

Supplementary Information

Emergy Evaluation of Different Straw Reuse Technologies in Northeast China. *Sustainability*, 2015, 7, 11360-11377.**Xiaoxian Zhang [†] and Fang Ma ^{†,*}**

School of Municipal and Environmental Engineering, Harbin Institute of Technology,
Harbin 150090, China; E-Mail: qianyu@hit.edu.cn

[†] These authors contributed equally to this work.

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; E-Mail: mafang@hit.edu.cn;
Tel.: +86-451-8628-2107; Fax: +86-451-8628-2107.

Table S1. Emergy analysis of straw-biogas production cases.

No.	Item	Raw data				
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
Natural ecosystem renewable resources (R)						
1	Straw J/year	4.70×10^{12}	6.90×10^{12}	7.11×10^{12}	4.16×10^{12}	9.13×10^{11}
2	Underground water J/year	3.65×10^9	-	-	1.28×10^{10}	-
3	Water g/year	-	5.61×10^9	1.65×10^8	2.20×10^7	-
4	Biogas J/year	8.28×10^{11}	-	-	-	-
Social economic system purchased inputs (F)						
5	Building & equipment \$/year	6.09×10^3	-	-	-	3.09×10^2
6	Steel \$/year	1.75×10^6	-	-	-	-
7	Nutritional agents \$/year	9.27×10^4	1.09×10^5	-	-	-
8	Pretreatment agent \$/year	-	4.23×10^3	-	-	-
9	J/year	1.08×10^{11}	5.78×10^{10}	7.92×10^{11}	7.20×10^{10}	4.25×10^8
10	Labor J/year	1.84×10^{10}	-	-	-	-
11	Lablor \$/year	-	4.65×10^3	-	5.81×10^4	-
12	Coal J/year	4.82×10^{11}	6.36×10^{12}	2.95×10^{11}	4.82×10^{11}	8.92×10^{10}
13	Maintenance \$/year	6.05×10^2	1.61×10^3	1.46×10^3	4.83×10^3	1.02×10^2
14	Investment \$/year	-	3.01×10^4	4.98×10^4	2.41×10^4	9.29×10^3
15	Desulfurizing agent kg/year	-	1.00×10^3	-	-	-
16	Microbial agents \$/year	-	-	-	-	6.58×10^2
17	Urea \$/year	-	-	-	-	3.36×10^2
18	Government subsidies \$/year	-	-	-	-	1.61×10^2
19	Oil \$/year	-	-	-	-	1.44×10^2

Table S1. Cont.

No.	Item	Raw data				
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
System yield (Y)						
20	Biogas J/year	2.79×10^{12}	2.52×10^{12}	5.18×10^{12}	-	-
21	Nitrogenous fertilizer g/year	6.58×10^5	-	4.49×10^6	-	-
22	Phosphate fertilizer g/year	3.29×10^5	-	2.81×10^6	-	-
23	Potash fertilizer g/year	4.94×10^5	-	-	-	-
24	Biogas residue g/year	-	-	1.58×10^6	-	-
25	Biogas fertilizer g/year	-	4.56×10^{09}	-	-	-

USD to CNY Exchange Rate is 6.1428 in this study, based on 2014 average.

Table S2. Emergy analysis of straw-based power generation system.

NO.	Item	Raw data				
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
Natural ecosystem renewable resources (R)						
1	Straw J/year	2.12×10^{15}	2.56×10^{15}	1.58×10^{12}	2.90×10^{13}	2.64×10^{15}
2	Cooling water \$/year	-	4.79×10^6	-		
3	Cooling water J/year	3.35×10^{14}	-	7.93×10^{13}	2.76×10^{15}	3.11×10^{10}
4	Air m ³ /year	5.31×10^8	4.43×10^8	1.59×10^5	3.56×10^8	6.03×10^3
5	Electricity J/year	1.50×10^{10}	1.67×10^{13}	2.52×10^{12}	7.87×10^{13}	5.40×10^{10}
Social economic system purchased inputs (F)						
6	Fixed-asset \$/year	1.61×10^7	4.16×10^7	6.95×10^4	3.15×10^6	2.01×10^7
7	Labor & welfare \$/year	-	1.90×10^6	5.79×10^4	2.44×10^5	2.41×10^5
8	Investment, operating & maintenance \$/year	3.02×10^6	1.93×10^6	8.04×10^4	3.22×10^6	4.82×10^3
9	Fossil energy \$/year	-	-	1.21×10^5	-	1.05×10^5
10	Government subsidies \$/year	7.97×10^5	3.15×10^5	-	-	-
11	Limestone t/year	1.92×10^5	9.24×10^5	6.60×10^4	9.24×10^5	1.92×10^5
System yield (Y)						
12	Electricity J/year	4.86×10^{14}	1.34×10^{14}	2.45×10^{13}	1.11×10^9	2.84×10^8
13	GHG emission reduction \$/year	4.04×10^5	1.35×10^6	-	1.34×10^{11}	1.50×10^8

