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Abstract
Since the beginning of BOF process, slag formation has been subjected to extensive development. During the initial stages of the blow, fast slag formation is primordial for the process performance. This is mainly to allow oxidizing reactions, and also to protect the refractory. A modeling of BOF process for the purpose of process optimization requires precise knowledge concerning the dissolution of CaO and MgO based materials. Using this knowledge, the optimal process conditions can be ensured by a controlling of the slag formation during the converter steelmaking process. Taking into account an application of large amount of different raw materials, as well as location-specific process conditions, the characterization of the dissolution behavior of different additives is an important key to improve the technological process. Thereby, in the frames of this project, an appropriate model for slag formation is established and compared to operational results for a 330t BOF, operating at ThyssenKrupp CSA, Santa Cruz, Brazil.
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1 INTRODUCTION

BOF slag is created by fluxing the first “FeO”-SiO\(_2\) rich slag with the addition of slag formers as a burnt lime with high contents of CaO and dolomitic lime as MgO source. A good rate of slag formation during the blow, with high contents of CaO and MgO close to saturation is crucial for the process performance and can be governed by the degree of dissolution, a key for understanding the progress of slag-metal reactions in the steelmaking system.

2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

According to experiments conducted by Matsushima [1] the dissolution rate of fluxes, \(v_r\) (m/min), into slag systems are controlled by mass transfer, and can be defined, assuming spherical geometry, as the dissolved volume per unit area in a unit of time.

\[
v_r = -\frac{1}{S} \frac{dV}{dt} = -\frac{dr}{dt}
\]

In a recent research, proposed by Dogan [2], the number of particles \(n_i\) dissolved in the slag is proportional to the particle concentration, individual calculation for different particle size is calculated, and the results are then; the sum of all particles (Equation 2). The amount of flux dissolved (Equation 3) in emulsion at time \(t\), \(M_{d,flux}^t\) is determined by summation of total amount of lime dissolved at time \(t\) - \(\Delta t\) and amount of lime dissolved at given time step \(\Delta t\). Subscript \(d\) refers to dissolved flux in emulsion.

\[
\frac{dw_i}{dt} = -\rho_i S \frac{dr}{dt} n_i
\]

\[
M_{d,flux}^t = M_{d,flux}^{t-\Delta t} + \frac{dw_i}{dt} \Delta t
\]

2.1 Lime Dissolution Mechanism

For stagnant laboratory experiments, irrespective of the lime type, the dissolution mechanism is very fast in the “FeO”-SiO\(_2\) slags, while the reaction became extremely slow in the case of CaO-“FeO”-SiO\(_2\) slags due a di-calcium silicate formation, the main dissolution mechanism of lime is assumed to be controlled by CaO diffusion through a boundary layer according to Matsushima [1].

\[
-\frac{dr}{dt} = k \frac{p_{slag}}{100 \rho_{Lime}} (%CaO_{saturation} - %CaO_{slag})
\]

2.1.1 CaO saturation

The saturation of CaO can be calculated according to Schürmann’s [3] research, where the CaO saturation is calculated by the conversion of all oxides contents in a in a simple quasi ternary system CaO-FeO\(_t\)-SiO\(_2\). MnO should not be considered into accounts, because has only a diluting (Equation 5) effect and all the other elements should be recalculated without MnO (Equation 6).

\[
F_{MnO} = \frac{100}{100 - %MnO}
\]

\[
%(Oxide) = F_{MnO} \cdot %Oxide_{initial}
\]

The analytical concentration of each component in the steelmaking slags are normalized by considering the equivalent amount designated in terms of mass;
%CaO* = %CaO’ + 0.238 %P2O5’ +(1 − 0.32 + (%FeO*, 200))MgO’ + 0.238 %Al2O3’ (7)

%SiO2* = %SiO2’ + 0.762 %P2O5’ +(0.32 − (%FeO*, 200))MgO’ + 0.762 %Al2O3’ (8)

%FeO* = FeO (9)

\[
\%CaO_s\% = 100(1 - (\frac{-0.64\varphi - 1}{0.00212\varphi^2})^2 - \frac{32}{(0.00212\varphi^2)})
\]

In order to consider the influence of temperature on lime saturation, allowing a complete mathematical description of the lime saturation contents in the system CaO*-FeO*-SiO2*, dependent on slag composition and temperature.

