



A multi-objective optimisation model for a general polymer electrolyte membrane fuel cell system

Sheila Mae C. Ang^{a,b}, Daniel J.L. Brett^a, Eric S. Fraga^{a,*}

^a Department of Chemical Engineering, University College London (UCL), Torrington Place, London WC1E 7JE, United Kingdom

^b Department of Chemical Engineering, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City 1101, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 26 May 2009

Received in revised form 2 September 2009

Accepted 21 October 2009

Available online 13 November 2009

Keywords:

Fuel cell
Multi-objective optimisation
Design
Modelling

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an optimisation model for a general polymer electrolyte membrane (PEM) fuel cell system suitable for efficiency and size trade-offs investigation. Simulation of the model for a base case shows that for a given output power, a more efficient system is bigger and *vice versa*. Using the weighting method to perform a multi-objective optimisation, the Pareto sets were generated for different stack output powers. A Pareto set, presented as a plot of the optimal efficiency and area of the membrane electrode assembly (MEA), gives a quantitative description of the compromise between efficiency and size. Overall, our results indicate that, to make the most of the size-efficiency trade-off behaviour, the system must be operated at an efficiency of at least 40% but not more than 47%. Furthermore, the MEA area should be at least $3 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ W}^{-1}$ for the efficiency to be practically useful. Subject to the constraints imposed on the model, which are based on technical practicalities, a PEM fuel cell system such as the one presented in this work cannot operate at an efficiency above 54%. The results of this work, specifically the multi-objective model, will form a useful and practical basis for subsequent techno-economic studies for specific applications.

© 2009 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

A fuel cell is an electrochemical engine that converts chemical potential into electric power. This technology is a promising power source for both mobile and stationary applications [1] as concern over depleting stocks of natural resources grows and awareness of environmental problems caused by burning of fossil fuels intensifies. Amongst the attractive benefits are high efficiency, low greenhouse gas emissions and quiet operation [2].

Several types of fuel cells are at present under development. The classification is primarily by the kind of electrolyte [1], which determines the chemical reaction that takes place in the cell, the catalyst required, the operating temperature range, and the fuel required. For certain applications, polymer electrolyte membrane (PEM) fuel cells are favoured over other types of fuel cells for the following reasons: their high power density means they are lighter and smaller compared to other fuel cells, low operating temperature allows fast start-up and immediate response in power demand, and use of a solid polymer simplifies assembly and handling [1].

Fuel cells are inherently more efficient than a combustion engine of comparable size. The maximum efficiency of an internal com-

bustion engine is limited by the Carnot efficiency [3]. For instance, the highest achievable efficiency of internal combustion engines having output power below 250 kW is 35%. Unlike a combustion engine, a fuel cell does not need to achieve a large temperature differential to achieve the same efficiency because its efficiency is determined by the Gibbs free energy [4]. The fuel cell system efficiency requirement for both stationary and transportation applications is at least 40% [5,6].

Significant effort has been exerted in recent years to achieve optimal PEM fuel cell system design. Even though most of these studies make significant contributions to the expanding PEM fuel cell literature (e.g. formulation of PEM fuel cell models with different levels of complexity and development of various optimisation techniques), most of them are limited to a single design objective. Many studies have optimised the performance [7–15], whilst some have considered the cost [16], the durability [17], and the emission [18] as objectives for the design. Moreover, some of the papers have performed single-objective optimisation for a specific part of the PEM fuel cell system such as the membrane electrode assembly (MEA) [19], the electrode [20], the bipolar plate and diffusion layer [21], the cathode and air distributor [22], and the catalyst layer [23,24]. However, the results of these studies might be misleading because the interaction or coupling between the multiple objectives has not been considered [6]. In addition, the potentially conflicting nature of the objectives makes the determination of the optimal solution more challenging.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 20 7679 3817; fax: +44 20 7383 2348.
E-mail address: e.fraga@ucl.ac.uk (E.S. Fraga).

Nomenclature

A	total active area of the MEA (cm^2)
a	water activity
c	concentration of water (mol cm^{-3})
c_p	specific heat constant of air ($\text{JK}^{-1} \text{kg}^{-1}$)
D_w	diffusion coefficient of water in the membrane ($\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$)
D_0	a parameter used in the expression for diffusion coefficient of water ($\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$)
F	Faraday's constant ($96,487 \text{ C equiv.}^{-1}$)
f	fraction of liquid water in the channel
I	current density (A cm^{-2})
I_0	exchange current density (A cm^{-2})
I_L	limiting current density (A cm^{-2})
LHV	lower heating value of hydrogen ($2.4 \times 10^5 \text{ J mol}^{-1}$)
M	molar flow rate (mol s^{-1})
$M_{m,dry}$	membrane dry weight (g mol^{-1})
m_{air}	mass flow rate of air (kg s^{-1})
n_{cell}	number of cells in a stack (1)
n_d	electro-osmotic coefficient (number of water molecules carried per proton)
P	system pressure (atm)
P_i	partial pressure of component i (atm)
P_{in}	inlet air pressure to the compressor
R	gas constant ($8.314 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$ or $82.057 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ atm mol}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$)
RH	relative humidity
T	temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)
T_e	entry air temperature (K)
t_m	thickness of the membrane (cm)
V	voltage (V)
W	power (W)
y	mole fraction of water vapour
z	weighted sum of the objectives
z_i	a single objective

Greek symbols

α	net water molecules per proton flux ratio
β	amplification constant ($\text{V}(\text{cm}^2 \text{A}^{-1})^k$)
η	system efficiency (%)
η_c	compressor connecting efficiency
η_{mt}	motor efficiency
λ	stoichiometric ratio
$\rho_{m,dry}$	dry membrane density (g cm^{-3})
σ_m	membrane conductivity ($\Omega^{-1} \text{cm}^{-1}$)
ω	weighting factor

