



HAL
open science

Digital design and 3D printing of innovative SiC architectures for high temperature volumetric solar receivers

Cyprien Heisel, Cyril Caliot, Thierry Chartier, Sylvain Chupin, Patrick David, Denis Rochais

► To cite this version:

Cyprien Heisel, Cyril Caliot, Thierry Chartier, Sylvain Chupin, Patrick David, et al.. Digital design and 3D printing of innovative SiC architectures for high temperature volumetric solar receivers. Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells, 2021, 232, pp.111336. 10.1016/j.solmat.2021.111336 . hal-03335187

HAL Id: hal-03335187

<https://univ-pau.hal.science/hal-03335187v1>

Submitted on 6 Sep 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Digital design and 3D printing of innovative SiC architectures for high temperature volumetric solar receivers

HEISEL Cyprien^a, CALIOT Cyril^{b,c}, CHARTIER Thierry^d, CHUPIN Sylvain^a, DAVID Patrick^a, ROCHAIS Denis^a

^aCEA, DAM, LE RIPAUT, F-37260 Monts, France

^bUniversité de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, E2S UPPA, CNRS, LMAP, Anglet, France

^cProcesses, Materials and Solar Energy Laboratory (CNRS-PROMES), 7 rue du Four Solaire – 66120 Font-Romeu, France

^dCNRS, University of Limoges, Institute of Research for Ceramics (IRCER), European Ceramics Center, Limoges, France

Corresponding author: ROCHAIS Denis (denis.rochais@cea.fr)

Abstract

In order to demonstrate that digital material engineering methodology is able to address the design and optimisation of architected ceramic materials, solar volumetric receivers employed in Solar Thermal Power Plants (STPP) have been studied. A digital design approach for obtaining new receivers, at the macroscopic structural scale, is proposed. This approach couples virtual structure generation, ray tracing and thermal simulations at the scale of the base structural components (microscopic scale). Then, a recently developed process for manufacturing silicon carbide (SiC) parts by binder jetting is used to elaborate three optimised structures which are tested on-sun at high temperature in a solar concentrator reproducing the STPP operation conditions. The results obtained with these structures, having original shapes, are promising: the average experimental outlet air temperature reaches a maximum of 1133 K, energy yields can reach 0.49 despite high experimental heat losses, and all the SiC structures, made with a new material based on 3D printing, withstood the high temperatures reached, up to 1500 K. Comparison between digital and experimental results shows that the approach presented in this paper paves the way to a new digital material engineering approach.

Keywords: SiC, binder jetting, solar volumetric receiver, ray tracing, conductive radiative heat transfer, high temperature.

1. Introduction


Experimental characterisation of some materials, when they have particular characteristics (complex microstructure and/or architecture, significant brittleness, small dimensions, etc.), is very delicate, sometimes even impossible. The objective set by the digital materials approach, developed at CEA Le Ripault over the past fifteen years [1], is to perform these experiments numerically. For this purpose, the real material is digitised or voxelised using 3D image reconstruction means (X-ray tomography,

37 FIB/SEM, for example). Then, using the intrinsic properties of the material components and numerical
38 tools to simulate physical phenomena, digital experiments can be used to study the coupled heat and
39 mass transfers, and to develop approximate models with their effective properties of the equivalent
40 material based on the detailed virtual structure.

41 Recent advances [2,3] in additive manufacturing processes now allow this approach to be extended to
42 the digital engineering of materials. The idea is to start with a virtual material and optimise it by
43 calculation to meet specifications as precisely as possible, and then to manufacture this customed
44 material by 3D printing. The objective of this article is to implement digital material engineering
45 methodology and to demonstrate that this innovative approach is relevant.

46 To this end, the study of high temperature volumetric receivers [4–8] of Solar Thermal Power Plants
47 (STPP) has been selected. These receivers, integrated at the top of a solar tower, are used to absorb
48 energy from the Sun's rays, concentrated via numerous heliostats. Then, a heat transfer fluid
49 (atmospheric air or pressurised air) [9,10] can flow through their 3D, macroporous architecture to
50 recover the captured solar energy. A high temperature thermodynamic system installed in the power
51 plant enables the recovered thermal energy to be converted at high efficiency.

52 In this type of receiver, the challenge consists in designing a receiver achieving the volumetric effect
53 which would result in a drastic increase in the thermal efficiency of the receiver (defined as the ratio
54 of the energy provided by the incident solar flux over the energy recovered by the heat transfer fluid)
55 [11]. This effect is characterised by two essential points depicted in Figure 1. The first point is an
56 absorber (solid part of the receiver) temperature that is lower at the inlet than at the outlet – labelled
57 “Exit” in Figure 1 – (limiting thermal losses by radiation towards the environment), and the second
58 point is an elevated outlet fluid temperature (typically 1200 K) which can be used in high efficiency
59 thermodynamic cycles.



60
61 *Figure 1: Temperature profile in a volumetric receiver, showing the volumetric effect [12].*

62 The materials used for these receivers are divided into two families [13]. They are either metallic or
63 ceramic. In the first case, the absorbers are more resistant to thermal shocks induced by fluctuations
64 in the incident solar flux, but the maximum temperatures reached cannot exceed approximately 1100
65 K (due to the risk of the metal melting or rusting), thus limiting the power released by the STPP.
66 Ceramic absorbers are, on the contrary, more resistant to high temperatures [14]. Ceramic absorbers,

67 which are more promising, are the subject of our study. Silicon carbide (SiC), the reference material
68 for this solar application [4,15,16], is known for its refractory nature and its high absorption in the solar
69 radiation wavelength spectrum. In this respect, SiC has been selected in this study.

70 The heat transfer fluid can be used pressurised or at atmospheric pressure. In theory, when the fluid
71 is pressurised, the energy yields of the receivers are greater [17,18] but the design of the window,
72 which keeps the fluid circuit closed while allowing the Sun's rays to pass through, is very difficult to
73 achieve [19,20]. Finally, the advantage of receivers at atmospheric pressure is their lower cost due to
74 their less complex implementation. The family of ceramic absorbers used at atmospheric pressure was
75 therefore preferred for our study.

76 Due to manufacturing considerations, the geometries of SiC receivers are mainly foams and
77 honeycombs. Honeycombs may be more sensitive to incident solar radiation heterogeneity (hot spots)
78 compared to foams [17,21], which have been widely studied experimentally [4,16,22,23] and
79 numerically [24–26]. Foams used as atmospheric air solar receivers present a major drawback, they
80 absorb the solar flux in the first part of their depth (5 to 10 %), not exploiting the full potential of the
81 specific surface area they offer. Nevertheless, some experimental [27] and numerical studies tend to
82 demonstrate that the volumetric effect may be possible to achieve, but important geometric or
83 physical considerations have to be taken into account [25,26,28].

84 The search for new geometries in SiC is therefore the key to improve the performance of volumetric
85 receivers, and additive manufacturing is a technological solution making it possible to manufacture
86 these new morphologies. Recent studies have shown how to do this and have proposed new 3D
87 printed complex ceramic geometries, most of them 3D lattices structures in alumina, zirconia, Si-SiC or
88 SiOC-SiC [29–32].


89 To our knowledge, two methods have been used to build 3D ceramics parts: stereolithography of
90 Polymer Derived Ceramics (PDC) and binder jetting [33]. In both cases, post-treatments are necessary
91 to obtain a rather dense final ceramic part. [34–38] recently reported printed Si-SiC or SiOC structures,
92 using the stereolithography process associated with pre-ceramic polymers. After thermal post-
93 treatments, the final parts are dense without cracks and have a good surface finish. This thermal
94 treatment leads to high linear shrinkage (i.e. greater than 25%) according to the ceramisation yield of
95 the prepolymer, which is about 60%. [39–41] used the binder jetting technique to print various cellular
96 structures. The linear shrinkage of the parts obtained, after post-treatments, is between 1 and 20%,
97 depending on the printing parameters and on the residual internal porosity, which can reach 40%.

98 In this work, the digital material approach described above is applied with the help of a modified
99 process [2] which makes it possible to manufacture, by binder jetting, complex parts in SiC, with a
100 minimum resolution of approximately 700 microns. After digital optimization of morphologies, thermal
101 simulations are carried out on these structures to evaluate their performances. Then they are printed
102 and experimental tests are carried out in order to compare the real behaviours with the virtual ones.
103 This work proposes and validates an approach which consists in numerically determining the best
104 morphology for a volumetric receiver and then to manufacture it in SiC. Furthermore, the 3D printer
105 used in this work enables parts to be manufactured with dimensions up to 20 cm, such as modules
106 used in the construction of volumetric receivers.

