\$/S)
c	-	Cost per exergy (\$/kW)
Cap	-	Capacity or size of system
CF	-	Cash flow
\vec{Cp}	-	Vector of heat capacities
cr	-	Product to fuel costs ratio
CR	-	Fixed to current costs ratio
DV	-	Vector of decision or design variables
E	-	Emission of CO ₂ (kg)
e	-	Emission of CO ₂ per unit of product (kg/kWh)
ex	-	Exergy per unit of mass (kJ/kg)
$\dot{E}x$	-	Exergy rate (kW)
FV	-	Future value
h	-	Enthalpy
i	-	Interest rate
\dot{m}	-	Mass flow rate (kg/s)
\vec{M}	-	Molar mass vector
\dot{n}	-	Molar rate
N	-	Operating hours (hr/year), or number of reactive carbons
P	-	Pressure (bar)
PV	-	Present value
\dot{Q}	-	Heat transfer rate (kW)
R	-	Gas constant
r	-	Pressure ratio
s	-	Entropy (J/mol-°K)

T	-	Temperature (°K)
U	-	Heat exchanger
$UCRF$	-	Uniform capital recovery factor
v	-	Specific volume(m ³ /kg)
V	-	Velocity(m/s)
w	-	Specific work (kJ/kg)
\dot{W}	-	Power (kW)
x	-	Mole fraction
X	-	Methane mole fraction
\vec{X}	-	Mole fraction vector
\vec{Y}	-	Vector of design parameters
\dot{Z}	-	Purchase (fix) cost rate (\$/s)
Z	-	Compressibility factor

Greek Letters:

α	-	Pressure drops , or change rates parameters
β	-	Exergy to LHV ratio, or chemical to physical exergy ratio
η	-	Efficiency
φ	-	Operation and maintenance cost correction factor

Subscripts:

0	-	Dead state
$*$	-	Dimensionless star values
a	-	Air
AC	-	Air compressor
AP	-	Air preheater
ch	-	Chemical
D	-	Destruction
eco	-	Economic
el	-	Electrical
ex	-	Exergetic
f	-	Fuel
g	-	Gas
i	-	Index
is	-	Isentropic

<i>k</i>	-	Air heat capacity ratio
<i>lm</i>	-	Logarithmic mean
<i>m</i>	-	Mixture
<i>net</i>	-	Net output
<i>OP</i>	-	Optimal
<i>p</i>	-	Product
<i>ph</i>	-	Physical
<i>r</i>	-	Ratio
<i>real</i>	-	Actual or real
<i>ref</i>	-	Reference value
<i>s</i>	-	Specific
<i>tot</i>	-	Total value
<i>W</i>	-	Work
<i>Z</i>	-	Purchase or fix cost
Superscript		
<i>0</i>		Value at standard condition , or formation
<i>n</i>	-	Years , or cost equation constant

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
Appendix A	Computer Code	116

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Problem background

“At today’s Climate Ambition Summit, I appealed to leaders worldwide to declare a State of Climate Emergency in their countries until carbon neutrality is **reached**”. UN secretary general, Antonio Guterres 12 December 2020.

Long-time debated global warming is the state of emergency now and carbon neutrality is not a classy dream but a must.

Despite astonishing advances in renewable energy and carbon emission control technologies, there are still issues, including but not limited to, economic concerns of renewable and carbon neutrality projects. Either the energy source or the technology is expensive. In fact, the economic consideration is a huge issue in marketing and globalising the green energy solutions and to achieve carbon neutrality and these concerns must be addressed. Methods like exergoeconomic optimization and analysis are developed to address this issue by considering the cost as well as efficiency to reach a feasible solution.

In addition to optimization, the price of energy source is affecting the cost of produced energy. Biogas is one of the interesting energy sources which is reasonably priced and carbon neutral. In fact, biogas from wastes is a source of methane which is ten time more dangerous than carbon dioxide and it is naturally produced from organic wastes. So, implementing biogas with exergoeconomic optimization delivers a feasible green solution.

