

MODELLING THE EFFICIENCY OF AN AUTOMATED SENSOR-BASED SORTER

Submitted by

Ofonime Bassey Udoudo

to

The University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by research in Earth Resources, September 2010.

This thesis is available for library use on the understanding that it is a copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all materials in this thesis which is not my work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

(Signature)

ABSTRACT

For future development of automated sensor-based sorting in the mining industry, an improvement in the separation efficiency of the equipment is desirable. This could be achieved through a better understanding of the identification and separation aspects of the automated sorter. For automated sorters that undertake separation through the use of compressed air jets, the problem of poor separation efficiency has been linked with co-deflection losses. Co-deflection losses occur as particles meant to pass on to the 'accept' bin are co-deflected with the particles (which are to be deflected) meant to go to the 'reject' bin.

To study co-deflection losses and suggest means of improving automated sorter separation efficiency, this research investigates the effects of particle size, shape, throughput, together with the proportion of particles (out of the total test batch) required to be deflected on separation efficiency. The effect of the air valve configuration on separation efficiency was also studied. Presented also is a mathematical model which could be used to predict automated sorter separation efficiency.

All separation efficiency investigations were undertaken using a TiTech Combisense[®] (BSM 063) automated sorter. Samples of granite were sized into -20+15mm, -15+10mm and -10+6mm size fractions and grouped into cubic and flaky shape fractions. These fractions were then divided into two with one portion painted for colour separation efficiency investigations.

The separation efficiency results confirmed earlier research indicating that particle size and the fraction requiring deflection affects separation efficiency, with separation efficiency decreasing with a decrease in particle size and an increase in throughput. It was observed that co-deflection loss occurs when correctly identified 'accept' particles are co-deflected due to their close proximity to 'reject' particles that are to be deflected. Observations from the tests indicate that an increase in the proportion of

particles requiring deflection increases the probability of finding 'accept' particles in close proximity to 'reject' particles leading to co-deflections.

Monte Carlo simulations were used to produce a random distribution of particles on the conveyor belt as would be obtained from actual investigations. From these simulations particle proximity relationships and particle co-deflections were studied. Results indicate that the Monte Carlo simulations under-predicts particle proximity associations.

The effect of shape on co-deflection was investigated with results indicating that flaky shaped particles produce higher number of co-deflections compared to cubic shaped particles. It was also observed that the valve sensitivity determined from valve opening and closing times is of importance to the selectivity (precision) of the separating air jets.

A mathematical separation efficiency model is presented which contains two variables, the belt loading (calculated using particle size, shape and throughput) and the particle fraction of the total test batch that are to be deflected (% deflection). The separation efficiency can be calculated once these two variables are determined.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have enjoyed support and assistance from many parties too numerous to list here during the course of this research, my thanks to you all.

I thank my sponsors the Akwa Ibom State government. I also would like to thank my supervisors Dr. Richard Pascoe and Prof. Hylke Glass for their contributions and useful suggestions while undertaking this research. I also wish to express my thanks to Dr. Robert Fitzpatrick and Steve Pendray for helping in the laboratory; and to Stefan Juergensen of TiTech for helping with some of the technical information with respect to the automated sorter.

To my colleagues Adam, Dan, Edward, James, KP, Matt, Philip and Solomon thanks a lot for all the camaraderie we enjoyed and the various tips we shared to enhance the research experience. Finally to my wife, I say thank you dear for your patience and support as I spent long hours away from home undertaking this research. Glory to God!

LIST OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
ABSTRACT	2
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF CONTENTS	5
LIST OF FIGURES	9
LIST OF PLATES	15
LIST OF TABLES	16
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	18
LIST OF SYMBOLS	20
1 INTRODUCTION	22
1.0 THESIS STRUCTURE	22
1.1 AIMS OF RESEARCH	24
1.2 BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION OF RESEARCH	25
1.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	28
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	31
2.0 SENSOR-BASED SORTER COMPONENTS AND CONFIGURATIONS	31
2.0.1 The feeding and presentation systems	32
2.0.2 The identification system	36
2.0.2.1 <i>Sensors applied to sorting</i>	38
2.0.3 The separation system	51
2.1 DEVELOPMENTS OF SENSOR-BASED SORTERS IN THE MINING INDUSTRY	54
2.2 APPLICATIONS OF SENSOR-BASED SORTERS	58
2.2.1 Mining Industry	58
2.2.2 Waste and recycling Industry	59
2.3 COMPETING TECHNOLOGY WITH AUTOMATED SENSOR- BASED SORTING IN THE MINING INDUSTRY	60
2.4 CHALLENGES TO IMPROVING SENSOR-BASED SORTING EFFICIENCY	62
2.5 THE KING MODEL FOR SENSOR-BASED SORTING	66
2.6 MONTE CARLO ANALYSIS	68
2.7 EVALUATING SEPARATION EFFICIENCY	69