Subscripts

a	anode
c	cathode
comp	compressor
H_2	hydrogen
N_2	nitrogen
O_2	oxygen
oc	open circuit
prs	parasitic
w	water

Superscripts

k	dimensionless power in the amplification term
l	liquid
sat	saturated
v	vapour

There are a few papers in the literature that have dealt with multi-objective optimisation. Barbir and Gomez [5] analysed the cost and performance of PEM fuel cells at different load profiles and design and cost scenarios. Their efficiency model was based on a linear polarisation curve. Similar objectives were considered by Xue and Dong [3] in their multi-objective optimisation of the 120 kW Ballard Mark V Transit Bus fuel cell system with the stack active intersection area and the air stoichiometric ratio as the design variables. Frangopoulos and Nakos [25] investigated the Ballard Mark V PEM fuel cell stack consisting of 35.5 kW cells for a merchant ship application. The system efficiency, power density and present worth cost were the design objectives, whilst the current density and temperature were the design variables. In their study, the interaction between the objectives was not considered; they optimised each objective individually. Also, for each objective, one of the two design variables was treated as a parameter. This resulted in a one-variable, single-objective optimisation problem, which was then solved at different values of the parameter. Na and Gou [6] optimised the efficiency and cost of a 50 kW PEM fuel cell system for transportation, using the system pressure, the hydrogen and air stoichiometric ratios, and the current density as the design variables. The Pareto set that they obtained using MATLAB's *fminimax* function, however, was influenced by the choice of the initial values of the design variables used in the solver, indicating the non-globality of the solution.

The trade-off between efficiency and size is inherent in the design of PEM fuel cell systems. These two objectives are both related to economics. Fuel consumption, hence operating cost, is directly determined by the efficiency. On the other hand, the bulk of the capital cost is contributed by the size of the MEA. The costs of the other components, such as the bipolar plates and auxiliaries (humidifiers, air compressor, and water coolant) which add up to the capital cost are strongly correlated with the variation in the area of the MEA [26]. However, the compromise between the capital investment and operating cost is not the only motivation for the trade-off investigation between size and efficiency. In the current consumer demographic, size and portability, for instance, may be the deciding factors for mobile users. On the other hand, other users may value operating costs more than portability.

This article presents a model suitable for multi-objective optimisation which allows us to investigate the efficiency and size trade-offs involved in the design of PEM fuel cell systems. The objective is to determine a set of trade-off optimal solutions, called the non-dominated or Pareto set, that maximises the efficiency and minimises the size of the system with respect to the current density, the cell voltage, the system pressure, the hydrogen and air stoichiometric ratios, and the relative humidities of fuel and air. To date, papers on multi-objective optimisation of PEM fuel cells have considered models that are specific to the application described in the paper [3,6,25,27]. Our model is more general and, thus, will be suitable for a wide range of applications. Furthermore, the model considers the multi-phase existence of water in the channels, thus capturing the fuel cell phenomena more thoroughly.

This paper is arranged as follows: Section 2 presents a general PEM fuel cell system and the model. Section 3 describes the multi-objective optimisation problem formulation based on this model and the solution approach taken. Section 4 presents results for a case study involving different output powers and highlights the important results from the analyses of the generated Pareto sets for the efficiency and size trade-offs.

2. A model for a general PEM fuel cell system

The major components of a general hydrogen-air PEM fuel cell system are shown in Fig. 1. The system includes a stack and the




Fig. 1. A general hydrogen-air PEM fuel cell system with a single-cell stack.

auxiliaries needed to operate the fuel cell. In this paper, a single-cell stack has been considered. Once the total active MEA area is known, the number of cells can be determined given the active area of a single cell. This study does not consider components such as a reformer or fuel processor, the power electronics, controllers, and any auxiliary power sources. At the anode side, pure pressurised hydrogen is fed; at the cathode side, there is an air supply system which includes a compressor. A humidifier is located on both sides for stack water management. A coolant regulates the operating temperature of the cell. This study assumes uniform temperature and pressure throughout the stack. The amount of power produced depends on several factors including the cell size, operating temperature and pressure, and flow rates and humidity of the gases supplied to the cell.

Multi-objective optimisation requires the evaluation of a large number of design alternatives with correspondingly high computational requirements. At present the use of a complex model is not practical for this purpose. We propose a simple and fast model for multi-objective optimisation. The model has an acceptable accuracy and is complex enough to differentiate between alternative designs, whilst being simple enough to allow for repeated calculations during optimisation.

In this work, the model is mainly based on an established, and well validated, principles presented by Nguyen and White [28]. In addition to the assumptions listed in Ref. [28], our model does not account for the spatial variations of the variables in the flow channels. Furthermore, we modified the water balance of Nguyen and White to address its non-validity in the event of no liquid water in the channels [29], and its inconsistency when both liquid and vapour phases of water are present, i.e. their model does not guarantee the equality between the partial pressure and vapour pressure of water at equilibrium. Also, the expression for the concentration of water in the membrane was taken from Hinatsu et al. [30], as appropriate for the temperature considered in this study.

2.1. Mass balances

For a given current density, the respective hydrogen and oxygen mass balances are

$$M_{H_2, \text{in}} = M_{H_2} + \frac{AI}{2F} \quad (1)$$

$$M_{O_2, \text{in}} = M_{O_2} + \frac{AI}{4F} \quad (2)$$

The second term on the right of Eqs. (1) and (2) are the consumption of hydrogen and oxygen, respectively.

Nitrogen does not participate in the reaction, thus, the incoming flow rate is equal to the outgoing flow rate.

$$M_{N_2, \text{in}} = M_{N_2} \quad (3)$$

The flow rates of water in the channels and the presence of liquid and vapour phases are affected by the following factors: the production of water at the cathode by the electrochemical reaction, the transport of water from the anode to the cathode via electro-osmosis or drag, the back diffusion of water from the cathode to the anode, and the condensation and evaporation of water [28,29,31,32].