However, when it comes to implement the exergoeconomic method on biogas fuelled systems, some issues are witnessed which must be addressed. The biogas

comes from variety of sources and production methods which results in large variation of its composition and price. The pricing based on LHV, which is the common method, does not account the resource quality and fuel costing based on LHV is not a suitable approach.

The second problem which is faced after optimization is that the approach to **find the optimal solution is not systematic and lacks generality**. To the author's knowledge, there is no established framework for optimization which leads to a general solution on literatures.

The lack of suitable fuel pricing method, and a systematic approach to optimization especially in result interpretation are two problems which are observed, and this research is focused to address them.

1.2 Problem statement

Biogas is vastly diverse in source and composition. Though mainly consists of two components, carbon dioxide and methane, the mole fraction of the components is largely affected by the production method and source of biowaste which makes the pricing sophisticated. The LHV of the fuel is common method for pricing. However, when the LHV is reducing significantly, the physical condition of delivered fuel including its pressure become important as well. In this case, using LHV based fuel costing ignores other possible sources of physical exergy and results in inappropriate fuel costing method which affects the estimated cost of final product of the system.

The current fuel costing is not appropriate to achieve a general optimal solution. Firstly, the fuel costing is based on LHV which is inconsistent with the exergoeconomic evaluation. Secondly there are plenty of the biogas production and fuel processing units, which results in different costs of fuel. The change to fuel costing based on exergy allows to treat the fuel as a product of a topping process, and lead to a general solution. For all the processing types and units, the economic effect can be summarized in the fuel exergy cost.

1.2.1 Need for an optimization framework

The second problem is lack of systematic optimization framework. While there are many optimization studies, no framework is developed which delivers general and extendable optimization results as functions of design parameters. For example, if design parameters like fuel cost, system size (power demand) and fuel composition change, the optimization should be conducted again to obtain the optimal design and product cost.

A framework is a structured procedure. The optimization framework is the structured methodology of the optimization, which can be applied step by step to achieve the goal of optimization. On the exergo-economic optimization, that means the steps from the modeling to final optimal point evaluation.

The framework must include the step-by-step structured method to achieve the goal of optimization. However, there are some key points in considering the goal of optimization:

- 1- When considering the economy of the plan, the goal of optimization is not always the cost minimization. The investment cost, cost of emission and other factors are involved in making the final decision on what is the optimal cost.
- 2- The design parameters are susceptible to change that affects the optimal point.
- 3- For each optimal point, one set of design variables exists. If optimal point selection and design parameters change, optimal design variables also change.

The point expressed above affects the optimization outcome. Currently the optimization carried out in following steps in most of cases.

- 1- System model development.
- 2- Setting objectives and design variable.
- 3- Optimization is conducted.
- 4- The optimal point is selected. Most used method is equilibrium point which is a mathematical concept.
- 5- The optimal design variables are values for corresponding optimal point (objectives).

The main drawback of the mentioned approach is the optimal point selection. In most of the cases, the optimal point is selected using a method called equilibrium point which is a purely mathematical idea and does not represent any significant physical meaning.

In addition, the methods of the optimal point selection normally dismiss the fact that all points on pareto frontier are optimal [1]. Points on the pareto frontier are optimal costs at given efficiencies or optimal efficiencies at given costs [2&3]. Hence, any point on pareto frontier can be the candid of optimal design for certain criteria and selecting the point is not simply a mathematical procedure. So, optimization outcome should contain all points on pareto and point selection should be excluded.

1.3 Research goal

The goal of this research is to improve the exergoeconomic optimization technique in a way that it can be applied on a biogas system with fuel composition and cost variations. Also, the improved method should result in general solution which is interpretable by different teams involved in decision making.

1.4 Research objectives

The objectives of the research are:

1. To propose a new fuel costing method based on its' total exergy and analysis its' effects and compare it with LHV costing method to ensure its superiority.
2. To introduce new non-dimensional variables for emission, performance and decision variables that solve the scattered data issue. This is a critical objective that must be achieved, and it is the fundamental block of the framework.
3. To develop a new framework for optimization which correlates objectives and design parameters to achieve general solutions.

