13. ABSTRACT
The dynamic behavior of laminar flames was studied for a wide range of conditions. The parameters considered included the fuel type, reactant composition, flame temperature, and combustion mode. Both gaseous and liquid fuels, including jet fuels and their surrogates, were considered. Flame ignition and extinction limits were determined experimentally and numerically for fuels and reaction conditions that have not been considered previously. For both low and high molecular weight fuels, it was determined that diffusion and kinetics can have similar effects on flames. Furthermore, it was found that kinetic mechanisms that predict laminar flame speeds do not necessarily predict extinction limits, even though both propagation and extinction are high temperature phenomena. Finally, it was determined that the chain mechanisms that control near-limit flames may change notably as the reactant temperature and pressure increase well above their standard values. These results enhance current understanding of the combustion behavior of fuels that are of relevance to air-breathing propulsion. Furthermore, the derived experimental data constitute a basis for partially validating combustion kinetics as well as proposed surrogates of jet fuels.
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Summary/Overview

The dynamic behavior of laminar flames was studied for a wide range of conditions. The parameters considered included the fuel type, reactant composition, flame temperature, and combustion mode. Hydrogen, carbon monoxide, single-component gaseous and liquid hydrocarbons, alcohols, as well as jet fuels and their surrogates were studied experimentally in the counterflow configuration. The experiments were modeled through the use of detailed description of chemical kinetics and molecular transport. During the reporting period, progress was made in the following: (1) ignition of premixed and non-premixed flames of gaseous and liquid fuels, (2) extinction of premixed and non-premixed flames of gaseous and liquid fuels, (3) assessment of the effect of diffusion on the flame behavior, and (4) lean flammability limits under high temperature and high pressure conditions. For both low and high molecular weight fuels, it was determined that diffusion and kinetics can have similar effects on flames. Furthermore, it was found that kinetic mechanisms that predict laminar flame speeds, do not necessarily predict extinction limits, even though both propagation and extinction are high temperature phenomena. Finally, it was determined that the chain mechanisms that control near-limit flames may change notably as the reactant temperature and pressure increase well above their standard values. These results enhance current understanding of the combustion behavior of fuels that are of relevance to air-breathing propulsion. Furthermore, the derived experimental data constitute a basis for partially validating combustion kinetics as well as proposed surrogates of jet fuels.

Technical Discussion

1.0 Introduction

The accurate knowledge of the oxidation kinetics of hydrocarbon fuels is essential for the design of the next generation of air-breathing engines operating at speeds and altitudes that are notably greater than the ones currently achieved. State-of-the-art knowledge of hydrocarbon oxidation chemistry is limited to that of H$_2$ and CH$_4$. For example, the GRI-3.0 mechanism [1] closely predicts a wide range of flame properties for H$_2$ and CH$_4$ mixtures with air, especially at high temperatures; however, even for H$_2$ and CH$_4$, their oxidation kinetics at low temperatures have not been probed systematically in previous flame studies. The oxidation kinetics of higher carbon hydrocarbons are subjected to significant uncertainties even at the C$_2$-level [e.g., 2]. Furthermore, systematic flame studies of liquid hydrocarbons are limited compared to gaseous studies.
This research was both experimental and numerical. The experimental measurements focused on the determination of global flame properties relevant to the phenomena of ignition and extinction. This was important, as these different flame phenomena are sensitive to different kinetics subsets at different temperatures. The high-temperature kinetics were validated against flame extinction data obtained for a wide range of fuels, such as H\textsubscript{2}, CO, C\textsubscript{1}-C\textsubscript{3} hydrocarbons, and liquid fuels such as C\textsubscript{7}-C\textsubscript{8} hydrocarbons and alcohols. While laminar flame speeds cannot be determined directly, extinction strain rates (in counterflow configurations) can, and a methodology has been introduced to do so. Similar kinetics pathways control propagation and extinction in general for C\textsubscript{1}-C\textsubscript{2} hydrocarbon flames [2], but this needs to be investigated further for fuels with higher carbon numbers. An alternative technique also was introduced for studying flame ignition in counterflow configurations by using vitiated air that was produced from the oxidation of ultra-lean H\textsubscript{2}/air flames as the ignition source rather heated air. The ignition behavior of several fuels thus was tested.

2.0 Experimental and Numerical Methodologies

The experiments were performed in the opposed-jet configuration and through the use of a recently developed digital particle image velocimetry (DPIV) technique [3]. The use of DPIV allowed for the determination of the instantaneous velocity field so that the imposed strain rate, \( K \), could be measured directly. The extinction strain rate, \( K_{ext} \), was determined directly by establishing flames very close to extinction and by reducing (for fuel-lean conditions) the fuel flow rate [4,5,6] rather than increasing the strain rate. The latter procedure also requires extrapolations. The experiments were modeled using a quasi one-dimensional code with detailed descriptions of molecular transport, chemical kinetics, and thermal radiation [7]. The chemical kinetics schemes tested included:

- the H\textsubscript{2}/O\textsubscript{2} mechanisms of Mueller et al. [8] and Davis et al. [9];
- the GRI30 mechanism [1] for H\textsubscript{2} and C\textsubscript{1}-C\textsubscript{3} hydrocarbons;
- a mechanism developed by Wang and coworkers [10] for C\textsubscript{1}-C\textsubscript{4} hydrocarbons;
- three mechanisms for CH\textsubscript{3}OH and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5}OH oxidation [11-13];
- two mechanisms describing C\textsubscript{7}-C\textsubscript{8} hydrocarbon oxidation [14,15].

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Ignition of Premixed and Non-Premixed Flames of Gaseous and Liquid Fuels

A new methodology was developed, allowing ignition studies in the counterflow configuration [16]. The methodology includes the use of ultra-lean H\textsubscript{2}/air flames as the ignition source, which eliminates the need of using heated air. The hot excess air dominates the composition of the post-flame products, while minor amounts of H\textsubscript{2}O are present. In order to achieve a wide range of "ignition temperatures" from as low as 1,000 K to as high as 1,400 K a platinum screen is used at the burner exit to support the H\textsubscript{2}/air flames catalytically. The use of the platinum screen also eliminates complications arising from the flame location, if the flame were stabilized by velocity gradients complicating data interpretation. Ignition of H\textsubscript{2}, CO, and various hydrocarbons was achieved, and data were found to be in close agreement with those determined in past studies by Law and co-workers [e.g., 17], in which heated air was used as the ignition source.

This approach was used for H\textsubscript{2}, CO, and C\textsubscript{1}-C\textsubscript{12} single component hydrocarbons. Additionally, the flame ignition of various petroleum-derived and synthetic jet fuels also was investigated, as well as representative surrogates. For fuels for which reliable kinetic mechanisms are available, numerical simulations also were performed.
Various combustion phenomena of mixtures of H₂ and CO with air and CO₂ were studied in collaboration with Professors Hai Wang of USC and Eric L. Petersen of University of Central Florida, and more details can be found in Ref. 18. The oxidation kinetics of H₂ and CO mixtures were examined experimentally and computationally for a wide range of mixture compositions and reaction conditions. Shock-tube ignition delay times were obtained for five CO/H₂/air mixtures (equivalence ratio \( \phi = 0.5 \)) over the pressure range of 1 to 20 atm and temperatures from 950 to 1330 K. The influence of CO and H₂ composition variations on flame ignition and propagation also was examined. Two types of experiments were carried out for H₂/CO/CO₂ mixtures with air. Laminar flame speeds, \( S'_\text{fl} \), were determined in the twin-flame counterflow configuration using DPIV [3]. Ignition temperatures, \( T_{\text{ign}} \), were determined by counterflowing a vitiated air jet against a premixed fuel/air jet [16]. Computationally, detailed modeling of the experiments was performed using a recently developed H₂/CO/O₂ reaction model [9]. Numerical simulations showed generally good agreement with the experimental data.

Flame ignition studies also were performed for C₁-C₄ hydrocarbons and notable differences between experimental and computed \( T_{\text{ign}} \)'s were identified. The ignition limits of \( n-\text{C}_7 \text{H}_{16} \) and \( \text{iSo}-\text{C}_8 \text{H}_{18} \) flames were not simulated, as the mechanisms that were tested [14,15] were reduced and validated against data derived in vigorously burning flames.

The ignition characteristics of jet fuels and their surrogates also were investigated. The goal of this investigation was dual: first, to compare the performance of jet fuels with that of single-component hydrocarbons, and second, to assess the validity of proposed surrogates, which have been derived typically based on matching physical properties [e.g., 19,20]. The liquid feed system was upgraded to vaporize practical jet fuels. The wall temperature of the evaporation chamber was controlled carefully to make sure that it was high enough to avoid condensation but low enough to avoid thermal cracking. \( T_{\text{ign}} \)'s of heated non-premixed fuel/N₂ mixtures of eight pure fuels from C₅ to C₁₂, ten practical fuels, and four JP8 surrogates were obtained by counterflowing them against cold oxygen. \( T_{\text{ign}} \)'s of mixtures of the same 20 fuels with nitrogen were obtained by counterflowing them against hot oxygen. The fuels studied were:

**Pure fuels:** \( n-\text{C}_5 \text{H}_{12} \), \( n-\text{C}_6 \text{H}_{14} \), \( n-\text{C}_7 \text{H}_{16} \), \( n-\text{C}_8 \text{H}_{16} \), \( \text{iSo}-\text{C}_8 \text{H}_{16} \), \( n-\text{C}_9 \text{H}_{20} \), \( n-\text{C}_{10} \text{H}_{22} \), \( n-\text{C}_{12} \text{H}_{26} \).


**Surrogates:** S2 – Two-Component Surrogate [21]
S3 – Three-Component Surrogate [22]
S6 – Six-Component Surrogate [19]
S12 – Twelve-Component Surrogate [20]

The compositions of the various jet fuels tested are shown in Table 1. JP10 is a single component jet fuel, i.e. \( \text{exo-} \) tetrahydrodicyclopentadiene. The compositions of the four surrogates tested are shown in Table 2. The compositions of the S6 and S12 surrogates were taken from the literature, and the compositions of the S2 and S3 surrogates were determined based on personal communications. More specifically the S2 composition is that used in Europe [21], while that of S3 was determined as part of the deliberations of the US surrogate fuels group [22].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>% by Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>m-Xylene</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iso-Octane</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methycyclohexane</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Dodecane</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Tetradecane</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tetralin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>n-Decane</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Butylcyclohexane</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Butylbenzene</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Composition of jet fuels tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>% by Mass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>m-Xylene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iso-Octane</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methycyclohexane</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Dodecane</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Tetradecane</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tetralin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cyclo-Octane</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Decane</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butylbenzene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tetramethylbenzene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methyleneaphthalene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Hexadecane</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>n-Decane</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n-Propylbenzene</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Composition of JP8 surrogates tested.
Figure 1. Non-premixed flame ignition of single-component, jet fuels, and JP8 surrogates.

Figure 2. Non-premixed flame ignition of jet fuels.
In Fig. 1, for single-component fuels, lower carbon numbers result in greater ignition propensities. Among practical fuels, JP8 is the hardest, while the JP10 is the easiest to ignite. In Fig. 2 the ignition limits of all jet fuels are shown. In Fig. 3 the ignition response of JP8 and its four surrogates is compared. All surrogates exhibit similar ignition behavior; however, their ignition propensity is notably higher compared to JP8.

![Figure 3. Non-premixed flame ignition of JP8 and its surrogates.](https://example.com/figure3.png)
3.2 Extinction of Premixed and Non-Premixed Flames of Gaseous and Liquid Fuels

$K_{\text{ext}}$'s were determined in the opposed-jet configuration both experimentally and numerically for a number of fuels [e.g., 5,6]. This work was performed for three reasons: First, to assess the validity of the thesis that propagation and extinction are controlled by similar kinetics, for fuels other than $C_1$-$C_2$ hydrocarbons. In other words, to test the thesis that a mechanism that predicts $S_n$'s also should predict $K_{\text{ext}}$'s. Second, the experimental determination of $K_{\text{ext}}$ is direct, as opposed to that of $S_n$, which requires either extrapolations or notable data processing. Thus, the comparison with the numerical predictions is more reliable. Finally, since $S_n$ is the most common fundamental flame property that has been measured for a variety of fuels, it is important that similar data on extinction become available. Extinction studies allow for the assessment of the resistance of fuels to blow-off as function of kinetics, molecular transport, and fluid mechanics. Additionally, the sensitivity of extinction to kinetics is notably larger compared to that of propagation [e.g., 5,6]. The extinction studies included a large number of fuels similar to the ignition studies described in Section 3.1, and details can be found in Refs. 4-6.

