A comparative study of water wall model with a linear model and a neural network model
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Abstract: A water wall system is one of the most important systems used in boilers of thermal power plants. In this study, we assume that an exact nonlinear water wall model is given. Then, from the viewpoint of controller design, we compare the effectiveness of two models, a linear model and a neural network model. The linear model is developed by linearizing a nonlinear model at an operating point. The neural network model is developed using simulation data from a nonlinear model. To compare the qualities of these two models, a PRBNS (Pseudo Random Binary Signal) is applied to each model, and the errors of the models are compared. In comparison to the nonlinear model, two models performed adequately. The neural network model achieved a better performance than the linear model.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Thermal power plants are designed to handle fluctuating load demands, while nuclear power plants handle the base electrical load. Therefore, thermal power plants need to operate efficiently to keep up with the load change (Miao, 2011). One such method to achieve this is a good controller design based on a good quality model.

A water wall system is one of the most important systems used in boilers of thermal power plants (Lu, 2008). Generally, a water wall system is modeled using a nonlinear system, which poses a challenge for controller design and analysis (Bentarzi, 2011).

However, most controllers were designed based on linear models. If the linear model is of a poor quality, the performance of the controller is also degraded (Moon, 2011). Thus, in order to overcome the nonlinearity of thermal power plants, many control techniques are developed using neural network models (Draeger, 1995; Thibault, 1992; MacMurray, 1992).

In this study, we assume a nonlinear water wall model to represent the water wall system. Next, from the controller design perspectives, we compare the relative qualities of the two models, a linear model and a neural network model, with that of the nonlinear model. The linear model is developed by linearizing the nonlinear model at an operating point, and the neural network model is developed using simulation data from the nonlinear model. To compare the qualities of the models, a Pseudo Random Binary Signal (PRBNS) is applied to the nonlinear model, linear model, and neural network model.

2. WATER WALL MODELING

2.1 A Nonlinear Water Wall Model

In this paper, we consider a water wall model in a 600MW oil drum boiler-turbine systems as shown in Fig.1. The water wall is located between the circulating pump and the drum in the boiler. The circulating water in the water wall is heated in the furnace, and then poured into the drum.
Mass balance equation, energy equilibrium equation, and thermal equilibrium equation can be defined based on boiler structure and physical principles. The description of the water wall system is as follows,

Mass balance equation is given by:

$$w_{ww} = W_{rw} + K_{wrps}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where,

- $w_{ww}$: Mass flow of water wall output,
- $W_{rw}$: Mass flow of recirculating water,
- $K_{wrps}$: Mass flow of recirculating pump.

According to (Usoro, 1977), $K_{wrps}$ accounts for recirculating pump leakages and seal injection. It is small and may be neglected.

Energy equilibrium equation is given by:

$$M_{ww} \times K_{ww} \times \frac{d}{dt}(T_{wm}) = Q_{wwgm} - Q_{wwmw}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where,

- $M_{ww}$: Effective mass of water wall metal,
- $K_{ww}$: Specific heat of water wall metal,
- $T_{wm}$: Temperature of water wall metal,
- $Q_{wwgm}$: Heat transfer rate of gas to metal,
- $Q_{wwmw}$: Heat transfer rate of metal to water.

$$M_{ww} = K_{ww} \times R_{dyw} \times H_{dyw}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where,

- $K_{ww}$: Mass of water wall metal,
- $R_{dyw}$: Volume of water wall,
- $H_{dyw}$: Enthalpy of drum water,
- $Q_{wwgm} = K_{ww} \times (T_{wm} - T_{dyw})$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where, $K_{ww}$: Constant with dimension of [W/K³].

Temperature equilibrium equation of circulating water is given by:

$$w_{ww} \times (H_{www} - H_{wpo}) = Q_{www}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where,

- $w_{ww}$: Enthalpy of recirculating pump output,
- $H_{www}$: Enthalpy of water wall output.