107 The first part of this article concerns a description of the manufacture of a 3D binder jetting printer
108 and the on-sun test bench with solar concentration. Then, in a second part, the approach followed to
109 optimise and create new geometries for volumetric receivers is detailed. The third part is devoted to
110 the description of the digital tools employed. The fourth part presents the various numerical and
111 experimental results. Finally, some conclusions and perspectives are given.

112 2. General approach


113 The desired ceramic material with optimised shaping for volumetric receptors is achieved through a
114 strategy combining numerical and experimental steps (Figure 2).



115
116 *Figure 2: Diagram of the approach followed. In blue: digital steps. In green: experimental steps. Dotted line: results*
117 *comparison.*

118 In order to determine an optimal shape, we used two computation codes. The first was a virtual
119 generating code, and the second was a ray tracing code. These two codes are closely linked since an
120 optimisation loop is formed between them.

121 Firstly, a structure is generated which follows the specifications from the literature. These are: i) to
122 absorb the incident solar flux as uniformly as possible according to its depth [16,42–44], presenting
123 very few absorptions skips to avoid thermal-mechanical stresses; ii) to limit reflective losses on the
124 front face [43,45]; iii) to capture the entire solar flux. Finally, these specifications can result in a curve,
125 shown in Figure 3, which is the dimensionless transmission of the incident solar flux as a function of
126 the depth of the receiver. This curve is linear (no absorption skips), decreasing (uniform absorption),
127 starts from 1 (no losses on the front face) and ends at 0 (all of the solar flux is absorbed). This “ideal”
128 curve is the reference for judging the solar absorption performance of the developed structures.



129

130
131

Figure 3: "Ideal" transmission describing our specifications. The transmission is rendered dimensionless relative to the incident solar flux and the depth is rendered dimensionless relative to the total length of the receiver.

132
133
134
135

Next, a ray tracing simulation is performed. The transmissivity results are compared with the ideal curve. If it is satisfactory, the structure is retained and the next steps can be started. Otherwise, the initial virtual structure is modified, or a new structure is generated, until a satisfactory result is obtained. To do so, a criterion Λ has been defined as the product of four quantities defined below:

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_{abs} * \Lambda_{skips} * \Lambda_{refl} * \Lambda_{trans} \quad 1$$

136
137
138
139

Where Λ_{abs} , Λ_{skips} , Λ_{refl} and Λ_{trans} allow to evaluate the deviations to the specifications mentioned above, corresponding respectively to the uniformity of absorption, to the absorption skips, to the reflective losses and to the losses by transmissivity. These quantities, comprising between 0 and 1 are calculating by the following formulas:

$$\Lambda_{abs} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |T(i) - T_{ideal}(i)|}{\sum_{i=1}^n T_{ideal}(i)} \quad 2$$

$$\Lambda_{skips} = \frac{1 - \max(|T(i) - T(i+1)|)}{1 - \max(|T_{ideal}(i) - T_{ideal}(i+1)|)} \quad 3$$

$$\Lambda_{refl} = 1 - \frac{Q_{r,front}}{Q_0} \quad 4$$

$$\Lambda_{trans} = 1 - T(n) \quad 5$$


140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147

Where $T(i)$ is the value of transmissivity calculated in the structure at the i^{th} slice (see formula 7 in section 4.2.1), $T_{ideal}(i)$ is the ideal transmissivity at the same i^{th} slice and n is the total number of slice. $Q_{r,front}$ is the reflective losses the front face, calculated during code execution, and Q_0 is the solar radiative flux of the light source. The calculation of Λ gives a value, comprising between 0 and 1 and the more this value is close to 1, the more the structure is considered to satisfying the specifications. To reach the higher possible value of Λ , modifications of the initial virtual structure can be made, for example, variations in the strut thickness or a rotation of this structure in space (modification of the impact of the solar flux incidence).

148
149

Figure 4 shows an example of an original structure, where the criterion is equal to 0.54, and an optimised structure, obtained after a rotation in space, and with a criterion equal to 0.70. The growth

150 of the criterion is due to a better absorption on space and lower absorption skips. Nevertheless, the
151 criterion is not closer to 1 because the losses by reflectivity on the front face and the transmissivity on
152 the rear face are high.



153
154 *Figure 4: Example of an optimization of a structure. On the left, the original structure and on the right, the final structure.*
155 *Black curve is the ideal transmission and blue curve is the transmission in each structure.*

156 Each step of the loop (generation/modification of the structure, calculation of the transmission and
157 calculation of the criterion) is carried out automatically but their sequence is done manually. One
158 iteration of the loop takes some minutes (a few seconds for the generation of the structure and about
159 twenty minutes for the ray tracing code).

160 After the numerical loop, the optimised structures are manufactured by 3D printing (binder jetting)
161 and then evaluated in the solar test bench (OPTISOL) [16] that reproduces, at the laboratory scale, the
162 conditions to which a high temperature solar volumetric receiver is subjected.

163 Finally, a digital step is carried out in parallel with the manufacturing and experimental tests. The flux
164 absorbed by the material structure is computed by ray tracing and included in a simulation of the
165 combined heat transfers. This code simulates the coupled conduction and radiation heat transfers, in
166 one hour approximatively on a 32 processor calculator. The fluid dynamics are not solved but a
167 constant convective heat transfer coefficient throughout the volume is considered. Once the
168 stationary regime is reached, a temperature field in the structure is established. Numerical outlet air
169 temperatures of the structures can thus be compared with the experimental results.

170 Two major simplifications were adopted in this approach.

171 The first concerns the approximation of the convective heat transfer with a coefficient instead of
172 solving the coupled fluid dynamics. The integration of a fluid dynamics code in the process would have
173 been computationally demanding.

174 The second simplification is the selection of structures after the loop on structure generation and ray
175 tracing (Figure 2). The ideal methodology would have been to choose the structures after having
176 carried out an optimisation loop on all the digital steps (blue cells in Figure 2). This option was not
177 selected because the heat transfer model was not considered precise enough due to the
178 approximation on the convection heat transfer.

179 Moreover, this simplification was made in our study because the distribution of the absorbed solar
180 energy and the specific surface area are considered the key parameters to maximise the energy
181 efficiency of the volumetric receiver [16,25,42,43,45].


182 **3. Experimental tools and methods**

183 **3.1 3D printing**

184 The manufacturing process of SiC structures with complex shapes consists of two major stages [2]. The
185 first stage is the printing of the part in its final shape using a binder jetting 3D printer (ZPrinter 310+
186 from ZCorporation, USA). The porous part thus obtained with low cohesion, which is called "raw", is
187 then subjected to different treatments in order to obtain the desired dense and cohesive SiC structure.
188 These post-processing treatments constitute the second major stage of the process used.

189 The raw part is obtained from a mixture of SiC powder ($d_{50}=25\mu\text{m}$, Sigma-Aldrich) and plaster powder
190 ($d_{50}=25\mu\text{m}$, ZCorp), with a SiC/plaster ratio of 56/44 wt%. The binder (ZCorp) is sprayed by a nozzle
191 moving in the XY plane, to consolidate a 100 μm deposited layer of a SiC/plaster powder in the defined
192 cross-sectional pattern. The deposition of a SiC/plaster powder layer and its consolidation by jetting of
193 binder is repeated until completion of the raw part. The cohesion of the raw part is ensured by the
194 plaster, which binds the SiC particles together, but the raw part remains brittle.