The current understanding of extinction phenomena was enhanced through the advancement of a numerical technique that allows the detailed determination of the sensitivities of $K_{\text{ext}}$ on the kinetics. The approach is similar to that taken for $S_n$. Logarithmic sensitivity coefficients are shown in Fig. 4 for an iso-octane/air flame, and distinct differences of the effect of kinetics on propagation and extinction can be seen. A logarithmic sensitivity coefficient is defined as $\left[ \frac{\ln K_{\text{ext}}}{\ln A} \right]$, where $A$ is the pre-exponential factor. The physical mechanisms behind the observed differences were explained by a detailed reaction path analysis [5]. The flame extinction studies showed that for both $H_2$ and liquid fuels, while existing kinetic mechanisms predict $S_n$'s they fail to predict experimentally determined $K_{\text{ext}}$'s. The rigorous sensitivity results allowed the reduction of such discrepancies. For example, the Davis & Law [14] (DL98) mechanism that closely predicts $S_n$'s but not $K_{\text{ext}}$'s, was revised by adding the CH2CHO species and its 22 subsequent reactions from Wang [10]. This minor revision (DL98-revised) improved prediction of $K_{\text{ext}}$ by 15%, as seen in Fig. 5. This mechanism revision was found to
affect the prediction of $K_{ext}$ twice as much as that of $S_v^\circ$. In Fig. 5 predictions are shown using the Pitsch et al. [15] (PPS96) mechanism. Both DL98 and PPS96 were validated against $S_v^\circ$ data.

The extinction of flames of jet fuels and their surrogates also was investigated and compared with that of single-component liquid hydrocarbons. Figures 6 and 7 depict, for single-component fuels, greater extinction propensities with increasing carbon numbers. Among the practical fuels, JP7, JP8, JP10, and RP1a are less resistant to extinction compared to the other fuels tested. In Fig. 8 the surrogates of JP8 exhibit similar extinction behavior, but they are more resistant to extinction than JP8.

The results of Figs. 1, 2, 6, and 7 clearly illustrate that in terms of ignition and extinction, the practical fuels tested behave similarly to single-component hydrocarbons that are heavier than $n$-decane, an anticipated result based on their compositions.

![Figure 6. Non-premixed flame extinction of single-component, jet fuels, and JP8 surrogates.](image-url)
Figure 7. Non-premixed flame extinction of jet fuels.

Figure 8. Non-premixed flame extinction of JP8 and its surrogates.
3.3 Assessment of the Effect of Diffusion on the Flame Behavior

Studies of flame extinction of ultra-lean H<sub>2</sub>/air flames have revealed that $K_{\text{ext}}$ is rather sensitive to the diffusion coefficients, and, in many cases, these sensitivities are of the same order as or higher than those of $S_u^0$ [4]. This finding suggests that optimizing chemical kinetics against flame data without considering the effect of diffusion potentially could falsify rate constants. Based on this observation, studies on the extinction of additional fuels were conducted, and it was shown that under most conditions the effect of diffusion is of the same order of that of kinetics [5]. Table 3 depicts logarithmic sensitivity coefficients for both kinetics and diffusion for $S_u^0$ and $K_{\text{ext}}$ of CH<sub>3</sub>OH/air, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH/air, $n$-C<sub>7</sub>H<sub>16</sub>/air, and iso-C<sub>8</sub>H<sub>18</sub>/air flames; the effect of kinetics is represented by the main branching reaction H+O<sub>2</sub> → OH+O (R1). For both lean $n$-C<sub>7</sub>H<sub>16</sub>/air and iso-C<sub>8</sub>H<sub>18</sub>/air flames, $S_u^0$ exhibits a small negative sensitivity to diffusion, with values that are an order of magnitude less than the sensitivity to R1. On the other hand, the effect of diffusion on $K_{\text{ext}}$ appears to be notably greater and of the same order as that of R1. Similar results were shown for lean C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH/air flames, with the exception that the sensitivity of $S_u^0$ to diffusion is rather similar in magnitude to R1. For lean CH<sub>3</sub>OH/air flames the magnitudes of the sensitivities of $S_u^0$ to diffusion and R1 are very close, while that of $K_{\text{ext}}$ to R1 is an order of magnitude greater compared to diffusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>$\phi$</th>
<th>Sensitivity to R1</th>
<th>Sensitivity to Fuel Diffusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iso-octane</td>
<td>DL98</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-heptane</td>
<td>DL98</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethanol</td>
<td>FDC00</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methanol</td>
<td>FDC00</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $S_u^0$ and $K_{\text{ext}}$ to the rate of the main branching reaction H+O<sub>2</sub> → OH+O (R1) and to the fuel diffusivity for CH<sub>3</sub>OH/air, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH/air, $n$-C<sub>7</sub>H<sub>16</sub>/air, and iso-C<sub>8</sub>H<sub>18</sub>/air mixtures.
The relative importance of diffusion and chemical kinetics was investigated further by quantifying their effects on flame ignition, and the details can be found in Ref. 23. The study was conducted in stagnation flows for atmospheric, laminar, premixed and non-premixed H₂, n-C₇H₁₆, and iso-C₈H₁₈ flames.

Ignition of premixed flames was studied by: (1) increasing the temperature of a N₂ jet counterflowing against a fuel/air jet, and (2) increasing the temperature of a solid wall against which a fuel/air jet was injected. Ignition of non-premixed flames was studied by increasing the temperature of an air jet counterflowing against a fuel-containing jet. The simulations were performed along the stagnation streamline and included detailed descriptions of chemical kinetics, molecular transport, and radiative heat transfer. Sensitivity analyses of the ignition temperatures to the diffusion coefficients of the reactants, as well as to the kinetics, were performed. Results revealed that premixed flame ignition is rather sensitive to the fuel diffusivity in the opposed-jet configuration and notably less sensitive in the jet-wall. In the opposed-jet configuration, diffusive transport conveys the reactants towards the ignition kernel. In the jet-wall configuration, the reactants are transported towards the ignition kernel largely by convection, and, as a result, ignition is not diffusion-limited. The two configurations resulted in similar $T_{\text{ign}}$'s only for fuel-rich cases, and $T_{\text{ign}}$'s tended to be lower as the equivalence ratio increased in the opposed-jet configuration. However, $T_{\text{ign}}$'s were found to depend mildly on the equivalence ratio in the jet-wall configuration. The sensitivity of ignition to diffusion in non-premixed systems was found also to be notable, especially for cases in which the fuel was diluted highly by an inert. For both premixed and non-premixed flames, the sensitivity of ignition to diffusion coefficients was of the same order or larger than that of kinetics, and representative results are shown in Figs. 9 and 10. Thus, uncertainties associated with transport coefficients need to be accounted for, when flame ignition data are used to validate kinetics. Otherwise, rate constants potentially could be falsified.
3.4 Lean Flammability Limits under High Temperature and High Pressure Conditions

This investigation was performed in collaboration with Professor Chung K. Law of Princeton University, and more details can be found in Ref. 24. The lean flammability limits of CH\textsubscript{4}/air and C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}/air mixtures were determined numerically for a wide range of pressures and unburned mixture temperatures in order to assess the near-limit flame behavior under conditions of relevance to air-breathing propulsion devices. The study included the simulation of freely propagating flames with the inclusion of detailed descriptions of chemical kinetics and molecular transport, radiative loss, and a one-point continuation method to solve around singular points as the flammability limit is approached. Results revealed that both pressure and unburned mixture temperature have significant effects on the lean flammability limit as well as the attendant limit flame temperature. Specifically, the lean limit was found first to increase and then decrease with pressure, while the limit temperature decreased with pressure in general, and could be reduced to values as low as 900 K at the highest values of unburned mixture temperatures and pressures that were considered. Sensitivity and species consumption path analyses showed that the chain mechanisms that control the near-limit flame response critically depend on the thermodynamic state of the mixture. Thus, mechanisms that are identified as important at near-atmospheric conditions may not be relevant at higher unburned mixture temperatures and pressures. The response of near-limit flames was found to resemble the homogeneous explosion limits of hydrogen/oxygen mixtures. While, at low pressures, the main branching and termination reactions are, respectively, H + O\textsubscript{2} → OH + O and H + O\textsubscript{2} + M → HO\textsubscript{2} + M, at high pressures, the system branching is controlled by the HO\textsubscript{2}-H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} kinetics. Potential avenues for extending the lean operation limits of engines were suggested based on the understanding gained from this analysis.

References


**Personnel**

This research was performed by the PI, two Research Associates (Dr. Yufei Dong and Dr. Gurhan Andac), and two graduate students (Jeff Langille and Adam Holley).

**Publications**

Interactions/Transitions
Presentations at Meetings and Conferences


11. "Diffusion and Reaction Effects on the Ignition of Premixed and Non-Premixed iso-Octane Flames," M.G. Andac and F.N. Egolfopoulos, paper No. 05F-015 Fall Technical Meeting, Western States Section/Combustion Institute, Stanford University, California, California, October 17-18, 2005.


Technical Interactions with AFRL Researchers

Several meetings with Dr. Tim Edwards of AFRL took place during the reporting period. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the measurements on the ignition and extinction limits of mixtures of air with JP7, JP8, JP10, RP1, and various synthetic jet fuels that were supplied to the USC Combustion and Fuels Laboratory by Dr. Edwards. Further discussions will follow in the future regarding the ongoing experimental and modeling work pertaining to jet fuels and their surrogates, as well as ongoing work on smaller hydrocarbons in the C₁-C₄ range. The latter is of relevance to the thermal cracking of jet fuels.

Other Technical Interactions

A close interaction has been established with Professor Hai Wang of the University of Southern California on the modeling aspects of this research. More specifically, the kinetic model development guides to great extent the experimental parameter space.
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Abstract

We propose a H\textsubscript{2}–CO kinetic model which incorporates the recent thermodynamic, kinetic, and species transport updates relevant to high-temperature H\textsubscript{2} and CO oxidation. Attention has been placed on obtaining a comprehensive and kinetically accurate model able to predict a wide variety of H\textsubscript{2}–CO combustion data. The model was subject to systematic optimization and validation tests against reliable H\textsubscript{2}–CO combustion data, from global combustion properties (shock-tube ignition delays, laminar flame speeds, and extinction strain rates) to detailed species profiles during H\textsubscript{2} and CO oxidation in flow reactor and in laminar premixed flames.
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1. Introduction

The most successful model of H\textsubscript{2}–CO combustion has been that of Mueller et al. [1], developed on the basis of a careful evaluation of relevant kinetic parameters and flow reactor experiments. The model is also able to predict a wide range of flame experiments. Over the last few years, however, the rate parameters of the key reaction H + O\textsubscript{2} + M = HO\textsubscript{2} + M and its third-body efficiencies have been revised [2,3], giving an urgent reason for a re-examination of the H\textsubscript{2}–CO combustion model. The downward revision of the enthalpy of formation of OH [4] may also exert an influence on the overall reaction kinetics of H\textsubscript{2} combustion.

Several new studies [5–7] have been reported in recent years. Two of these studies analyzed the hydrogen submodel [5,6], both being an extension of the model of Mueller et al. The third analysis [7] considered both H\textsubscript{2} and CO chemistry and is the predecessor to the present study. The objectives of the present study are (1) to provide an update for the H\textsubscript{2}–CO combustion reaction model on the basis of recent kinetic data, and (2) to optimize the H\textsubscript{2}–CO model against available H\textsubscript{2}–CO combustion data.

2. Reaction model

The unoptimized (trial) reaction model consists of 14 species and 30 reactions as shown in Fig. 1. The model and its thermochemistry and transport property files can be found at the URL: http://ignis.me.udel.edu/h2co. The trial model was based on a careful review of recent kinetics literature, considering both direct data and compilations. A large number of GRI 3.0 rate parameters [8] were
The rate expression of Michael et al. [10] was herein employed for $H_2 + O_2 = H + HO_2$. For $OH + OH(+M) = HO_2(+M)$, the $k_0$ expression, given in the reverse direction by Baulch et al. [12], was refitted based on the new heat of formation of the OH radical along with the low temperature data of Zellner et al. [11]. The $k_{rec,CO}$ expression and the $\beta$ value of $H_2O$ (6) were taken from [11] while the Troe fall-off parameters [22] were the same as those in GRI 3.0. The rate expressions for $H_2O_2 + OH = HO_2 + H_2O$ were taken directly from [15], though the high-temperature expression was refitted using a modified Arrhenius expression to avoid the rate constant values exceeding the collision limit when extrapolated to high temperatures.