1.5 Scope of study

This study aims to develop an optimization framework for energy systems. However, the focus of the current work is on the exergo-economic optimization of biogas fueled gas turbine. The system under study is a gas turbine with net power output of 1 to 10 MW. This is an industrial range which is suitable for large biogas production plants. The focus is on the biogas fuel with main components of CO₂ and CH₄.

Though the fuel is biogas, emission factor is introduced to extend the generality of the framework to the cases which pure methane is added or, the carbon emission per unit of product is important even for biogas fuels.

Though the obtained framework is applicable in any optimization problem, but the obtained numeric data in this research is only applicable to gas turbines with biogas which is mainly consists of carbon dioxide and methane.

In the economic analysis of the current study, purchase cost of components, the O&M and fuel cost is considered. The target is to produce the most work with minimal cost of equipment and fuel. There is no carbon mitigation plan, tax intensives or other supportive green measures involve in the analysis. This research does not deal with any benefit or investment return measures like rate of return or net present value. It solely focused on the cost minimization. However, the obtained data is the foundation for the desired financial analysis.

The thermodynamic model of the system is carried out at design point. There is no off-design calculation as well as operation strategy optimization. The output is the best system design for given interest rate and biogas composition.

The scope of this study is not, the optimization of a single case study, but to develop a framework and methodology for optimization of energy systems. the implementation of the method is presented for a gas turbine optimal design.

In addition, it worth emphasizing that, the scope of the current work is limited to design point. Off design calculations and operation strategy optimization is not a part of the current work.

1.6 Significance of study

With increasing concerns over the carbon reduction and system optimization, a framework for exergo-economic optimization is a necessity. There should be an approach which provides general and extendable solutions with a systematic method to present and select the optimal point according to quantified and justified cost of product, emission, and investment cost.

In addition, the methods of data presentation which are proposed in this research solves the issue of scattered pattern in obtained optimal decision variables. The dimensionless form of variables defined in this study, provides a clear and smooth functionality between the design variables, objectives, and design parameters.

In addition, the fuel costing method proposed here is based on exergy and is a unified resource costing method which allows us to cost all resources on a basic merit of exergy delivered. This method of costing solves the issue of case-dependent optimization result. This makes the analysis more realistic, generic, and comprehend since it involves all the exergy flows and types which enter the system and produce the output.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Deb, *Multi-Objective Optimization using Evolutionary Algorithms* Kalyanmoy. 2001.
- [2] A. Ganjehkaviri, M. N. Mohd Jaafar, S. E. Hosseini, and H. Barzegaravval, “On the optimization of energy systems: Results utilization in the design process,” *Appl. Energy*, vol. 178, 2016.
- [3] A. Ganjehkaviri, M. N. Mohd Jaafar, S. E. Hosseini, and H. Barzegaravval, “Genetic algorithm for optimization of energy systems: Solution uniqueness, accuracy, Pareto convergence and dimension reduction,” *Energy*, vol. 119, 2017.
- [4] S. E. Hosseini, M. A. Wahid, and N. Aghili, “The scenario of greenhouse gases reduction in Malaysia,” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 28, pp. 400–409, Dec. 2013.
- [5] S. E. Hosseini and M. A. Wahid, “Utilization of palm solid residue as a source of renewable and sustainable energy in Malaysia,” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 40, pp. 621–632, Dec. 2014.
- [6] S. E. Hosseini and M. A. Wahid, “Feasibility study of biogas production and utilization as a source of renewable energy in Malaysia,” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 19, pp. 454–462, Mar. 2013.
- [7] F. Li, S. Cheng, H. Yu, and D. Yang, “Waste from livestock and poultry breeding and its potential assessment of biogas energy in rural China,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 126, pp. 451–460, Jul. 2016.
- [8] W. Uddin *et al.*, “Biogas potential for electric power generation in Pakistan: A survey,” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 54, pp. 25–33, Feb. 2016.
- [9] P. Abdeshahian, J. S. Lim, W. S. Ho, H. Hashim, and C. T. Lee, “Potential of biogas production from farm animal waste in Malaysia,” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 60, pp. 714–723, Jul. 2016.
- [10] I. F. S. dos Santos, R. M. Barros, and G. L. Tiago Filho, “Electricity generation from biogas of anaerobic wastewater treatment plants in Brazil: an assessment of feasibility and potential,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 126, pp. 504–514, Jul. 2016.
- [11] M. Rios and M. Kaltschmitt, “Electricity generation potential from biogas