The water balance in the anode channel is

$$M_{w,a, \text{in}}^v = M_{w,a}^v + M_{w,a}^l + \frac{A\alpha I}{F} \quad (4)$$

where α is the net water molecules per proton flux ratio. This equation states that the water vapour going into the anode channel either leaves as vapour or condensed liquid water or migrates across the membrane to the cathode channel. The fraction of liquid water, f_a , and the water vapour–liquid equilibrium in the anode channel are described by the following equations:

$$f_a = \frac{M_{w,a}^l}{M_{w,a}^v + M_{w,a}^l} \quad (5)$$

$$0 = f_a \left[\frac{M_{w,a}^v}{M_{w,a}^v + M_{H_2}} P - p_w^{\text{sat}} \right] \quad (6)$$

where $f_a \in [0, 1]$. If both liquid and vapour phases of water are present in the anode channel, i.e. $f_a \neq 0$, the expression inside the bracket of Eq. (6), representing the vapour–liquid equilibrium condition, is zero. In this case, Raoult's law describes the flow rate of water vapour going out of the anode channel, $M_{w,a}^v$. The flow rate of condensed liquid water going out of the anode channel, $M_{w,a}^l$, can be computed from Eq. (4). Conversely, if liquid water is not present in the anode channel, i.e. $f_a = 0$, equilibrium between liquid and vapour phases of water does not exist. In this case, $M_{w,a}^l = 0$ and $M_{w,a}^v$ can be calculated from Eq. (4).

Similarly, the water balance in the cathode channel can be expressed as

$$M_{w,c, \text{in}}^v = M_{w,c}^v + M_{w,c}^l - \frac{A\alpha I}{F} - \frac{AI}{2F} \quad (7)$$

The terms on the right of Eq. (7) are the flow rates of water vapour and condensed liquid water going out of the cathode channel, the water vapour that migrated from the anode to the cathode channel, and the water generated at the cathode by the electrochemical reaction, respectively. The fraction of liquid water, f_c , and the water

Table 1
Expressions for the physical parameters in the model.

Description	Equation	Ref.
Activity of water in the anode channel	$a_a = \frac{y_{w,a}P}{p_{\text{sat}}^w} = \left(\frac{M_{w,a}^v}{M_{w,a}^v + M_{\text{H}_2}} \right) \frac{P}{p_{\text{sat}}^w}, a_a \in [0, 1]$	
Activity of water in the cathode channel	$a_c = \frac{y_{w,c}P}{p_{\text{sat}}^w} = \left(\frac{M_{w,c}^v}{M_{w,c}^v + M_{\text{O}_2} + M_{\text{N}_2}} \right) \frac{P}{p_{\text{sat}}^w}, a_c \in [0, 1]$	
Concentration of water at the k interface of the membrane	$c_{w,k} = \frac{\rho_{m,\text{dry}}}{M_{m,\text{dry}}} (0.300 + 10.8a_k - 16.0a_k^2 + 14.1a_k^3), k = a, c, a_k \in [0, 1]$	[30]
Diffusion coefficient of water in the membrane	$D_w = n_d D_0 \exp \left[2416 \left(\frac{1}{303} - \frac{1}{273+T} \right) \right]$	[28,47,48]
Electro-osmotic coefficient	$n_d = 0.0049 + 2.024a_a - 4.53a_a^2 + 4.09a_a^3, a_a \in [0, 1]$	[28,47,48]
Membrane conductivity	$\sigma_m = (0.00514 \frac{M_{m,\text{dry}}}{\rho_{m,\text{dry}}} c_m - 0.00326) \cdot \exp \left[1268 \left(\frac{1}{303} - \frac{1}{273+T} \right) \right]$	[47]
Net water molecules per proton flux ratio	$\alpha = n_d - \frac{F}{I} D_w \frac{(c_{w,c} - c_{w,a})}{l_m}$	[47]
Partial pressure of component i	$P_i = \sum_{M_j} \frac{M_j}{M_j} P, \text{ anode: } i, j = \text{H}_2, \text{H}_2\text{O}, \text{ cathode: } i, j = \text{O}_2, \text{N}_2, \text{H}_2\text{O}$	
Saturation pressure	$\log_{10} p_{\text{sat}}^w = -2.18 + 2.95 \times 10^{-2} T - 9.18 \times 10^{-5} T^2 + 1.44 \times 10^{-7} T^3$	[47]

vapour–liquid equilibrium in the cathode channel are given by

$$f_c = \frac{M_{w,c}^l}{M_{w,c}^v + M_{w,c}^l} \quad (8)$$

$$0 = f_c \left[\frac{M_{w,c}^v}{M_{w,c}^v + M_{\text{N}_2} + M_{\text{O}_2}} P - p_{\text{sat}}^w \right] \quad (9)$$

where $f_c \in [0, 1]$. The same reasoning given for Eqs. (4)–(6) applies to Eqs. (7)–(9).

The hydrogen and air flow rates going into the channels are determined by their respective stoichiometric ratios,

$$M_{\text{H}_2,\text{in}} = \lambda_{\text{H}_2} \frac{IA}{2F} \quad (10)$$

$$M_{\text{O}_2,\text{in}} = \lambda_{\text{air}} \frac{IA}{4F} \quad (11)$$

The water vapour flow rate going into the anode channel can be computed from the relative humidity of the hydrogen fuel,

$$M_{w,a,\text{in}}^v = \frac{y_{w,a,\text{in}}}{1 - y_{w,a,\text{in}}} M_{\text{H}_2,\text{in}} \quad (12)$$

$$y_{w,a,\text{in}} = RH_{\text{fuel}} \frac{p_{\text{sat}}^w}{P} \quad (13)$$

where $y_{w,a,\text{in}}$ is the mole fraction of water vapour going into the anode and p_{sat}^w is the saturation pressure.