USD to CNY Exchange Rate is 6.1428 in this study, based on 2014 average.

Table S3. Emergy analysis of straw-briquetting system.

NO.	Item	Raw data				
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
Natural ecosystem renewable resources (R)						
1	Straw J/year	1.80×10^{14}	1.00×10^{13}	1.20×10^{13}	3.14×10^{14}	1.38×10^{14}
Social economic system purchased inputs (F)						
2	Investment\$/year	3.38×10^4	2.00×10^4	1.80×10^4	6.50×10^4	3.50×10^4
3	Electricity J/year	4.50×10^{12}	1.69×10^{12}	1.55×10^{12}	1.90×10^{13}	4.50×10^{12}
4	Labor\$/year	5.65×10^4	2.41×10^3	3.05×10^3	1.01×10^5	5.72×10^4
5	Mold\$/year	2.94×10^3	1.56×10^3	1.48×10^3	4.26×10^3	2.85×10^3
6	Lubricant oil J/year	1.46×10^{11}	7.55×10^8	7.04×10^8	3.06×10^{11}	1.52×10^{11}
System yield (Y)						
7	Briquette J/year	1.64×10^{11}	8.90×10^{10}	9.05×10^{10}	4.00×10^{12}	1.60×10^{11}

USD to CNY Exchange Rate is 6.1428 in this study, based on 2014 average.

Table S4. Emergy analysis of straw-ethanol production system.

NO.	Item	Raw data				
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
Natural ecosystem renewable resources (R)						
1	Straw J/year	5.62×10^{12}	2.12×10^{12}	1.66×10^9	3.00×10^{11}	1.66×10^9
2	Water g/year	7.69×10^{13}	3.07×10^{13}	2.49×10^{12}	6.40×10^{11}	2.79×10^{12}
Social economic system purchased inputs (F)						
3	Investment \$/year	5.43×10^3	6.61×10^3	2.80×10^4	1.47×10^7	3.01×10^4
4	Fossil energy J/year	3.50×10^{15}	3.27×10^{15}	1.58×10^{12}	1.44×10^{11}	2.42×10^{12}
5	Labor & maintenance \$/year	1.77×10^6	7.88×10^5	3.31×10^4	2.88×10^6	3.31×10^4
6	Cellulase \$/year	2.86×10^9	1.52×10^8	1.00×10^5	8.04×10^6	1.03×10^5
7	Chemical reagent \$/year	9.29×10^7	4.15×10^7	1.51×10^4	6.91×10^6	3.14×10^4
8	Sulfuric acid \$/year	9.98×10^7	1.14×10^7	-	9.32×10^6	7.36×10^4
System yield (Y)						
9	Ethanol J/year	3.06×10^{16}	1.70×10^{16}	8.90×10^{12}	1.48×10^{15}	8.90×10^{12}

USD to CNY Exchange Rate is 6.1428 in this study, based on 2014 average.

Table S5. Emergy analysis of straw-gasification system.