For $CO + O(+M) = CO_2(+M)$, the $k_\infty$ expression was taken from [13], and following Allen et al. [23], $k_0$ was taken from the QRRK analysis of Westmoreland et al. [24] and fall-off was that of Lindemann. The collision efficiency of $H_2O$ was assumed to be 12. The rate constant for $CO + OH = CO_2 + H$ was re-analyzed in the present study, and the experimental data were refitted by the sum of two modified Arrhenius expressions. The new expression resolves more accurately the high temperature data of Wooldridge et al. [25] as well as the data found in [26]. Without this revision, it was not possible to reconcile the high-temperature $H_2$ ignition data with the $H_2$–CO laminar flame speeds. The known pressure dependence of this reaction was not considered as this dependence is quite unimportant for the CO oxidation experiments considered herein.
3. Computational and optimization method

A comprehensive review was conducted for a large number of H$_2$–CO combustion data. Thirty-six experiments were chosen as optimization targets as shown in Table 1. They can be classified into four categories: (1) laminar flame speeds of H$_2$–air, H$_2$–O$_2$–He, and H$_2$–CO–air mixtures, (2) the peak mole fractions of H and O in a low-pressure burner-stabilized H$_2$–O$_2$–Ar flame, (3) the consumption rates of H$_2$ and CO during the reaction of H$_2$–O$_2$–N$_2$ and CO–O$_2$–H$_2$O–N$_2$ mixtures in a turbulent flow reactor, and (4) ignition delay times of H$_2$–O$_2$–Ar and H$_2$–CO–O$_2$–Ar mixtures behind reflected shock waves.

Ignition delay and flow reactor calculations were performed using a kinetic integrator interfaced with CHEMKIN [19] by assuming adiabatic condition. Ignition delays were modeled using the constant-density model, whereas flow reactor modeling used the constant-pressure assumption. The numerical ignition delays were determined following the same ignition criteria as in the respective experiments. Laminar flame speeds and structure were calculated using Premix [40], employing thermal diffusion, and multicomponent transport. Diffusion coefficients of several key species were updated [41].

Sensitivity analyses were conducted for ignition delay and consumption rates of the fuel in flow reactor with a brute force method. For laminar flame speeds and H and O peak mole fractions in burner-stabilized flames, the local sensitivity methods were utilized. Based on the sensitivity information, active rate parameters (to be optimized) were chosen for each target. The entire set of active parameters consists of 28 A-factors and third-body efficiency factors as shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

The optimization approach is similar to earlier studies [8,43]. Briefly, the solution mapping technique was employed to express a response by a second-order polynomial $\eta(x) = \eta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x_i + \sum_{i,j>1} b_{ij} x_i x_j$, where $a_i$ and $b_{ij}$ are the coefficients, $x_i$'s are factorial active variables given by $x = \ln(x_{true})/\ln(f)$, where $x$ is the active A factor or third-body efficiency factor, and $f$ is its span or uncertainty factor. The uncertainty factor was estimated on the basis of kinetic uncertainty and is provided in Fig. 1 for each active parameter. Though an optimization of the temperature dependence of rate coefficients is possible, we chose not to vary the $T$-dependence because of the insufficient number of systematic experimental targets [43].

For flow reactor targets, the response was found to be highly non-linear with respect to $x$'s. These responses are expressed by adding a hyperbolic tangent term to account for the S-shaped dependence of response with respect to $x$'s, $\eta = \eta^{(1)} + c \tanh(a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i x_i + \sum_{i,j>1} b_{ij} x_i x_j)$. The coefficients for the flow reactor and ignition delay targets were calculated by a factorial design test [43]. The coefficients for flame targets were obtained using the sensitivity analysis based method [44].

Minimization was carried out on the objective function $L^2 = \sum((n_{true} - n_{calc})/\sigma_i)^2$ subject to the constraint $-1 < x < +1$, where the subscript $i$ denotes the $i$th target. Each target was individually weighted by their uncertainty $\sigma_i$. The target values and their uncertainties are presented in Table 1.

4. Results and discussion

The trial kinetic model was tested against a wide range of experimental data. The predictions of the trial model for the 36 target values are shown in Table 1 (the "trial" column). Overall, the model performed well against these experimental data. The exceptions are: it overpredicts H$_2$–O$_2$–He flame speeds, the H and O mole fractions in the burner-stabilized flame, and the consumption rate of H$_2$ for the 1.0% H$_2$–1.5 O$_2$–N$_2$ flow reactor mixture at 943 K and 2.5 atm.

To reconcile these discrepancies, optimization was then carried out for 28 active parameters with respect to 36 targets. All active parameters were allowed to vary freely within their uncertainty spans. The optimal parameter set was obtained as the minimum of $L^2$, first from a random sample of the multidimensional parameter space, followed by a Newton search of the $L^2$ minimum in the parameter space. The values of optimized active parameters are shown in the last column of Fig. 2 (expressed as the optimized-to-trial parameter ratio). To obtain the optimized model, the active parameters (A-factors and third-body efficiency factors) shown in Fig. 1 should be multiplied by their corresponding ratios.

Validation of the optimized model will be discussed below. Figure 3 presents experimental [27–31,45] and computed laminar flame speeds of H$_2$–air and air-equivalent mixtures where N$_2$ was replaced by Ar or He. With trial model predictions already close to the experimental values, the optimization served only to fine-tune the model, resulting in excellent agreement with the experiment as can be seen in Fig. 3 and Table 1. The trial model tends to overpredict the H$_2$–O$_2$–He flame speeds at elevated pressures (Table 1). The discrepancies are clearly caused by kinetics as a previous study showed that the uncertainty in the transport coefficients cannot account for the observed differences [41]. Now the optimized model can successfully predict these H$_2$–O$_2$–He flame speeds [27] as seen in Fig. 4. This agreement was brought by lowering the rate of OH + H$_2$ = H + H$_2$O, H + HO$_2$ = OH + OH, and a small increase in the rate of H + O$_2$ = H$_2$O = HO$_2$ + H$_2$O.

The dominant sensitivity of the laminar flame speeds of H$_2$–CO–air mixtures, especially the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target No.</th>
<th>Composition (mol %)</th>
<th>T_α(T_β)(K)</th>
<th>p_α(p_β)(atm)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Target Value ± σ</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Model Trial</th>
<th>Opt.</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flame speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 1a</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H_2-air, ( \phi = 1 )</td>
<td>204 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 1b</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H_2-air, ( \phi = 3 )</td>
<td>217 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 2a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \phi = 1 )</td>
<td>206 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 2b</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \phi = 2.25 )</td>
<td>249 ± 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 3a</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>( \phi = 1 )</td>
<td>38 ± 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 3b</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>( \phi = 1.75 )</td>
<td>88 ± 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 4a</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \phi = 1.148 )</td>
<td>40 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 4b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \phi = 3.895 )</td>
<td>52.5 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 5a</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \phi = 1 )</td>
<td>111.5 ± 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 5b</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( \phi = 3.05 )</td>
<td>154.5 ± 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 6a</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CO/H_2 = 0.84</td>
<td>10.3 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fls 6b</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CO/H_2 = 4.90</td>
<td>18.5 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat flame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ffl 1a</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>( \Delta p_{\text{fl}} )</td>
<td>0.067 ± 0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ffl 1b</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>( \Delta \rho_{\text{fl}} )</td>
<td>0.002 ± 0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow reactor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 1a</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>8.6 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 2a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>13.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 3a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>98 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 4a</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>261 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 5a</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>354 ± 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 6a</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>364 ± 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 6b</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>229 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 7a</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>14.1 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 8a</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>19.0 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fwr 8b</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>N_2</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>70 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock-tube ignition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 1a</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>Onset of p rise</td>
<td>231 ± 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 2a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>Maximum p</td>
<td>238 ± 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 2b</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>Maximum p</td>
<td>29 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 3a</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Maximum (OM)</td>
<td>10 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 4a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Maximum (OM)</td>
<td>293 ± 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 4b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Maximum (OM)</td>
<td>11 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 5a</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Maximum (OM)</td>
<td>54 ± 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 6a</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>Onset of CO2 rise</td>
<td>63 ± 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 6b</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>( [O] = 2.5 \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3} )</td>
<td>47 ± 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 6c</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>Onset of CO2 rise</td>
<td>23 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg 6d</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>( [O] = 2.5 \times 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3} )</td>
<td>11 ± 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The target value is \( \Delta A_{\text{fl}}/\Delta A_{\text{fl}} \) for \( x \) is the mole fraction (ppm); \( c \) is the fractional conversion.
* \( \Delta A_{\text{CO}}/\Delta A_{\text{CO}} \) for \( \Delta A_{\text{CO}}/\Delta A_{\text{CO}} \) for.
* \( \Delta A_{\text{CO}}/\Delta A_{\text{CO}} \) for.
* \( \Delta A_{\text{CO}}/\Delta A_{\text{CO}} \) for.
* \( \Delta A_{\text{CO}}/\Delta A_{\text{CO}} \) for.
* \( \Delta A_{\text{CO}}/\Delta A_{\text{CO}} \) for.
Fig. 2. Target-active parameter matrix.

Fig. 3. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines: the optimized model) H₂-air and air equivalent (N₂ is replaced by Ar or He) flame speed at a pressure of 1 atm.

Fig. 4. Experimental (symbols [27]) and computed (lines: the optimized model) H₂-O₂-He flame speeds.

95% CO + 5% H₂ mixtures, to CO + OH = CO₂ + H has been observed elsewhere [32] and necessitated a re-evaluation this reaction. It was determined that the sum of two modified Arrhenius expressions was necessary to predict the laminar flame speed data. Figures 5 and 6 show that the optimized model reproduces experimental H₂-CO-air laminar flame speeds [32,33].

Figure 7 depicts species profiles for four selected H₂ oxidation experiments in a turbulent flow reactor [13]. Time shift was necessary to match the computed profiles with the experimental counterparts. The amounts of time shift were found to be similar with those used by Mueller et al. [13]. It is seen that the optimized model predicts the experimental species profile accurately, and it also improved the prediction of the experiment as compared to the trial model (cf. Fig. 7B). Similarly, the results of Fig. 8 show that for CO oxidation [35] the optimized model accurately predicts the CO consumption rate over an extended pressure range.

The trial model could accurately reconcile most of the ignition delay data for H₂-O₂-diluent mixtures, and optimization served only to improve these predictions as can be seen in Table 1. In addition, Fig. 9 shows a plot of experimental and computed ignition delay times for H₂-O₂-Ar mixtures [36–38,46] behind reflected shock waves. Here, the experimental shock-tube ignition delay data were fitted into τ (μs) = [H₂]⁻⁰·¹⁵⁴[O₂]⁻⁰·⁶⁹³[Ar]⁻⁰·⁰⁴ [6.77 × 10⁻⁸ T⁻⁰·₂⁵² e⁻⁹²₃₄/K] for non-"run-
Fig. 7. Experimental (symbols [13]) and computed (lines) species mole fraction profiles during moist hydrogen oxidation in a flow reactor. Solid lines: optimized model; dashed lines: trial model.

Fig. 8. Experimental (symbols [35]) and computed (lines) [CO]/[CO]_0 profiles during moist CO oxidation in a flow reactor. Cases (a): 1.014% CO + 0.496% O_2 + 0.65% H_2O in N_2, p = 1 atm, T_0 = 1038 K, (b) 1.014% CO + 0.988% CO + 3.33% H_2O in N_2, p = 2.44 atm, T_0 = 1038 K, (c) 1.014% CO + 0.988% CO + 3.33% H_2O in N_2, p = 1 atm, T_0 = 1038 K, (d) 0.984% CO + 0.97% O_2 + 0.65% H_2O in N_2, p = 6.5 atm, T_0 = 1040 K, and (e) 0.994% CO + 1.47% O_2 + 0.65% H_2O in N_2, p = 9.6 atm, T_0 = 1039 K.