3 EXPERIMENTAL EQUIPMENT	71
3.0 THE VIBRATORY FEEDER	71
3.1 THE TITECH AUTOMATED SENSOR-BASED SORTER	73
3.1.1 The operational sequence	73
3.1.2 The conveyor system	74
3.1.3 The sensor	75
3.1.4 The separation components	80
3.1.5 The control components	81
3.1.5.1 An introduction to the PACT software	82
3.1.5.2 The automated sorter starting procedures	84
3.1.6 Obtaining data from the automated sorter	89
4 SAMPLE PREPARATION AND EFFICIENCY TEST PROCEDURES ..	92
4.0 SAMPLE PREPARATION	94
4.1 MACHINE PREPARATION	100
4.1.1 Valve tests	100
4.1.2 Belt speed	100
4.1.3 Background colour determination	100
4.2 TEST PROCEDURES	102
4.2.1 Colour classification tests	102
4.2.2 Optimisation tests	103
4.2.3 Separation efficiency tests	111
4.2.4 Particle proximity tests	113
4.2.5 Video observations	117
4.2.6 Valve precision tests	120
4.2.7 Belt loading tests	123
4.3 MATERIAL DESCRIPTIONS	128
4.3.1 Particle weight	128
4.3.2 Particle surface area	128
4.3.3 Particle belt distribution	129
5 SEPARATION EFFICIENCY TEST RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS..	131
5.0 RECOVERY OF BLUE PARTICLES	132
5.1 SEPARATION EFFICIENCY	134
5.1.1 Throughput and separation efficiency	134
5.1.2 Percent blue deflection and separation efficiency	136
5.1.3 Co-deflection and throughput	139
5.1.4 Shape and co-deflection	141

5.1.5	Summary	142
5.2	SAMPLE PROXIMITY DATA ANALYSIS	144
5.2.1	Belt loading and throughput	144
5.2.2	Belt loading and co-deflection	145
5.2.3	Composites	146
5.2.4	Composites and co-deflection	150
5.2.5	Monte Carlo analysis of composites	153
5.2.6	Particle zone of influence	161
5.2.7	Summary	164
5.3	DISCUSSION: FACTORS CONTROLLING AUTOMATED SORTER EFFICIENCY	166
5.3.1	Machine controlled factors	166
5.3.1.1	<i>Air ejector precision</i>	166
5.3.2	Material controlled factors	167
5.3.2.1	<i>Size</i>	167
5.3.2.2	<i>Shape</i>	167
6	MODELLING EFFICIENCY	169
6.0	MODEL CALCULATIONS	169
6.0.1	Material parameters	169
6.1	EFFICIENCY LOSS RELATIONSHIPS	173
6.1.1	Efficiency of blue particle deflection	173
6.1.2	Efficiency of granite particle deflection	173
6.2	THE MODEL	174
6.3	MODEL VALIDATION	177
6.3.1	Sample preparation	177
6.3.2	Machine preparation and test procedures	177
6.3.3	Calculating separation efficiency using the model	178
6.3.4	Results	180
6.4	DISCUSSION	181
7	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	182
7.0	CONCLUSIONS	182
7.1	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	184
	REFERENCES	185

APPENDIX A - DESCRIPTIONS OF THE PACT SOFTWARE AND COMPLETE DATA EXTRACTED USING PACT	195
APPENDIX B - RESULTS OF SHAPE TESTS	202
APPENDIX C – SEPARATION EFFICIENCY TEST RESULTS OF ALL SIZE FRACTIONS	212

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.

