



Raimundo Augusto Ferro de Oliveira Fortes

**Decarburization and Slag Formation Model for the Electric
Arc Furnace**

Tese de Doutorado

Thesis presented to the Postgraduate Program of the
Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais, PUC-Rio
as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doutor em Engenharia de Materiais e de
Processos Químicos e Metalúrgicos .

Advisor: José Carlos D'Abreu

Co-Advisors: Roberto Ribeiro de Avillez

Richard James Fruehan



Raimundo Augusto Ferro de Oliveira Fortes

**Decarburization and Slag Formation Model for the Electric
Arc Furnace**

Tese de Doutorado

Thesis presented to the Postgraduate Program of the
Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais, PUC-Rio as
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doutor em Engenharia de Materiais e de Processos
Químicos e Metalúrgicos .

Prof. José Carlos D'Abreu

Advisor – Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais-PUC-Rio

Prof. Roberto Ribeiro de Avelaz

Co-Advisor – Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais-PUC-Rio

Prof. Francisco José Moura

Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais-PUC-Rio

Prof. Helio Kohler

Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais-PUC-Rio

Prof. André Luiz da Costa e Silva

Universidade Federal Fluminense

Dr. Luis Augusto Colemborgue Kluszo

Gerdau Aços Especiais Brasil

Dr. Inigo Unamuno

Sidenor Spain

Prof. José Eugenio Leal

Coordinator of the Centro Técnico Científico da PUC-Rio

Rio de Janeiro
April 19th, 2010

All rights reserved. Total or partial reproduction, use to derivative works or disclosure to third parties without permission of the author, the university, the advisors and Gerdau Corporation is strictly forbidden.

Raimundo Augusto Ferro de Oliveira Fortes

Earned a bachelor's degree in Metallurgical Engineering and Materials Science from UFRJ (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro) in 1981 and a Master of Science title from COPPE UFRJ (Coordenação dos Programas de Pós Graduação em Engenharia) in 1988. He began his career at Gerdau S.A. steelmaking industry in Brazil in 1983, where he progressed through several supervisory positions in the quality control department, ferrous materials and melt shop facilities. From 1990 to 1998 Fortes served as process engineer and melt shop manager in Rio de Janeiro, and from 1999 to 2010 has been serving the Gerdau Industrial Processes headquarter as a senior process manager. Manage the development of optimization systems for meltdown processes. Support technical survey and evaluation of melt shop operations across Gerdau mills in Americas.

Bibliographic data

Fortes, Raimundo Augusto Ferro de Oliveira

Decarburization and slag formation model for the electric arc furnace / Raimundo Augusto Ferro de Oliveira Fortes ; advisor: José Carlos D'Abreu ; co-advisors: Roberto Ribeiro de Avillez, Richard James Fruehan. – 2010.

319 f. : il. ; 30 cm

Tese (Doutorado em Engenharia de Materiais)–Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2010.

Inclui bibliografia

1. Engenharia de materiais – Teses. 2. Forno elétrico a arco. 3. Descarburização. 4. Desfosforação. 5. Formação de escórias. 6. Balanço de massa. 7. Modelagem. I. Abreu, Jose Carlos d'. II. Avillez, Roberto Ribeiro de. III. Fruehan, Richard James. IV. Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro. Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais. V. Título.

CDD: 620.11

Acknowledgements

I would like first to express my sincere gratitude to Claudio Gerdau Johannpeter, who encouraged me to take on such a challenge. Thanks to the Gerdau Corporation for supporting this project and reaffirming the belief that knowledge is one of the essential pillars for process stability and innovation.

I am very grateful to Professors R.J. Fruehan from Carnegie Mellon University - CMU, and J.C. D'Abreu and R.R. Avelaz from Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro – PUC RJ for the opportunity to continue my studies at both of these renowned engineering centers. I thank them all for their inspiring leadership, advice, and patience during the ups and downs throughout the course of this investigation.

I would like to extend my deep appreciation to the members of Center of Iron and Steel Research – CISR, especially to Dr. Hiroyuki Matsuura, Dr. Rodrigo Corbari, Dr. Sabuj Halder, and Dr. Christopher Manning for their encouragement during the hard work required by the experiments and the invaluable discussions and suggestions. I thank the CISR member companies who have also supported this research project both financially and with important useful information. My special thanks to Mrs. Madeleine Lesko for her patience and support for a non-native English speaker.

This project could not be completed without the cooperation of so many people at Gerdau's Cosigua - Rio de Janeiro steel plant. Experimental design, plant sampling, and data collection required a lot of effort, involvement, and the dedication of overhead crane operators, melters, keepers, and process engineers. I would like to specifically mention and thank some of the many valuable steelmakers: José L. Souza, Leonardo M. Araujo, Bruno S. Breder, Fernando Cerqueira, Gilberto Santos Carlos A. Nascimento, Victor Araujo, Tiago Bittencourt, Douglas Cardoso, Alexandre Messias, Marcio Rosa, Melissa Gomes and Edmilson Silva.

I sincerely thank the members of my thesis review committee for their invaluable time and advice.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my family, Helenilde, Wagner, Marcelo, Marcio and Carla for being so patient and kind, in spite of the last four long years of trying to balance time spent between family activities and the endless study duties. I also dedicate this work to my Father and Mother who taught me the principles necessary to go through this chapter of my life with peace and joy.

Resumo

Fortes, R.A.F. **Modelo de descarburização e formação de escórias na produção de aço em aciaria elétrica**. Rio de Janeiro, 2010. 319p. – Tese de Doutorado – Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.