Fig. 9. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines) ignition delay times of H_2–O_2–Ar mixtures behind reflected shock waves. Symbols: (a) 6.67% H_2 + 3.33% O_2, p_s = 1.35–2.90 atm; (b) 5% H_2 + 5% O_2, p_s = 1.35–2.90 atm (onset of pressure rise [36]; (c) 0.5% H_2 + 0.25% O_2, p_s = 33 atm, (d) 2% H_2 + 1% O_2, p_s = 33 atm, (e) 0.5% H_2 + 0.25% O_2, p_s = 57 atm, (f) 0.33% H_2 + 0.17% O_2, p_s = 64 atm, (g) 0.1% H_2 + 0.05% O_2, p_s = 64 atm, (h) 0.5% H_2 + 0.25% O_2, p_s = 87 atm (maximum OH absorption rate [38]), (i) 8% H_2 + 2% O_2, p_s = 5 atm (maximum OH emission [46]), and (j) four H_2 + O_2 mixtures [37]. Lines: (1) 0.5% H_2 + 0.25% O_2, p_s = 87 atm (maximum [OH] rate), (2) 2% H_2 + 1% O_2, p_s = 33 atm (maximum [OH] rate), (3) 8% H_2 + 2% O_2, p_s = 5 atm (maximum [OH]), and (4) 5% H_2 + 5% O_2, p_s = 2 atm (maximum pressure gradient).

Fig. 10. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines) ignition delay times behind reflected shock waves for H_2–O_2–N_2 mixtures. Experimental data were determined from onset of pressure rise [47] and maximum rate of OH emission [48].

away data, i.e., those fall on the nearly linear portion of the curves of Fig. 9, where [] denotes concentration in mol/cm^3. For mixtures of H_2–O_2–N_2 [47,48], comparison was also made as seen in Fig. 10, where the result should only be considered as a secondary validation because the vibrational relaxation of N_2 was not accounted for in modeling. The optimized model also predicts fairly well the ignition delay of CO–H_2–O_2–Ar mixtures [39] as seen in Fig. 11.

The optimized model resulted in improved prediction of the species profiles measured in a low-pressure H_2–O_2–Ar flame, though the concen-
Fig. 11. Experimental (symbols [39]) and computed (lines) ignition delay times behind reflected shock waves. The experimental ignition delay was determined from the onset of infrared emission due to CO$_2$; the computational ignition delay determined from the maximum CO$_2$ concentration gradient.

Fig. 12. Experimental (symbols [42]) and computed (lines) extinction strain rates as a function of the equivalence ratio for ultra-lean H$_2$-air mixtures.

trations of H and O are still overpredicted (see, Table 1). These discrepancies may well be caused by the experimental uncertainty due to flame perturbation by the sample probe.

Finally, the trial model (dashed lines) and the optimized model (solid lines) were compared against extinction strain rates of ultra-lean H$_2$-air mixtures [42]. These experiments were not used as optimization targets because of large influences from the uncertainties in the diffusion coefficients. The results of Fig. 12 indicate that both the trial and optimized model can accurately predict the data for the leaner equivalence ratios, and begin to deviate as the equivalence ratio approaches 0.5. Again, this deviation may be due to diffusion effects and shows the need to include diffuse coefficients in the optimization space [42].

The optimization procedure also allows us to probe the residual kinetic uncertainties. We found that the rate coefficient of H + O$_2$ = OH + O always stayed within 5% of the trial value for all optimization runs made, including the use of a smaller number of targets and/or a reduced dimensionality of active parameter space. The rate coefficient is within 8% and 20% from the analysis of Troe and Ushakov [49] for T > 1500 and 1000 K, respectively. Again, our assignment of rate constant uncertainties prior to optimization is consistent with these differences. Of the remaining active parameters, the optimized $k_3$, $k_4$, and $k_5$ values are often within 20% of the trial values. For H + O$_2$ (+M) = HO$_2$ (+M), optimization led to a 10% increase in the rate coefficient of the base reaction (M = N$_2$), which is acceptable. For M = H$_2$O, the optimized third-body efficiency was a factor of 1.09 of the trial value. Coupled with the change in the rate for base reaction (M = N$_2$), the third-body efficiency of H$_2$O relative to N$_2$ remains unchanged. Optimization yielded a smaller efficiency factor for argon, driven primarily by the ignition delay data (the trial model overpredicts ignition delays). The resulting efficiency factor is equal to 0.46 (relative to N$_2$), and the corresponding rate factor for H + O$_2$ + Ar = HO$_2$ + Ar is within the experimental uncertainty given in [10]. The low-temperature rate coefficient of HO$_2$ + OH = H + O and the high-temperature rate of HO$_2$ + H$_2$ = HO + H$_2$O were lowered by 18% and 13% upon optimization, respectively. Both give a better agreement with the rates recommended by Troe and Ushakov [49].

Among the 28 active parameters, 12 "hit" their respective boundaries of uncertainty spans. The fraction of these parameters is much smaller than what is usually encountered in kinetic model optimization (see, for example [50]). Some of these parameters are either inadequately constrained because of a lack of relevant targets or because they are only marginally active for H$_2$-CO combustion (e.g., 9c, 9e, 23, 25, 29, and 29a). Others may be caused by target data inconsistency [51]. These issues, while worthy to explore, are clearly outside of the scope of the present study.

5. Summary

A H$_2$-CO kinetic model was proposed. The model was based on a comprehensive review of literature kinetic data, considering the recent revisions in the rate coefficient of H + O$_2$ (+M) = HO$_2$ (+M), its third-body efficiencies, and the enthalpy of formation of the OH radical. The trial model performed very well against most of the H$_2$/CO combustion data. Discrepancies in the predictions, however, existed for several data sets. These discrepancies were successfully resolved by optimization within the uncertainty bounds of the relevant rate parameters with respect to 36 targets, including the global combustion properties of ignition delays and laminar flame speeds, and the detailed species profiles during H$_2$ and CO oxidation in flames and flow reactors. It is shown that this set of H$_2$-CO combustion targets can be reconciled within the underlying kinetic uncertain-
ties, and the optimized kinetic model is predictive for all reliable H2–CO combustion data considered herein.
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efficiency factors are 0.4, 0.46, 0.85, 11.9, and 0.75. These submitted.

For Ar, He, H2O, O2, and N2, the un-optimized third body efficiencies are 0.53, 0.53, 0.75, 12, and 1 for Ar, He, O2, H2O, and H2, respectively, relative to that of N2, and the optimized efficiency factors are 0.4, 0.46, 0.85, 11.9, and 0.75. These optimized factors are well within their respective range of uncertainties.

Juan Li, Princeton University, USA. The rate constant of CO + OH ⇌ CO2 + H is pressure-dependent. The authors provide a new expression of the rate constant by fitting the literature experimental results. However, most of the experimental results were measured at low pressures. Is it proper to use the rate constant expression for high-pressure cases?

Reply. A recent theoretical study [1] showed that the rate coefficient for CO + OH = CO2 + H starts to deviate from the low pressure limit (by more than 2%) when pressure becomes greater than ca. 20, 80, 700, 3600 and 13000 bar for T = 800, 1000, 1500, 2000, and 2500 K, respectively. This suggests that the reaction would indeed be at or nearly at its low-pressure limit under the conditions of all experimental data considered herein. Furthermore, the optimized rate expression agrees to within 5% of the theoretical result of [1] in the temperature range of 800-2500 K.

References


Comments

J. Troe, University of Göttingen, Germany. I see problems with this type of optimization of elementary reaction rate coefficients on the basis of macroscopic reaction systems. The conditions of the macroscopic experiments just do not correspond to those of separate studies of the elementary reactions. In particular, pressure-dependent reactions like H + O2 + M or HO + CO + M depend strongly on the third bodies M. In macroscopic reaction systems, these M may also be H2O, reactive atoms, or reactive radicals. For the latter, collision efficiencies may differ markedly from the values derived for third bodies like N2. The optimization of this paper may mix this all up. I would recommend leaving the results, from separate elementary reaction rate studies untouched and only optimize those collision efficiencies (or rate coefficients) that are otherwise inaccessible or unknown.

Reply. We agree that optimization of reaction rate coefficients on the basis of macroscopic reaction systems cannot provide rate values more accurate than isolated “microscopic” experiments or “ab initio” theoretical studies. The purpose of optimization is to examine the ability of up-to-date rate coefficients for predicting the responses of macroscopic reaction systems. This is, after all, the practical purpose of fundamental reaction kinetics. In our optimization procedure, we ask two basic questions. First, do the latest developments in reaction kinetics, i.e., better and more accurate rate coefficients, predict or give rise to better predictions for the macroscopic reaction systems? Second, given the uncertainty in each and every rate parameter, can the responses of macroscopic reaction systems be better predicted by systematic optimization within the uncertainty bounds of each rate parameter? We maintain that the ultimate goal of kinetics studies can only be achieved by fundamental theoretical and experimental studies supplemented frequently by studies such as the one reported here.

The collision efficiencies of different species are indeed markedly different, and it is precisely this reason why we chose to optimize the key, individual collision efficiencies for key pressure-dependent reactions. Uncertainty bounds intrinsically limit to which extent each efficiency factor can be varied, thus maintaining their physical nature, for example, H2O is a more efficient third body. For this reason, we do not see any fundamental reason why optimization would mix this up. As a practical measure we note that for H + O2 + M = HO2 + M the un-optimized third body efficiencies are 0.53, 0.53, 0.75, 12, and 1 for Ar, He, O2, H2O, and H2, respectively, relative to that of N2, and the optimized efficiency factors are 0.4, 0.46, 0.85, 11.9, and 0.75. These
David Smith, University of Leeds, UK. For part of their optimization, the authors use the burning velocity data of McLean (Ref. [32] in paper). The experiments, particularly those with 25% CO/5% H2 fuel were carefully chosen to have high sensitivity to the CO + OH reaction. Two comments on these data:

1. All expanding spherical flame methods for burning velocity measurements have hot burnt gas inside the flame; thereby prone to radiative heat loss. For these flames (relatively show burning and high CO2 content), measured burning velocities may be low by up to 4-5%.

2. As reported in the paper, the authors found that computed burning velocities were sensitive to CO + OH rate only at temperatures around 1160 K. Comparison with these experimental data says essentially nothing about CO + OH at other temperatures.

Reply. Radiative heat loss would have little influence on measured flame speeds, as long as you are not near the flammability limits [1,2]. The 95% CO + 5% H2 in air flame data measured by the expanding spherical flame methods and used as model optimization and validation targets were far from the flammability limits and thus they should be affected minimally by radiative heat loss.

The fact that the CO + OH reaction is influential in a fairly narrow temperature range for the 95% CO + 5% H2 flames is a very important result. Although comparison with these flame speed data says very little about CO + OH at other temperatures, it does point out the subtle fact that a single modified Arrhenius expression cannot reconcile available flame speed and shock tube data of CO. Specifically, a proper prediction for the 95% CO + 5% H2 flames requires a smaller rate coefficient at temperatures around 1160 K, yet a single modified Arrhenius expression would not be able to reconcile flame speed and shock tube data that are sensitive to the rate coefficient of the CO + OH reaction at higher temperatures.
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Frederick L. Dryer, Princeton University, USA. Your method of optimization appears to involve adjustments only in the pre-exponent in rate correlations, which results in rate changes at all temperatures. We have shown [1] that there are “temperature windows” for each input parameter (rate constant, diffusion coefficient) where laminar flame speed is most sensitive to the specific parameter. These windows are small in comparison to the total temperature range of the particular flame. Thus in optimizing against all of the different types of experimental targets that were utilized, your method simultaneously adjusts each rate constant at all temperatures while optimizing against a particular target that covers a particular temperature range. Would it not be more appropriate to optimize both the pre-exponent and temperature dependence (functional shape) of each rate correlation? Essentially you forced such a result here for one rate by proposing a different correlation of CO + OH than appears in the published literature. We have shown the importance of adjusting both pre-exponent and temperature dependence of rate correlations for several elementary reactions involved in the H2/CO/O2 oxidation mechanism, including this one [2].
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Reply. We agree with the fact that each target (flame speed, ignition delay, and flow reactor) is sensitive to a given input parameter (i.e., reaction rate, diffusion coefficient) at a specific temperature or over a given temperature range, depending on the experimental conditions, including pressure. This is precisely the reason why we chose targets that covered an extensive temperature (880–2625 K) and pressure (0.3–33 atm) range in order to ensure accurate optimization of the input parameter over an extended temperature and pressure range. While we agree that a simultaneous optimization of the pre-exponential and temperature dependence would be more rigorous, this level of optimization was not needed as can be seen by the excellent agreement between model predictions of the optimized model and experimental data over extensive temperature and pressure ranges.