Similarly, we can describe the water vapour flow rate going into the cathode channel:

$$M_{w,c,\text{in}}^v = \frac{y_{w,c,\text{in}}}{1 - y_{w,c,\text{in}}} (M_{\text{O}_2,\text{in}} + M_{\text{N}_2,\text{in}}) \quad (14)$$

$$y_{w,c,\text{in}} = RH_{\text{air}} \frac{p_{\text{sat}}^w}{P} \quad (15)$$

2.2. Electrochemistry

The effective cell voltage can be expressed as the difference between the thermodynamically reversible cell voltage and the losses due to overpotential,

$$V = V_{\text{oc}} + \frac{R(273 + T)}{2F} \ln \left(\frac{P_{\text{H}_2} P_{\text{O}_2}^{0.5}}{P_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}} \right) - \frac{R(273 + T)}{0.5F} \ln \left(\frac{I}{I_0 P_{\text{O}_2}} \right) - \frac{I t_m}{\sigma_m} - \beta I^k \ln \left(\frac{I_L}{I_L - I} \right) \quad (16)$$

where V_{oc} is the open-circuit potential, I_0 is the exchange current density, βI^k is the amplification term associated with the total mass

transport overpotential, expressed in potential units [33], and I_L is the limiting current density. The first two terms on the right of Eq. (16) represent the thermodynamic reversible voltage based on the Nernst equation [29]. The third term is the activation overpotential [28], which is the voltage loss due to the rate of reactions on the surface of the electrodes. This assumes that the activation overpotential is mainly located at the cathode. The fourth term is the ohmic overpotential [28], which is the voltage drop due to the resistance to the flow of protons in the electrolyte. The last term is the overall concentration overpotential [33], which is the voltage loss due to the mass transport limitation.

2.3. System efficiency

One of the key properties of a fuel cell, used to evaluate its performance, is the efficiency. The efficiency of the system is defined by

$$\eta = \frac{W_{\text{stack}} - W_{\text{prs}}}{W_{\text{fuel}}} \quad (17)$$

where W_{stack} is the output power of the stack, W_{prs} is the parasitic power and W_{fuel} is the power inherent in the fuel used:

$$W_{\text{stack}} = n_{\text{cell}} A I V \quad (18)$$

$$W_{\text{prs}} = W_{\text{comp}} + W_{\text{others}} \quad (19)$$

Table 2
Parametric constants in the model.

Parameter	Value	Ref.
Amplification constant (β)	0.085 V(cm ² A ⁻¹) ^k	[4,33]
Dimensionless power in the amplification term (k)	1.1	[4,33]
Limiting current density (I_L)	1.4 A cm ⁻²	[4]
Lower heating value of hydrogen (LHV)	2.4 × 10 ⁵ J mol ⁻¹	[25]
Oxygen exchange current density (I_0)	0.01 A cm ⁻²	[31]
Reversible open-circuit potential (V_{oc})	1.1 V	[31]
Membrane		
Diffusion coefficient of water in membrane (D_0)	5.5 × 10 ⁻⁷ cm ² s ⁻¹	[28]
Dry density ($\rho_{m,\text{dry}}$)	2.0 g cm ⁻³	[28]
Dry equivalent weight ($M_{m,\text{dry}}$)	1100 g mol ⁻¹	[28]
Thickness (t_m)	5 × 10 ⁻³ cm (50 μm)	[34]
Compressor		
Compressor efficiency (η_c)	0.85	
Entry air temperature (T_e)	288 K (15 °C)	
Inlet pressure (P_{in})	1 atm	
Motor efficiency (η_{mt})	0.85	
Specific heat constant of air (c_p)	1004 J K ⁻¹ kg ⁻¹	




Fig. 2. Simulation of the system for a base case: (a) polarisation curve, (b) system efficiency, and (c) power density, all with respect to the current density at various operating pressures.

$$W_{\text{fuel}} = \lambda_{\text{H}_2} n_{\text{cell}} \frac{IA}{2F} \text{LHV} \quad (20)$$

$$W_{\text{comp}} = \frac{c_p T_e}{\eta_c \eta_{\text{mt}}} \left[\left(\frac{P}{P_{\text{in}}} \right)^{0.286} - 1 \right] m_{\text{air}} \quad (21)$$

$$m_{\text{air}} = 3.57 \times 10^{-7} \lambda_{\text{air}} n_{\text{cell}} IA \quad (22)$$

$$W_{\text{others}} = 0.05 W_{\text{stack}} \quad (23)$$

In this paper, $n_{\text{cell}} = 1$, thus A represents the total active MEA area. Eqs. (18), (19), (21) and (22) were taken from Pei et al. [34]. The parasitic power is composed of the power consumption of the compressor, W_{comp} , and the other power losses, W_{others} . Pei et al. [34] assumed W_{others} to be equal to 2 kW based on a stack output power of 62.5 kW. Instead, we set W_{others} to 5% of the nominal stack output




Fig. 3. Pareto set at stack output power of 50 kW.

power for the equations above to be applicable at different stack output powers. Also, the compressor and motor efficiencies vary with the size of the compressor and the fraction of full load at which it is operated at. However, it is assumed that the compressor and motor efficiencies are constant, similar to the approach adopted by others [6,34].

Table 1 presents the expressions for the physical parameters used in the model, whilst Table 2 gives the values of the constant parameters.

2.4. Model validation

The model was evaluated for a base case corresponding to a stack having a MEA total active area of $25 \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^2$ and an operating temperature of 80°C . Pure hydrogen at 100% relative humidity and air at 50% relative humidity are supplied to the anode and cathode channels, respectively. The hydrogen stoichiometric ratio is 1.25 (i.e. hydrogen utilisation rate of 80%), whilst the air stoichiometric ratio is 2.