Um modelo de descarburização e formação de escórias foi desenvolvido e aplicado ao processo de fabricação de aço em forno elétrico a arco de 120 ton de capacidade, com carga de ferro gusa e de sucata ferrosa. O carregamento de carbono foi significativamente variado para testar a consistência do modelo, considerando a cinética de oxidação do carbono, oxidação do fósforo e de redução do óxido de ferro. Gusa e coque foram empregados como fontes mais relevantes de carbono, resultando na entrada de 15 a 35 kg carbono/ton. As taxas de fusão do gusa e da sucata governam a disponibilidade dos elementos mais relevantes tais como carbono, fósforo e silício em solução, portanto, afetam as taxas de descarburização e de formação de escórias. A principal fonte de fósforo na carga ferrosa é o gusa. Desta forma, a evolução do teor de fósforo na fase metal mostrou-se importante para as estimativas das taxas de fusão do gusa, uma vez que o fósforo pode ser empregado como traçador adicional ao carbono. Modelos cinéticos envolvendo as reações do fósforo e silício operam simultaneamente com os modelos cinéticos referentes às reações do carbono e do ferro.

Integrações numéricas associadas a um algoritmo de gradientes reduzidos generalizado foi empregado para o sistema não linear com restrições, de forma a determinar a maioria dos parâmetros cinéticos do modelo. A taxa de fusão global da carga de sucata foi maior do que a taxa de fusão aparente do gusa. Supõe-se que, o gusa apesar de ter relações geométricas desfavoráveis à transferência de calor em relação à sucata, poderia fundir mais rapidamente influenciado pelo seu baixo ponto de fusão. Entretanto, devido à formação de camada solidificada a partir da massa líquida na qual é imerso, é provável que mesmo fundido

posteriormente, ocorra um processo de encapsulamento temporário, conferindo-lhe uma taxa aparente de fusão mais baixa. A constante cinética da reação de descarburização quando o teor de carbono é inferior ao carbono crítico de 0.19% em massa e pelo menos 60% da carga ferrosa estão fundidas, foi estimada em 0.74 min^{-1} , taxas comparáveis às obtidas em aciaria a oxigênio.

A principal fonte de oxigênio para oxidação do ferro é disponibilizada por lanças supersônicas. Estima-se que 20% do oxigênio injetado via lanças sejam consumidos para a formação de óxido de ferro. Entretanto, cerca de 31% e 26% do oxigênio oriundo de injetores de pós-combustão podem contribuir na formação de óxido de ferro ou são captados pelo sistema de exaustão de gases, respectivamente. Os resultados indicam que em torno de 15-30% do carbono injetado podem não reagir no forno, sendo removidos com a escória. Adicionalmente ao estado de não-equilíbrio no sistema Fe-C-O observado, a dispersão nas estimativas de carbono solúvel na fase metal também pode ter sido influenciada pela intensidade de penetração da injeção de coque.

O algoritmo proposto se constitui num promissor simulador de práticas que visam otimizar o rendimento metálico do ferro, a partir da dependência da cinética de redução do óxido de ferro com sua atividade química na escória.

Palavras-chave

Forno elétrico a arco; descarburização; desfosforação; formação de escórias; balanço de massa; modelagem.

Abstract

Fortes, R.A.F. **Decarburization and slag formation model for the electric arc furnace**. Rio de Janeiro, 2010. 319p. – Doctoral Thesis – Departamento de Engenharia de Materiais, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.

A decarburization and slag formation model was developed and applied to a steelmaking process based on scrap and pig iron mixes melted in a conventional AC electric arc furnace (EAF) with 120 ton capacity. The amount of carbon input was varied significantly in order to evaluate the model consistency regarding mainly the kinetics of carbon oxidation, phosphorus oxidation and iron oxide formation and reduction. Pig iron and coke were used as sources of carbon, resulting in variation of total carbon input in the range of 15 to 35 kg carbon/ton. The pig iron and scrap melting rates determine the availability of the most relevant elements such as carbon, phosphorus and silicon in solution in Fe-C melts, and therefore, affecting the decarburization as well the slag formation rates. The pig iron is the main source of phosphorus in the ferrous charge. Hence, the evolution of the phosphorus content in the metal phase is important to predict the pig iron melting rate, since phosphorus can be used as a tracer element in addition to carbon. Kinetic models regarding phosphorus and silicon were applied simultaneously to kinetic models of carbon and iron reactions.

A numerical integration method supported a generalized reduced gradient algorithm for non-linear and constrained system (GRG) was applied to determine most of the kinetic model parameters. The scrap melting rates were found to be higher than pig iron apparent melting rates. This is expected that, even though the heat transfer issues related to significant differences in the area to volume ratio compared to scrap, pig iron may melt faster influenced by its low melting point. However, a solidified shell maybe created from the hot heel where pig iron is immersed, even when further melting occur, Fe-rich carbon melts could be

encapsulated temporarily and present lower apparent melting rate. The decarburization rate parameter, when at least 60% of the charge is melted, was estimated as 0.74 min^{-1} , when carbon content is lower than the critical carbon 0.19 %wt, which is similar to the rate range observed in oxygen steelmaking facilities. Around 31% and 26% of the oxygen input through post combustion injectors were addressed to iron oxidation and to the off-gas system, respectively.

The main source of oxygen taking part of iron oxidation is available from supersonic lances. Approximately 20% of the oxygen input through lancing are consumed to form iron oxide. The results also indicate about 15-30% of the injected carbon may not react and leave EAF during slag-off. In addition to the observed non-equilibrium state in Fe-C-O system, the dispersive behavior of the prediction of soluble carbon content in the metal phase could also be influenced by the intensity of penetration coke.

The model framework is a promising tool to work preliminarily in “what-if” process scenario builder as a static model for iron yield optimization, regarding the kinetics of iron oxide reduction reaction and the proposed dependence on its chemical activity in the slag phase.

Key words

Electric arc furnace; decarburization; dephosphorization; slag formation; mass balance; model development.