195 In order to obtain a final dense SiC part, several post-treatments were carried out. Firstly, the raw part
196 was immersed in a solution of SiC precursor (SMP-10, Starfire, USA) diluted in toluene (toluene/SMP-
197 10 = 40 wt%), in air and at room temperature, in order to impregnate the porous raw part with SiC.
198 The SMP-10 precursor was chosen because it is liquid at room temperature, it easily infiltrates the
199 porous structure and because it allows a high ceramisation rate (greater than 70%) [46–48]. Then, the
200 part was heated to 250°C in air for one hour (with a heating rate of 100°C/hour), then cooled down to
201 room temperature (cooling rate of 100°C/hour). This stage makes it possible to polymerise the
202 precursor and therefore to consolidate the raw part with a SiC (ex-precursor) lattice. A second heat
203 treatment is then carried out at 1000°C for two hours under argon (with an increase and decrease rate
204 of 100°C/hour). This pyrolysis makes it possible to ceramise the precursor [46,49]. In order to ensure
205 good cohesion of the part at this stage, the plaster still contained in the part can then be removed by
206 immersing the part in a hydrochloric acid bath at 50°C, in air, for four hours. This chemical removal of
207 the plaster leaves microporosity within the part, which is further partially filled by Chemical Vapour
208 Infiltration (CVI). Finally, a subsequent reinforcement was performed by Chemical Vapour Deposition
209 (CVD), to also fill a part of the microporosity, and mostly to create a solid skeleton of a few tens of
210 microns around the part. All these treatments (SMP-10 infiltration, CVI, CVD) reinforce the material
211 and improve its properties (thermal, mechanical, resistance to rusting, etc.). A complex material,
212 composed of several types of SiC, is thus obtained. This material, a cross section of which is shown in
213 Figure 5, was observed in a previous study [50]. In this same study, the conditions of these last two
214 reinforcements, as well as details regarding the manufacturing stages, are detailed.



215

216 *Figure 5: Cross-section of a sample after all treatments (SMP-10 infiltration, CVI, CVD). α -SiC is the SiC powder and PDC is the*
 217 *SiC from the SMP-10 precursor (from [50]).*

218 3.2 OPTISOL: on-sun test bench

219 3.2.1 Solar facility

220 The experimental device of the PROMES laboratory (CNRS, Odeillo, France) is divided into two parts.
 221 A small solar facility allows the solar flux to be concentrated and directed towards the OPTISOL test
 222 bench used to characterise samples of high temperature solar volumetric receivers.

223 Figure 6 shows the two parts. Sun rays are reflected by a 27m² heliostat towards a dish concentrator,
 224 after passing through a hatch. This is the “6 kW” solar facility at the PROMES laboratory. The dish is
 225 composed of 306 hexagonal facets, all oriented towards a focal point, making a total surface area of
 226 13.45 m². Once the solar rays are reflected on this surface, they are concentrated conically towards
 227 the OPTISOL test bench, with a half angle of 30°.



228

229 *Figure 6: The two parts constituting the experimental device. On the left, the heliostat and the hatch and, on the right, the*
 230 *OPTISOL test bench held by a mechanical arm (in grey) and the concentrator (above). The photographs were taken from*
 231 *[16].*

232 3.2.2 OPTISOL test bench

233 The purpose of the OPTISOL test bench [16] is to characterise the conversion efficiency of a
 234 concentrated solar flux into sensible heat transported by a high temperature atmospheric air flow
 235 thanks to a high temperature volumetric receiver. It consists of a fixed part and three interchangeable
 236 parts, depending on the type of measurement to be made.

237 The fixed part includes the following elements:

- 238 - A shutter, composed of eight fins, allowing the incident solar flux to be modulated,
- 239 - A glass flask, transparent to solar radiation, to separate the ambient air and the air injected
 240 into the system,
- 241 - A flow meter and a pressure sensor, to control the injected air flow,
- 242 - A homogeniser, to render the incident solar flux spatially uniform,
- 243 - A 5 cm diameter diaphragm, mounted on the homogeniser,
- 244 - Cooling water supplies for components exposed to the direct or overflowing solar flux,
- 245 - An infrared camera to measure the temperature distribution at the volumetric receiver inlet.

246

247 The interchangeable parts are:

- 248 - A cooled plate covered with a layer of magnesia to serve as a reflecting target in order to
 249 deduce the spatial distribution of the solar flux on the sample,
- 250 - A cooled black cavity, used as a calorimeter to deduce the value of the concentrated solar
 251 flux incident on the sample,
- 252 - An insulated sample holder with an outlet for the heated air flow, including thermocouples
 253 to measure the temperature of the volumetric receiver on its rear face.

254

255 3.2.3 Characterisation of samples

256 After the characterisation of the solar flux incident on the porous sample, the sample holder is inserted
 257 on the interchangeable part. The characterisation takes place in the following way. The hatch opens

258 to let the solar flux illuminate the dish. This solar flux, initially oriented by a heliostat, is reflected on
259 the "6 kW" dish and passes through the glass flask to irradiate the front face of the samples. The air,
260 separated from the ambient air by the glass flask, then circulates in the sample, from the front face to
261 the rear face. Its flow is controlled using a mass flow controller. Thermocouples in contact with the
262 rear face of the SiC sample measure its temperature, which can be associated with the fluid
263 temperature if thermal equilibrium between the solid and fluid phases is reached. By measuring the
264 incident solar flux, it is then possible to obtain an energy yield for the sample. More details about the
265 test bench and about the associated solar flux measurements can be found in [16].

266 4 Digital tools


267 4.1 Generation of virtual structures

268 The virtual structures were all discretised into cubic voxels, where each is representative of the
269 constituent of the medium it represents. The material properties were considered to be homogeneous
270 in each voxel.

271 In addition, in order to being able to work on the digitised structures obtained from experimental
272 characterisation (X-ray tomography, FIB / SEM), idealised structures with very varied shapes can also
273 be digitally generated. We classified all of the digital structures into two large families: "random" and
274 "organised" structures.

275 The so-called "random" structures correspond to those in which the solid skeleton of the virtual
276 structure is constructed through random laws. This is the case in particular of foams generated by
277 sphere growth, the position and radius of which are determined by normal or uniform laws, or even
278 by fibrous media, represented by cylinders with random or pseudo-random orientations.

279 The so-called "organised" structures are, in contrast to "random" structures, all those in which the
280 solid skeleton of the virtual structure is constructed in a deterministic way. This is the case of foams
281 generated by duplication of an elementary pattern (Kelvin cell, for example), structures based on
282 simple geometric shapes (cylinder, cone, sphere, etc.) and whose geometric parameters, position and
283 orientation are defined exactly, or structures based on surface equations (Figure 7).



284
285 *Figure 7: Examples of "organised" and periodic structures that we can generate. (a) Trellis-type honeycomb structure. (b)*
286 *Structure with sphere growth arranged in a Cartesian layout in space. (c) Structure resulting from a surface equation.*

287 For these two families of virtual structures it is possible to adjust one or more parameters (radius,
288 number of elementary objects, for example) in order to regulate the porosity and/or the volume

289 surface. Finally, the digital tools described allow us to design a multitude of digital structures with a
290 wide range of geometries.

291 4.2 Ray tracing

292 4.2.1 Computing code

293 The computing code developed makes it possible to model the energy distribution in a voxelised
294 structure with solar rays starting from one of its faces. Several million digital rays are generated. Their
295 initial starting point is located on the front face of the receiver and their initial direction is determined
296 by a pair of angles from the spherical coordinates system. All of the rays are evenly dispersed on the
297 front face (Cartesian section). The possible heterogeneity of the light source is considered by the
298 energy transported by each ray, which can be different depending on the position where it is located
299 on this front face.

300 A ray begins its path on the front face and propagates linearly within the volume. As soon as it meets
301 a voxel representing the solid wall, this voxel absorbs part of the energy of the ray, depending on the
302 absorptivity of the material represented by the voxel. The rest of the energy is transported by a new
303 ray whose initial position becomes that of the affected voxel. The direction of this new ray
304 (represented by a new pair of angles) is calculated using the Snell-Descartes law; the normal to each
305 wall voxel is determined by a preliminary calculation, consisting in applying respectively a Gaussian
306 blur and a Sobel filter over the entire structure. Then, the propagation of the new ray takes place in
307 the same way as previously.

308 In addition, if a ray reaches one of the six edges of the domain, then boundary conditions apply. In the
309 event of a periodic condition, the exiting ray is then replaced on the opposite edge with the same
310 energy and the same direction. In the case of a "free" condition, the ray leaves the domain and it is no
311 longer processed: the energy that it carries is added to that of all of the other rays having exited
312 through this face. In this way, it is easy to determine energy losses through reflection (ray having exited
313 through the front face) and through transmission (ray having exited through the rear face).