	Page
2.1: Schematic flow sheet of a typical sorting system	32
2.2: The feed and presentation system - conveyor belt configuration (from King, 1978)	33
2.3: The feed and presentation system - rotatory disc configuration (after King, 1978)	34
2.4: The presentation system in free fall configuration (from CommoDas, 2006)	35
Figure 2.5: Some material information that could be used for Identification classification and sorting (after Manouchehri, 2006; Arvidson, 1988)	37
Figure 2.6: Schematic of the image processing procedure(s) (after Kattentidt <i>et al</i> 2003, Cinque and Lombardi, 1995)	38
Figure 2.7: The general working principle of a sensor (after Killmann and Pretz, 2006)	39
Figure 2.8: Two-dimensional representation of the electromagnetic vector (after Skoog <i>et al</i> , 1996)	40
Figure 2.9: Schematic of energy states/changes that occur during molecular absorption (after Skoog <i>et al</i> , 1996)	41
Figure 2.10: Modes of light energy measurements (after Pasquini, 2003)..	42
Figure 2.11: A diagram of the electromagnetic spectrum (after Skoog <i>et al</i> , 1996)	43
Figure 2.12: Monochromation by a diffraction grating (after Denney and Sinclair, 1987)	44
Figure 2.13: Operation of a conductivity sensor (after CommoDas, 2006)	51
Figure 2.14: Various configurations of deflection nozzles	52

Figure 2.15: A diagram of a MAC latching solenoid valve (after MAC, 2008)	53
Figure 2.16: Principle of DMS sorting	60
Figure 2.17: Existence probabilities of n-th particle overlap planes as a function of the particle rate; (after De Jong <i>et al</i> , 2005)	64
Figure 2.18: Sorter throughput as a function of particle size and % deflection (after Arvidson, 2002)	65
Figure 3.1: A diagram of the feeding system	72
Figure 3.2: Path of a particle from the chute to the conveyor belt	72
Figure 3.3: The TiTech automated sorter, indicating the operational sequence (after CommoDas 2006)	74
Figure 3.4: Positioning of lighting of the TiTech automated sorter	76
Figure 3.5: Positioning of the camera indicating the line of sight angle	76
Figure 3.6: Trichroic prism splitting light into RGB components (after TVI, 2010)	77
Figure 3.7: How a 2D image is obtained from a line scan camera	77
Figure 3.8: Surface area of material captured by the automated sorter camera varying with incident angle of light (after Fitzpatrick, 2008)	79
Figure 3.9: A diagram indicating the deflection of materials into the 'reject' bin by air jets	81
Figure 3.10: The <i>PACT</i> controlling system concept (after CommoDas, 2006)	82
Figure 3.11: A simplistic image processing procedure	83
Figure 3.12: Flowchart of set up of the TiTech automated sorter for colour separation purposes	85
Figure 3.13: A typical YUV analysis tab with the background colour also included	87
Figure 3.14: An example of colour class utilised to define material rules	88

Figure 3.15: The valve configuration for a deflected particle based on "reject rule 1" (after CommoDas, 2006)	89
Figure 3.16: The valve configuration for a deflected particle based on "reject rule 3" (after CommoDas, 2006)	89
Figure 3.17: A screen shot of selected data obtained from the image processing analyser of the <i>PACT</i> software	90
Figure 3.18: A diagram indicating the calibration of the automated sorter for the purposes of data capture	91
Figure 4.1: Lees (1964) classification chart of aggregates (after Smith and Collis, 1993)	96
Figure 4.2: -15+10mm fraction, calibrated using the British standard Classification	97
Figure 4.3: -20+15mm fraction, calibrated using the British standard Classification	98
Figure 4.4: UV colour space classification of the blue painted granite, granite and the background	103
Figure 4.5: Throughput calibration of some of the sample fractions	104
Figure 4.6: Delay time test results for -10+6mm fraction	105
Figure 4.7: Delay time test results for cubic shaped -20+15mm fraction	106
Figure 4.8: Delay time test results for flaky shaped -20+15mm fraction	106
Figure 4.9: Positioning of the splitter with respect to the edge of the conveyor belt	107
Figure 4.10: Deflection scenarios for reject rules 1 and 3	110
Figure 4.11: A diagram indicating the points where composite boundaries were delineated	114
Figure 4.12: Distribution of particle surface pixels for all size fractions ...	114