Table of contents

1.	Introduction	27
2.	Literature Review	29
2.1.	Thermodynamic and Kinetic Review	29
2.1.1.	Thermodynamics of the Decarburization	30
2.1.2.	Thermodynamics of the Iron Oxide Reduction.....	36
2.1.3.	Summary – Thermodynamics of System Fe-C-O.....	40
2.2.	Decarburization Kinetics	41
2.2.1.	Decarburization Kinetics Summary	61
2.3.	Kinetics of Iron Oxide Reduction	62
2.3.1.	Kinetics of Iron Oxide Reduction Summary.....	72
2.4.	Melting Kinetics	73
2.4.1.	Mass And Heat Transfer During Dissolution Of Low Carbon Steel In High Carbon Melt	89
2.4.1.1.	Melting Kinetics Summary	97
2.5.	Meltdown at Electric Arc Furnace	98
3.	Process Models.....	103
3.1.	The main chemical reactions	105
3.2.	Control Volume.....	107
3.3.	Ferrous Raw Materials Properties.....	108
3.4.	Slag Formers Properties	109
3.5.	Carbonaceous Materials Properties	110
3.6.	Initial Conditions Setup	110
3.7.	Meltdown Model	110
3.7.1.	Processing Times	111
3.7.2.	Melting and Dissolving Rates.....	111
3.7.3.	Charging (Solid Phase).....	113
3.7.4.	Partition of Raw Materials.....	114
3.7.4.1.	Partition of Ferrous Materials.....	114

3.7.4.2. Partition of Slag Formers Materials.....	117
3.7.4.3. Partition of Carbonaceous Materials.....	118
3.7.5. Oxy-Reduction Reactions.....	119
3.7.6. Metal Phase	121
3.7.7. Slag Phase.....	124
3.7.8. Dust Phase	127
3.7.9. Gas Phase	127
3.7.9.1. Oxygen Mass Balance	128
3.8. Decarburization Rate Model.....	131
3.9. Desiliconization Rate Model.....	134
3.10. Dephosphorization Rate Model	136
3.11. Iron Oxidation and Reduction Rate.....	137
3.12. Slag Off Rate	139
3.13. Re-Carburization	139
3.14. Model Parameters Determination	142
3.15. Process Model Summary	143
 4. Experimental Procedure	 145
4.1. Industrial Apparatus.....	145
4.2. Industrial Experiments – Selecting Relevant Variables	147
4.2.1. Charging.....	150
4.2.2. Slag Formers and Carbonaceous Materials.....	151
4.2.3. Electrical and Burners Power Rates	151
4.2.4. Post Combustion and Off-Gas.....	151
4.2.5. Melt Stirring and Hot Heel Size	152
4.2.6. Gases Injection.....	152
4.2.7. Variables Summary and Measurements Methodology	152
4.3. Laboratory Apparatus – Melting Rates.....	154
 5. Results and Discussion.....	 159
5.1. Decarburization and Slag Formation – Industrial Tests.....	160
5.1.1. Decarburization	169
5.1.1.1. Decarburization rate constant.....	176
5.1.2. Silicon and Phosphorus oxidation	179
5.1.2.1. Desiliconization	179

5.1.3.	Dephosphorization.....	184
5.1.4.	Post combustion ratio.....	199
5.1.5.	Iron Oxide Reduction.....	200
5.1.5.1.	Iron Oxide Activity	203
5.1.5.2.	Rate Constant of Iron Oxide Reduction	209
5.1.5.3.	Recarburization	216
5.1.6.	Initial slag amount.....	227
5.1.7.	Effectiveness of oxygen flow rate.....	227
5.1.8.	Melting Rates.....	228
5.1.8.1.	Melting Rates – Laboratory Experiments and the Chilling Effect	233
5.1.8.2.	Model Validation.....	251
6.	Conclusions	261
	References.....	267
	Appendices 1 – Short Literature Review on Melting Experimental Apparatus	275
	Annex 1 – Thermodynamics – Equations and Data Summary.....	280
	Annex 2 – Kinetics Equations Summary	293
	Annex 3 – Transport Phenomena – Equations Summary	305

List of symbols

a		Thermodynamic activity
A	m^2	Area
A_s	m^2	Solid phase area
A_{s0}	m^2	Initial solid phase area
B	$m/s.N$	Mobility
Bi		Biot number
C	mol/m^3	Molar density
c	$J/(kg.K)$	Heat capacity
	mol/Nm^3	Ideal gas conversion constant ($P/R.T$)
c_p	$J/(kg.K)$	Heat capacity at constant pressure
C_L^0	%	Initial carbon content at the melt (liquid bulk)
C_S^0	%	Carbon content at the solid phase
C_L^i	%	Carbon content in the liquid phase at Solid-Liquid interface
C_S^i	%	Carbon content in the solid phase at Solid-Liquid interface
D_{AB}	m^2/s	Mass diffusivity or Binary diffusion coefficient of specie A in medium of A and B
D_0	m^2/s	Pre-exponential factor of diffusivity
E	kJ/mol	Activation energy
ΔH_s	J/kg	Enthalpy to heat a solid
ΔH_m	J/kg	Melting enthalpy
ΔH_B	J/kg	Enthalpy available it the melt
ΔH_R	J/kg	Enthalpy of chemical reactions
ΔH_L	J/kg	Enthalpy consumed to heating melt
f		Activity coefficient in respect to Henryan scale
\vec{f}_μ	N/m^3	Shear stress due to viscous fluid
\vec{g}	m/s^2	Gravitational field
ΔG^0	kJ/mol	Standard Gibbs Free Energy
h		Henryan activity
h	$W/(m^2.K)$	Convective heat transfer coefficient
J	$Kg/(s.m^2)$	Mass flow per unit of area
k_B	$J/K.mol$	Boltzman constant
k	$W/(m.K)$	Thermal conductivity
k	$m^2/(mol.s)$	Rate constant of reaction
k_0	$m^2/(mol.s)$	Pre-exponential factor of the rate constant
K		Equilibrium constant
		Adsorption coefficient
m	m/s	Mass transfer coefficient
	m/min	
MW	g/mol	Molecular weight
n		Symmetry number or shape number
		Number of moles