%CaO_{Sat,T_C} = %CaO_s + 0.0225(T_{Slag} - 1600) (11)

### 2.2 Dolomitic Lime Dissolution Mechanism

Dolomitic lime has a tendency to form a solid product with FeO. Umakoshi [4], suggested that diffusion of dolomitic lime is controlled by CaO dissolution of CaO through a boundary layer when the FeO content in slag is lower than 20% (Equation 12), otherwise MgO is the rate limiting for FeO concentrations higher than 20% (Equation 13).

\[
\frac{dr}{dt} = \left(1 + \frac{M_{MgO}}{M_{CaO}}\right) \cdot k_{dol} \cdot \frac{\rho_{slag}}{100 \cdot \rho_{dolime}} \cdot (\%CaO_{saturation} - \%CaO_{slag})
\]

\[
\frac{dr}{dt} = \left(1 + \frac{M_{CaO}}{M_{MgO}}\right) \cdot k_{dol} \cdot \frac{\rho_{slag}}{100 \cdot \rho_{dolime}} \cdot (\%MgO_{saturation} - \%MgO_{slag})
\]

#### 2.2.1 MgO saturation

In the present study, the MgO saturation levels is calculated according to a mathematical description of magnesia saturation in complex steelmaking slags proposed by Schürmann [5], all steps are similar to the CaO saturation proposed in this study.

%CaO* = %CaO + 0.59.%MnO + 0.37.%P2O5 + 0.21.%Al2O3 (14)

%SiO2* = %SiO2 + 0.63.%P2O5 + 0.79.%Al2O3 + 0.41.%MnO (15)

%FeO* = FeO (16)

Then, the normalized values for CaO-FeO-SiO2 are.

%CaOΔ = 100.%CaO*/(%CaO* + SiO2* + FeO*) (17)

%SiO2Δ = 100.%SiO2*/(%CaO* + SiO2* + FeO*) (18)
\%FeO_t^\Delta = 100 - \%SiO_2^\Delta - \%CaO^\Delta \quad (19)

The mathematical descriptions presented below describe the MgO saturation;
\[ \%MgO_{s,1600} = a + b \cdot \%SiO_2^\Delta + 0.01354 \cdot (\%SiO_2^\Delta)^2 \quad (20) \]

The factors (a) and (b) are function of normalized total iron oxide, and are described below.
\[ a = 7.989 - 0.1547 \cdot \%FeO_t^\Delta + 0.001232 \cdot (\%FeO_t^\Delta)^2 \quad (21) \]
\[ b = -0.4374 + 0.01034 \cdot \%FeO_t^\Delta \quad (22) \]

A complete mathematical description of the MgO saturation contents in the system CaO*-FeO*-SiO_2* dependent on slag composition and temperature is described below.
\[ \%MgO_{sat,T(K)} = \left( \%MgO_{s,1600} \right) \cdot e^{\left(5.5478 \cdot \frac{10391}{T(K)}\right)} \quad (23) \]

2.3 Slag Properties

2.3.1 Density of multicomponent slags

An additive method for the estimation of densities in alloys and slags has been widely used. In this method, proposed by Keene [6] the density can be obtained from the following equation.
\[ \rho = \frac{M_1 x_1 + M_2 x_2 + M_3 x_3 + \ldots}{x_1 V'_1 + x_2 V'_2 + x_3 V'_3 + \ldots} \quad (24) \]

Where, \( \rho \) = Density (g/cm\(^3\)), \( M \) = Molecular weight (g/mol), \( x \) = Mole fraction, \( V' \) = Partial molar volume (cm\(^3\)/mol).