- produced from organic waste in Mexico,” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 54, pp. 384–395, Feb. 2016.
- [12] M. Speidel, G. Kraaij, and A. Wörner, “A new process concept for highly efficient conversion of sewage sludge by combined fermentation and gasification and power generation in a hybrid system consisting of a SOFC and a gas turbine,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 98, pp. 259–267, Jul. 2015.
- [13] J. Van herle, Y. Membrez, and O. Bucheli, “Biogas as a fuel source for SOFC co-generators,” *J. Power Sources*, vol. 127, no. 1–2, pp. 300–312, Mar. 2004.
- [14] S. Wongchanapai, H. Iwai, M. Saito, and H. Yoshida, “Performance evaluation of a direct-biogas solid oxide fuel cell-micro gas turbine (SOFC-MGT) hybrid combined heat and power (CHP) system,” *J. Power Sources*, vol. 223, pp. 9–17, Feb. 2013.
- [15] A. Skorek-Osikowska, Ł. Bartela, J. Kotowicz, A. Sobolewski, T. Iluk, and L. Remiorz, “The influence of the size of the CHP (combined heat and power) system integrated with a biomass fueled gas generator and piston engine on the thermodynamic and economic effectiveness of electricity and heat generation,” *Energy*, vol. 67, pp. 328–340, Apr. 2014.
- [16] J. Y. Kang, D. W. Kang, T. S. Kim, and K. B. Hur, “Economic evaluation of biogas and natural gas co-firing in gas turbine combined heat and power systems,” *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 723–731, Sep. 2014.
- [17] S. Pipatmanomai, S. Kaewluan, and T. Vitidsant, “Economic assessment of biogas-to-electricity generation system with H₂S removal by activated carbon in small pig farm,” *Appl. Energy*, vol. 86, no. 5, pp. 669–674, May 2009.
- [18] W. M. Budzianowski and D. A. Budzianowska, “Economic analysis of biomethane and bioelectricity generation from biogas using different support schemes and plant configurations,” *Energy*, vol. 88, pp. 658–666, Aug. 2015.
- [19] F. Basrawi, H. Ibrahim, and T. Yamada, “Optimal Unit Sizing of Biogas-Fuelled Micro Gas Turbine Cogeneration Systems in a Sewage Treatment Plant,” *Energy Procedia*, vol. 75, pp. 1052–1058, Aug. 2015.
- [20] J. Y. Kang, D. W. Kang, T. S. Kim, and K. B. Hur, “Comparative economic analysis of gas turbine-based power generation and combined heat and power systems using biogas fuel,” *Energy*, vol. 67, pp. 309–318, Apr. 2014.
- [21] H. Yağlı, Y. Koç, A. Koç, A. Görgülü, and A. Tandiroğlu, “Parametric optimization and exergetic analysis comparison of subcritical and supercritical