The following constant values are used:

$$K_{ww} = 1063000, \hspace{0.5cm} K_{ww} = 2318.61, \hspace{0.5cm} K_{ww} = 0.11, \hspace{0.5cm} K_{ww} = 173.5205$$

For equations (1)-(5), we define the inputs, the outputs, and the states as follows,

Input :

$$U = [u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5] = [W_{rw}, H_{wpo}, R_{dyw}, H_{dyw}, T_{dyw}, Q_{www}]$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Output :

$$Y = [y_1, y_2, y_3] = [w_{www}, T_{wm}, T_{wm}]$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

State :

$$X = [x] = [T_{wm}]$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

Then, the nonlinear model of water wall system is represented in the following equation,

$$\dot{x} = \frac{u_2 - K_{ww} \times (x - u_1)^{y}}{(K_{ww} + K_{pp} \times u_1 \times u_1) \times K_{wm}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

$$y_1 = u_1$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

$$y_2 = u_2 + \frac{K_{ww} \times (x - u_1)^{y}}{u_1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

$$y_3 = x$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

From the above equations, we notice that the water wall system has severe nonlinearity.

### 2.2 A Linear model of Water Wall System

The nonlinear model, given by equations (9)-(12), is linearized using the first order Taylor approximation at an operating point. The operating point was selected so as to keep the power output steady at 500MW. Table 1 shows the operating point of 6 inputs, 3 outputs, and a state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Operating value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$u_1 (W_{rw})$</td>
<td>4596.1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_2 (H_{wpo})$</td>
<td>725.5982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_3 (R_{dyw})$</td>
<td>33.5881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_4 (T_{dyw})$</td>
<td>744.7551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_5 (Q_{www})$</td>
<td>1138.1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_1 (W_{www})$</td>
<td>1150.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_2 (H_{www})$</td>
<td>803.1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_3 (x, T_{wm})$</td>
<td>1150.832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, the first order approximation of equations (9)-(12) at the operating point is given by,

$$\dot{x} = (-3.9975 \times 10^{-8} \times (u_1 - 33.5881) - 1.8028 \times 10^{-7} \times (u_1 - 744.7551) + 0.5031 \times (u_1 - 1138.1153) + (5.9763 \times 10^{-8}) \times (u_1 - 356915.0337) + (-0.5031) \times (x - 1150.832)$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

$$y_1 = u_1$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)
\( y_2 = 803.1653 - 1.0126 \times 10^{-3} \times (u_1 - 4596.1272) + (u_2 - 725.5982) - 18.2988 \times (u_3 - 1138.1153) + 18.2988 \times (x - 1150.832) \)  

(15)

\( y_3 = x \)  

(16)

When all the variables are defined as deviations from the operation values in Table 1, the linear model is given by,

\[ \Delta x = -3.9975 \times 10^{-4} \times \Delta u_i - 1.8028 \times 10^{-7} \times \Delta u_3 + 0.5031 \times \Delta u_4 + 5.9763 \times 10^{-4} \times \Delta u_6 - 0.5031 \times \Delta x \]  

(17)

\[ \Delta y_i = \Delta u_i \]  

(18)

\[ \Delta y_2 = -1.0126 \times 10^{-4} \times \Delta u_1 + \Delta u_2 - 18.2988 \times \Delta u_3 + 18.2988 \times \Delta x \]  

(19)

\[ \Delta y_3 = \Delta x \]  

(20)

We notice that equation (17) is a simple first order system with a pole at \( s = -0.5031 \) and the overall system is stable without any oscillation mode. The transfer function matrix, \( \overline{G}(s) \), of equations (17)–(20) for the 6-input 3-output system is given by,

\[
\overline{G}(s) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{-0.0001403x}{s + 0.5031} & 1 & -7.315 \times 10^{-5} \\
0 & 0 & \frac{-3.998 \times 10^{-6}}{s + 0.5031}
\end{bmatrix} \\
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & -3.299 \times 10^{-6} & -18.3x & 0.0001094 \\
-3.998 \times 10^{-6} & s + 0.5031 & 0.5031 & 5.976 \times 10^{-5} \\
-1.803 \times 10^{-7} & s + 0.5031 & s + 0.5031 & s + 0.5031
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(21)

2.3 Neural Network Model of Water Wall System

Neural network has been widely applied in various fields because of its ability to learn arbitrary functions (Fausett, 1994). In this study, water wall system is modeled using a perceptron network.