Fig. 2(a)–(c) shows the effects of operating pressure and current density on polarisation, system efficiency, and power density curves, respectively. With respect to the current density, the polarisation curve, which is commonly used as a measure of the performance of fuel cell systems, is in direct correlation with the system efficiency. The voltage, and hence the efficiency, decreases with increasing current density due to the combined irreversibility contributions of activation, ohmic and concentration overpotentials. The power density, on the other hand, increases with increasing current density and displays a maximum at a particular value of the current density. The polarisation curves also show that gains in voltage result when pressure is increased. However, the pressure has no significant effect on the system efficiency because the increase in cell potential is offset by the increase in parasitic power with increasing pressure. Furthermore, at high current densities, the power density increases with increasing pressure. These results are in agreement with the conclusions drawn by a large section of the literature [35–41].

The solution of the base case suggests that the efficiency and size are conflicting objectives. To achieve high efficiency, the system must be operated at low current density. At low current density the power density is also low, which means a larger system per unit of power. Conversely, for the same output power, a small system requires high power density, which demands high current density, resulting in a lower efficiency. The systematic and detailed investigation of the trade-offs between the efficiency and size is the focus of the succeeding sections.

Table 3

Comparison of the representative solutions in the Pareto set (Fig. 3) with the base case at stack output power of 50 kW.

	η (%)	A ($\times 10^4$ cm 2)	I (A cm $^{-2}$)	V (V)	P (atm)	λ_{H_2}	λ_{air}	RH_{fuel}	RH_{air}	W_{fuel} (kW)	W_{prs} (kW)
Base case	44.18	25	0.25	0.79	2	1.25	2	1	0.5	98.52	6.47
$\omega = 1$	53.15	52.93	0.11	0.86	3.03	1.10	1.66	1	0.5	79.66	7.66
$\omega = 0.85$	51.33	40.56	0.14	0.87	4.91	1.10	1.53	1	0.5	78.44	9.74
$\omega = 0.5$	42.20	19.19	0.35	0.75	5.00	1.10	1.58	1	0.5	91.65	11.32
$\omega = 0.15$	32.41	15.00	0.56	0.60	5.00	1.10	1.46	1	0.5	114.96	12.74
$\omega = 0$	24.80	14.51	0.67	0.51	5.00	1.20	1.39	1	0.5	145.60	13.89

3. Multi-objective optimisation

The model presented in the previous section has been shown to behave as expected for a base case. The simulation of the model for a base case reveals that for a given output power, a more efficient fuel cell is bigger and *vice versa*. We now wish to use this model within an optimisation-based design framework. The aim is to identify the efficiency and size trade-offs involved in the design of PEM fuel cell system for any given output power. The determination of a set of optimal solutions that represent the compromise between the objectives, called the non-dominated or Pareto set, requires a multi-objective optimisation technique.

There is a large variety of techniques for solving multi-objective optimisation problems [42]. In this paper, the weighting method is used to approximate the Pareto set. This method transforms the multi-objective optimisation problem into a single-objective optimisation problem by associating each objective function with a weighting coefficient and then minimising the weighted sum of

the objectives. This can be expressed mathematically as

$$\min z = \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i z_i \quad (24)$$

where $\omega_i \in [0, 1]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i = 1$. In Eq. (24), z is the weighted sum of the objectives, z_i is a single-objective and ω_i is a weighting factor. The solution of Eq. (24) produces a single result that is as good as the selection of the weights [43]. A Pareto set can be generated by evaluating a series of single-objective optimisation problems at different values of the weighting factor to avoid having to, *a priori*, select a particular weighting between objectives.

The PEM fuel cell system efficiency-size multi-objective optimisation problem is formulated using the weighting method as

$$\min_{I, P, \lambda_{H_2}, \lambda_{air}, RH_{fuel}, RH_{air}} z = -\omega\eta + (1 - \omega)A \quad (25)$$




Fig. 4. Comparison of the Pareto sets at different stack output power, showing (a) the entire range and (b) an enlarged region to emphasise the difference in the solutions.




Fig. 5. Optimal values of the design objectives plotted against the current density: (a) MEA area per Watt and (b) system efficiency.




Fig. 6. Optimal values of some of the design variables plotted against the current density: (a) voltage, (b) pressure, (c) hydrogen stoichiometric ratio, (d) air stoichiometric ratio, (e) input power and (f) parasitic power.

subject to:

$$0.11 \text{ A cm}^{-2} \leq I \leq 1.3 \text{ A cm}^{-2}$$

$$1.2 \text{ atm} \leq P \leq 5 \text{ atm}$$

$$1.1 \leq \lambda_{\text{fuel}} \leq 10$$

$$1.1 \leq \lambda_{\text{air}} \leq 10$$

$$0.5 \leq RH_{\text{fuel}} \leq 1$$

$$0.5 \leq RH_{\text{air}} \leq 1$$

The system efficiency, η , is given by Eq. (17), whereas the system size is represented by the total active area of the MEA, A . The size of the other components such as the bipolar plates and auxiliaries (humidifiers, air compressor, and water coolant) are directly correlated with the variation in the area of the MEA. A single-cell fuel cell stack has been considered. Once the total active area is known, the number of cells can be determined given the active area of a single cell. Although a fuel cell's performance will be affected by the tem-

perature, in this study the temperature is fixed at 80 °C. It is difficult to derive a reliable analytical expression for the exchange current density, I_0 , as a function of the temperature, since it depends on the specifics of the catalyst used. The lower bound on the pressure is 1.2 atm because the compressor cannot provide a pressure below atmospheric (i.e. the system pressure is always higher than the atmospheric pressure) [6]. The lower bound on the hydrogen and air stoichiometric ratios should be higher than the minimum limit to prevent depletion [6]. With regard to the relative humidity, when using air as the oxidant it is a common practice to use at least 50% relative humidity. Using the same set of objective function and constraints, the Pareto set is obtained at different stack output powers, namely 1, 25, 50, 75 and 100 kW.