N	moles/(m ² .s)	Molar flow per unit of area
p	Pa, N/m ²	Pressure, Partial pressure
Ph		Phase transition number
Pr		Prandtl number
q	W/m ²	Energy rate transferred from or to the system
Q	J	Energy transferred from or to the system
	Nm ³ /h	Gas flow rate
r	moles/s	Rate of reaction
	m	Cylindrical coordinate, or sample radius at a time t
R	J/(mol.K)	Gas constant
	W/K	Resistance to mass transfer or to chemical reaction
R_0	m	Initial radius of cylinder solid (sample)
Re		Reynolds number
Sc		Schmidt number
St		Stephan number
T	K	Temperature
T_m	K	Melting temperature
T_δ	K	Temperature at the boundary layer
t	s	Time
u	m/s	Fluid velocity
\mathcal{U}	m/s	Interface velocity
V	m ³	Volume
X		Molar fraction
W	kg	Weight
	J	Work done by or on the system
% wt	%	Mass fraction
w		

Greek letters

α	m ² /s	Thermal diffusivity
α_L	m ² /s	Thermal diffusivity of the liquid phase
α_S	m ² /s	Thermal diffusivity of the solid phase
δ	m	Boundary layer thickness
δ_C	m	Concentration boundary layer thickness
δ_T	m	Temperature boundary layer thickness
ε	W/m ³	Average mixing power due to turbulent regime
γ		Activity coefficient
φ		Enthalpy ratio
μ	Pa.s, Poise	Viscosity
	Kg/s.m	
θ		Fraction of surface
ρ	kg/m ³	Mass density
σ	N/m ²	Surface tension
τ_s	N/m ²	Shear stress
τ		Dimensionless time
ν	m ² /s	kinematic viscosity

Indices

<i>(ad)</i>	Adsorbed
<i>(g)</i>	Gas phase
<i>(l)</i>	Liquid phase
<i>0</i>	Initial, at time=0
<i>cg</i>	Carbon-gas interface
<i>cm</i>	Carbon-metal interface
<i>Cr</i>	Critical
<i>eq</i>	Thermodynamic equilibrium
<i>gr</i>	Graphite
<i>i</i>	Interface
	Specie, element, component
<i>L</i>	Liquid
<i>m</i>	Melting point; Melting; Metal phase
<i>mg</i>	Metal-gas interface
<i>S</i>	Solid
<i>sg</i>	Slag-gas interface
μ	Viscous character
∞	At the bulk of a specific phase

List of figures

Figure 1 – Heterogeneous reactions in the system Fe-C-O interface.....	29
Figure 2 - Equilibrium curves for C-O dissolved in iron at 1873 K, according to eq.AN1 - 9 (solid line) and eq.AN1 - 18 (dashed line, alternative data base) demonstrated in Annex 1, for different CO partial pressures.....	31
Figure 3 – Soluble oxygen (a) in a vacuum degasser; (b) Industrial data 1 [7], Industrial Data 2 and 3 [9]	32
Figure 4 – Equilibrium of CO and CO ₂ at 1873 K.	33
Figure 5 – Effect of slag basicity on the activity coefficient of iron oxide in simple and complex slags at 1600 °C [8]	35
Figure 6 – FeO in slag in equilibrium with Fe-C alloy. The FeO is computed assuming effect of the slag basicity on the FeO activity	37
Figure 7 – Relation between %FeO in slag and %C in steel at tap in EAF steelmaking is compared with the relations in BOF (Basic Oxygen Furnace) and OBM(Q–BOP) steelmaking [9].....	38
Figure 8 – (a) Variation of product (FeO)[%C] with carbon content of steel at first turndown;(b) Variation of product [ppm O][%C] with carbon content of steel at first turndown [10].....	39
Figure 9 – Decarburization rates as function of carbon content of melts when top blowing at various oxygen flow rates onto 5 kg iron-carbon melts in an induction furnace [11];(b) Rate of decarburization vs. carbon content for two heats under identical lowing conditions.	42
Figure 10 – (a) Decarburization profile in (a) low [9] and (b) high initial silicon content [12]; (c) Decarburization of Fe-C-Si alloys with a gas mixture of O ₂ -He. Initial silicon content varied between 0.38 to 0.71% [13].	43
Figure 11 – Decarburization Stages. Schematic representation of (a) dC/dt vs. %C [1]; (b) dC/dt vs. blowing time [15]; (c) %C vs. blowing time.	44
Figure 12 – Distribution of CO ₂ near the reaction surface of liquid Fe-C system. (modified figure)[16].	44
Figure 13 – (a) Rate of decarburization of Fe-C and Fe-C-S alloys and oxidation of graphite at 1800 K [23]; (b) Rate of decarburization as a function of in (1+P _{O2}) [2]	47
Figure 14 – (a) Dependence of the decarburization rate of continuously carbon-saturated vs. p_{CO_2} at several temperatures. Flow rate 20-24 lpm [24]; (b) Initial rate of decarburization at 1580 °C as a function of p_{CO_2} [25].	53
Figure 15– (a) Temperature dependence of rate constants for several iron-melts.; (b) Comparison of the rate constants for the decarburization of solid and liquid iron [24]. A dashed line is added.	54