314 Once the simulation has ended, a loop traversing all of the voxels is made in order to count the energy
315 recovered by each voxel. In the case of a homogeneous source (with solar radiative flux Q_0), the solar
316 radiative flux $Q(i)$ of the incident flux transmitted throughout the depth of the structure is deduced
317 using the following formula:

$$Q(i) = Q_0 \left(1 - \sum_{p=1}^i A(p) - Q_{r,front} \right) \quad 6$$

318

319 where i is the index of the layer depth, $A(p)$ is the absorption of the slice p (deduced by adding the
320 energy of each voxel included in this slice) and $Q_{r,front}$ is the value of the losses on the front face. The
321 transmissivity at each slice i , $T(i)$ is deduced by the formula:

$$T(i) = \frac{Q(i)}{Q_0} \quad 7$$

322 **4.2.2 Simulation assumptions**

323 This computing code was developed respecting the following assumptions:

- 324 1- Part of the energy of a ray striking a wall voxel is absorbed and another part is reflected. No
325 part of this energy is transmitted, because of the strong absorptivity of the SiC material in the
326 solar radiation wavelength spectrum and associated photon extinction after only a few tens of
327 nanometres. Considering the size of the voxels used in this study (50 μm minimum),
328 transmission is therefore negligible.
- 329 2- Since the manufactured SiC material has strong absorptivity at high temperature [50], which
330 is about 0.9, ray scattering has been neglected and therefore their reflection is considered
331 specular.
- 332 3- The voxels corresponding to the fluid are considered to be voxels of air: we consider that the
333 energy of the rays is not absorbed when they pass through these voxels.
- 334 4- The incidence angles of the rays can have a very wide range of values, depending on the
335 modelling of the selected light source (here a heliostat).

336 **4.2.3 Validation**


337 Ray tracing code validation is based on the correspondence between the macroscopic extinction
338 coefficient obtained experimentally on SiC foams, and that calculated by the code, on equivalent foams
339 (same porosity and same average pore diameter).

340 Several formulas have been postulated, whether digitally or experimentally, to link the macroscopic
341 extinction coefficient of SiC foams with their porosity and average pore diameter [51–54]. To validate
342 the ray tracing code, we chose to refer to that provided by Hendricks and Howell [52] because it results
343 from an experimental study on SiC foams with high absorptivity (0.9), like the manufactured SiC
344 material produced in this work:

$$\beta = \frac{4.8}{d}(1 - \varphi) \quad 8$$

345 where β is the macroscopic extinction coefficient, d is the average pore diameter and φ is the porosity.
346 This formula is valid only if the porosity is equal to 80% and if the average pore diameter varies
347 between 0.6 and 2 mm. Thus, to respect the validity domain of the empirical formula (8), 6 virtual
348 foams were generated (examples in Figure 8) with these two parameters:


- 349 - 80% porosity for each of them;
350 - An average pore diameter varying between 0.8 mm and 1.8 mm, with a step of 0.2 mm.



351

352 *Figure 8: Example of three virtual foams made with 1200^3 voxels. Each of them has a porosity of 80%, a length of 2 cm and*
 353 *an increasing pore diameter.*

354 The procedure to determine a digital macroscopic extinction coefficient in each virtual foam takes
 355 places in three steps: i) a simulation with the ray tracing code where rays are launched with a normal
 356 incidence angle to the front surface and where both front and rear faces have “free” boundary
 357 conditions (the four others have periodic boundary conditions). The absorptivity of the solid skeleton
 358 is taken at 0.9; ii) at the end of the simulation, formula (6) is applied to obtain the curve of the intensity
 359 of the incident flux transmitted ($I(z)$) throughout the depth (z); iii) a least squares method is used
 360 between the curve obtained in the previous step and the Beer-Lambert law $I(z) = I_0 e^{-\beta z}$ to
 361 determine the digital macroscopic extinction coefficient (I_0 is the intensity of the incident flux
 362 transmitted on the front face). Figure 9 shows the results obtained for each simulation on different
 363 virtual foams. They are very close to the experimental curve resulting from formula (8).



364

365 *Figure 9: Result of the comparison between the extinction coefficients calculated for digital foams with 80% porosity and*
 366 *variable pore diameter and the relationship stated by Hendricks and Howell [52].*

367

368 4.3 Heat transfer simulations

369 4.3.1 Computing code

370 The high temperatures reached in volumetric receivers led us to use a computing code coupling heat
 371 transfers by conduction and by radiation developed by Niezgodna et al. [1]. This code, where basic
 372 equations are widely described in the previous reference, is based on a discretisation by finite
 373 differences of the heat equation coupled with the Radiation Transfer Equation (RTE). For each voxel i ,
 374 a flux balance equation can be written:

$$\sum_{k=1}^6 \frac{2\delta\lambda_i\lambda_k}{\lambda_i + \lambda_k} (T_k - T_i) + \pi\delta^2 \sum_{k=1}^6 (I_k^e - I_k^s) = 0 \quad 9$$

375 Where k iterate on his six neighbours voxels, λ and T are respectively the thermal conductivity and
 376 the temperature (air or solid, depend of the nature of the voxel or his neighbour), δ is the size of a
 377 voxel, I^e is the inlet intensity on the k -face and I^s is the outlet intensity on the k -face. Two equations
 378 link these last two intensities. The first one, which indicates that the outlet intensity on the j -face of
 379 the voxel i is dependent on the inlet intensity of the five others faces of the voxel, is given by:

$$I_j^s = \sum_{k=1}^5 (I_k^e - I_i^0) F_k + I_i^0 \quad 10$$

380 Where I_i^0 is the intensity of the blackbody (dependant on T) and F_k is a special form ratio with
 381 absorption. The second equation indicates, for a face j of the voxel i , that the inlet intensity is the sum
 382 of the transmitted intensity of the outlet intensity of the neighbour voxel (in contact with this j -face)
 383 and the reflected outlet intensity on this j -face of this voxel i :

$$I_j^e = \tau_k I_k^s + \rho_i I_i^s \quad 11$$

384 Where τ_k and ρ_i are respectively the transmittivity on the face j of the neighbour k and the reflectivity
 385 on the face j of the voxel i .

386 The radiative boundary conditions of each voxel positioned at the boundaries are:

- 387 • If a flux ϕ_0 is imposed: $I_j^e = \phi_0$, where j is the boundary face;
- 388 • If a temperature T_{imp} is imposed: $I_j^e = \varepsilon I^0(T_{imp})$, where ε is the emissivity of the voxel

389 There are 13 unknowns per voxel (6 inlet intensities, 6 outlet intensities and the temperature). The
 390 problem can be simplified from thirteen to seven unknowns per voxel by injecting equations (9) into
 391 equations (10). In fact, the system to be solved is composed of $7 \times N$ unknowns (6 inlet intensities and
 392 the temperature), where N is the total number of voxel. For this study, this code was slightly modified
 393 in terms of the resolution of the matrix system. The $7 \times N$ unknowns of the problem are no longer
 394 determined by the minimisation of a single system, but rather by the iterative resolution of two
 395 coupled systems, one governing the $6 \times N$ intensities and the other governing the N temperatures. This
 396 modification made it possible on the one hand to decrease the computation time and, on the other
 397 hand, to deal with complex structures, such as those on which we wish to work, because this
 398 mathematical scheme is more stable, in particular in the case where air and solid temperatures are
 399 highly different.

400 4.3.2 Assumptions


401 Various assumptions are made in this thermal computing code:

- 402 1) The intensities are isotropic per half-space on each face of each voxel. Two intensities are
403 therefore considered per face (front and back).
- 404 2) The properties and radiative quantities of each constituent are independent of the wavelength
405 (grey medium). This amounts to considering average properties and radiative quantities. This
406 assumption, which may seem to be a strong assumption, is nevertheless legitimate because
407 the temperature field sought results from the consideration of energy quantities that integrate
408 all of the contributions of each wavelength.
- 409 3) For a reason of calculating time-consuming, the thermophysical and radiative properties of air
410 and solid are independent of the temperature. This point will be improved for future work.
- 411 4) The internal exchange coefficient between the solid/air interface is constant within the
412 volume. The internal air reference temperature associated with the internal exchange
413 coefficient is assumed to be the mean air temperature within the whole volume.

414 5 Results and discussion

415 5.1 Virtual structures generated

416 The three virtual structures resulting from the digital optimisation loop (see “General approach” and
417 Figure 2) are shown in Figure 10. They are all cylindrical, measuring 5 cm in diameter and about 5 cm
418 in depth. These dimensions correspond to the size of the samples imposed by the OPTISOL test bench.