Fig. 2 shows the training data from the nonlinear model represented by equations (9)–(12). In the figure, 6 inputs were generated by random signal. The training data is rearranged to reflect the water wall system dynamics as follows,

\[
Y(k+1) = f\{Y(k), Y(k-1), U(k)\}
\]

(22)

where \( k \) is the discrete time step.

Fig. 3 shows the structure of neural network used to train the water wall system. The input of perceptron is \( U(k), Y(k), Y(k-1) \), and the number of input nodes is 12. The output of the neural network is \( Y(k+1) \), the number of output node is 3. The number of hidden layer nodes is determined to be 13. Fig. 4 shows the reduction of mean square error while the neural network is being trained using the Matlab toolbox. Finally, the trained perceptron is used as a water wall model.
3. SIMULATIONS

The qualities of two models are tested by simulation. First, a set of PRBNS inputs are designed to perturb the system. Then, the PRBNS inputs are applied to each of the three models, nonlinear model, linear model and neural network model independently. Fig. 5 shows the six PRBNS inputs used in the simulation.

![Fig. 5. Six PRBNS Inputs.](image)

Fig. 6 shows the output $y_1$ of the three models, nonlinear, linear, and neural network. In Fig. 6, three outputs show almost similar response. This is because $y_1$ is a linear system from (10), which is not a function of the state $x$. Therefore, the responses of the linear model and the nonlinear model are mathematically equivalent for $y_1$. The $y_1$ of the neural network also matches with that of the nonlinear model. This means that the neural network effectively describes the dynamics of $y_1$.

![Fig. 6. $y_1$ (WWWO, Mass flow of Water wall Output).](image)

Fig. 7 shows the output $y_2$ of the three models. In this case, $y_2$ of the neural network and the nonlinear model are almost similar. Although $y_2$ of the linearized model shows a similar response to that of the nonlinear model, the undershoot response shows some differences. Fig. 8 is a zoomed in version of Fig. 7. Fig. 8 shows a clear difference between the linear model and the neural network model. In this figure, the response of the neural network is almost the same with that of the nonlinear model. Fig. 9 shows the output $y_3$ of the three models, and Fig. 10 is a zoomed in version of Fig. 9. For $y_3$, the output of the neural network is almost similar to that of the nonlinear model, while the linear model exhibits some difference.

![Fig. 7. $y_2$ (HWWO, Enthalpy of Water Wall Output).](image)

Table 2 shows the absolute error for the linear and the neural network model. In the table, linear model exhibits better performance for $y_1$, while neural network model exhibits better performance for $y_2$ and $y_3$. The better performance of the linear model for $y_1$ can be attributed to $y_1$ being a linear output.

The outlet of the water wall is a mixture of water and steam, i.e. saturated condition. At that phase, assuming constant pressure, the temperature of the fluid is constant while the enthalpy may change as a function of water/steam ratio. This can be a major reason the temperature is modeled exactly while the enthalpy shows some undershoot.
4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we presented a comparison between linear model and the neural network model for the water wall system in drum boiler-turbine power plant. A simple perceptron neural network model shows almost similar responses to those of the nonlinear model. Though there are some differences, linear model also shows similar performance in comparison to that of the nonlinear model. Since the linear model is valid near nominal operating point, the performance of the linear model will be worse at low power generation while the neural network preserves the nonlinearity of the plant.

Because it is not easy to predict the control performance in design process, it is not clear that the quality of linear model is suitable for a controller design. If this model is used for part of the model of the boiler system describing the dynamics of energy flows, the mismatch in enthalpy needs to be considered. However, the presented model can be used for the temperature control problem. Similar analysis can be performed to heat exchangers placed in the superheater system since both the input and output are steam. In such case, both temperature and enthalpy may be equally sensitive to input variation. The control aspect of such heat exchanger is even greater.

Table 2. Comparison between Linear and Neural Network model error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Linear model (% to neural network model)</th>
<th>Neural Network model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(y_1)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(y_2)</td>
<td>4.9218 (29296%)</td>
<td>0.0168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(y_3)</td>
<td>0.325 (900%)</td>
<td>0.0361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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