A theoretical analysis by Troe [1] has shown that due to the complexity of the CO + OH reaction, there is no inherent reason to believe that a single modified Arrhenius expression can adequately describe the rate of this reaction over an extended temperature range. We proposed to refit the experimental data for the CO + OH reaction using a summation of two modified Arrhenius expressions to more accurately reconcile the experimental data for high, intermediate and low temperatures. This expression also agrees very well with our recent theoretical result [2].
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Abstract

Laminar flame speed has traditionally been used for the partial validation of flame kinetics. In most cases, however, its accurate determination requires extensive data processing and/or extrapolations, thus rendering the measurement of this fundamental flame property indirect. Additionally, the presence of flame front instabilities does not conform to the definition of laminar flame speed. This is the case for Le $< 1$ flames, with the most notable example being ultralean H$_2$/air flames, which develop cellular structures at low strain rates so that determination of laminar flame speeds for such mixtures is not possible. Thus, this low-temperature regime of H$_2$ oxidation has not been validated systematically in flames. In the present investigation, an alternative supplemental approach is proposed that includes the experimental determination of extinction strain rates for these flames, and these rates are compared with the predictions of direct numerical simulations. This approach is meaningful for two reasons: (1) Extinction strain rates can be measured directly, as opposed to laminar flame speeds, and (2) while the unstretched lean H$_2$/air flames are cellular, the stretched ones are not, thus making comparisons between experiment and simulations meaningful. Such comparisons revealed serious discrepancies between experiments and simulations for ultralean H$_2$/air flames by using four kinetic mechanisms. Additional studies were conducted for lean and near-stoichiometric H$_2$/air flames diluted with various amounts of N$_2$. Similarly to the ultralean flames, significant discrepancies between experimental and predicted extinction strain rates were also found. To identify the possible sources of such discrepancies, the effect of uncertainties on the diffusion coefficients was assessed and an improved treatment of diffusion coefficients was advanced and implemented. Under the conditions considered in this study, the sensitivity of diffusion coefficients to the extinction response was found to be significant and, for certain species, greater than that of the kinetic rate constants.

© 2005 The Combustion Institute. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

Accurate knowledge of the chemical kinetic mechanisms of hydrocarbon fuels is essential for design of...
the next generation of engines. While progress in fundamental reaction kinetics has facilitated the growth of this knowledge, it is still essential that the resulting reaction model be tested against a wide variety of fundamental flame properties to ensure model completeness and accuracy. Laminar flame speed, $S_0$, has been the main property against which kinetic mechanisms have been tested and optimized (e.g., [1]). While this is an acceptable approach, there are drawbacks. First, the determination of $S_0$ frequently requires either extrapolations or data processing. Additionally, $S_0$ cannot be defined under conditions that do not conform to the steady, laminar, one-dimensional, stretch-free, planar, adiabatic flame model. This is the case when instabilities develop. The most profound example covers flames with $L \ll 1$ such as ultralean H$_2$/air flames; $L$ is the mixture’s effective Lewis number. These flames are severely affected by cellular instabilities as the stretch rate approaches zero.

Yet the properties of these ultralean, weak flames are particularly useful to kinetic model development, in that the maximum temperature of these flames approaches or is below the crossover temperature of chain branching versus chain termination. The overall reaction becomes slow and rate limiting. And for this reason, the properties of ultralean flames are expected to be more sensitive to reaction kinetics than those of stronger flames. The intensity of ultralean flames may also be limited by the rate of fuel supply to the intense reaction zone. Consequently diffusion–kinetic coupling is expected to be ever important.

The current study was directly motivated by the aforementioned considerations. Specifically, an alternative/supplemental approach is proposed here for the validation of flame kinetics. It is proposed that the extinction strain rate, $K_{ext}$, determined in counterflow configurations be used to supplement $S_0$; considering that $K_{ext}$ is often sensitive to kinetic subsets similar to $S_0$ (e.g., [2]). In the counterflow configuration the surface of $L \ll 1$ flames become smooth under the influence of positive stretch, as the cellular instabilities are suppressed.

To ensure that the comparisons between the experimental and predicted $K_{ext}$ values are reliable, the flame extinction experiments must be performed so that several subtle issues are adequately addressed. First, given that the extinction state cannot be measured and only the strain rates of preextinction states can be determined, a methodology is required to ensure that there is no need for extrapolations. Second, some geometric requirements must be met for the experimental configuration to be truly represented by the numerical simulations. Both these points were carefully considered, and the details are presented next.

In summary, implementation of $K_{ext}$ for kinetic validation allows for probing of the ultralean H$_2$/air regime that has not been adequately assessed in past flame studies. This kinetic regime corresponds to temperatures of about 1000 to 1400 K that are well below those encountered in hydrocarbon/air flames, and is also of direct relevance to hydrocarbon ignition. In addition, molecular diffusion is expected to be important in the flame extinction process. In the present investigation, the effects of uncertainties associated with the diffusion coefficients and their formulations are also addressed.

2. Experimental approach

The experiments were conducted using the counterflow technique, which allows for the establishment of planar single or twin flames. Single flames were considered and they were established by counter-flowing a fuel/air jet against an opposing ambient-temperature air jet. In the present investigation this approach was preferred over the symmetric twin-flame configuration (e.g., [3]) because, for the same equivalence ratio, $\phi$, the single-flame configuration results in lower $K_{ext}$ values compared with the twin-flame configuration. Consequently, lower Reynolds numbers are required, thus minimizing the effect of intrinsic instabilities that are present in flow systems.

For the experiments to be consistent with the assumptions of the quasi-one-dimensional stagnation code that is presented in the following section, the $L/D$ ratio was chosen to be less than 1.0, typically between 0.5 and 1.0; $L$ is the burner separation distance and $D$ is the burner diameter. It has been confirmed experimentally that as long as $L/D \leq 1$, the experimental and predicted velocity profiles along the stagnation streamline are in close agreement. The nozzle diameters used were $D = 7$, $14$, and $22$ mm, and the reported data were taken by using $L = 7$, $14$, and $18$ mm; typically smaller (greater) $L$ and $D$ values are used for stronger (weaker) flames.

The digital particle image velocimetry (DPIV) technique [4] was used for determination of the axial velocity profile along the stagnation streamline. The flow was seeded by 0.3-μm-diameter silicon oil droplets, produced by a nebulizer similar to that of Hirasawa et al. [5]. The absolute value of the maximum velocity gradient in the hydrodynamic zone is defined as the strain rate, $K$.

The extinction strain rate, $K_{ext}$, cannot be directly determined given that measurements at the extinction state cannot be made, and, therefore, extrapolations may be needed. This problem was resolved by establishing flames at states very close to extinction, determining the prevailing $K$, and by subsequently achiev-
ing extinction through a slight reduction of the fuel flow rate for these fuel-lean flames. It was shown both experimentally and numerically that \( K \) is minimally affected through such slight variations of the fuel flow rate. Thus, the measured \( K \) for a slightly richer flame is a very close representation of the actual \( K_{\text{ext}} \). This approach provides a direct measurement of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) that can be used with confidence for validating chemical kinetics.

The measurements were performed for atmospheric ultralean H\(_2\)/air mixtures. Additionally, and to moderate potential \( \text{Le} \) number effects, \( \text{N}_2 \)-diluted near-stoichiometric H\(_2\)/air mixtures were also considered.

3. Numerical approach

The counterflow configuration was numerically simulated by solving the quasi-one-dimensional conservation equations of mass, momentum, species concentrations, and energy along the stagnation streamline [6–8]. The effect of thermal radiation from CH\(_4\), H\(_2\)O, CO\(_2\), and CO at the optically thin limit [7] was also included. The code was integrated with the CHEMKIN [9] and Sandia Transport [10] subroutine libraries. Modifications were made in the Transport subroutines to account for recent updates of diffusion coefficients for pairs whose interactions cannot be accurately described by the Lennard–Jones potential function, as is discussed in Section 4.

The extinction condition was achieved by first establishing a vigorously burning flame and by increasing the flow velocities at the burner exits; all experimental conditions were modeled directly by considering the exact values of \( L \) (i.e., 7, 14, and/or 18 mm) that were used in the experiments as they can have a notable effect on \( K_{\text{ext}} \) [7]. At the extinction state, the response of any flame property to the strain rate is characterized by a turning point behavior. The code has been modified to allow for capturing this singular behavior and allowing, thus, for the accurate determination of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) (e.g., [11]). More specifically, a two-point continuation approach was implemented by imposing a predetermined temperature or species mass fraction at two points in the flow field, so that the nozzle exit velocities are solved for, rather than imposed as boundary conditions. In doing so, the local strain rate, \( K \), and as a result \( K_{\text{ext}} \), become dependent variables rather than independent ones and the turning point behavior is not a singular one.

Four H\(_2\)/O\(_2\) kinetic models were used in the numerical simulations. The first two models are those of Mueller et al. [12] (hereafter referred to as MKYD99) and Li et al. [13] (hereafter referred to as LZKD04). Two additional models were also considered and the details are given in Ref. [14]. Briefly, a “trial” model (hereafter referred to as TRM04) was compiled based on a comprehensive review of literature data considering recent kinetic developments, especially in the rate constants of the \( \text{H} + \text{O}_2 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{M} \) reaction and the revision of the enthalpy of formation of the OH radical. An “optimized” model (hereafter referred to as OPM04) was derived from the “trial” model by optimizing rate parameters with respect to a wide range of H\(_2\) and CO oxidation data in shock tubes, flow reactors, and flames. It is important to note that the objective of the current simulations was not to compare the performance of various reaction models. Rather selected models were employed to illustrate two important points: (1) the suitability of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) as a tool of kinetic mechanism validation, and (2) the strong diffusion-kinetic coupling that exists for all models tested.

Assessing the effects of chemical kinetics and molecular diffusion on \( K_{\text{ext}} \) requires the use of sensitivity analysis. While the standard CHEMKIN-based codes do allow for automated sensitivity analysis with respect to all rate constants for \( S_0^k \) and all temperature and species concentrations (e.g., [15]), this is not the case for the important \( K_{\text{ext}} \). In this investigation, this was achieved for the first time by realizing, as described earlier, that \( K_{\text{ext}} \) becomes a dependent variable when the aforementioned two-point continuation approach is invoked. As a result it was possible to perform rigorous sensitivity analysis with respect to rate constants for \( K_{\text{ext}} \) at the exact location that is determined experimentally, i.e., where it reaches its maximum value in the hydrodynamic zone. However, the capability of performing sensitivity calculations of the various dependent flame properties on species diffusivities is not readily available in the existing codes. Thus, a “brute force” approach was implemented. More specifically, the mass diffusivity of each species \( i \) to the mixture, \( D_{i,m} \), was perturbed by \( \pm 25\% \) and the attendant \( K_{\text{ext}} \) values were subsequently determined. Subsequently, logarithmic sensitivity coefficients were formed by determining the derivatives \( \partial (\ln K_{\text{ext}}) / \partial (\ln D_{i,m}) \).

As is shown in the Section 5, the sensitivity of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) to diffusion was found to be significant for certain species. This motivated further assessment of the validity of the diffusion coefficient formulation of the Sandia Transport subroutine library [10] which is extensively used in flame modeling. As a result, an improved treatment of the diffusion coefficients was advanced and is presented next.

Additional simulations were performed using the Premix code [15] for the determination of laminar flame speeds, \( S_0^k \), to address the relative sensitivities of kinetics versus diffusivities to \( S_0^k \). The code automatically outputs the logarithmic sensitivity coef-
fusion coefficients of key pairs be directly modeled, might be too restricted and suggested that the diffusion coefficients are seemingly small (i.e., within 10%), using potential functions calculated from first principles, without resorting to the use of tabulated L-J 12–6 collision integrals. The rationale behind this approach is that when the resulting diffusion coefficient is appropriately compared with experimental data at or near room temperature, the extrapolation of diffusion coefficient into the high-temperature region is made more reliable, as the potential function is solidly based on ab initio quantum chemistry theories.

In this work an update for binary diffusion coefficients is provided for selected pairs (see Table 1). All of the updates are based on ab initio theory, and all the corresponding diffusion coefficients validated against the room-temperature experimental data [17–22]. Fig. 1 compares the binary diffusion coefficients of the Sandia compilation [10] and those of the current update for pairs (H₂, N₂) and (H, N₂). Although the differences in the two sets of diffusion coefficients are seemingly small (i.e., within 10%), this same difference could cause notable differences in predicted $K_{ext}$, as is discussed later.