419

420 *Figure 10: Three structures generated, with a voxel size of 167 μm . Left: Modified gyroid. Centre: Forest of cones. Right:*
421 *Criss-crossed cones*

422 The first is a modified TPMS (Triply Periodic Minimal Surface) structure. It was first generated according
423 to the approximation of its surface equation given by [55]:

$$\sin(2\pi x) \cos(2\pi y) + \sin(2\pi y) \cos(2\pi z) + \cos(2\pi x) \sin(2\pi z) = 0 \quad 12$$

424 where x , y and z are the coordinates of any point belonging to a Cartesian coordinates system and
425 satisfying this equation. It then underwent two modifications. The first was an elongation along its
426 depth; to achieve this, we replaced z in formula 12 with $z/2$. The second modification was a 45°
427 rotation along one of the two axes perpendicular to the depth. Its wall thickness was 667 microns. This
428 value corresponds to a compromise allowing a high specific surface area to be achieved, while retaining

429 the ability to produce the part with the ZPrinter 310+. Indeed, the size of the smallest achievable details
430 is around 500 μm . Its volume surface area and its porosity are, respectively, 333.28 m^{-1} and 92.21%.

431 The second structure generated is a structure based on a "cone forest", and inspired by Olalde et al.
432 [56]. Several cones, spaced apart, are staggered in space. They are all oriented perpendicular to the
433 front face and oriented in such a way that their truncated apexes coincide with this face. In order to
434 ensure a single-piece structure, cylindrical bars connect the neighbouring cones to each other, from
435 the top of one to the centre of the base of the other. Due to its cone-based composition, this structure
436 has a porosity gradient, from the front face (greater porosity) to the rear face (lower porosity). Its
437 overall porosity is 71.63% and it has a volume surface area of 479.54 m^{-1}

438 The third structure studied is also composed of cones. These are regularly arranged in space, but for
439 this geometry the axis of the cones is not perpendicular to the front face. They are oriented to criss-
440 cross at different levels to form regular cells, the ligament section of which is increasingly higher with
441 depth. This structure, also exhibiting a porosity gradient as a function of depth, can be assimilated with
442 modification of the structures currently being studied (foams, honeycombs): it is composed of regular
443 cells, but with different geometric characteristics depending on their depth. Its average porosity is
444 77.33%, and its volume surface area is 558.42 m^{-1}

445 5.2 Solar absorption and energy distribution


446 The ray tracing code, described above, was applied to the three virtual structures generated. For these
447 three simulations, the numerical parameters were identical, and are summarised in Table 1.

Characteristics	Parameters
Light source shape	Conical
Light source opening half-angle	30°
Number of rays traced per voxel	32
Solid absorption	0.9
Boundary conditions	Free for the 6 faces

448 *Table 1: Parameters used for ray tracing simulations*

449 To comply with the conditions of the OPTISOL test bench, the light source chosen for these simulations
450 was conical and had an opening half-angle of 30°. This source was, in addition, discretised into 32 rays
451 per voxel. The solar absorptivity of the solid skeleton was set at 0.9, and therefore its solar reflectivity
452 was 0.1 (no transmissivity). The boundary conditions were free for all 6 faces, which implies the rays
453 are not reintegrated into the domain (by reflection or by periodicity) once they reach one of these 6
454 faces.

455 The intensity of the incident flux transmitted (formula 6) through the three structures is shown in
456 Figure 11. For comparison, the curve of the intensity of the incident flux transmitted in a foam with
457 80% porosity and a pore diameter equal to 2 mm is plotted. This foam was generated with the
458 numerical tools described above, and the result is consistent with Chen et al. [57]. The three complex
459 geometries exhibit a much lower extinction rate than the foam curve in the inlet zone (between 1 and
460 2 cm depth, see Figure 11), but this rate is still higher than the ideal curve. And, after this zone, the
461 extinction rate drastically decreases to a constant transmissivity value due to the presence of holes at
462 the end of the sample geometry.



463

464 *Figure 11: Simulation results on the three virtual structures generated. Dotted lines: ideal transmission curve. Full lines:*
 465 *dimensionless transmission calculated for the three structures.*

466 For the modified Gyroid structure, extinction skips are almost non-existent due to the geometric
 467 continuity of the structure. However, absorption on the front face is not negligible (approximately 10%
 468 of the total flux), as evidenced by the drop in transmission at zero depth. To improve this point, it
 469 would have been necessary to decrease the volume of solid on the front face, but that would certainly
 470 have been problematic for manufacturing. Transmission through the rear face is high (about 8% of the
 471 total flux), because this structure is very porous. A fairly significant loss of energy is expected during
 472 the characterisation in the OPTISOL test bench, which will necessarily affect the final energy yield.

473 The structure organised into a cone forest presents a smooth extinction of solar radiation along the
 474 depth due to the continuous cone structure. In addition, transmission through the rear face, of
 475 approximately 5% of the incident solar flux, is a low value, which makes this structure efficient with
 476 respect to solar absorption. However, its weakest point is the absorption on the front face, of
 477 approximately 8% of the incident solar flux, due to the truncation of the cone tips.

478 The transmissivity curve of the criss-crossed structure exhibits extinction skips due to the regular
 479 position of the strut connections and transmission through the rear face is weak (about 5% of the
 480 incident solar flux)

481 5.3 Thermal distribution

482 After analysing the transmissivity curves for these three structures, the thermal distribution induced
 483 by solar absorption was modelled. Simulations with the thermal computing code presented above
 484 were carried out.

485 The energy distribution in each voxel, expressed as thermal flux (W/m^2), becomes a source term for
 486 this computation. The material properties used are shown in Table 2.

Properties	Air/Solid	Values
Thermal conductivity $W.m^{-1}.K^{-1}$	Air	0.06
	SiC	15
Absorption coefficient m^{-1}	Air	0
	SiC	Imposed to have an absorptivity of 0.9
Extinction coefficient m^{-1}	Air	0
	SiC	Imposed to have an emissivity of 0.9
Complex optical index component	Air	$n=1; k=0$
	SiC	$n=2.58; k=0.005$
Internal convection coefficient – $W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$		100 - 150

Table 2: Properties of the materials used for thermal computations

487

488 The complex optical index of the solid was found in [58] and assumed independent of temperature.
 489 Absorptivity and emissivity, as well as that of the thermal conductivity of the solid, also independent
 490 of temperature, come from [50], which lists some properties of the SiC material that we manufactured
 491 (3D printing by binder jetting, thermal treatments, plaster elimination, SMP-10 infiltration, CVI and
 492 then CVD). The heat exchange coefficient by convection is constant within the structure for an airflow
 493 at 1 g/s [59]. All these values were taken for a temperature of 873K.

494 The boundary conditions are as follows:

- 495 • Four lateral faces: adiabatic for solid and air phases.
- 496 • Front face: air temperature is imposed at 293 K and a convection condition is assumed for the
 497 solid (exchange coefficient equal to $10 W/m^2/K$, air reference temperature equal to 293 K).
- 498 • Rear face: a convection condition is assumed for the solid (exchange coefficient equal to 10
 499 $W/m^2/K$, air reference temperature equal to the air on this same face, and therefore
 500 determined iteratively).

501 Result simulations

502 Two simulations were carried out on each structure: one with an internal convection coefficient of 100
 503 $W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$, and another with an internal convection coefficient of $150 W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$. The results of the
 504 thermal simulations, with an internal convection coefficient of $100 W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$, are shown in Figure 12.
 505 For each structure, either air or solid temperature profiles have the same behaviour. The curves
 506 increase to a maximum, located at a depth of about 1 cm for the air and about 0.5 cm for the solid,
 507 then decrease to the rear face. The rise in the temperature curve of the solid close to the front face of
 508 the receiver is significant of a gradual absorption of the solar flux, tending towards the beginning of a
 509 volumetric effect. However, the following decrease is significant of a strong absorption in the zone
 510 where the maximum temperature is located, thus preventing the volume effect from being
 511 established.


512 For the forest of cones structure, the solid temperature curve is smooth because there are no
 513 absorption skips of the solar flux, as shown in Figure 11. At the rear face, for an internal convection
 514 coefficient of $100 W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$, the solid temperature is equal to 1272 K and the air temperature is equal
 515 to 1227 K. For an internal convection coefficient of $150 W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$, these temperatures are respectively
 516 equal to 1222 K and 1189 K.

517 For the criss-crossed cones structure, the solid temperature curve is broken where the absorption of
 518 the solar flux included skips (see Figure 11). At the rear face, for an internal convection coefficient of

519 100 W.m⁻².K⁻¹, air and solid temperatures are very close and are respectively equal to 1183 K and 1181
520 K. For an internal convection coefficient of 150 W.m⁻².K⁻¹, these temperatures are respectively equal
521 to 1175 K and 1174 K.

