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Background
Residential heating with wood (and coal) in small stoves and boilers emits about 50 percent of the total fine particle and black carbon emissions in Europe. Furthermore, many studies have confirmed a significant emission of ultrafine particles from residential heating. In other sectors, particle emissions have been successfully reduced by particulate filters. However, filters or other flue gas cleaning systems are still not standard equipment for small stoves or boilers. Even though new stoves and boilers still pollute much more compared to other heat sources and road traffic.

Purpose
The purpose was to investigate the removal of particles in an electrostatic filter and a condensing flue gas system with a bag filter adapted for small stoves and boilers.

Methods
This study investigates the removal efficiency in two filter systems adapted for stoves and boilers: An electrostatic filter and a condensing flue gas system with a bag filter. Measurements were done with dilution tunnels to include condensates. Measurements were performed with P-Traks for ultrafine particles (PM_{1.0}) and traditional particle mass collection (quartz filters) concerning fine particles (PM_{2.5}). The collected particle mass was analyzed for elementary carbon (EC) equivalent to black carbon (soot) and analyzed for organic carbon (OC).

Removal efficiencies were found comparing measurements before and after both filter systems.

Results
Average removal efficiencies over a burning cycle (40 min.) are shown in table 1. Both filters showed high removal efficiencies for both fine particles, elementary carbon and organic carbon, with the bag filter having highest efficiency. The bag filter showed a high removal of ultrafine particles as well. No net removal of ultrafine particles over a whole burning cycle (40 min.) was observed in the electrostatic filter: in the ignition phase (0-10 min.) the filter almost doubled the ultrafine particle emission, whereas it reduced the particle emission around 85 percent in burning phase (10-40 min.).

Discussion
If all stoves and boilers were fitted with these filters it would reduce the total emission of fine particles and black carbon in Europe by 40-50 percent. Furthermore, the bag filter would significantly reduce emissions of ultrafine particles as well as soot and PAHs adsorbed to their surfaces. The prototypes of both filter systems (incl. regeneration) have now been successfully tested for several years on chimneys for small stoves operated under controlled conditions at test facilities. Next steps are crash testing the filter systems and testing under real conditions in private households. Even if the filters are reliable in use and maintain the high efficiencies, next challenge will be to get filters installed on chimneys. This will either require legal filter requirements or high taxes on residential heating without filters since the filter price is believed to be around 3,000 euro in mass production.

Conclusion
The two investigated filter systems efficiently remove particles, both fine particles, elementary carbon and organic carbon. The bag filter has the highest efficiency and showed a high removal of ultrafine particles as well.
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Further info:
Clean Heat website: www.clean-heat.eu
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Table 1: Average removal efficiencies over a burning cycle (40 min.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PM_{0.1}</th>
<th>PM_{2.5}</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electrostatic filter</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>87 %</td>
<td>98.5 %</td>
<td>74 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag filter</td>
<td>98.7 %</td>
<td>94 %</td>
<td>99.6 %</td>
<td>85 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the ignition phase (0-10 min.) the filter almost doubled the ultrafine particle emission, whereas it reduced the particle emission around 85 percent in burning phase (10-40 min.).