- organic Rankine cycle (ORC) for biogas fuelled combined heat and power (CHP) engine exhaust gas waste heat,” *Energy*, vol. 111, pp. 923–932, Sep. 2016.
- [22] C. A. Gibson, M. A. Meybodi, and M. Behnia, “Investigation of a gas turbine CHP system under the carbon price in Australia considering natural gas and biogas fuels,” *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, vol. 68, no. 1–2, pp. 26–35, Jul. 2014.
- [23] A. Yechiel and Y. Shevah, “Optimization of energy generation using landfill biogas,” *J. Energy Storage*, vol. 7, pp. 93–98, Aug. 2016.
- [24] W. Gazda and W. Stanek, “Energy and environmental assessment of integrated biogas trigeneration and photovoltaic plant as more sustainable industrial system,” *Appl. Energy*, vol. 169, pp. 138–149, May 2016.
- [25] S. Farhad, F. Hamdullahpur, and Y. Yoo, “Performance evaluation of different configurations of biogas-fuelled SOFC micro-CHP systems for residential applications,” *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 3758–3768, Apr. 2010.
- [26] S. E. Hosseini, H. Barzegaravval, M. A. Wahid, A. Ganjehkaviri, and M. M. Sies, “Thermodynamic assessment of integrated biogas-based micro-power generation system,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 128, pp. 104–119, Nov. 2016.
- [27] N. S. Siefert and S. Litster, “Exergy & economic analysis of biogas fueled solid oxide fuel cell systems,” *J. Power Sources*, vol. 272, pp. 386–397, Dec. 2014.
- [28] N. F. Tumen Ozdil and A. Tantekin, “Exergy and exergoeconomic assessments of an electricity production system in a running wastewater treatment plant,” *Renew. Energy*, vol. 97, pp. 390–398, Nov. 2016.
- [29] B. Wu, X. Zhang, D. Shang, D. Bao, S. Zhang, and T. Zheng, “Energetic-environmental-economic assessment of the biogas system with three utilization pathways: Combined heat and power, biomethane and fuel cell,” *Bioresour. Technol.*, vol. 214, pp. 722–728, Aug. 2016.
- [30] A. Colmenar-Santos, G. Zarzuelo-Puch, D. Borge-Diez, and C. García-Diéguez, “Thermodynamic and exergoeconomic analysis of energy recovery system of biogas from a wastewater treatment plant and use in a Stirling engine,” *Renew. Energy*, vol. 88, pp. 171–184, Apr. 2016.
- [31] K. A. Al-attab and Z. A. Zainal, “Performance of a biomass fueled two-stage

- micro gas turbine (MGT) system with hot air production heat recovery unit,” *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 61–70, Sep. 2014.
- [32] S. E. Hosseini and M. A. Wahid, “Development of biogas combustion in combined heat and power generation,” *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 40, pp. 868–875, Dec. 2014.
- [33] H. Nikpey Somehsaraei, M. Mansouri Majoumerd, P. Breuhaus, and M. Assadi, “Performance analysis of a biogas-fueled micro gas turbine using a validated thermodynamic model,” *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, vol. 66, no. 1–2, pp. 181–190, May 2014.
- [34] H. Nikpey, M. Assadi, P. Breuhaus, and P. T. Mørkved, “Experimental evaluation and ANN modeling of a recuperative micro gas turbine burning mixtures of natural gas and biogas,” *Appl. Energy*, vol. 117, pp. 30–41, Mar. 2014.
- [35] J. Beddoes, K. Bracmort, R. Burns, and W. Lazarus, “An analysis of energy production costs from anaerobic digestion systems on US livestock production facilities,” *USDA NRCS Tech. Note*, 2007.
- [36] A. Jalalzadeh-Azar, G. Saur, and A. Lopez, “Biogas Resources Characterization,” 2010.
- [37] M. F. Bin Basrawi, T. Yamada, K. Nakanishi, and H. Katsumata, “Analysis of the performances of biogas-fuelled micro gas turbine cogeneration systems (MGT-CGSs) in middle- and small-scale sewage treatment plants: Comparison of performances and optimization of MGTs with various electrical power outputs,” *Energy*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 291–304, Feb. 2012.
- [38] S. E. Hosseini, H. Barzegaravval, M. A. Wahid, A. Ganjehkaviri, and M. M. Sies, “Thermodynamic assessment of integrated biogas-based micro-power generation system,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 128, 2016.
- [39] S. Mirmasoumi, R. Khoshbakhti Saray, and S. Ebrahimi, “Evaluation of thermal pretreatment and digestion temperature rise in a biogas fueled combined cooling, heat, and power system using exergo-economic analysis,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 163, pp. 219–238, May 2018.
- [40] A. Darabadi Zareh, R. Khoshbakhti Saray, S. Mirmasoumi, and K. Bahlouli, “Extensive thermodynamic and economic analysis of the cogeneration of heat and power system fueled by the blend of natural gas and biogas,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 164, pp. 329–343, May 2018.