Figure 16 - Effect of sulfur in Fe-C _{saturated} -S on the rate constant of CO ₂ reaction [26].	54
Figure 17 –Decarburization rate vs. carbon content in various open hearth furnaces in Japan [1].	58
Figure 18 – (a) Possible diffusion paths of carbon and oxygen toward the surface of a CO bubble in an emulsion of molten iron and FeO particles; (b) Schematic representation of the three-phase region shown in (a) [6].	59
Figure 19 - Calculated carbon oxidation rate vs. the carbon concentration for various values of F_g (geometry factor, proportional to the emulsification intensity) [6]	60
Figure 20 – Possible cases of iron oxide reaction with different sources of carbon in steelmaking facilities.	62
Figure 21 – Schematic diagrams of reduction of FeO containing slag by (a) carbon dissolved in Fe-C melts [34] and (b) solid carbon [36].	63
Figure 22 – Diagram representing resistance series circuit for reduction of iron oxide in slag.	65
Figure 23 – Reaction rate vs. slag FeO content for reduction by stationary and rotating rods [38]	66
Figure 24 – Comparison of experimental measurements with the rate model predictions for 1 cm diameter graphite rods (a) stationary rod and (b) rotating rod at 1050 rpm [39]	69
Figure 25 – (a) dependence of the apparent rate constant for the reduction of iron oxide by CO on iron oxide content in slags [33]; (b) Iron oxide reduction rate by solid carbon change with FeO activity (CaO/SiO ₂ mass 1.15) [36].	71
Figure 26 – Schematic diagram of the rate-limiting step vs. FeO content in slag [36].	72
Figure 27 – Laboratory experiments map as a function of %C in the liquid metal phase, %C in the solid samples and convective conditions.	74
Figure 28 - Heat flux on a solid immersed in its own melt	76
Figure 29 – Adiabatic melting of a plate, cylinder or sphere. Theoretical estimate of dimensionless melting time for solids with the same volume, preheated to close to the their melting temperature and immersed in their own melt [56] (condition II, Table 11).	80
Figure 30 - Cylindrical sample immersed in its own melt pool, submitted to a constant external heat source.	82
Figure 31 – Temperature profile through the sponge iron pellet and frozen shell [59].	83
Figure 32 – (a) Melting behavior of sponge iron pellets with initial radius $R_0 = 1$ cm [59].	83
Figure 33 - Initial Melt temperature (T_{OM})=1600 °C. Initial pellet temperature (T_{OS})=25 °C [60].	84

Figure 34 – (a) Radius variation and (b) Melting rate for a 1.22 %wtC HBI cylinder immersed in a 0.03 %wt C Melt [64].	85
Figure 35 – Predicted and experimental melting times for HBI cylinders [64].	86
Figure 36 – Experimental scrap melting time in EAF. Time 0 corresponds to power-on for the third basket [42].	87
Figure 37 – (a) Final melting vs. porosity for multi-bar sample (initial temperature of all samples $T_{s0} = 25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ an initial liquid melt temperature $T_L = 1650\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$; (b) Cross sections after immersion for approximately 10 s.	88
Figure 38 - Temperature and carbon distribution through the interface of high carbon melt – low carbon solid sample [43], [66], [45].	89
Figure 39 – Predicted melting times for vertical steel plates and cylinders, 0.1” thickness immersed in stagnant pig iron melts versus melt temperature ($^{\circ}\text{F}$) for various melt carbon content [45].	93
Figure 40 – Mass transfer coefficient vs. CO evolution rate for stationary dissolution at various temperatures [47].	95
Figure 41 – Mass transfer coefficient vs. oxygen concentration for stationary dissolution at different temperatures [47].	95
Figure 42 – Simultaneous dissolution of different scrap blend [52].	96
Figure 43 – Typical conventional EAF facilities, including auxiliary equipments: scrap bucket, slag pots; steel ladles; overhead cranes and off-gas system [70].	99
Figure 44 – Typical EAF lower and upper shell. (a) Eccentric bottom tapping design – EBT; refractory line in the lower shell suitable for high melt temperatures; (b) Water cooled parts and oxygen injectors at upper shell.	99
Figure 45 – Meltdown and primary refining in conventional EAF [71].	100
Figure 46 – Consteel process by Techint	101
Figure 47 – Shaft Furnace by Fuchs	101
Figure 48 - Typical EAF Mass Flowchart	104
Figure 49 - Typical EAF Mass Balance	104
Figure 50 – EAF process flowchart	106
Figure 51 – EAF Control Volume	107
Figure 52 – Weight partition flow for Rust and Impurities content in the ferrous materials charge	115
Figure 53 – Weight partition flow for elements and oxides content in the slag former materials	117
Figure 54 – Weight partition flow for elements and oxides content in the carbonaceous materials	118
Figure 55 – Ellingham diagram for some of the usual tramp elements in steel [75].	120
Figure 56 – Schematic representation of carbonaceous particle immersed (a) in Fe melt with high soluble oxygen; (b) neglected CO	

production and recarburization reaction takes place; (c) slag-metal interface.	140
Figure 57 - Example of different oxy-gas-coke injector's applications in EAF.....	145
Figure 58 – Grouping variables and defining two levels “bands”	149
Figure 59 – Lindberg Resistance Furnace	154
Figure 60 – Apparatus arrangement in a resistance furnace.....	155
Figure 61 – Details of sample coupling, crucible and process tube dimensions	156
Figure 62 - Temperature profile measured with type B thermocouple at the gas phase in the process tube and in the melt.....	157
Figure 63 – Steel and pig iron cylindrical samples wrapped up in steel mesh, simulating composed charges.....	158
Figure 64 – %wt C measured in the metal phase vs. model prediction.....	160
Figure 65 – %wt FeO measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.....	161
Figure 66 – %wt CaO measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.	161
Figure 67 – %wt SiO ₂ measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.	162
Figure 68 – %wt MgO measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.....	162
Figure 69 – %wt MnO measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.....	163
Figure 70 – %wt P ₂ O ₅ measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.....	163
Figure 71 – %wt Si measured in the metal phase vs. Model prediction.....	164
Figure 72 – %wt P measured in the metal phase vs. Model prediction.....	164
Figure 73 - Model prediction (lines) and experimental data (discrete points) for (a) carbon content in the metal phase and melting rates of pig iron and scrap blend; (b) slag composition along the heat 78787. Charge 8% of pig iron, and melt not submitted to oxygen flow through the lances and full coke injection during 5 minutes in the interval of 38 to 43 minutes of the tap-to-tap time.	165
Figure 74 – Model prediction (lines) and experimental data (discrete points) for (a) carbon content in the melt and melting rates of pig iron and scrap blend; (b) slag composition along the heat 80120. Charge 32% of pig iron, and melt submitted to full oxygen flow through the lances and no coke injection during 6 minutes in the interval of 27 to 34 minutes of power on time.	166
Figure 75 – Model prediction Net Slag = (+) Slag Generated (-) Slag Off, non-reacted carbon and non-dissolved fluxes along the heat 78787.	167
Figure 76 – Equilibrium curve for %C vs. %O soluble in iron melt, Henryan activity coefficients for carbon and oxygen are closer to 1.0. Plot of soluble oxygen measured by electrochemical probes and carbon content through optical spectrometer. Heats series 101423-101467 are additional samples.	169