Within the framework of the Sandia Premix [15] and similar codes, implementing these updates is quite easy and adequate, even if diffusion coefficients are available for only a few pairs. The temperature dependence of binary diffusion coefficients at 1 atm was fitted, as in Ref. [10], by

$$\ln D_{ij} = d_0 + d_1 \ln T + d_2 (\ln T)^2 + d_3 (\ln T)^3,$$

Table 1
Summary of polynomial coefficients for updated binary diffusion coefficients and ratios of collision integrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Diffusion coefficient, $D_{ij}$</th>
<th>$A'_{ij}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d_0$</td>
<td>$d_1$</td>
<td>$d_2 \times 10^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H–He</td>
<td>–9.6699</td>
<td>2.1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H–Ar</td>
<td>–9.0511</td>
<td>1.6161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H–H₂</td>
<td>–11.7498</td>
<td>3.1507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$a$ The fits are based on diffusion coefficients taken directly from the referenced article, or those computed using the potential functions given in the referenced article.
where $d_k$ ($k = 0, 3$) is the polynomial coefficient, tabulated in Table 1. For the mixture-averaged transport formulation, the above polynomial is sufficient for flame simulations. The multicomponent transport formulation, as well as computation of the thermal diffusion ratio in both transport formulations, however, requires the input of the ratios of collision integrals [10,23], i.e.,

$$A_{ij}^* = \frac{\Omega_{ij}^{(2,2)}}{(2\Omega_{ij}^{(1,1)})},$$
$$B_{ij}^* = \frac{(5\Omega_{ij}^{(1,2)} - \Omega_{ij}^{(1,3)})}{(3\Omega_{ij}^{(1,1)})},$$
$$C_{ij}^* = \frac{(3\Omega_{ij}^{(1,2)})}{(3\Omega_{ij}^{(1,1)})}.$$

These ratios are given for each pair in the following forms:

$$A_{ij}^* = a_0 + a_1 \ln T_{ij}^* + a_2 (\ln T_{ij}^*)^2 + a_3 (\ln T_{ij}^*)^3,$$
$$B_{ij}^* = b_0 + b_1 \ln T_{ij}^* + b_2 (\ln T_{ij}^*)^2 + b_3 (\ln T_{ij}^*)^3,$$
$$C_{ij}^* = c_0 + c_1 \ln T_{ij}^* + c_2 (\ln T_{ij}^*)^2 + c_3 (\ln T_{ij}^*)^3.$$

Here $a_k, b_k,$ and $c_k$ ($k = 0, 3$) are the polynomial coefficients, the values of which are listed in Table 1, and $T_{ij}^*$ is the reduced temperature determined by the collision well depth $\varepsilon_{ij}$ as $T_{ij}^* = kT/\varepsilon_{ij}$.

5. Results and discussion

The experimental $K_{\text{ext}}$ values were modeled by using four different kinetic models and several diffusion coefficient models. Typically, in most flame modeling studies, the Sandia Transport library [10] is used, which includes two options for the calculation of $D_{ij,m}$ values. The first option is the multicomponent approach, and the second is the mixture-averaged approach. Although not explicitly reported, the latter approach is the one that is used more frequently given its significantly lower computational cost. In the present study the effect of such choices was assessed. Additional comparisons were made between predictions based on the $D_{ij,m}$ values as calculated by the present update and that of Ref. [10]. In all simulations the Soret effect was included.

The extent of spatial resolution had a first-order effect on the predicted $K_{\text{ext}}$ values. More specifically, by varying the number of grid points, $N$, from 300 to 2000–3000, $K_{\text{ext}}$ was found to increase by as much as 25%, reaching asymptotically the values that are reported hereafter. It should be noted that in all subsequent figures that contain the experimental and predicted $K_{\text{ext}}$ values, the vertical scale is logarithmic given the large scale of variation of $K_{\text{ext}}$ considered. It should also be noted that the logarithmic scale tends to underemphasize discrepancies. Thus, to accurately illustrate the comparisons between experimental and
predicted $K_{ext}$ values, their ratio is also shown when appropriate.

Fig. 2 depicts comparisons between the experimental and predicted $K_{ext}$ values for ultralean H$_2$/air flames; the simulations shown in the figures included use of updated multicomponent diffusion model (UMC). Fig. 3 depicts the ratio between predicted and experimental $K_{ext}$ values. It is of interest to note that significant disagreements exist between experimental and predicted $K_{ext}$ values, and that there is a difference in the “slope” of the results. At low $\phi$ values, TRM04 closely predicts the experimental $K_{ext}$ values, whereas at high $\phi$, it overpredicts by nearly 40%. The predictions achieved by the other three mechanisms appear to be shifted toward lower $K_{ext}$ values throughout the domain considered. It is apparent that
no mechanism can reproduce the slope of the experimental data.

The results in Figs. 2 and 3 illustrate the effect of chemical kinetics on predicting \( K_{\text{ext}} \). The effect of diffusivity on predicting \( K_{\text{ext}} \) was also assessed by performing simulations using the TRM04 model and three different diffusion models. For clarity, the results are shown in Fig. 4 scaled by the values of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) determined by using the UMC diffusion model. The other two diffusion models were the Sandia multicomponent [10] formulation (SMC) and the updated mixture-averaged formulation (UMA). Comparison of the predictions obtained by the two multicomponent models reveals that the SMC predicts larger \( K_{\text{ext}} \) values, by 15–35% compared with UMC. Furthermore, the UMA model gives \( K_{\text{ext}} \) values 15–50% larger than those given by UMC. These results suggest that the widely used mixture-averaged diffusion models can result in computed flame properties that are notably in error. Similarly, even if a full multicomponent model is used, the values of various molecular diffusion properties could also result in notably different results. Inspection of the results shown in Figs. 3 and 4 also reveals that the UMC model presents roughly 20 and 15% improvements for the predicted \( K_{\text{ext}} \) at \( \phi = 0.35 \) and \( 0.45 \), respectively, compared with the SMC model. The degree of improvement, however, depends on the kinetic model employed.

The reported differences on the order of 15–50% cannot be considered minor. Without proper consideration of diffusion uncertainties, these differences could be falsely attributed to kinetics. Clearly, probing this unique flame region, from both kinetic and molecular diffusion points of view, the uncertainties associated with both processes must be taken into account. It should also be noted from the results shown in Figs. 2–4, the range of the attendant adiabatic flame temperatures, \( T_{\text{ad}} \), is of direct relevance to the ignition of practical hydrocarbon fuels.

To moderate potential diffusion effects, additional experiments were performed, by determining \( K_{\text{ext}} \) values for \( N_2 \)-diluted near-stoichiometric \( H_2/air \) mixtures. The results are illustrated in Figs. 5 and 6 for \( \phi = 0.777 \) and Figs. 7 and 8 for \( \phi = 0.965 \). In these studies the attendant \( T_{\text{ad}} \) values vary from 1600–1700 K down to \( \sim 1200 \) K, thus assessing flame temperatures similar to those of ultralean flames. The numerical simulations shown in Figs. 5–8 were conducted by using the UMC diffusion model and all four kinetic models. The results reported for both \( \phi = 0.777 \) and 0.965 exhibit similar behavior compared with those of Fig. 2 in which the UMC diffusion model was also used. More specifically, for \( \phi = 0.777 \), all mechanisms underpredict \( K_{\text{ext}} \) at low \( T_{\text{ad}} \) values by 25–50%, whereas they overpredict \( K_{\text{ext}} \) at high \( T_{\text{ad}} \) values by 50–60%. For \( \phi = 0.965 \), all mechanisms appear to have a better agreement at low \( T_{\text{ad}} \) values, with discrepancies within \( \pm 15\% \), but at high \( T_{\text{ad}} \), the overpredictions persist and are of the order of 40–50%.

The results shown in Figs. 2–8 clearly indicate that both chemical kinetics and diffusion have a notable
effect on the predicted $K_{\text{ext}}$ values. It is also of interest to note the similarity of the results shown in Figs. 2-4 with those of Figs. 5-8. This similarity does not provide any further insight into the relative importance between chemistry and diffusion. To further investigate the effects of kinetics and diffusion, sensitivity analyses of both processes were performed.

Fig. 9 depicts logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $K_{\text{ext}}$ for the kinetics for ultralean $H_2/air$ flames with $\phi = 0.289$ and 0.314. The analysis was con-
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Fig. 7. Experimental and numerical $K_{\text{ext}}$ values for $N_2$-diluted, $\phi = 0.965$ $H_2$/air flames. The effect of reaction model is shown.
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Fig. 8. Ratio of numerical to experimental $K_{\text{ext}}$ values for $N_2$-diluted, $\phi = 0.965$ $H_2$/air flames. The effect of reaction model is shown.

ducted by using TRM04. As expected, $K_{\text{ext}}$ is positively sensitive to the reactions

$H_2 + O \rightarrow OH + H,$

$H_2 + OH \rightarrow H_2O + H,$

$HO_2 + H \rightarrow OH + OH,$

and the radical chain branching reaction

$H + O_2 \rightarrow OH + O.$

As also expected, the reaction

$H + O_2 (+M) \rightarrow HO_2 (+M)$
exhibits a large negative sensitivity along with other radical termination reactions:

\[ \text{HO}_2 + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{O}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}, \]
\[ \text{HO}_2 + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2. \]

The HO\textsubscript{2} chemistry is significant for \( \phi = 0.289 \), but its role is diminished for the higher \( \phi = 0.314 \) for which \( T_{ad} \) is higher. Based on these results, it is reasonable to attribute some of the observed discrepancies to uncertainties associated with the rate parameters of the aforementioned reactions.

On the other hand, the influence of kinetic uncertainties cannot be adequately assessed without considering the uncertainties in the diffusion coefficients. This point is illustrated in Fig. 10, which depicts logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) with respect to the mass diffusion coefficients for ultralean \( \text{H}_2/\text{air} \) flames with \( \phi = 0.289 \) and \( \phi = 0.47 \), as well as two \( \text{N}_2 \)-diluted \( \phi = 0.777 \) \( \text{H}_2/\text{air} \) flames. It was found that the diffusivity of only four species had a notable effect on \( K_{\text{ext}} \), namely, \( \text{H}_2, \text{O}_2, \text{H}_2\text{O}, \) and \( \text{H} \). Comparing the results of Figs. 9 and 10, the large sensitivity values derived from diffusion are rather striking. Logarithmic sensitivity coefficients for diffusion are not only comparable to those of reaction rates, but, in the case of \( \text{H}_2 \), are nearly three times larger than those of reaction rates. Additionally, the logarithmic sensitivities of the diffusivities of other species such as \( \text{H} \) and \( \text{O}_2 \), although smaller than that of \( \text{H}_2 \), are still of the order of those of reaction rates.

A simple analysis of the diffusion problem reveals that the diffusion coefficients of all species of interest in the mixture, \( D_{i,m} \), are nearly equal to the binary diffusion coefficient of the species in \( \text{N}_2 \), \( D_{i,\text{N}_2} \), for these highly diluted flames in which \( \text{N}_2 \) is the dominant species. Thus, a 10% difference in \( D_{\text{H}_2,\text{N}_2} \) between the Sandia compilation and the current update (see, e.g., Fig. 1) could lead to about a 30% difference in the predicted \( K_{\text{ext}} \)!

Even if \( D_{\text{H}_2,\text{N}_2} \) is accurate to within 5%, we are still faced with an uncertainty of 15% in \( K_{\text{ext}} \). While the prospect of narrowing \( D_{\text{H}_2,\text{N}_2} \) to within 5% at high temperatures is small, the current work highlights the importance of considering diffusion coefficient uncertainties in future reaction model optimization and validation. It is also apparent from the above discussion that the discrepancies between experiment and the four models tested cannot be conclusively viewed as deficient kinetics, because the diffusion uncertainties may be solely responsible.

Comparing the various sensitivities in Fig. 10 reveals that although the diffusivities of \( \text{H}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) are positively sensitive to \( K_{\text{ext}} \) for all cases studied herein, this is not the case for \( \text{H} \) and \( \text{O}_2 \). The positive sensitivity on the \( \text{H}_2 \) diffusion coefficient is physically sound and can be explained based on the very low Le number for these fuel-lean mixtures (e.g., [24]). More specifically, increasing the diffusivity of \( \text{H}_2 \) results in higher flux of \( \text{H}_2 \) into the reaction zone compared with the loss of thermal energy. As a result the flame temperature increases and the flames become more resistant to extinction. Note that the ultralean \( \phi = 0.289 \) and highly diluted (\( \text{N}_2/\text{air} = 1.68 \)) \( \phi = 0.777 \) flames have the highest sensitivities to \( \text{H}_2 \) diffusivity compared with the more stoichiomet-
Fig. 10. Logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $K_{\text{ext}}$ with respect to mass diffusion coefficients, computed for ultralean and $N_2$-diluted near-stoichiometric $H_2$/air flames using the TRM04 model.