In Eq. (25), $\omega \in [0, 1]$ represents the weighting factor. The negative sign in front of the efficiency objective indicates a maximisation problem. The extreme points $\omega = 0$ and $\omega = 1$ represent the single-objective optimisation problems where the size and the efficiency

are minimised and maximised, respectively. Solving the optimisation problem for any $\omega \in (0, 1)$ will generate solutions between these two extremes where the two objectives will be considered simultaneously. The value of ω will determine the relative importance of each objective. For example, at $\omega = 0.25$, the size is of higher importance than the efficiency. The reverse is true at $\omega = 0.75$, in which more weight is given to the efficiency than size. However, assigning equal weights to the objectives does not necessarily mean giving equal importance to the objectives. Furthermore, as the relative weights matter in this technique, the objectives were scaled to have comparable values. In addition, since the problem involves both maximisation and minimisation, the solver may be ineffective in searching the region at which the value of the weighted sum of the objectives is zero. This can be overcome by translating the problem (i.e. adding an appropriate constant to Eq. (25)) such that the values of the weighted sum of the objectives are either positive or negative for all ω s.

The optimisation model was written in the GAMS [44] modelling language and was solved using LINDOGlobal. LINDOGlobal employs branch-and-cut method to break a nonlinear programming (NLP) model down into a list of subproblems [45]. A discussion of the branch-and-cut method is given in Ref. [46]. For a given weighting factor, ω , an optimisation run usually converges to a solution with a relative tolerance of 0.01% after approximately 120 s on a desktop computer with a 2.66 GHz Intel Core Duo CPU and with 2 GB RAM.

4. Results and discussion

Fig. 3 gives the trade-off solutions for a stack output power of 50 kW. The efficiency and the MEA area are plotted on the two axes and the curve consists of a set of designs that are all optimal in a Pareto sense. For comparison, the base case solution at stack output power of 50 kW and pressure of 2 atm (referred later as base case) is given in the first row of Table 3. The highest point (top right) in Fig. 3 represents the optimal solution at $\omega = 1$, which corresponds to the single-objective optimisation problem of maximising the efficiency of the system without taking the size into account. This solution is 20% more efficient but 112% bigger in size relative to the base case. This solution requires operation at a lower current density (thus, a higher voltage), at a higher pressure, and with lower hydrogen and air stoichiometric ratios with respect to the base case. As a consequence of the higher efficiency, this solution has a lower fuel consumption. However, the parasitic loss is higher due to the increase in the pressure. Conversely, the lowest point (bottom left) in the curve corresponds to the optimal solution at $\omega = 0$, which is the minimisation of the size regardless of the efficiency. This solution represents a design that is 42% smaller in size but 44% less efficient than the base case. In comparison with the base case, this design has a higher operating current density (thus, a lower voltage), operates at a higher pressure, and with lower hydrogen and air stoichiometric ratios. This design has higher power consumption and parasitic loss. From the results, it can be concluded that the efficiency and size of the system must be optimised simultaneously. If only the efficiency is maximised, the outcome is a possibly impractically large system. On the other hand, optimising for size results in a system almost four times smaller in size but efficiency that is less than desirable.

As shown in Fig. 3, the base case is a dominated solution because it lies “inside” of the Pareto set. In Fig. 3, the points that correspond to $\omega = 0.60$ up to $\omega = 0.65$ have both a higher efficiency and a smaller size compared to the base case so they improve on both objectives.

The points at the far right of Fig. 3 represent solutions in which the size of the system is compromised in favour of the efficiency. Moving down the curve, to the left, the size of the system is improved but the efficiency reduces. None of the points is essen-

tially superior and the final design choice will depend on the factors specific to the application. For stationary applications, the size of the system can be traded for the efficiency. This is not the case, however, for mobile and transportation applications which require highly efficient and small systems. Furthermore, at the efficiency of approximately 47% and above, the slope of the curve is very steep. In this region large increases in the size of the system result in small gains in efficiency. For instance, 51% efficiency is better than 52% from an economic point of view. This is because approximately 6 m² (15%) additional MEA area is likely to be too much to justify the 1% increase in the efficiency. Conversely, at the efficiency of about 40% and below, the curve appears to be flat. This suggests that in this region, a small change in the size of the system leads to a large impact on the efficiency. An example from Fig. 3 is a 5% efficiency jump from 25% to 30% will only require 0.20 m² (1.5%) increased in the MEA area. In this region, the average increase in the MEA area is roughly 0.20 m² for every 1% increase in the efficiency. Overall, to make the most of the trade-off behaviour in Fig. 3, the PEM fuel cell system must be operated at an efficiency of at least 40%.

Table 3 gives the optimal values of the design variables for the representative solutions highlighted in Fig. 3. The extreme points, $\omega = 1$ and $\omega = 0$ represent the single-objective optimisation solutions and, thus are not expected to follow the trend of how each variable behaves. In general, moving from a high efficiency, large size solution to a non-dominated, low efficiency, small size solution in the Pareto set involves increases in the operating current density (thus, decreased cell voltage) and pressure. The optimal values of the hydrogen fuel and air relative humidity turn out to be 1 and 0.5, respectively, for all ω s. The optimal hydrogen stoichiometric ratio is 1.1 (i.e. hydrogen utilisation rate of 91%) for all ω s except at an extreme point. Finally, in moving along the Pareto set in the mentioned manner, the fuel consumption and parasitic loss increase.

Similar analyses were performed for different stack output powers, namely, 1, 25, 50, 75 and 100 kW. Fig. 4(a) shows the comparison of the generated Pareto sets. In this figure, the MEA area per Watt is plotted against the efficiency for each stack output power. The Pareto sets are qualitatively similar in shape but differ in span. Also, the solutions of the single-objective efficiency maximisation at different stack output powers nearly completely converge with an efficiency of 54% and a MEA area of 10.5 cm² W⁻¹. On the other hand, the solutions of the single-objective size minimisation settled at an average MEA area of 2.8 cm² W⁻¹ with increasing efficiency as stack output power increases. A region of interest is enlarged in Fig. 4(b) to emphasise the difference in the solutions at different stack output power. It can be observed that for a particular value of the efficiency, increasing the stack output power eventually results to an increase in the MEA area required per Watt of power produced. For example, at an efficiency of 45%, the MEA area per Watt at stack output power of 75 and 100 kW are 3% and 7%, respectively, bigger relative to the MEA area per Watt at stack output power of 1, 25, and 50 kW.