522 For the modified gyroid structure, the solid temperature curve is discontinuous, and a plateau is
523 present between 0.45 cm and 1.15 cm in depth. Unlike the criss-crossed cones structure, they are not
524 due to solar flux absorption skips (see Figure 11). Initially, the gyroid structure is periodic and its
525 volume fraction is constant throughout the depth. However, in this work, it was rotated with respect
526 to an axis perpendicular to the depth, thus making this structure non-periodic and with a volume
527 fraction not evolving linearly or constantly with depth. In addition, since the structure is thin, the
528 temperature distribution over a slice of the depth can be very scattered. At the rear face, for an internal
529 convection coefficient of 100 W.m⁻².K⁻¹, the solid temperature is equal to 1170 K and the air
530 temperature is equal to 1208 K. For an internal convection coefficient of 150 W.m⁻².K⁻¹, these
531 temperatures are respectively equal to 1147 K and 1177 K.

532



533

534

535

Figure 12: Results of thermal simulations on the 3 virtual structures, for an internal convection coefficient of $100 \text{ W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{K}^{-1}$.
 A: Forest of cones structure. B: Criss-crossed cones structure. C: Modified gyroid structure.

536

5.4 Manufacturing

537

538

539

540


541

542

543

The three structures were produced by the process described in Part III. The structures are shown in Figure 13 at two different stages: before reinforcement by CVI/CVD and after. A 3D microscope image was also produced after the reinforcement stage, on the one hand in order to measure the thickness of the ligaments at the end of the process and, on the other hand, to observe the surface finish. For the three structures, the surface shows a granular appearance despite the CVD post-treatment, which must limit the “staircase” effect due to the layer-by-layer manufacture of the part. Compared to the theoretical models, the wall thickness of the structures is approximately 100 to 150 μm greater,

544 reflecting the difficulty in mastering the entire production chain, which combines various processes
545 (additive manufacturing and CVI/CVD).



546
547 *Figure 13: Three printed structures. From top to bottom: Modified gyroid, forest of cones and criss-crossed cones. On the left:*
548 *after CVI / CVD reinforcement. On the right: 3D microscope images (after reinforcement) showing the surface finish and*
549 *thickness of the ligaments.*

550 The structure organised into a cone forest suffered some damage at the most fragile locations of its
551 perimeter during the post-treatment stages. However, the consequences with regard to the solar flux
552 absorption are minimal, since this damage is located at the edges.

553 5.5 Tests on the OPTISOL test bench

554 The structures, once manufactured, were tested on the OPTISOL test bench (Table 3). For each
555 structure, the tests were carried out with a mass flow of 1 g/s. The energy efficiency η was calculated
556 using the following formula, where T_{air}^{in} is the air temperature at the inlet, equal to 293 K:
557

$$\eta = \frac{\varphi_{inc}}{\dot{m}C_p(T_{air}^{out} - T_{air}^{in})}$$

558
559
560
561
562

φ_{inc} is the incident flux, measured for each test, \dot{m} is the mass flow of air, C_p is the specific heat of air and T_{air}^{out} is the outlet air temperature, measured at the outlet of the tested sample. The values of the incident flux, lateral losses and the outlet temperature determined digitally (for comparison) are also indicated in this table.

Structure	φ_{inc}	Lateral losses	η	T_{air}^{out} (experimental)	T_{air}^{out} (numerical)
	kW/m ²	kW/m ²	-	K	K
Modified gyroid	944	178	0.47	1098	[1177 – 1208]
Forest of cones	942	146	0.49	1133	[1189 – 1227]
Criss-crossing cones	928	199	0.44	1038	[1175 – 1183]

563
564

Table 3: Results of tests carried out on the OPTISOL test bench for the three printed structures. Numerical values obtained after thermal simulations are also given for comparison.

565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576

Experimental tests show outlet air temperatures between 1038 K and 1133 K and energy yields between 0.44 and 0.49. Among these three structures, the best performances were obtained for the forest of cones structure. This is explained by the fact that this structure offers the best compromise between porosity (for uniform absorption in depth) and volume surface area (for greater local convective exchanges). Conversely, the structure with the worst performance was the criss-crossed cones structure. This structure, with a greater surface area than the other two, absorbs the incident solar flux very quickly (the volume of the structure is not well exploited, see Figure 11). It can also be noted that, for the three structures, lateral losses were very significant: they can represent up to around 20% of the incident solar flux. These losses are mainly due to conduction through the insulation in contact with the cooled optical homogeniser, which acts as a heat sink (producing a heat flux through the insulation). These losses were monitored by using the cooled homogenizer as a calorimeter which was previously calibrated on-sun without the sample holder and the heated insulation.

577
578
579
580
581

Mey-Cloutier et al. [16] performed similar tests on the same setup, but with SiC foams having higher specific surface area. For an incident solar flux of 884 kW/m² and a mass air flow rate equal to 1 g/s, they reported a temperature of the exiting air of 1271 K, for an energy efficiency of 0.59. The lower values of the temperatures of outlet air and energy yields recorded in this study may be explained by the following three points:

582
583
584
585


- 1) The specific surface area is too small in the inlet zone leading to weak convective exchanges.
- 2) Not all the incident solar flux is intercepted by the geometry, it is either absorbed by the sample holder lateral walls (due to high porosity of the samples) or transmitted.
- 3) The lateral losses are considerable.

586
587
588
589

The comparison between the experimental and the numerical outlet temperature shows an important difference (103.5 K on average). The principal reasons are the large thermal losses through the lateral walls of the sample holder and the approximation of the convective heat transfer where both the

590 internal exchange coefficient and the associated internal air reference temperature have been set at
591 a constant value. For a more precise numerical result, fluid dynamics must be modelled in future works.
592 Nevertheless, numerical hierarchy between the outlet air temperature for the three structures is the
593 same as the experimental hierarchy.

594 Images of the front face of the structures provided by the thermal camera during the tests (Figure 14,
595 at the top) and pictures of the structures after the tests (Figure 14, centre) confirm that the
596 temperatures computed are relevant (Figure 14, bottom).



597
598 *Figure 14: Top: black body equivalent temperature images at the front for an air flow equal to 1 g/s. Centre: Pictures of the*
599 *structures after the tests. Bottom: Numerical results. From left to right: modified gyroid structure, forest of cones structure*
600 *and criss-crossed cones structure.*

601
602 The pictures of the three structures after testing show a blue iridescent layer formed where the
603 maximum values are reached numerically. Analysis by electron probe microanalyser of a printed
604 sample subjected to the same exposure conditions as on the OPTISOL bench (Figure 15), shows an
605 oxidised silica (SiO_2) layer formed after air has passed through the hottest parts of the structures.




Figure 15: Electron probe microanalyses of a sample manufactured by the same process sequence as the structures. Left, analysis of a non-bluish area; Right, analysis of a bluish area (oxidation layer).

6 Conclusions and perspectives

This work demonstrates that digital material engineering methodology is promising for optimising a ceramic architecture. Following the application of this approach to high temperature volumetric STPP receivers, it has been shown that new geometries, made of SiC and with complex shapes, can be manufactured by 3D printing (binder jetting).

After numerical structure optimisation, performed using an iterative loop between the generation of the structures and ray tracing, 3 structures were printed and tested on the OPTISOL test bench of the PROMES laboratory. In parallel with the experimental tests, conductive-radiative simulations, without modelling of the fluid dynamics, were carried out on these 3 structures, in order to compare the numerical and experimental results. Despite the presence of large experimental losses, the comparison shows that the numerical results are in acceptable agreement with the experimental values.

The experimental tests highlighted the following points:

- The material manufactured by 3D printing withstands the conditions of high temperature volumetric receivers.
- A layer of silica formed at the hottest parts of the structure.
- The performances of these new geometries are lower than those of the conventional foams normally used because they had an insufficient specific surface area, even if the temperatures of the outlet air reached a maximum of 1133 K.

628 These first results are very encouraging, since it is recommended to have an air temperature at the
629 outlet of the receiver above 750°C [60]. However, the receiver efficiency must be greater than 75%,
630 which was not achieved in this study (maximum 49%). Thus, improvements to the receiver shape and
631 the digital model should be implemented in future work.