Table 1. Recommended values for partial molar volume of slag constituents (Slag Atlas, 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>( V ) (cm(^3)/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeO</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO(_2)</td>
<td>19.55 + 7.996x_{SiO2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 Viscosity of multicomponent slags

In order to calculate the viscosity of slags, a model proposed by Mills [7] is applied, the slags constituents are divided in three categories; glass formers (Equation 25) modifiers (Equation 26) and amphoterics (Equation 27).
\[ X_G = X_{SiO_2} + X_{P_{2}O_5} \quad (25) \]
\[ X_M = X_{CaO} + X_{MgO} + 3 \cdot X_{CaF_2} + X_{FeO} + X_{MnO} + X_{TiO_2} \quad (26) \]
\[ X_A = X_{Al_2O_3} + X_{Fe_2O_3} + X_{B_2O_3} \quad (27) \]

Normalized values \( x_G^* \), \( x_M^* \), \( x_A^* \) are obtained by dividing the mole fractions, \( x_G \), \( x_M \), \( x_A \) by the equation 28;
\[ 1 + X_{CaF_2} + 0.5 \cdot X_{FeO} + X_{TiO_2} + X_{KzO} \quad (28) \]
The viscosity of slag (in poise) can then be determined by using the equation below:

\[ \mu_s = AT \exp \left( \frac{1000 B}{T} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (29)

Parameters A and B can be expressed as detailed below (\( \alpha = \frac{x_M}{x_M + x_A} \)). The parameters for B are available on Table 2.

\[ B = B_0 + B_1 x_G^2 + B_2 (x_G^2)^2 + B_3 (x_G^3)^3 \]  \hspace{1cm} (30)

\[ -\ln A = 0.2693 \cdot B + 11.672 \]  \hspace{1cm} (31)

**Table 2. B parameters for calculating the viscosity of slag** [11]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( B_i )</th>
<th>( \alpha_i + b_i \alpha + c_i \alpha^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( B_0 )</td>
<td>( 13.8 + 39.9355 \alpha - 44.049 \alpha^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_1 )</td>
<td>( 50.481 - 117.1505 \alpha + 139.9978 \alpha^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_2 )</td>
<td>( -40.9429 + 234.0486 \alpha - 300.04 \alpha^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_3 )</td>
<td>( 60.7619 - 153.9276 \alpha + 211.1616 \alpha^2 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the viscosity of the slag is strongly influenced by the solid fraction (\( \varepsilon \)) in the slag, the equation proposed (Equation 32) by Einstein-Roscoe is considered by Oeters [8].

\[ \mu_{slag} = \mu_s (1 - \varepsilon)^{-2.5} \]  \hspace{1cm} (32)

### 2.4 Mass Transfer Coefficients

Mass transfer coefficient can be estimated by semi-empirical relationship based on Sherwood, Reynolds and Schmidt numbers. Schmidt number for CaO and MgO can be found as a function of physical properties of slag and diffusivities of lime and dololime. Dogan [2] suggested that there are two different flow regimes in the slag due to the stirring conditions. The regime near the lance has a higher stirring intensity due to the CO gas generation. The regime far away from the lance and close to the refractory lining is expected to be more stagnant regime. Therefore, dissolution of solid particles in this stagnant regime takes place at a slower rate compared to that in the turbulent regime. As a practical solution to the problem, an empirical correlation for Reynolds Number (Re') was applied.

\[ Re' = 10 \left( \frac{u_p d_p \rho_s}{\mu_s} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (33)

\[ Sc = \frac{\mu_s}{\rho_s D} \]  \hspace{1cm} (34)

\[ Sh = 1 + 0.724 \left( Re' \right)^{0.48} Sc^{1/3} \]  \hspace{1cm} (35)

\[ k = \frac{Sh \cdot D}{d_p} \]  \hspace{1cm} (36)