Figs. 5 and 6 show the optimal values of the design objectives and some of the design variables, respectively, plotted against the current density for different stack output powers. The solutions that are large in size and high in efficiency, forming the right branches of the Pareto sets in Fig. 4(a), occur at low current density. Conversely, the left branches of the Pareto sets in Fig. 4(a), containing the solutions that are small in size and low in efficiency, occur at high current density. Overall, with respect to the current density, the MEA area, efficiency and voltage are decreasing, whilst the input power and parasitic power are increasing. Furthermore, the input power and parasitic power are increasing, whilst the voltage and air stoichiometric ratio are decreasing with increasing stack output power. Moreover, the single-objective size minimisation at the stack output power of 1 kW resulted to a solution with zero effi-




Fig. 7. Optimal values of the operating pressure with the upper bound increased to 10 atm.

ciency. In this particular solution, the power produced by the stack is all consumed by the system as the parasitic loss resulting in a zero net output power.

It can also be observed from Fig. 6 that some of the bounds on the design variables were hit during optimisation, specifically the lower bound on the current density, the upper bound on the pressure, and the bounds on the hydrogen stoichiometric ratio. Lowering the bounds on the current density and hydrogen stoichiometric ratio are not useful because in an actual operation current density below 0.11 A cm^{-2} and hydrogen stoichiometric ratio less

than 1.1 are not practical. Comparison of Fig. 6(b) with Fig. 4(a) shows that the solutions that hit the upper bound on the pressure correspond to the region in Fig. 4(a) where the branches of the Pareto sets appear to be separated. These solutions could have achieved smaller sizes and higher efficiency values if the bound on the pressure had allowed them to.

Consequently, the effect of increasing the upper bound on the pressure to 10 atm was investigated. Pressures higher than 5 atm are not usually used in actual operation. This upper bound was only considered, in this paper, for diagnostic purposes. In Fig. 7, the solutions that previously hit the 5 atm upper bound on the pressure assumed higher values of pressure when the bound is relaxed. The resulting Pareto sets for different stack output powers are shown in Fig. 8. As an illustration, for the stack output power of 100 kW at an efficiency of 45%, the size is reduced by 6.25% by using an upper bound on the pressure of 10 atm (MEA area of 45 m^2) instead of 5 atm (MEA area of 48 m^2). Moreover, the Pareto sets for different stack output powers appear to be closer to each other when compared with Fig. 4. The slight separation is due to the solutions still reaching the 10 atm upper bound on the pressure at high current density.

5. Conclusion

An optimisation model for a general PEM fuel cell system, suitable for use within a multi-objective framework, has been proposed. This model allows us to investigate the trade-offs between the efficiency and the size. The simulation of the model for a base case shows that for a given output power, a more efficient system is bigger and *vice versa*. The Pareto sets, generated for different output powers, represent a quantitative description of the trade-offs between efficiency and size. The results of this study illustrate the importance of formulating the problem as a multi-objective optimisation. Maximisation of the efficiency without taking the size into account will result to a possibly impractically large system. Conversely, a significantly small system but with very low efficiency will result if the only objective is size. Overall, the system must be operated at an efficiency of at least 40% but not more than 47% to make the most of the size–efficiency trade-off behaviour. Furthermore, the MEA area should be at least $3 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ W}^{-1}$ for the efficiency to be practically useful. Moreover, given the constraints of the model, which are based on technical practicalities, a PEM fuel cell system such as the one presented cannot reach an efficiency of more than 54%. Our work presents a way of determining the PEM fuel cell system optimal design such that for a particular application, a balance between efficiency and size is achieved. The results from this work can be further applied to techno-economic studies given a specific application.

Acknowledgements

The scholarship support provided by the Department of Science and Technology (Philippines) and the University of the Philippines to Sheila Ang is gratefully acknowledged. This work has been partially funded by the EPSRC Supergen programme to support Dr. Brett's fuel cell research.

References

- [1] EG&G Technical Services, Inc., Fuel Cell Handbook, 7th edition, U.S. Department of Energy, Morgantown, WV, 2004.
- [2] J. Larminie, A. Dicks, Fuel Cell Systems Explained, 2nd edition, John Wiley & Sons, Japan, 2003.
- [3] D. Xue, Z. Dong, Journal of Power Sources 76 (1) (1998) 69–80.
- [4] C. Spiegel, PEM Fuel Cell Modeling and Simulation Using MATLAB, Elsevier Inc., 2008.
- [5] F. Barbir, T. Gomez, International Journal of Hydrogen Energy 22 (10–11) (1997) 1027–1037.




Fig. 8. Comparison of the Pareto sets at different stack output power with the upper bound on the pressure increased to 10 atm, showing (a) the entire range and (b) an enlarged region to emphasise the difference in the solutions.