632
633 In terms of the shape of the receiver, in a general manner, it would be interesting to generate
634 structures that are closed on the sides to limit lateral losses and with a higher specific surface area.
635 This last point can be solved by the generation of new geometries and/or by manufacturing using
636 stereolithography. This process would make it possible to manufacture structures with higher
637 resolution and therefore increase their specific surface area.

638
639 In terms of material, it is possible to modify the SiC/plaster ratio of the initial powder. This would make
640 it possible to obtain a final material with a different microstructure comprising more or less residual
641 porosity. The thermal and optical properties would be modified, thus implying different solar
642 absorption and thermal distributions.

643
644 In terms of simulation, to fully optimise the structures, i.e. comprising thermal simulations in the
645 optimisation loop, thermal simulations must be coupled with fluid dynamics to have a local internal
646 exchange coefficient, and not constant such as in this study. This will therefore result in more precise
647 results.

648 **References**

- 649
- 650 [1] M. Niezgodá, D. Rochais, F. Enguehard, B. Rousseau, P. Echegut, Modeling heat transfer
651 within porous multiconstituent materials, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. 369 (2012).
652 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/369/1/012001>.
- 653 [2] P. David, T. Piquero, J. Martegoutte, F. Schuster, Matériau céramique composite particulière,
654 pièce le comprenant, et procédé de préparation de cette pièce, 3074171A1, 2017.
- 655 [3] M. Pelanconi, E. Rezaei, A. Ortona, Cellular ceramic architectures produced by hybrid additive
656 manufacturing: a review on the evolution of their design, *Journal of the Ceramic Society of*
657 *Japan*. 128 (2020) 595–604. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.2109/jcersj2.2007>.
- 658 [4] A.L. Ávila-Marín, Volumetric receivers in Solar Thermal Power Plants with Central Receiver
659 System technology: A review, *Solar Energy*. 85 (2011) 891–910.
660 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2011.02.002>.
- 661 [5] C.K. Ho, B.D. Iverson, Review of high-temperature central receiver designs for concentrating
662 solar power, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 29 (2014) 835–846.
663 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2013.08.099>.
- 664 [6] F. Gomez-Garcia, J. González-Aguilar, G. Olalde, M. Romero, Thermal and hydrodynamic
665 behavior of ceramic volumetric absorbers for central receiver solar power plants: A review,

- 666 Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews. 57 (2016) 648–658.
667 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.106>.
- 668 [7] C.K. Ho, Advances in central receivers for concentrating solar applications, *Solar Energy*. 152
669 (2017) 38–56. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2017.03.048>.
- 670 [8] J.-F.P. Pitot de la Beaujardiere, H.C.R. Reuter, A review of performance modelling studies
671 associated with open volumetric receiver CSP plant technology, *Renewable and Sustainable*
672 *Energy Reviews*. 82 (2018) 3848–3862.
673 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.10.086>.
- 674 [9] S. Alexopoulos, B. Hoffschmidt, Advances in solar tower technology, *Wiley Interdisciplinary*
675 *Reviews: Energy and Environment*. 6 (2017) e217. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wene.217>.
- 676 [10] O. Behar, A. Khellaf, K. Mohammedi, A review of studies on central receiver solar thermal
677 power plants, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 23 (2013) 12–39.
678 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2013.02.017>.
- 679 [11] M. Boehmer, M. Becker, M. Sanchez, Development of Volumetric Air Receivers, (1991).
- 680 [12] T. Fend, High porosity materials as volumetric receivers for solar energetics, 2010.
- 681 [13] B. Hoffschmidt, F.M. Téllez, A. Valverde, J. Fernández, V. Fernández, Performance evaluation
682 of the 200-kWth HiTRec-II open volumetric air receiver, *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering,*
683 *Transactions of the ASME*. 125 (2003) 87–94. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.1530627>.
- 684 [14] J. Karni, A. Kribus, R. Rubin, P. Doron, The “Porcupine”: A Novel High-Flux Absorber for
685 Volumetric Solar Receivers, *Journal of Solar Energy Engineering*. 120 (1998) 85–95.
686 <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2888060>.
- 687 [15] M. Böhmer, C. Chaza, The ceramic foil volumetric receiver, *Solar Energy Materials*. 24 (1991)
688 182–191. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1633\(91\)90058-S](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1633(91)90058-S).
- 689 [16] S. Mey-Cloutier, C. Caliot, A. Kribus, Y. Gray, G. Flamant, Experimental study of ceramic foams
690 used as high temperature volumetric solar absorber, *Solar Energy*. 136 (2016) 226–235.
691 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2016.06.066>.
- 692 [17] A. Kribus, H. Ries, W. Spirkl, Inherent Limitations of Volumetric Solar Receivers, *Journal of*
693 *Solar Energy Engineering*. 118 (1996) 151–155.
694 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2870891>.
- 695 [18] H.W. Price, D.D. Whitney, H.I. Beebe, SMUD Kokhala Power Tower Study, (1997).
- 696 [19] M. Posnansky, T. Pylkkänen, Development and testing of a volumetric gas receiver for high-
697 temperature applications, *Solar Energy Materials*. 24 (1991) 204–209.
698 [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1633\(91\)90060-X](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1633(91)90060-X).
- 699 [20] W.E.C. Pritzkow, Pressure loaded volumetric ceramic receiver, *Solar Energy Materials*. 24
700 (1991) 498–507. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1633\(91\)90086-Z](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1633(91)90086-Z).

- 701 [21] M. Becker, Th. Fend, B. Hoffschmidt, R. Pitz-Paal, O. Reutter, V. Stamatov, M. Steven, D.
702 Trimis, Theoretical and numerical investigation of flow stability in porous materials applied as
703 volumetric solar receivers, *Solar Energy*. 80 (2006) 1241–1248.
704 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2005.11.006>.
- 705 [22] G. Barreto, P. Canhoto, M. Collares-Pereira, Parametric analysis and optimisation of porous
706 volumetric solar receivers made of open-cell SiC ceramic foam, *Energy*. 200 (2020).
707 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.117476>.
- 708 [23] T. Fend, B. Hoffschmidt, R. Pitz-Paal, O. Reutter, P. Rietbrock, Porous materials as open
709 volumetric solar receivers: Experimental determination of thermophysical and heat transfer
710 properties, *Energy*. 29 (2004) 823–833. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-5442\(03\)00188-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-5442(03)00188-9).
- 711 [24] S. Du, M.J. Li, Q. Ren, Q. Liang, Y.L. He, Pore-scale numerical simulation of fully coupled heat
712 transfer process in porous volumetric solar receiver, *Energy*. 140 (2017) 1267–1275.
713 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.08.062>.
- 714 [25] A. Kribus, Y. Gray, M. Grijnevich, G. Mittelman, S. Mey-Cloutier, C. Caliot, The promise and
715 challenge of solar volumetric absorbers, *Solar Energy*. 110 (2014) 463–481.
716 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2014.09.035>.
- 717 [26] Z. Wu, C. Caliot, G. Flamant, Z. Wang, Coupled radiation and flow modeling in ceramic foam
718 volumetric solar air receivers, *Solar Energy*. 85 (2011) 2374–2385.
719 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2011.06.030>.
- 720 [27] S. Luque, G. Menéndez, M. Rocca-bruna, J. González-Aguilar, L. Crema, M. Romero, Exploiting
721 volumetric effects in novel additively manufactured open solar receivers, *Solar Energy*. 174
722 (2018) 342–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2018.09.030>.
- 723 [28] C. Caliot, P.M. Déjardin, Numerical demonstration of the volumetric effect in a high specific
724 surface absorber with Kelvin cells, in: *AIP Conference Proceedings*, American Institute of
725 Physics Inc., 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5117523>.
- 726 [29] M. Pelanconi, S. Zavattoni, L. Cornolti, R. Puragliesi, E. Arrivabeni, L. Ferrari, S. Gianella, M.
727 Barbato, A. Ortona, Application of Ceramic Lattice Structures to Design Compact, High
728 Temperature Heat Exchangers: Material and Architecture Selection, *Materials* 2021, Vol. 14,
729 Page 3225. 14 (2021) 3225. <https://doi.org/10.3390/MA14123225>.
- 730 [30] M. Pelanconi, P. Colombo, A. Ortona, Additive manufacturing of silicon carbide by selective
731 laser sintering of PA12 powders and polymer infiltration and pyrolysis, *Journal of the*
732 *European Ceramic Society*. 41 (2021) 5056–5065.
733 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEURCERAMSOC.2021.04.014>.
- 734 [31] C. Pan, Y. Han, J. Lu, Design and Optimization of Lattice Structures: A Review, *Applied Sciences*
735 2020, Vol. 10, Page 6374. 10 (2020) 6374. <https://doi.org/10.3390/APP10186374>.
- 736 [32] O. Santoliquido, F. Camerota, A. Ortona, The influence of topology on DLP 3D printing,
737 debinding and sintering of ceramic periodic architectures designed to replace bulky