The species with the second most important sensitivity to $K_{\text{ext}}$ is the H radical. For all cases except one, its sensitivity is negative, and these are the cases in which the H radical pool is small so that any increase in its diffusivity leads to a "loss" from the reaction zone. For the vigorously burning case of $\phi = 0.777$ flames with relatively low dilution ($N_2/\text{air} = 0.47$), the sensitivity of the H diffusion coefficient is positive given that the radical pool is large, and increasing H radical diffusivity facilitates the initiation of reactions upstream of the intense burning zone.

The species with the second most important sensitivity to $K_{\text{ext}}$ is the H radical. For all cases except one, its sensitivity is negative, and these are the cases in which the H radical pool is small so that any increase in its diffusivity leads to a "loss" from the reaction zone. For the vigorously burning case of $\phi = 0.777$ flames with relatively low dilution ($N_2/\text{air} = 0.47$), the sensitivity of the H diffusion coefficient is positive given that the radical pool is large, and increasing H radical diffusivity facilitates the initiation of reactions upstream of the intense burning zone.

The sensitivities of the mass diffusion of $O_2$ are negative for the ultralean flames, whereas they are positive for the $\phi = 0.777$ flame. This can be explained by the fact that for ultralean flames, $O_2$ is abundant and increasing its diffusion coefficient tends to transport more $O_2$ into the reaction zone, making it thus fuel-leaner and less reactive. However, for the more stoichiometric $\phi = 0.777$ flame, $O_2$ is no longer abundant, and increasing its diffusivity augments the chain branching within the reaction zone.

The extinction process in stagnation-type flows is expected to be sensitive to molecular transport. On the other hand, flame propagation is less sensitive to molecular diffusion. As such, predictions of laminar flame speeds, $S_0^d$, are expected to be less sensitive to molecular diffusion uncertainties. This thesis was also assessed and logarithmic sensitivity coefficients were derived for lean ($\phi = 0.4$), stoichiometric ($\phi = 1.0$), and rich ($\phi = 5.0$) $H_2$/air flames. The simulations were performed using the OPM04 kinetic model and the logarithmic sensitivity coefficients are shown in Figs. 11 and 12 for kinetics and diffusivities, respectively. The sensitivity results are in agreement with previous studies [25,26]. Although the magnitude of the sensitivities of $S_0^d$ with respect to the diffusion coefficients of $H_2$ and H is indeed smaller compared with $K_{\text{ext}}$, they are still of the same order as those of kinetics. Thus, validating the kinetic mechanism against $S_0^d$ values without considering uncertainties related to diffusivities could also result in falsification of the rate constants.

It is of interest to note that although the sensitivity coefficient of $K_{\text{ext}}$ with respect to $H_2$ was shown to be positive, it is notably negative on $S_0^d$, especially for fuel-lean flames, meaning that increasing the diffusivity of the fuel decreases $S_0^d$, which appears to be counterintuitive. For one-dimensional, stretchless, freely propagating flames, it can be theoretically shown that the thickness of the diffusive layer of any reactant $i$, $\delta_i$, scales with its mass diffusivity to the mixture, $D_{i,m}$, according to the relation $\delta_i \sim D_{i,m}^{1/2}$. (Note that this is not the case for near-extinction stagnation-type and $Le < 1$ flames that are stabilized on the stagnation plane and its structure is largely affected by stretch.) Analysis of the computed detailed structures of freely propagating flames indeed confirmed that scaling. For example, 20% increase in the diffusivity of $H_2$ leads to an increase of about 30% in the thickness of the
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Fig. 11. Logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $S_0^d$ with respect to reaction rate coefficients, computed for ultralean, stoichiometric and rich H$_2$/air flames using the OPM04 model.

Fig. 12. Logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $S_0^d$ with respect to mass diffusion coefficients, computed for ultralean, stoichiometric and rich H$_2$/air flames, using the OPM04 model.

H$_2$ diffusive layer, which in turn results in milder H$_2$ concentration gradients. The flux of H$_2$ into the flame is proportional to the product of the diffusion coefficient and the concentration gradient. In the absence of flame stretch, which is present in stagnation flows but not in freely propagating one-dimensional flames, the decrease in the concentration gradient overwhelms the increase in diffusivity. This results in an overall decrease in the flux of H$_2$ to the flame. Thus, the diffusivities of H$_2$ and $S_0^d$ are inversely related.
6. Concluding remarks

A detailed experimental and numerical investigation was conducted on the extinction of ultralean H\textsubscript{2}/air mixtures under atmospheric pressure. The flame kinetics of such mixtures have not been previously validated as laminar flame speeds under such conditions cannot be determined, given the presence of thermodiffusional instabilities. Extinction strain rates were determined instead in the counterflow configuration, which were subsequently compared against predictions based on four kinetic models. Such comparisons are meaningful, as these low-Le number mixtures do not develop instabilities when subjected to high strain rates. Comparisons between experimental and predicted extinction strain rates revealed significant discrepancies for well-validated and widely used models. Under certain conditions, discrepancies of a factor of 2 were realized.

Through detailed sensitivity analysis, it was also shown that the extinction states of such mixtures are sensitive not only to the kinetics but also to the species diffusivities. Thus, validation of models against flame data of such highly diffusive mixtures must be done by considering the uncertainties associated with both kinetics and molecular diffusion. In view of this consideration, an additional contribution of this study was the advancement of a somewhat improved treatment of the mass diffusion coefficients.

Detailed simulations also showed that the predicted extinction strain rates based on the present formulation of diffusion coefficients were different by 15–35% compared with the Sandia transport coefficient compilation. Similarly, it was found that using mixture-averaged versus full multicomponent formulation could affect the predicted extinction strain rates by 15–50%. From a kinetic point of view, differences of the order of 15–50% in predicting global flame properties are rather large and could have a major impact on the approach traditionally taken in kinetic model validation.

Additional studies were conducted for N\textsubscript{2}-diluted near-stoichiometric H\textsubscript{2}/air flames, to obtain results at flame temperatures similar to those of ultralean mixtures but with moderated diffusion effects. However, it was found that for these less diffusive mixtures, the predictions of the four kinetic models were very similar to those for ultralean mixtures, under similar adiabatic flame temperatures.

Finally, additional computations of laminar flame speeds of lean, stoichiometric, and rich H\textsubscript{2}/air mixtures revealed that their sensitivities to kinetics could be of the same order as those to diffusivities. This finding suggests that caution is needed when H\textsubscript{2} oxidation kinetics are validated through comparisons with laminar flame speeds without considering uncertainties in molecular diffusion coefficients.
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Ignition studies have been conducted in counterflow configurations in recent years by using heated air as the ignition source. In the present investigation, an alternative methodology has been advanced for studying ignition, by utilizing vitiated air that is produced from the oxidation of ultra-lean H2/air mixtures supplied from one burner. Non-premixed ignition is achieved by counterflowing the hot vitiated air against a fuel-containing jet. The ultra-lean H2/air mixtures are oxidized on a catalyst positioned at the burner exit, allowing thus for the effective variation of the temperature of the hot gases, which are mainly composed by N2, excess O2, small amounts of H2O, and negligible amounts of radical species. Thus, the heat release of the H2 oxidation serves as the ignition source and eliminates the need of heating the air. This new methodology was tested for non-premixed ignition of H2 and
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H₂-enriched CO. H₂ and CO were studied first, given that the kinetics of these fuels, constitute the fundamental “building blocks” of the hydrocarbons oxidation kinetics. For the H₂ studies, the ignition temperatures were measured for global strain rates varying between 100 and 250 s⁻¹ and mole fractions of H₂ in the (H₂ + N₂) stream varying between 10–60%. Similar studies were conducted for non-premixed H₂-enriched CO, with H₂ molar fractions ranging from 0.3–3% in the fuel stream. The fuel stream was not diluted with N₂ in these studies, given the relatively low ignition propensity of CO, and the need to avoid excessively high ignition temperatures as they could impact the performance of the catalyst and its supporting ceramic material. The present experimental results compare favorably with previously reported ones in similar configurations, providing thus confidence in the proposed ignition methodology. Agreements with numerical predictions were partially satisfactory.

Keywords: ignition, laminar flames, non-premixed flames

INTRODUCTION

As noted by Kreutz, Nishioka, and Law (1994), until recently, most of our knowledge of the low-temperature chemistry that governs flame ignition has come from past studies on the development of chemical mechanisms in homogeneous systems. Subsequently, Law and coworkers (e.g., Fotache et al., 1995, 2000; Kreutz and Law, 1996, 1998) performed rigorous flame ignition studies in the counterflow configuration. H₂ and CO ignition was studied first given the importance of the oxidation chemistry of these fuels in the hierarchy of hydrocarbon chemistry. These studies have indicated that H₂ exhibits a 3-limit dependency on pressure that is similar to the homogeneous explosive limits, and they have also characterized the effect of H₂ concentration on CO ignition in a convective-diffusive system.

The ignition studies of Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000) were conducted by counter-flowing fuel/inert jets against a heated air-jet. The heating of the air was achieved by using electrically heated coils placed within a quartz tube through which the air was passing. The design of the system is rather involved, and there may be some physical limitations associated with the quartz material with respect to the maximum temperature that it could be attained. It has also been reported that the radial temperature profiles are uniform in only 30–50% of the radial range, and this is the result of the unavoidable heat
losses to the quartz tube walls. However, and given that ignition initiates at the highest temperature, which for the experiments of Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000) is located around the centerline, achieving uniformity at 30–50% of the radial range, makes the reported data reliable, and a close representation of what is modeled using the quasi-one dimensional stagnation-flow code.

The purpose of this work is to introduce an alternative approach for ignition studies in the counterflow configuration by utilizing the chemical energy of fuels to create a hot stream of gases that will also have a rather uniform radial temperature distribution. This approach can be much simpler compared to that of Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000) and can be readily used in environments, such as for example in microgravity, in which there are time limitations, and reduced availability of electrical power. Non-premixed H$_2$ and CO ignition is studied first, as these fuels are kinetically simple and constitute the fundamental “building blocks” of the hydrocarbons oxidation kinetics. Furthermore, comparing the experimental results for these simple fuels with those of Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000) would test the validity of the proposed technique.

**EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH**

A variation of the counterflow configuration has been adapted for the present ignition studies. The schematic is shown in Figure 1. Each burner includes an aerodynamically shaped converging nozzle that results in a top-hat velocity profile at the nozzle exit that has a diameter of 10 mm. The top burner contains both internal cooling and an external cooling coil to prevent heating of the system by the flames upon ignition, and/or the vitiated air. Nitrogen co-flow is used to negate the effects of ambient gases, preserving thus the radial uniformity of all properties of the two opposing jets.

The bottom burner includes a 52-mesh, 25 × 25 mm platinum gauze woven from 0.1 mm diameter wire (Alfa Aesar) supported 1 mm above the nozzle exit; see for details Figure 1. A non-porous 99.9% aluminum-oxide ceramic disk, machined with an 11 mm hole, was used to support the platinum mesh due to its high temperature durability, ability to withstand fast temperature loading (thermal shock), and low thermal conductivity (to minimize heat loss in the radial direction). The spacing between the top burner and the platinum screen was set at 12 mm.
Ultra-lean H₂/air mixtures are catalyzed on the platinum surface and become the heat source for ignition, resulting in essence in an H₂/air flame that is stabilized on the catalyst surface. Using a combination of ultra-lean H₂/air mixtures and a catalyst, results in flame temperatures in the range of 650 to 1300 K, that are of relevance to ignition, as Law and coworkers have shown (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000); the lower end of this temperature range can only be achieved in the presence of the catalyst. Furthermore, under such conditions the combustion products largely consist of O₂ and N₂, small amounts of H₂O, and negligible amounts of radical species.

In addition to controlling the vitiated air temperature within the range that is of interest to ignition, the use of a platinum screen to catalyze H₂/air mixtures was implemented in order to assure that the hot gases are produced at the nozzle exit, so that there is no need for stabilizing a (strained) flame between the nozzle exit and the stagnation plane. The location of such flame would become an important parameter in the ignition problem as, to the first order, would affect the heat flux to the opposing fuel/inert jet. Furthermore, it is rather difficult to simultaneously control the flame location and temperature for these ultra-lean H₂/air flames that are characterized by Lewis numbers, Le, notably less than one (e.g., Law, 1988). Variation of the temperature right after the
platinum screen is achieved by changing the equivalence ratio, \( \phi \), of the \( \text{H}_2/\text{air} \) mixture. It should be noted that some initial energy must be supplied to activate the \( \text{H}_2/\text{air}/\text{catalyst} \) system and initiate the heat production, after which the system is completely self-sustaining. The use of a pilot flame or heated wire was concluded to be effective for this task.