- [41] N. Akkouché, K. Loubar, F. Nepveu, M. E. A. Kadi, and M. Tazerout, “Micro-combined heat and power using dual fuel engine and biogas from discontinuous anaerobic digestion,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 205, p. 112407, Feb. 2020.
- [42] I. Govender, G. A. Thopil, and R. Inglesi-Lotz, “Financial and economic appraisal of a biogas to electricity project,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 214, pp. 154–165, Mar. 2019.
- [43] B. Su, W. Han, H. He, H. Jin, Z. Chen, and S. Yang, “A biogas-fired cogeneration system based on chemically recuperated gas turbine cycle,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 205, p. 112394, Feb. 2020.
- [44] M. Aghbashlo, M. Tabatabaei, and S. Hosseinpour, “On the exergoeconomic and exergoenvironmental evaluation and optimization of biodiesel synthesis from waste cooking oil (WCO) using a low power, high frequency ultrasonic reactor,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 164, pp. 385–398, May 2018.
- [45] E. Bellos and C. Tzivanidis, “Multi-objective optimization of a solar driven trigeneration system,” *Energy*, vol. 149, pp. 47–62, Apr. 2018.
- [46] H. Ershadi and A. Karimipour, “Present a multi-criteria modeling and optimization (energy, economic and environmental) approach of industrial combined cooling heating and power (CCHP) generation systems using the genetic algorithm, case study: A tile factory,” *Energy*, vol. 149, pp. 286–295, Apr. 2018.
- [47] J. Hosseinpour, M. Sadeghi, A. Chitsaz, F. Ranjbar, and M. A. Rosen, “Exergy assessment and optimization of a cogeneration system based on a solid oxide fuel cell integrated with a Stirling engine,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 143, pp. 448–458, Jul. 2017.
- [48] M. A. M. Ramli, H. R. E. H. Bouchekara, and A. S. Alghamdi, “Optimal sizing of PV/wind/diesel hybrid microgrid system using multi-objective self-adaptive differential evolution algorithm,” *Renew. Energy*, vol. 121, pp. 400–411, Jun. 2018.
- [49] L. Khani, A. S. Mehr, M. Yari, and S. M. S. Mahmoudi, “Multi-objective optimization of an indirectly integrated solid oxide fuel cell-gas turbine cogeneration system,” *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 41, no. 46, pp. 21470–21488, Dec. 2016.
- [50] P. Gabrielli, M. Gazzani, E. Martelli, and M. Mazzotti, “Optimal design of multi-energy systems with seasonal storage,” *Appl. Energy*, vol. 219, pp. 408–

424, Jun. 2018.

- [51] H. Rashidi and J. Khorshidi, “Exergoeconomic analysis and optimization of a solar based multigeneration system using multiobjective differential evolution algorithm,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 170, pp. 978–990, Jan. 2018.
- [52] W. He, A. A. Barzinjy, S. Khanmohammadi, A. Shahsavar, M. A. Moghimi, and M. Afrand, “Multi-objective optimization of a photovoltaic thermal-compound sensible rotary heat exchanger system using exergo-economic and enviro-economic approaches,” *J. Environ. Manage.*, vol. 254, p. 109767, Jan. 2020.
- [53] Y. Du, X. Liang, Y. Liu, L. Xie, and S. Zhang, “Exergo-economic analysis and multi-objective optimization of seawater reverse osmosis desalination networks,” *Desalination*, vol. 466, pp. 1–15, Sep. 2019.
- [54] M. Babaelahi and H. Jafari, “Analytical design and optimization of a new hybrid solar-driven micro gas turbine/stirling engine, based on exergo-enviro-economic concept,” *Sustain. Energy Technol. Assessments*, vol. 42, p. 100845, Dec. 2020.
- [55] T. Ouyang, Z. Su, Z. Zhao, Z. Wang, and H. Huang, “Advanced exergo-economic schemes and optimization for medium–low grade waste heat recovery of marine dual-fuel engine integrated with accumulator,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 226, p. 113577, Dec. 2020.
- [56] N. Nazari, P. Heidarnejad, and S. Porkhial, “Multi-objective optimization of a combined steam-organic Rankine cycle based on exergy and exergo-economic analysis for waste heat recovery application,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 127, pp. 366–379, Nov. 2016.
- [57] M. Z. Malik, F. Musharavati, S. Khanmohammadi, M. M. Baseri, P. Ahmadi, and D. D. Nguyen, “Ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) system boosted with solar energy and TEG based on exergy and exergo-environment analysis and multi-objective optimization,” *Sol. Energy*, vol. 208, pp. 559–572, Sep. 2020.
- [58] M. Babaelahi, E. Rafat, and E. Mofidipour, “Emergy-based economic and environmental analysis and multi-objective optimization of a two-cascade solar gas turbine power plant,” *Sustain. Prod. Consum.*, vol. 20, pp. 165–177, Oct. 2019.
- [59] S. Sadeghi, S. Ghandehariun, and G. F. Naterer, “Exergoeconomic and multi-