It is assumed the diffusivity of 1.6x10-5 cm²/s for MgO 1.400°C, for CaO diffusivities, the table below (Table 3) is assumed.
Table 3. Diffusivities of lime available at Matsushima research [1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$ (°C)</th>
<th>$D$ (cm$^2$/s)</th>
<th>$\mu_{slag}$ (Poise)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$5.5 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>9,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>$2.7 \times 10^{-7}$</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to calculate the diffusivities of CaO and MgO for various temperatures, the equation of Stokes-Einstein and Eyring, $D \propto \frac{T_S}{\mu_S}$, is considered by Dogan [2].

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Some experimental heats were conducted in order to validate and check the model at ThyssenKrupp CSA (TKCSA), Santa Cruz, Brazil. There are two state of art BOF installed, a nominal capacity of 350t of charge and Thyssen Blowing Metallurgy (TBM) technology available.

An example for one typical chemical composition (Metal and Slag) is available in the table below (Table 4), and also the slag and metal behavior (Figure 1 and 2) for one simulated heat as result of the proposed slag model.

Table 4. Heat 740897 - Hot Metal and EOB steel analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>C (%)</th>
<th>Mn (%)</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
<th>S (ppm)</th>
<th>Si (%)</th>
<th>Oxygen (ppm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot Metal</td>
<td>4,97</td>
<td>0,44</td>
<td>0,096</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,52</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel EOB</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>0,013</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>516 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slag EOB (Sample)</td>
<td>48,8</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>16,1</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slag EOB (Model)</td>
<td>51,2</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td>15,9</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Typical metal behavior during BOF blow - Heat 740897.
According to Figure 2 and 3 for the first step of the blow, an acid slag is formed from oxidized Si and Fe, the lime is only very partially dissolved and the temperature is low, so that part of the phosphorus is oxidized. Then, in the second step, lime is progressively dissolved with enrichment of liquid slag in CaO and decrease in FeO content due to dilution and FeO reduction during full decarburization. It means a heterogeneous slag and non-reactive with respect to phosphorus. At the end, the slag is reactive and suitable for final dephosphorization, as shown in Figure 1 and 2.
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Figure 5. Slag weight and free lime content along the process at Siderar steel plant in a recent study of Cicutti [10] about an analysis of slag foaming.

Establishing a comparison between the proposed model (Figures 3 and 2) and the study developed by Cicutti [10], on Figure 5, and also the models proposed by Brahma Deo [10], on Figure 4, the results of proposed model are in accordance with the literature. The different curve for free lime, is regarding to different additions steps between both plants, at TKCSA 90% of lime addition is made just after the ignition, at Siderar there is an addition of 1000 kg of lime before start the process, and the 6600 kg in first half of the process. All heats simulated below (Figure 6) were carried out in a BOF without slag splashing procedure just before the simulated heat (remaining slag were not considered). Also, the dissolution of BOF lining to slag was not considered.

Figure 6. Comparison between slag samples at the end of BOF blow (EOB) X Predicted by current work.
4 CONCLUSION

A suitable model were developed and proposed, a comparison between slag sample and predicted values by the proposed model at BOF end of blow were done (Figure 6), as well literature validation with previously works, as already mentioned before. All of the mentioned comparisons displayed a good consistency. Nevertheless, there is still an opportunity to improve the phosphorous modeling (Figure 6), some other challenging points to be considered are the suction of flux by a primary dedusting system, which is estimated to be around 5-10% in TKCSA regular process. A good technical approach for this issue can be a combination of process data and the modeling of terminal velocity in the presence of buoyancy force. One other important point is the dissolution of BOF lining and slag-splashing “cover” in the subsequent heat. A better comprehension for BOF lining dissolution over the process is a key point not only to improve the slag modeling, but also to improve the BOF lining life time, by reducing the refractory wear.
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