Figure 4.13: Schematic showing the position of the video camera with respect to the conveyor belt and particles	118
Figure 4.14: Belt distribution of -20+15mm sized particles	120
Figure 4.15: A diagram indicating positions of the blue (b) and granite particles utilised to determine zone of influence of sample composites	121
Figure 4.16: Flow chart indicating belt loading determination procedures	124
Figure 5.1(a): Throughput and separation efficiency relationships for cubic particles at 10 and 50% blue deflect	135
Figure 5.1(b): Throughput and separation efficiency relationships for flaky particles at 10, 30 and 50% blue deflect	135
Figure 5.2(a): Relationship between separation efficiency and % blue deflect for cubic shaped -20+15mm fraction at varying throughputs	137
Figure 5.2(b): Relationship between separation efficiency and % blue deflect for flaky shaped -20+15mm fraction at varying throughputs	137
Figure 5.2(c): Relationship between separation efficiency and % blue deflect for cubic shaped -15+10mm fraction at varying throughputs	138
Figure 5.2(d): Relationship between separation efficiency and % blue deflect for flaky shaped -15+10mm fraction at varying throughputs	138
Figure 5.2(e): Relationship between separation efficiency and % blue deflect for -10+6mm fraction at varying throughputs	139
Figure 5.3(a): Co-deflections and throughput relationships for -20+15mm fraction at varying % blue deflect	140
Figure 5.3(b): Co-deflections and throughput relationships for -15+10mm fraction at varying % blue deflect	140
Figure 5.3(c): Co-deflections and throughput relationship for -10+6mm fraction at varying % blue deflect	141
Figure 5.4: Relationship between shapes with throughput for -20+15mm and -15+10 mm fraction at 50% blue deflection	142
Figure 5.5(a): Throughput and belt loading relationships for the cubic shaped fractions	144

Figure 5.5(b): Throughput and belt loading relationships for the flaky fraction	145
Figure 5.6: Co-deflection and belt loading relationships for all samples at varying % blue deflect	146
Figure 5.7: Particle groupings referred to as composites	147
Figure 5.8(a): Calculated particles in composites for flaky shaped -20+15mm fraction	147
Figure 5.8(b): Calculated particles in composites for cubic shaped -20+15mm fraction	148
Figure 5.8(c): Calculated particles in composites for flaky shaped -15+10mm fraction	148
Figure 5.8(d): Calculated particles in composites for cubic shaped -15+10mm fraction	149
Figure 5.8(e): Calculated particles in composites for -10+6mm fraction	149
Figure 5.9(a): Composites and co-deflection relationship for cubic shaped -20+15mm fraction	150
Figure 5.9(b): Composites and co-deflection relationship for flaky shaped -20+15mm fraction	151
Figure 5.9(c): Composites and co-deflection relationship for cubic shaped -15+10mm fraction	151
Figure 5.9(d): Composites and co-deflection relationship for flaky shaped -15+10mm fraction	152
Figure 5.9(e): Composites and co-deflection relationship for -10+6mm Fraction	152
Figure 5.10: Flow chart showing the classification procedure for Monte Carlo analysis	156
Figure 5.11: Particle positioning for Monte Carlo analysis	158

Figure 5.12: A screen shot of Monte Carlo simulation of belt loading for -10+6mm fraction 30% blue deflect, at 2.5tonnes/hr	159
Figure 5.13(a): Comparison of Monte Carlo analysis determination with actual single touching sample particles for cubic shaped -20+15mm fraction	160
Figure 5.13(b): Comparison of Monte Carlo analysis determination with actual single touching sample particles for cubic shaped -15+10mm fraction	160
Figure 5.13(c): Comparison of Monte Carlo analysis determination with actual single touching sample particles for -10+6mm fraction	161
Figure 5.14: Positions of the blue and granite particles utilised to investigate zone of influence of sample composites	162
Figure 5.15: A particle zone of influence	163
Figure 6.1: Distribution of samples based on identification parameters ($I(a/a) = 0.99$, $I(d/d) = 0.93$) and deflection parameters ($D(a/a) = 0.98$ and $D(d/d) = 0.99$	171
Figure 6.2: The slope and belt loading relationship	175
Figure 6.3: Throughput calibration for the -20+14mm particles	178