- objective optimization of a solar thermochemical hydrogen production plant with heat recovery,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 225, p. 113441, Dec. 2020.
- [60] S. Anvari, R. Khoshbakhti Saray, and K. Bahlouli, “Employing a new optimization strategy based on advanced exergy concept for improvement of a tri-generation system,” *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, vol. 113, pp. 1452–1463, Feb. 2017.
- [61] A. Entezari, A. Manizadeh, and R. Ahmadi, “Energetical, exergetical and economical optimization analysis of combined power generation system of gas turbine and Stirling engine,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 159, pp. 189–203, Mar. 2018.
- [62] P. Movahed and A. Avami, “Techno-economic optimization of biogas-fueled micro gas turbine cogeneration systems in sewage treatment plant,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 218, p. 112965, Aug. 2020.
- [63] A. Farsi, I. Dincer, and G. F. Naterer, “Multi-objective optimization of an experimental integrated thermochemical cycle of hydrogen production with an artificial neural network,” *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 45, no. 46, pp. 24355–24369, Sep. 2020.
- [64] N. Nasruddin, I. Dwi Saputra, T. Mentari, A. Bardow, O. Marcelina, and S. Berlin, “Exergy, exergoeconomic, and exergoenvironmental optimization of the geothermal binary cycle power plant at Ampallas, West Sulawesi, Indonesia,” *Therm. Sci. Eng. Prog.*, vol. 19, p. 100625, Oct. 2020.
- [65] K. Bahlouli, “Multi-objective optimization of a combined cycle using exergetic and exergoeconomic approaches,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 171, pp. 1761–1772, Sep. 2018.
- [66] M. A. Emadi and J. Mahmoudimehr, “Modeling and thermo-economic optimization of a new multi-generation system with geothermal heat source and LNG heat sink,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 189, pp. 153–166, Jun. 2019.
- [67] S. Lee, I. J. Esfahani, P. Ifaei, W. Moya, and C. K. Yoo, “Thermo-environmental modeling and optimization of an integrated wastewater treatment plant with a combined heat and power generation system,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 142, pp. 385–401, Jun. 2017.
- [68] S. Sanaye, M. Emadi, and A. Refahi, “Thermal and economic modeling and optimization of a novel combined ejector refrigeration cycle,” *Int. J. Refrig.*, vol. 98, pp. 480–493, Feb. 2019.
- [69] N. Hashemian and A. Noorpoor, “Assessment and multi-criteria optimization