NO.	Item (unit)	Raw data				
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
Natural ecosystem renewable resources (R)						
1	Straw g/year	1.83×10^9	1.50×10^9	2.00×10^9	1.20×10^9	1.30×10^9
2	Straw gas J/year				1.05×10^{12}	-
3	Wood tar \$/year				2.62×10^4	-
Social economic system purchased inputs (F)						
4	Fixed-asset \$/year	5.21×10^4	2.46×10^4	2.17×10^4	1.20×10^4	4.82×10^3
5	Electricity J/year	5.26×10^{10}	5.40×10^{10}	1.80×10^{11}	-	2.63×10^{10}
6	Labor \$/year	3.94×10^3	2.25×10^3	8.55×10^3	-	2.89×10^3
7	Maintenance \$/year	3.22×10^3	1.93×10^3	5.62×10^2	-	9.00×10^2
8	Government subsidies \$/year	-	6.59×10^3	-	-	1.29×10^4
9	Variable cost \$/year				3.38×10^4	-
System yield (Y)						
10	Straw gas J/year	6.38×10^{12}	5.25×10^{12}	7.00×10^{12}	2.62×10^{12}	5.62×10^{12}
11	Straw carbon J/year	-	-	9.37×10^{12}	5.36×10^{12}	-
12	Wood tar \$/year				2.09×10^4	-

USD to CNY Exchange Rate is 6.1428 in this study, based on 2014 average.

Table S6. Transformity of straw reuse cases.

NO.	Item (unit)	Transformity (sej/unit)
1	Investment(Variable and Fixed-asset, government subsidies) \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
2	Building & equipment \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
3	Maintenance \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
4	Labor J/year	3.80×10^{05} sej/J [3]
5	Labor \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [3]
6	Nutritional agents \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
7	Chemical reagent \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
8	Pretreatment agent \$/year	1.40×10^9 sej/\$ [1]
9	Desulfurizing agent kg/year	3.08×10^{12} sej/kg [1]
10	Microbial agents \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [3]
11	Urea \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [3]
12	Steel \$/year	1.40×10^9 sej/\$ [5]
13	Limestone t/year	3.46×10^{12} sej/t [3]
14	Mold \$/year	5.87×10^{12} sej/\$ [5]
15	Fossil energy \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
16	Coal J/year	4.00×10^4 sej/J [1]
17	Oil \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
18	Lubricant oil J/year	6.60×10^4 sej/J [5]
19	Electricity J/year	2.67×10^5 sej/J [1]
20	Water g/year	4.65×10^5 sej/g [1]
21	Underground water J/year	4.10×10^4 sej/J [2]
22	Cooling water \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [2]
23	Cooling water J/year	1.90×10^4 sej/J [2]
24	Straw J/year	2.70×10^4 sej/J [5]
25	Straw g/year	4.37×10^9 sej/g [5]
26	Wood tar \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
27	Nitrogenous fertilizer g/year	4.62×10^9 sej/g [4]
28	Phosphate fertilizer g/year	1.78×10^{10} sej/g [4]
29	Potash fertilizer g/year	2.96×10^9 sej/g [4]
30	Biogas residue g/year	4.62×10^9 sej/g [4]
31	Biogas fertilizer g/year	4.62×10^9 sej/g [4]
32	GHG emission reduction \$/year	4.94×10^{12} sej/\$ [1]
33	Briquette J/year	6.60×10^4 sej/J [5]
34	Biogas J/year	2.48×10^5 sej/J [5]
35	Air m ³ /year	6.68×10^{10} sej/m ³ [5]
36	Straw gas J/year	3.44×10^4 sej/J [5]
37	Straw carbon J/year	3.44×10^4 sej/J [5]
38	Ethanol J/year	4.57×10^5 sej/J [5]
39	Straw gas J/year	3.44×10^4 sej/J [5]

USD to CNY Exchange Rate is 6.1428 in this study, based on 2014 average.

References

1. Wang, L.M.; Zhang, J.T. Emergy evaluation of power plant eco-industrial park. *Chin. J. Appl. Ecol.* **2004**, *15*, 1047–1050.
2. Brown, M.T.; Bardi, E. *Handbook of Emergy Evaluation Folio 3: Emergy of Ecosystems*; University of Florida: Gainesville, FL, USA, 2001.
3. Brandt-Williams, S.L. Emergy of Florida agriculture. In *Handbook of Emergy Evaluation: a Compendium of Data for Emergy Computation Issued in a Series of Folios*; University of Florida: Gainesville, FL, USA, 2002.
4. Bastianoni, S.; Marchettini, N. The problem of co-production in environmental accounting by emergy analysis. *Ecol. Model* **2000**, *129*, 187–193.
5. Odum, H.T. *Environmental Accounting*; Wiley: New York, NY, USA, 1996.

© 2015 by the authors; licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).