LIST OF PLATES

	Page No.
Plate 3.1: A picture of the sensor-based sorter in the laboratory	75
Plate 4.1: A picture of a flaky sieve	94
Plate 4.2: A picture of a frame of cubic shaped -20+15mm samples	119
Plate 4.3: A picture of coarse particles placed before a test	122
Plate 4.4: Progressive video frames (progressing from 1 to 2) 2 frames apart	123
Plate 4.5: Progressive video frames (progressing from 1 to 2) 2 frames apart	123

LIST OF TABLES

	Page No.
Table 2.1: Applications/developments of sorting machines in the Mining industry	55
Table 2.2: Summary of differences between DMS and sensor-based sorting	61
Table 4.1: YUV values of blue and red painted particles (-20+15 mm fraction)	103
Table 4.2: Splitter deflection test results	108
Table 4.3: Optimal air pressures for the various size fractions and shapes	109
Table 4.4: Misplaced and co-deflected particles at reject rule 1 and 3 for -10+6mm fraction	110
Table 4.5: Cut off value test results	111
Table 4.6: Comparison between 20% and 50% cut off values based on separation efficiency for flaky shaped -20+15mm fraction (at a 50% blue deflection)	112
Table 4.7: Example of cut point values determined for -10+6mm fraction ('x' set to 0.95)	116
Table 4.8: Converted data from the image analyser of the TiTech automated sorter for -10+6mm fraction	125
Table 4.9: Average particle weight data	128
Table 4.10: Average particle surface area data	129
Table 4.11: Average belt distribution data	129
Table 5.1 Measure of efficiency of blue particle separation	132
Table 5.2: Standard deviation for separation efficiency tests at varying % blue deflect and throughputs for all the size fractions	134
Table 5.3: Calculated composites data for all size fractions	150
Table 5.4: Weighted distribution of belt area for -15+10mm fraction	154

Table 5.5: Sample groupings	157
Table 5.6(a): Particle positions for the -10+6mm fractions	162
Table 5.6(b): Particle positions for the -15+10mm fractions	162
Table 5.6(c): Particle positions for the -20+15mm fractions	163
Table 6.1: Y colour scale values used for validation tests	177
Table 6.2: Validation and calculated separation efficiency results	180

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

2D: Two-dimensional

AOTF: Acousto-Optical Tunable Filter

CCD: Charge-coupled device

CYMK: Cyan-Yellow-Magenta-black

DE-XRT: Dual energy x-ray transmission

DMS: Dense medium separation

ELV: End of life vehicle

EM: Electromagnetic

FIR: far Infrared

HDPE: High-density polyethylene

LDPE: Low-density polyethylene

LED: Light-emitting diodes

LIBS: Laser induced breakdown spectroscopy

LIF: Laser induced fluorescence

MIR: mid Infrared

NIR: near Infrared

PET: Polyethylene terephthalate

PP: Polypropylene

PVC: Polyvinyl chloride

RGB: Red-Green-Blue

UV: Ultraviolet

WEEE: Waste electrical and electronic equipment

XRD: X-ray diffraction

XRF: X-ray fluorescence

XRT: X-ray transmission

YUV: Y (luma/luminance/brightness) UV (chroma) colour scale

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A = Absorbance of materials, m

B = Magnetic induction, T

B_L = Belt loading, %

c = Velocity of electromagnetic radiation in a vacuum, ms^{-1}

— = Magnetic field gradient, T/m

ΔE = A quantum (photon) of energy, J

E_{electr} = Energy associated with the electrons in the various outer orbitals of the molecules, J

E_{over} = The overall energy, J

E_{rot} = Energy associated with the rotation of molecules about the centre of gravity of the atom, J

E_{vib} = Energy due to inter-atomic vibrations, J

F = The magnetic force, N

H = Magnetic field strength, A/m

h = Planck's constant, 6.626×10^{-34} J

I = intensity of light transmitted through the sample at a given wavelength, m

I_o = intensity of incident light on the sample at a given wavelength, m

k = volume magnetic susceptibility

N_d = blue deflect, %

R_b = Recovery of blue painted particles, %

R_g = Recovery of granite particle, %

S.E = Separation efficiency, %

Tot_E = Total efficiency, %

λ = Wavelength of the electromagnetic radiation, m

μ = Magnetic permeability, H/m