Figure 77 – Model prediction for %wt carbon content (line) and experimental data (dots) along the heats (a) 99735, 9% pig iron; (b) 80883, 8% pig iron; (c) 80120, 30% pig iron; (d) 75138, 44% pig iron.	171
Figure 78 – %wt C measured in the metal phase vs. model prediction for pig iron charge in the range of 8% to 14%.	172
Figure 79 – %wt C measured in the metal phase vs. model prediction for pig iron charge in the range of 29% to 51%.	172
Figure 80 – Model prediction for %wt carbon content (line) and experimental data (dots) along the heats (a) 75137, 42% pig iron; (b) 79727, 30.4% pig iron.	173
Figure 81 – Model prediction for %wt carbon content (line) and experimental data (dots) along the heat 80887, 40 % pig iron computed for different pig iron average melting rates (a) 2356 [kg/min], %C ^{Cr} 0.36%; (b) 3529 [kg/min], %C ^{Cr} 0,36% respectively, and (c) 3529 [kg/min], %C ^{Cr} 0,10%.	175
Figure 82 – Computed rate parameter of decarburization reaction (heat 99318). The rate parameters for decarburization are excluding each other. The critical carbon content determines what rate controlling mechanism is predominant at every time t , and consequently, k_C is switched accordingly. k_{C1} depends on oxygen flow rate and k_{C2} is governed by carbon diffusion, metal phase weight and the driving force $[\%C]_t - [\%C]^{\text{eq}}$	177
Figure 83 – Rate parameter of decarburization and critical carbon content. k_{C2} is computed as an average.	178
Figure 84 – Model prediction for %wt carbon and silicon content (line) and experimental data (dots) along the heat 80887, 40 % pig iron (a) 2693 [kg/min], %Si ^{Cr} 0.15% ; (b) 1675 [kg/min], %Si ^{Cr} 0.15%; (c) 2693 [kg/min], %Si ^{Cr} 0.35%.	181
Figure 85 – Model prediction for product “ $m_i.A$ ” along the heat 80882 processing time	182
Figure 86 – Model prediction for decarburization and desiliconization rate parameters.	182
Figure 87 – Model prediction for critical carbon and silicon contents	183
Figure 88 – %wt Phosphorus and carbon evolution for (a) heat 80882, 8% pig iron; (b) heat 80120, 30% pig iron; (c) heat 104428, 40% pig iron. The discrete points are actual furnace melt chemistries	185
Figure 89 – Slag chemical composition predicted by the model and measured %wt chemistry (discrete points): (a) heat 80882, 8% pig iron; (b) heat 80120, 30% pig iron; (c) heat 104428, 40% pig iron	188
Figure 90 – Temperature profile along the heat 104428 processing time.	189
Figure 91 – Estimated solid phase (pig iron + scrap mix) evolution along the heat 104428.	189
Figure 92 – Model prediction for soluble carbon and oxygen in the metal phase and FeO content in the slag phase. (Heat 104428)	190

Figure 93 – Estimate of m_p^*A for another EAF facility [72]	191
Figure 94 – Phosphorus distribution L_p , product m_p^*A , and overall dephosphorization rate parameter k_p : (a) heat 80882, 9% pig iron (b) heat 80120, 30% pig iron; (c) heat 104428, 40% pig iron	193
Figure 95 – Dephosphorization rate parameters for all heats vs. time	193
Figure 96 – Decarburization vs. dephosphorization rate parameters	194
Figure 97 – %wt Phosphorus prediction, measured phosphorus (discrete points) and phosphorus in equilibrium computed for heat 104428.	195
Figure 98 – Model 1 $\log K_P$ vs. an empirical equation including CaO, MgO, FeO and P_2O_5 [72]. The discrete points are the present study industrial data (1873 K).	197
Figure 99 – Model 2 $\log K_P$ vs. an empirical equation including CaO, MgO and P_2O_5 . Other EAF and laboratory data [82] are added to the present study data (1873 K).	197
Figure 100 – Model prediction for CO flow rate and PCR (Post combustion Ratio); heat 80883.	199
Figure 101 – The curves are the mass concentration of FeO in slag phase for different basicity index in equilibrium with carbon in the Fe-C metal phase. The discrete points are measured furnace slag chemistries.	201
Figure 102 – Iron oxide activity coefficient [8] curve and discrete points [105] represent the measured furnace slag chemistries.	203
Figure 103 – Schematic representation of a pseudo-ternary phase-diagram adapted from Slag Atlas [106] for simplification plot of slag chemistry. The discrete points are measured furnace slag chemistries (% $Al_2O_3 \sim 3\%$).	204
Figure 104 – Mole fraction interdependence between slag oxides.	205
Figure 105 – Effect of FeO concentration on its activity in the range of 1573-1873 K, based on several authors data [105].	205
Figure 106 – Activity coefficient of FeO vs. its mole fraction computed by the regular solution model at 1873 K.	206
Figure 107 – FeO activity (i) empirical model at 1873 K [105]; (ii) empirical model with basicity index $B = 3.5$; (iii) Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) at 1723-1823 K [33]; (iv) schematic average of data collection at 1573-1873 K Figure 105; Discrete points computed from regular solution model applied to the slag chemistries of the present study at 1873 K.	207
Figure 108 – FeO activity coefficient estimates versus basicity index B at 1873 K [10]. The discrete points are measured furnace slag chemistries and computed at 1873 K.	208
Figure 109 – Activity coefficient of FeO versus optical basicity at 1873 K.	208
Figure 110 – Activity of FeO versus optical basicity at 1873 K.	209