- of a solar and biomass-based multi-generation system: Thermodynamic, exergoeconomic and exergoenvironmental aspects,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 195, pp. 788–797, Sep. 2019.
- [70] S. M. Alirahmi, S. Rahmani Dabbagh, P. Ahmadi, and S. Wongwises, “Multi-objective design optimization of a multi-generation energy system based on geothermal and solar energy,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 205, p. 112426, Feb. 2020.
- [71] A. H. Keshavarzzadeh, P. Ahmadi, and M. R. Safaei, “Assessment and optimization of an integrated energy system with electrolysis and fuel cells for electricity, cooling and hydrogen production using various optimization techniques,” *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 44, no. 39, pp. 21379–21396, Aug. 2019.
- [72] S. Javan, V. Mohamadi, P. Ahmadi, and P. Hanafizadeh, “Fluid selection optimization of a combined cooling, heating and power (CCHP) system for residential applications,” *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, vol. 96, pp. 26–38, Mar. 2016.
- [73] R. Tariq, A. Sohani, J. Xamán, H. Sayyaadi, A. Bassam, and O. M. Tzuc, “Multi-objective optimization for the best possible thermal, electrical and overall energy performance of a novel perforated-type regenerative evaporative humidifier,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 198, p. 111802, Oct. 2019.
- [74] S. Hou, Y. Zhou, L. Yu, F. Zhang, S. Cao, and Y. Wu, “Optimization of a novel cogeneration system including a gas turbine, a supercritical CO₂ recompression cycle, a steam power cycle and an organic Rankine cycle,” *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 172, pp. 457–471, Sep. 2018.
- [75] S. Nikbakht Naserabad, A. Mehrpanahi, and G. Ahmadi, “Multi-objective optimization of feed-water heater arrangement options in a steam power plant repowering,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 220, pp. 253–270, May 2019.
- [76] E. W. Lemmon, and Ian H. Bell, M. L. Huber, and M. O. McLinden, “NIST Standard Reference Database 23: Reference Fluid Thermodynamic and Transport Properties-REFPROP, Version 10.0, National Institute of Standards and Technology.” 2018.
- [77] B. E. Poling, J. M. Prausnitz, and J. P. O’Connell, *The Properties of Gases and Liquids, Fifth Edition*. 2011.
- [78] J. Szargut, “Chemical exergies of the elements,” *Appl. Energy*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 269–286, Jan. 1989.

- [79] M. Garfias, “Standard chemical exergy of elements updated,” *Energy*, vol. 31, no. 15, pp. 3310–3326, Dec. 2006.
- [80] H. Barzegar Avval, P. Ahmadi, A. R. Ghaffarizadeh, and M. H. Saidi, “Thermo-economic-environmental multiobjective optimization of a gas turbine power plant with preheater using evolutionary algorithm,” *Int. J. Energy Res.*, vol. 35, no. 5, 2011.
- [81] A. Bejan and G. Tsatsaronis, *Thermal Design and Optimization*. John Wiley & Sons, 1996.
- [82] W. Short, D. J. Pakey, and T. Holt, “A Manual for the Economic Evaluation of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Technologies,” 1995.
- [83] A. Valero *et al.*, “CGAM problem: Definition and conventional solution,” *Energy*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 279–286, Mar. 1994.
- [84] A. Ganjehkaviri, M. N. Mohd Jaafar, P. Ahmadi, and H. Barzegaravval, “Modelling and optimization of combined cycle power plant based on exergoeconomic and environmental analyses,” *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, vol. 67, no. 1–2, 2014.
- [85] R. H. Perry and D. W. Green, *Perry’s Chemical Engineers’ Handbook, 8th Edition*. 2013.
- [86] G. F. Hewitt and S. J. Pugh, “Approximate design and costing methods for heat exchangers,” *Heat Transf. Eng.*, 2007.
- [87] *Gas Turbine World Handbook*. Southport 06890 USA: Pequot Publishing Inc, 2012.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

ISI:

- Hasan Barzegaravval, Seyed Ehsan Hosseini, Mazlan Abdul Wahid, Aminuddin Saat, “Effects of fuel composition on the economic performance of biogas-based power generation systems”, *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol 128, 2018.
- Hasan Barzegaravval, Seyed Ehsan Hosseini, Mazlan Abdul Wahid, Aminuddin Bin Saat, “Dimensionless exergo-economic and emission parameters for biogas fueled gas turbine optimization”, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 262, 2020.

Conference:

- Mazlan Aabdul Wahid, Hasan Barzegaravval, Ahmad Dairobi Ghazali, Adam Kasani, Mohammad Amri Mazlan, Aminuddin Saat, Mohd Yasin, “Fuel composition influences on exergetic performance of a standalone internal reforming solid oxide fuel cell”, *AIP Conference Proceedings*, vol 2062, 2019.