Procemin-GEOMET2024

20th International Mineral Processing Conference and Geometallurgy

MAGNETIC MILL LINERS (MML): An Innovative Ball Mill Lining Technology

Jaime Sepúlveda, Walter Gómez, Alejandro Rodríguez and José Marín













Introduction MAGNETIC MILL LINERS (MML)

- □ Magnetic Mill Liners (MML) were first invented and patented in China, some 35 years ago, as Hermes[™] Metal Magnetic Mill Linings.
- To date, MML liners have been installed in more than 600 ball mills, worldwide. The oldest MML liners, still in-service, were installed more than 20 (!) years ago.
- In spite of their demonstrated performance particularly their very extended in-service durability MML liners have not received full adoption from the hard-rock mineral industry where conventional Ball Mills are typically used.













Magnetic Mill Liners MML INSTALLATION

- MML liners consist of permanent magnets embedded in metallic, high chrome *"bricks"* that firmly attach and protect the interior walls of the mill.
- The heavier of such "bricks" weighs less than 20 kgs.















Magnetic Mill Liners MML INSTALLATION

The *"bricks"* may be arranged in rows of high-and-low thickness, in order to create a well–spaced lifter bars profile.













Magnetic Mill Liners PROTECTIVE "AUTOGENOUS" LAYER





MML liners are, in turns, protected by a continuously <u>renewable</u> layer of ball chips and magnetic mineral particles that attach to the exposed surface of the MML "bricks".











Magnetic Mill Liners PROTECTIVE "AUTOGENOUS" LAYER

- Such <u>protective</u>, continuously <u>renewable</u> layer may reach **1" to 2"** in thickness.
- Worth noting that the presence of magnetic mineral particles is <u>not</u> a requirement for the creation of the protective layer; **ball chips** can equally serve the same purpose.















Industrial Evaluation MML TRIALS AT CMP-HUASCO PLANT

- In December, 2016, Compañía Minera del Pacífico (CMP) installed the first MML liners in Chile in Ball Mill 1 at their Huasco Pellets Plant.
- □ These liners are still operating almost 8 (!) years later and are expected to last for several more years.
- Later, in December, 2022, CMP installed a second set of MML liners, now in Ball Mill 3, at the same facility.
- The comparative performance of both alternative lining systems; i. e.,
 Steel/Rubber vs. MML, is discussed next.













Empirical Database

MML TRIALS AT CMP-HUASCO PLANT

- The comparative analysis was based on a set of detailed, 9,001 <u>hourly</u> operating records, for two consecutive periods: Jun-Dec, 2022 and Jan-May, 2023, for both Mills 1 and 3, including:
 - Line Capacity, t/h
 - Fresh Feed Fineness, % 100#
 - Mill Power, kW
 - Mill Head Water Addition, m³/h
 - Sump Water Addition, m³/h

- Cyclone Feed Flowrate, m³/h
- Cyclone Feed % Solids
- Cyclone Overflow % Solids
- Ground Product Size, % 325#
- These data were properly filtered off *"outliers"* by applying the so-called Data Binning Methodology.









Data Filtering DATA BINNING METHODOLOGY

- Data Binning is a numerical technique for dealing with data preferentially clustered around similar sets of conditions by placing equal weight on each "bin" (narrow range), rather than equal weight on each data point.
- The equally weighted "bins" can more accurately reveal the <u>underlying</u> trends in the data, provided there are sufficient data points per bin across the entire range of interest.
- A single variable Data Binning process was applied, calculating averages of all relevant hourly operating records, for selected ranges of % 325#, before and after the installation of MML in Ball Mill 3.











Experimental Results EVALUATION SCENARIOS

- Throughout the whole reported period, MML liners were installed and running in Ball Mill 1.
- Since January, 2023, MML liners have also been operating in the parallel Ball Mill 3 line.
- Ball Mill 2 is still equipped with Steel/Rubber liners, but its operation has been too <u>discontinuous</u> to be considered as a valid empirical reference for the purposes of the current evaluation.













Experimental Results LINE GRINDING CAPACITY, t/h

- Within normal process variability ranges, binned data indicated that there would be no <u>statistically</u> significant differences in Line Capacity (t/h) that could be caused by the 2 alternative mill lining systems under evaluation.
- Notice, however, that BM3 with Steel/Rubber liners developed <u>slightly</u> lower capacities than when MML liners were installed.













Experimental Results MILL POWER DRAW, kW

- Same observation applies to the
 Mill Power Draw, kW associated
 to each lining system.
- These data disqualify the popular belief that MML liners draw <u>less</u> power than other types of liners.
- In fact, at least in this case,
 Steel/Rubber liners have drawn slightly lower power than MML liners.













Experimental Results SPECIFIC ENERGY, kWh/t

- In terms of Specific Energy Consumption, kWh/t – for comparable grinding tasks – both lining systems also exhibited similar levels of Grinding Energy Efficiency.
- Notice, once again, that
 Steel/Rubber liners would consume more Specific Energy, but hardly significantly more.













FINAL COMMENTS

- Overall within normal process variability ranges there would be no significant statistical differences in operational performance that could be associated to the two mill lining systems under evaluation.
- Besides the actual grinding performance the primary purpose of the current evaluation MML liners exhibit other attributes of relevant financial impact, like significant savings in liner replacement costs as well as in periodic liner condition inspections (e. g. liner bolts re-tightening; simply non-existent in the case of MML installations).
- Both grinding lines will continue to be monitored over longer periods of time for further comparative evaluations.