Figure 111 – Estimated values for a_{FeO} by regular solution model and the measured values in FeO - CaO - SiO_2 slags equilibrate with liquid iron at 1873 K [107].....	211
Figure 112 – Iron oxide reduction rate parameter versus the average of iron oxide mass concentration ($y = a.e^{b.(wt\% FeO)}$, $R^2 = 0.27$)	212
Figure 113 – Iron oxide reduction rate parameter versus the average of iron oxide activity. ($y = a.e^{b.(a_{FeO})}$, $R^2 = 0.47$)	212
Figure 114 – Schematic representation of a pseudo-ternary viscosity (Poise = 10^{-1} Pa.s at 1400 °C) diagram adapted from Slag Atlas [106] for simplification plot of slag chemistry. The discrete points are measured furnace slag chemistries (% $Al_2O_3 \sim 3\%$).....	215
Figure 115 – Schematic representation of the expected patterns reduction of iron and recarburization.	216
Figure 116 – Dissolution of injected coke in terms of mass conversion. “overall” means the weighted average of the size distribution of the carbonaceous material used in this study.	217
Figure 117 – Carbon and phosphorus model prediction, measured chemistry (discrete points) in metal phase; heat 99317, 11% pig iron	218
Figure 118 – Phosphorus distribution L_p , product m_p^*A , and overall dephosphorization rate parameter k_p , heat 99317, 11% pig iron.....	219
Figure 119 – Slag chemical composition predicted by the model and %wt measured slag chemistry (discrete points): heat 99317, 11% pig iron	219
Figure 120 – FeO activity predicted by the model and FeO activity in equilibrium, heat 99317, 11% pig iron	220
Figure 121 – Carbon and phosphorus model prediction, measured chemistry (discrete points) in metal phase; 90306, 34% pig iron.....	221
Figure 122 – Slag chemical composition predicted by the model and measured slag chemistry (discrete points): heat 90306, 34% pig iron	221
Figure 123 – FeO activity predicted by the model and FeO activity in equilibrium, heat 90306, 34% pig iron	222
Figure 124 – Estimated solid phase (pig iron + scrap mix) evolution along the heat 90306.....	222
Figure 125 – Measurement of experimental oxygen injection profile along the heat 90306. Both Coherent Jets and Lance Manipulator are dedicated to inject oxygen in the metal phase.....	223
Figure 126 – Phosphorus distribution L_p , product m_p^*A , and overall dephosphorization rate parameter k_p , heat 90306, 34% pig iron.....	224
Figure 127 – Schematic representation of typical patterns of oxy-reduction of iron, and decarburization and recarburization.....	225

Figure 128 – Equilibrium curve for %C vs. %O soluble in iron melt. Plot of soluble oxygen by electrochemical probes and carbon content through optical spectrometer. Discrete points refer to heats 2155051 and 2264317, produced in EAF facility of the same size, scrap-pig iron basis, and regularly submitted to full carbon deoxidation before tapping [112].	226
Figure 129 – Mass concentration of FeO in slag phase in equilibrium with carbon in the Fe-C metal phase. The discrete points are measured furnace slag chemistries submitted to deep deoxidation through carbon injection. Three presumed equilibrium curves are depicted in dashed-thin lines, according to different basicity indexes found in this study.	226
Figure 130 – Computed overall melting rates for scrap mix and pig iron charged over hot heel of 10-15 ton	229
Figure 131 – Computed overall melting rates for scrap mix and pig iron charged over hot heel of 20-30 ton.	229
Figure 132 – Computed overall melting rates for ferrous materials (scrap blend and pig iron) versus the overall apparent density.	230
Figure 133 – Effect of pig iron and scrap melting rates on the model prediction for slag chemistry. Heat 99318, 11% pig iron.	232
Figure 134 – Effect of pig iron melting rates on the model prediction for slag chemistry. Heat 99736, 39% pig iron.	233
Figure 135 – Weight ratio of cylindrical samples. Mild steel samples of OD 12 mm were pre-heated up to 1200 °C and OD 10 mm up to 124 °C. Pig iron sample was not pre-heated.	234
Figure 136 – (a) Melting time and (b) melting rates plot according to eq. 226 and the experiment results. The steel samples were preheated up to 1200 °C.	235
Figure 137 – Area to volume ratio for typical scrap and pig iron grades.	236
Figure 138 – Low density scrap (0.25 – 0.55 ton/m ³)	237
Figure 139 – Intermediate density scrap (0.60 – 1.1 ton/m ³)	238
Figure 140 – High density scrap and pig iron	239
Figure 141 – Melting rates prediction for 1,000 kg of different geometries immersed individually in melt volume (Hot Heel) varying from 10-120 ton at: (a) 1540 °C and (b) 1580 °C.	241
Figure 142 – Hot heel temperature measurements and calculated weight considering a 100 ton EAF tapping capacity and resident hot heel of 15-20 ton.	242
Figure 143 – Calculated Hot heel weight vs. electrical energy consumption ratio	243
Figure 144 – Effect of melt temperature on melting rates prediction for variable weight of different geometries immersed individually in melt volume (Hot Heel). Melting rates discrete plots for scrap mix and pig iron were obtained through GRG calculation based on industrial tests.	245
Figure 145 – Wrapped up samples	246