- [6] W. Na, B. Gou, *Journal of Power Sources* 166 (2) (2007) 411–418.
- [7] M. Al-Baghdadi, H. Al-Janabi, *Renewable Energy* 32 (7) (2007) 1077–1101.
- [8] A.M. Azmy, I. Erlich, *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery* 20 (2) (2005) 1051–1058.
- [9] S. Chen, J.C. Ordonez, J.V.C. Vargas, J.E.F. Gardolinski, M.A.B. Gomes, *Journal of Power Sources* 162 (1) (2006) 356–368.
- [10] P.K. Das, X.G. Li, Z.S. Liu, *Journal of Electroanalytical Chemistry* 604 (2) (2007) 72–90.
- [11] W.R.W. Daud, A.B. Mohamad, A.A.H. Kadhum, R. Chebbi, S.E. Iyuke, *Energy Conversion and Management* 45 (20) (2004) 3239–3249.
- [12] J. Godat, F. Marechal, *Journal of Power Sources* 118 (1–2) (2003) 411–423.
- [13] A.J.J. Kadjo, P. Brault, A. Caillard, C. Coutanceau, J.P. Gamier, S. Martemianov, *Journal of Power Sources* 172 (2007) 613–622.
- [14] G. Karimi, J.J. Baschuk, X. Li, *Journal of Power Sources* 147 (1–2) (2005) 162–177.
- [15] J. Wishart, Z. Dong, A. Secanell, *Journal of Power Sources* 161 (2) (2006) 1041–1055.
- [16] K.I. Chen, J. Winnick, V.I. Manousiouthakis, *Computers & Chemical Engineering* 30 (8) (2006) 1226–1234.
- [17] R. Chandrasekaran, W. Bi, T.F. Fuller, *Journal of Power Sources* 182 (2) (2008) 546–557.
- [18] S.K. Kamarudin, W.R.W. Daud, A.M. Som, M.S. Takriff, A.W. Mohammad, *Journal of Power Sources* 159 (2) (2006) 1194–1204.
- [19] S.E. Iyuke, A.B. Mohamad, A.A.H. Kadhum, W.R.W. Daud, C. Rachid, *Journal of Power Sources* 114 (2) (2003) 195–202.
- [20] C.C. Boyer, R.G. Anthony, A.J. Appleby, *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry* 30 (7) (2000) 777–786.
- [21] S.A. Grigoriev, A.A. Kalinnikov, V.N. Fateev, A.A. Wragg, *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry* 36 (9) (2006) 991–996.
- [22] M. Grujicic, C.L. Zhao, K.M. Chittajallu, J.M. Ochterbeck, *Materials Science and Engineering B-Solid State Materials for Advanced Technology* 108 (3) (2004) 241–252.
- [23] R.M. Rao, R. Rengaswamy, *Chemical Engineering Research & Design* 84 (A10) (2006) 952–964.
- [24] S.D. Yim, W.Y. Lee, Y.G. Yoon, Y.J. Sohn, G.G. Park, T.H. Yang, C.S. Kim, *Electrochimica Acta* 50 (2–3) (2004) 713–718.
- [25] C.A. Frangopoulos, L.G. Nakos, *Energy* 31 (10–11) (2006) 1501–1519.
- [26] A.J. Hung, Y.H. Chen, L.Y. Sung, C.C. Yu, *AIChE Journal* 54 (7) (2008) 1798–1810.
- [27] K. Subramanian, U.M. Diwekar, A. Goyal, *Journal of Power Sources* 132 (1–2) (2004) 99–112.
- [28] T.V. Nguyen, R.E. White, *Journal of the Electrochemical Society* 140 (8) (1993) 2178–2186.
- [29] J. Golbert, D.R. Lewin, *Journal of Power Sources* 135 (1–2) (2004) 135–151.
- [30] J.T. Hinatsu, M. Mizuhata, H. Takenaka, *Journal of the Electrochemical Society* 141 (1994) 1493–1498.
- [31] J.S. Yi, T.V. Nguyen, *Journal of the Electrochemical Society* 145 (4) (1998) 1149–1159.
- [32] S.H. Ge, B.L. Yi, *Journal of Power Sources* 124 (1) (2003) 1–11.
- [33] G. Squadrito, G. Maggio, E. Passalacqua, F. Lufirano, A. Patti, *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry* 29 (12) (1999) 1449–1455.
- [34] P.C. Pei, W. Yang, P. Li, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 31 (3) (2006) 361–369.
- [35] F. Barbir, *PEM Fuel Cells: Theory and Practice*, Academic Press, 2005.
- [36] J. Kim, S.-M. Lee, S. Srinivasan, C.E. Chamberlin, *Journal of the Electrochemical Society* 142 (1995) 2670–2674.
- [37] L. Wang, A. Husar, T.H. Zhou, H.T. Liu, *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 28 (11) (2003) 1263–1272.
- [38] A. Kazim, P. Lund, *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers Part A-Journal of Power and Energy* 220 (A8) (2006) 847–853.
- [39] A. Mughal, X. Li, *International Journal of Environmental Studies* 63 (4) (2006) 377–389.
- [40] Q.G. Yan, H. Toghiani, H. Causey, *Journal of Power Sources* 161 (1) (2006) 492–502.
- [41] Y. Zhang, R. Pitchumani, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer* 50 (23–24) (2007) 4698–4712.
- [42] U. Diwekar, *Introduction to Applied Optimization*, Springer, New York, 2008.
- [43] P. Ngatchou, A. Zarei, M. El-Sharkawi, *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Intelligent Systems Application to Power Systems*, 2005, pp. 84–91.
- [44] R.E. Rosenthal, *GAMS—A User's Guide*, GAMS Development Corporation, Washington, DC, USA, 2008.
- [45] Lindo Systems, Inc., *LINDOGlobal*, available from <http://www.gams.com/dd/docs/solvers/lindoglobal.pdf>.
- [46] A. Lucena, J. Beasley, in: J.E. Beasley (Ed.), *Advances in Linear and Integer Programming*, Oxford University Press, Inc., Oxford, 1996, pp. 187–221.
- [47] T. Springer, T. Zawodzinski, S. Gottesfeld, *Journal of the Electrochemical Society* 138 (8) (1991) 2334–2342.
- [48] T. Springer, T. Zawodzinski, S. Gottesfeld, in: R. White, M. Verbrugge, J. Stockel (Eds.), *Modelling of Batteries and Fuel Cells*, vol. 91(10), *Softbound Proceedings Series*, The Electrochemical Society, Pennington, NJ, 1991, pp. 209–223.