- 738 components, *Open Ceramics*. 5 (2021) 100059.
739 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OCERAM.2021.100059>.
- 740 [33] T. Chartier, A. Badev, *Rapid prototyping of Ceramics*, Elsevier, 2013.
741 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385469-8.00028.9>.
- 742 [34] Y. de Hazan, D. Penner, SiC and SiOC ceramic articles produced by stereolithography of
743 acrylate modified polycarbosilane systems, *Journal of the European Ceramic Society*. 37
744 (2017) 5205–5212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2017.03.021>.
- 745 [35] Z.C. Eckel, C. Zhou, J.H. Martin, A.J. Jacobsen, W.B. Carter, T.A. Schaedler, Additive
746 manufacturing of polymer-derived ceramics, *Science*. 351 (2016) 58–62.
747 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad2688>.
- 748 [36] S. Li, W. Duan, T. Zhao, W. Han, L. Wang, R. Dou, G. Wang, The fabrication of SiBCN ceramic
749 components from preceramic polymers by digital light processing (DLP) 3D printing
750 technology, *Journal of the European Ceramic Society*. 38 (2018) 4597–4603.
751 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2018.06.046>.
- 752 [37] J. Schmidt, P. Colombo, Digital light processing of ceramic components from polysiloxanes,
753 *Journal of the European Ceramic Society*. 38 (2018) 57–66.
754 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2017.07.033>.
- 755 [38] E. Zanchetta, M. Cattaldo, G. Franchin, M. Schwentenwein, J. Homa, G. Brusatin, P. Colombo,
756 *Stereolithography of SiOC Ceramic Microcomponents*, *Advanced Materials*. 28 (2016) 370–
757 376. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.201503470>.
- 758 [39] Z. Fu, L. Schlier, N. Travitzky, P. Greil, Three-dimensional printing of SiSiC lattice truss
759 structures, *Materials Science and Engineering A*. 560 (2013) 851–856.
760 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.msea.2012.09.107>.
- 761 [40] C. Polzin, D. Günther, H. Seitz, 3D Printing of Porous Al₂O₃ and SiC ceramics, *Journal of*
762 *Ceramic Science and Technology*. 6 (2015) 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.4416/JCST2015-00013>.
- 764 [41] A. Zocca, C.M. Gomes, A. Staude, E. Bernardo, J. Günster, P. Colombo, SiOC ceramics with
765 ordered porosity by 3D-printing of a preceramic polymer, *Journal of Materials Research*. 28
766 (2013) 2243–2252. <https://doi.org/10.1557/jmr.2013.129>.
- 767 [42] S. Du, Z.Y. Li, Y.L. He, D. Li, X.Q. Xie, Y. Gao, Experimental and numerical analysis of the
768 hydraulic and thermal performances of the gradually-varied porous volumetric solar receiver,
769 *Science China Technological Sciences*. 63 (2020) 1224–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11431-020-1580-2>.
- 771 [43] F. Gomez Garcia, J. Gonzalez-Aguilar, S. Tamayo-Pacheco, G. Olalde, M. Romero, Numerical
772 analysis of radiation attenuation in volumetric solar receivers composed of a stack of thin
773 monolith layers, in: *Energy Procedia*, Elsevier Ltd, 2014: pp. 457–466.
774 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.10.199>.

- 775 [44] Q. Zhu, Y. Xuan, Improving the performance of volumetric solar receivers with a spectrally
776 selective gradual structure and swirling characteristics, *Energy*. 172 (2019) 467–476.
777 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.01.166>.
- 778 [45] S. Du, M.J. Li, Y. He, Z.Y. Li, Experimental and numerical study on the reflectance losses of the
779 porous volumetric solar receiver, *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells*. 214 (2020).
780 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solmat.2020.110558>.
- 781 [46] R. Sreeja, B. Swaminathan, A. Painuly, T. v. Sebastian, S. Packirisamy,
782 Allylhydridopolycarbosilane (AHPCS) as matrix resin for C/SiC ceramic matrix composites,
783 *Materials Science and Engineering B: Solid-State Materials for Advanced Technology*. 168
784 (2010) 204–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mseb.2009.12.033>.
- 785 [47] J. Yin, S.H. Lee, L. Feng, Y. Zhu, X. Liu, Z. Huang, S.Y. Kim, I.S. Han, The effects of SiC precursors
786 on the microstructures and mechanical properties of SiCf/SiC composites prepared via
787 polymer impregnation and pyrolysis process, *Ceramics International*. 41 (2015) 4145–4153.
788 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceramint.2014.11.112>.
- 789 [48] S.C. Zunjarrao, A. Rahman, R.P. Singh, Characterization of the evolution and properties of
790 silicon carbide derived from a preceramic polymer precursor, *Journal of the American Ceramic*
791 *Society*. 96 (2013) 1869–1876. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jace.12273>.
- 792 [49] S. Kaur, R. Riedel, E. Ionescu, Pressureless fabrication of dense monolithic SiC ceramics from a
793 polycarbosilane, *Journal of the European Ceramic Society*. 34 (2014) 3571–3578.
794 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2014.05.002>.
- 795 [50] A. Baux, A. Goillot, S. Jacques, C. Heisel, D. Rochais, L. Charpentier, P. David, T. Piquero, T.
796 Chartier, G. Chollon, Synthesis and properties of macroporous SiC ceramics synthesized by 3D
797 printing and chemical vapor infiltration/deposition, *Journal of the European Ceramic Society*.
798 40 (2020) 2834–2854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeurceramsoc.2020.03.001>.
- 799 [51] B. Dietrich, T. Fishedick, S. Heissler, P.G. Weidler, C. Wöll, M. Kind, Optical parameters for
800 characterization of thermal radiation in ceramic sponges - Experimental results and
801 correlation, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*. 79 (2014) 655–665.
802 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2014.08.023>.
- 803 [52] T.J. Hendricks, J.R. Howell, Absorption / Scattering Coefficients and Scattering Phase Functions
804 in Reticulated Porous Ceramics, *Journal of Heat Transfer*. 118 (1996) 79–87.
805 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2824071>.
- 806 [53] P.F. Hsu, J.R. Howell, Measurements of thermal conductivity and optical properties of porous
807 partially stabilized zirconia, *Experimental Heat Transfer*. 5 (1992) 293–313.
808 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08916159208946446>.
- 809 [54] Y. Zhao, G.H. Tang, Monte Carlo study on extinction coefficient of silicon carbide porous
810 media used for solar receiver, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*. 92 (2016)
811 1061–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2015.08.105>.

- 812 [55] H.G. von Schnering, R. Nesper, Nodal surfaces of Fourier series: fundamental invariants of
813 structured matter, *Z. Phys. B-Condensed Matter*. 83 (1991) 407–412.
814 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01313411>.
- 815 [56] G. Olalde, G. Flamant, D. Schwander, C. Combescure, Advanced high temperature semi-
816 transparent solar absorbers, *Solar Energy Materials*. 12 (1985) 461–469.
817 [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1633\(85\)90039-5](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1633(85)90039-5).
- 818 [57] X. Chen, X.L. Xia, H. Liu, Y. Li, B. Liu, Heat transfer analysis of a volumetric solar receiver by
819 coupling the solar radiation transport and internal heat transfer, *Energy Conversion and*
820 *Management*. 114 (2016) 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2016.01.074>.
- 821 [58] E.D. Palik, *Handbook of Optical Constants of Solids* - Google Livres, Academic Press, 1998.
- 822 [59] Z. Li, X. Xia, X. Li, C. Sun, Discrete vs. continuum-scale simulation of coupled radiation and
823 convection inside rectangular channel filled with metal foam, *International Journal of Thermal*
824 *Sciences*. 132 (2018) 219–233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijthermalsci.2018.06.010>.
- 825 [60] Y.L. He, Y. Qiu, K. Wang, F. Yuan, W.Q. Wang, M.J. Li, J.Q. Guo, Perspective of concentrating
826 solar power, *Energy*. 198 (2020) 117373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.117373>.
- 827
- 828