Figure 146 – Mild Steel samples wrapped up in steel mesh after immersion in melt at 1560 °C	247
Figure 147 – Longitudinal and transversal cross section of steel samples wrapped up in steel mesh immersed in melt at 1560 °C for 10 sec (S10-10).....	247
Figure 148 – Single mild steel sample immersed in melt at low temperature 1518 °C for 16 sec (S12-11).....	248
Figure 149 – Single pig iron sample immersed in melt at low temperature 1472 oC for 8 sec (PH10-206).	248
Figure 150 – Longitudinal and transversal cross section of pig iron wrapped up on steel mesh sample and immersed in melt at 1563 0C for 9 sec (PH10-200).....	249
Figure 151 – Pig iron encapsulating progress and final leak to the hot heel volume	250
Figure 152 – Pig iron and solidified shell interface	250
Figure 153 – Computed overall melting rates for scrap mix and pig iron charged over hot heel of 20-30 ton; included all validation heats 91014 to 91018, 22-24% pig iron.....	253
Figure 154 – Carbon and phosphorus model prediction, measured chemistry (discrete points) in metal phase; heat 91016, 23% pig iron.	253
Figure 155 – Carbon content model prediction, measured chemistry (discrete points) in metal phase; included all validation heats 91014 to 91018, 22-24% pig iron.	254
Figure 156 – %wt C measured in the melt vs. Model prediction.....	254
Figure 157 – Phosphorus content model prediction, measured chemistry (discrete points) in metal phase; all heats used for validation n. 91014 to 91018, 22-24% pig iron.	255
Figure 158 – %wt P measured in the melt phase vs. Model prediction.....	255
Figure 159 – Slag chemical composition predicted by the model and measured %wt chemistry (discrete points): heat n. 91014, 24% pig iron.	256
Figure 160 – wt% FeO content in slag predicted by the model and measured %wt chemistry (discrete points): all heats used for validation n. 91014 to 91018, 22-24% pig iron.	256
Figure 161 – %wt FeO measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.....	257
Figure 162 – %wt CaO measured in the slag vs. Model prediction	257
Figure 163 – %wt SiO ₂ measured in the slag vs. Model prediction	258
Figure 164 – %wt MgO measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.....	258
Figure 165 – %wt P ₂ O ₅ measured in the slag vs. Model prediction.....	259

List of tables

Table 1 – Minimum carbon concentration estimate [9].....	34
Table 2 – Estimate for minimum carbon concentration taking into account FeO activity in the slag different than unity. Where, $B_2 = CaO/SiO_2$	36
Table 3 – Estimate the ratio p_{CO_2}/p_{CO} taking into account FeO activity in the slag as a function of slag basicity. Where, $B_2 = CaO/SiO_2$	39
Table 4 – Decarburizing process steps of Fe-C melt submitted to CO_2 as the oxidizing agent.....	48
Table 5 – Decarburizing process steps of Fe-C melt submitted to O_2 as the oxidizing agent	49
Table 6 – Apparent activation energy for decarburization process estimated from induction melting experiments.....	51
Table 7 – Process variables affecting the decarburization rate-controlling mechanism.....	56
Table 8 – decarburization rate-controlling mechanism and transition carbon content (critical carbon).	57
Table 9 – Most accepted decarburization rate equations for stage II and III.	61
Table 10 – Process steps for iron oxide reduction by dissolved carbon in Fe-C melts and by a generic solid carbon source.	64
Table 11 - Typical variables affecting the melting of ferrous charge in EAF.	75
Table 12 – Heat transfer equations for special cases applied to meltdown a solid in its own melt [56, 58].....	79
Table 13 – Mass and heat transfer coefficients estimates	93
Table 14 – Average mixing power versus heat transfer coefficient in converters	94
Table 15 – Reaction type and destination of elements and oxides	121
Table 16 – Most relevant variables affecting the decarburization, iron oxidation, as well iron oxide reduction and re-carburization rates.....	148
Table 17 – Pre-Factorial experiment design. Conditions ID # 1 to 22: (a) Decarburization experiments; (b) Decarburization and deep carbon injection.	149
Table 18 – Scrap and substitutes properties.....	150
Table 19 – Properties of slag formers and carbonaceous materials	151
Table 20 – Input and output variables managed by the process model ..	153
Table 21 – Summary of the GRG calculation for model parameters.	167
Table 22 – Carbon and silicon diffusivity in liquid iron at 1873, according to References (i) [9] and (ii) [98].	183
Table 23 – Summary of operational data for heats 80120, 80882 and 104428.....	186
Table 24 – Carbon and phosphorus diffusivity in liquid iron at 1873 reference (i) [9], reference (ii) [98].....	195
Table 25 – Summary of rate parameter of dephosphorization and product m_p^*A for the current study and other researchers [72].	198

Table 26 – The overall injected oxygen mass balance.....	228
Table 27 – Area to volume ratio for typical scrap and pig iron grades.....	236
Table 28 – (a) Dimensions of typical scrap and pig iron grades applied to Figure 141 and Figure 144; (b) Physical properties.....	240
Table 29 – Data for melting rate simulation.....	244
Table 30 – Models parameters settings for validation tests.....	252
Table 31 - Interaction energy between cations of major components in steelmaking slag [107].	291

List of acronyms

BOF	Basic Oxygen Furnace (Converter)
DRI	Direct Reduced Iron
EAF	Electric Arc Furnace
EBT	Eccentric Bottom Tap Hole
GPMT	Gas phase mass transfer
HBI	Hot Briquette Iron
LD	Linz-Donawitz converter technology by VAI
LET	Converter
LPMT	Liquid phase mass transfer
LWS	Loire-Wendel-Sprunk converter
OBM	Oxygen Bottom Blowing Maxhute
OSM	Oxygen Steelmaking
Q-BOP	Quick Basic Oxygen Process (Bottom blowing)
SBQ	Special Billet Quality
GRG	Generalized Reduce Gradient
VAI	Voest-Alpine Industry

Although nature commences with reason and ends in experience, it is necessary for us to do the opposite that is to commence with experience and from this to proceed to investigate the reason.

Leonardo Da Vinci