The system was found to be stable within a temperature variation of less than 1 K for over 3 hours of operation in the range of 650 to 1300 K. The adiabatic flame temperature limits the maximum temperature that can be achieved over the catalyst, based on the principle of chemical equilibrium. It should be also noted, that because \( \text{H}_2 \) oxidation takes place on the platinum screen, the prevailing strain rate has no effect on the flame temperature which, as a result, cannot exceed its equilibrium value; this would not be the case, if these ultra-lean, \( \text{Le} < 1 \) \( \text{H}_2/\text{air} \) air mixtures were allowed to form a flame that is stabilized by the fluid mechanics (e.g., Law, 1988). Repeatability of the temperatures obtained was found to be within 10 K. Initial temperature measurements for a new Pt mesh may be observed to be higher than those of a used mesh, but preventive maintenance can eliminate further deactivation of the platinum. It was found that “baking” the catalyst in a furnace at 1000 K for 3 hours, shortly after shutdown and during storage, is effective in burning-off any organic matter that can poison the platinum. The radial temperature profile was measured and was found to be uniform within approximately 60% of the radial range, which is an improvement over the temperature profile uniformity reported by Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000).

Non-premixed ignition of \( \text{N}_2 \)-diluted \( \text{H}_2 \) was investigated for \( \text{H}_2 \) mole fractions in the fuel stream, \( X_{\text{H}_2} \), ranging from 10 to 60%, and global strain rates, \( K_{\text{gill}} \), ranging from 100 to 250 s\(^{-1}\). A similar study on \( \text{H}_2 \)-enriched \( \text{CO} \) was carried out for strain rates between 150 and 260 s\(^{-1}\).

For all cases, the catalytic activity was first established opposite to a flow of \( \text{N}_2 \). The temperature of the ignition source was then reduced far below the anticipated ignition value, while the desired concentration of fuel/\( \text{N}_2 \) exiting the top burner was set. For the case of \( \text{CO} \) that ignites at higher temperatures compared to \( \text{H}_2 \), \( \text{N}_2 \) was entirely eliminated in order to maintain relatively low ignition temperatures that would not compromise the performance of the catalyst and its ceramic support. Ignition was subsequently obtained by gradually increasing the temperature of the hot gases until a vigorously burning flame is established. It
should be noted that a dark environment is necessary to observe the ignition of H₂ flames, as they are colorless.

The temperature was measured at a distance of 0.5 mm above the platinum just prior to ignition and is used as the ignition temperature, \( T_{\text{ign}} \), similarly to the approach of Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000). An yttrium-beryllium-oxide-coated Omega S-type thermocouple with a 0.041 mm junction was used for the temperature measurements. All temperatures were corrected for radiation losses in the manner consistent with that of Qin (2000). Correction of measured temperatures does have a tendency to introduce uncertainties that stem particularly from the choice of model assumed for the thermocouple wire. Relevant models assume the junction to be either a sphere or a cylinder in cross flow (Qin, 2000). Differences in the corrected temperatures vary by as much as 40 K between the models for some measurements, but were on average no more then 30 K apart. Given that the thermocouple used can most accurately be described as somewhere between the cylinder and sphere (e.g., Fotache et al., 1995), the uncertainty introduced by the thermocouple corrections is as much as \( \pm 20 \) K at a conservative estimate, but more realistically \( \pm 15 \) K.

In order to investigate uncertainties regarding the composition of the vitiated air, which is an important boundary condition in the numerical simulations, stable species measurements just downstream of the platinum screen were carried out using mass spectrometry. To sample the flow, the technique reported by Ren (2001) was utilized. Briefly, a microprobe was inserted into the stagnation streamline of the vitiated air at 1 mm above the platinum screen. The vacuum inside the probe was set so that the flow velocity inside the probe entrance was equivalent to that of the sample stream. This is important, because as it has been noted in previous studies (e.g., Ren, 2001; Westenberg et al., 1957), the introduction of microprobes into laminar flows does not significantly affect the concentrations of the measured species only if the flow velocity at the probe entrance is equivalent to the flow velocity of the undisturbed stream at the same point, unperturbed by the probe. The sample was then transferred to the UTI 100c mass spectrometer for analysis. This particular model utilizes a quadrupole design coupled with a tuning fork chopper cycling at 400 Hz that feeds into a lock-in amplifier that ensures that only the modulated mass spectrometer output that coincides to the beat frequency of the chopper is read. This process helps to enhance the signal-to-noise ratio of the measurements.
NUMERICAL APPROACH

The opposed-jet configuration was simulated along the stagnation streamline by solving the quasi-one dimensional conservation equations of mass, momentum, energy, and species concentration similar to previous studies (e.g., Egolfopoulos and Campbell, 1996). The code is integrated with the CHEMKIN (Kee et al., 1989) and Transport (Kee et al., 1983) subroutine libraries. The GRI 3.0 (Smith et al., 2000) and Mueller et al. (1999) kinetic mechanisms were used to describe the details of the H$_2$/CO/O$_2$ oxidation.

In the simulations, the ignition state was reached through successive solutions of the governing equations that were obtained by increasing the values of temperature, and by also considering the attendant changes of the composition of the vitiated air. The composition of the vitiated air at a particular temperature was determined by calculating the equilibrium products of the catalyzed H$_2$/air mixture using STANJAN (Reynolds, 1987). Thus, the equilibrium products determined at the measured temperature and for the prevailing $\phi$ of the (ultra-lean) H$_2$/air stream, were used as boundary conditions. The validity of the assumption and its implications on the ignition process will be further assessed in the Results and Discussion section.

The ignition state is described by a “turning-point” behavior as the temperature of the vitiated air increases (e.g., Law et al., 1995, 1998, 2000). To capture this behavior, the stagnation code was modified by imposing a one-point continuation technique (Egolfopoulos and Dimotakis, 1998; Nishoika et al., 1996) with respect to any radical concentration. Given its importance to chain-branching, the H radical can be used as a good measure of the ignition kernel characteristics. A pre-determined increment on the H-radical concentration was imposed at the location where this concentration had a maximum slope on the side that is near to the hot boundary, i.e., the bottom burner. Thus, this new boundary condition replaces the temperature at the bottom burner for which the “S”-curve is single-valued. Progressive steady-state solutions were obtained and monitored until turning point behavior was exhibited on the system response curve of the maximum H mass fraction, $(Y_H)_{max}$, versus the maximum temperature of the vitiated air, $T_{max}$, as shown in Figure 2; note that $T_{max} = T_{ign}$. The solution at the turning point corresponds to the ignition state. It should be noted that this method can capture the entire “S” shaped system response curve, but simulations were stopped
Figure 2. Variation of numerically determined $Y_{H_{\text{max}}}$ vs. $T_{\text{max}}$ around the ignition state of non-premixed $H_2$ vs. vitiated air for $X_{H_2} = 0.4$ and $E_{ign} = 150 \text{ s}^{-1}$. Simulations included the use of the GRI 3.0 mechanism (Smith et al., 2000).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hydrogen Ignition

Figure 3 depicts the effect of $N_2$ dilution on $H_2$ ignition, and it is shown to exhibit three regions of distinct trends. In the first region corresponding to $X_{H_2} < 0.15$, $T_{\text{ign}}$ monotonically decreases with increasing $X_{H_2}$. In the third region corresponding to $X_{H_2} > 0.20$, $T_{\text{ign}}$ appears to minimally depend on $X_{H_2}$. For $0.15 < X_{H_2} < 0.20$, a transition from the first to the third region takes place. Error bars reflect the standard deviation that results from the data scatter. The numerically predicted $T_{\text{ign}}$'s, using the mechanisms of Mueller et al. (1999) and GRI 3.0 (Smith et al., 2000), are also shown in Figure 3. The Mueller et al. mechanism...
under-predicts the experimental $T_{\text{ign}}$'s for all $X_{\text{H}_2}$'s, while the GRI 3.0 mechanism under-predicts the experiments for low $X_{\text{H}_2}$'s and over-predicts them for high $X_{\text{H}_2}$'s. In general, the predictions using the GRI 3.0 mechanism are closer to the experimental data when compared to the Mueller et al. mechanism, which under-predicts the $T_{\text{ign}}$ by as much as 70 K at the lowest $X_{\text{H}_2}$ tested.

In the present investigation the results are presented in terms of the global strain rate, $K_{\text{gb}}$, rather than the local strain rate before the flame, $K$. While $K_{\text{gb}} = u_{\text{exit}}/(L/2)$, where $u_{\text{exit}}$ is the nozzle exit velocity and $L$ is the nozzle separation distance, $K$ is the absolute value of the axial velocity gradient at the boundaries of the ignition kernel, and can be only determined through the use of laser-based velocity measurements diagnostics. To assess if reporting experimental data for a given value of $K_{\text{gb}}$ are meaningful, the effect of $K_{\text{gb}}$ on $T_{\text{ign}}$ was determined numerically and the results are shown in Figure 4. It can be seen that for the range of $K_{\text{gb}}$ studied here, $T_{\text{ign}}$ is, for the most part, nearly invariant with $K_{\text{gb}}$, eliminating thus the need for determining the local strain rates. The lack of dependency of ignition on strain rate allows for a detailed view of the
steady-state system as dependent on diffusion and kinetics only. It should be noted that this finding should not be generalized, as it is known from the work of Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000) that for a wider range of strain-rate variation the effect on ignition can be significant. What is reported here is a relatively narrow range of strain rates as far as ignition is concerned, which however is wide enough to eliminate the need for using more detailed measurements of convective velocities. This constitutes a major simplification of the experimental approach, and the data can, therefore, be used with confidence to assess the effects of kinetics on ignition.

The analyses of the ignition states were performed within the ignition kernel, similarly to Kreutz, Nishioka, and Law (1995). Figure 5 depicts the kernel structure at the ignition state for \(X_{H_2} = 0.10\). The structure shown in Figure 5 was found to be very similar to that reported by Kreutz, Nishioka, and Law (1995), implying that the ignition state using vitiated air is very similar to that of heated air.

As expected, reaction path analysis performed in the third region with \(X_{H_2} > 0.40\) reveals that the \(H_2\) oxidation at the ignition state is
Figure 5. Structure of the numerically determined ignition kernel at the ignition state for non-premixed H\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} vs. vitiated air configuration with X\textsubscript{H\textsubscript{2}} = 0.10. Simulations included the use of the GRI 3.0 mechanism (Smith et al., 2000).

governed by the following four reactions (The preceding reaction numbers correspond to those in the H\textsubscript{2}/O\textsubscript{2} sub-mechanism of the original GRI 3.0 mechanism):

\begin{align*}
R10 & \quad H + O_2 \leftrightarrow OH + O \\
R20 & \quad H_2 + O \leftrightarrow OH + H \\
R3 & \quad H_2 + OH \leftrightarrow H + H_2O \\
R8 & \quad H + O_2 + (M) \leftrightarrow HO_2 + (M)
\end{align*}

R3 is dominant as it consumes the majority of H\textsubscript{2} and accounts for almost all the water production. In this case, the OH radical production is almost evenly split between the two branching reactions R10 and R20, and both are highly dependant on H, which is competed for by the 3-body reaction R8. These results are identical to those previously reported by Kreutz, Nishioka, and Law (1995).

The first region with X\textsubscript{H\textsubscript{2}} < 0.15 exhibits a monotonically increasing T\textsubscript{ign} with decreasing X\textsubscript{H\textsubscript{2}}. Note that as a result of the dependence of Arrhenius kinetics on temperature, the ignition kernel is located close
to the hot boundary, i.e., the oxidizer boundary. Furthermore, within the kernel the reactants are well mixed for the chemistry to be activated. Thus, a local equivalence ratio, $\phi$, can be determined within the kernel; $\phi \equiv (X_{H_2}/X_{O_2})/(X_{H_2}/X_{O_2})_{stoichiometric}$. The value of $\phi$ is chiefly affected by the flux of $H_2$, which has to diffuse across the stagnation plane in order to reach the oxidizer boundary. Figure 6 depicts the variation of $\phi$, determined at the position of maximum $H$ concentration, with respect to $X_{H_2}$. It can be seen that $\phi$ in the kernel decreases more rapidly as the $X_{H_2} = 0.10$ limit is approached. This is due to the decrease in $H_2$ concentration on the fuel side, which, in turn, decreases the driving force of diffusion or in other words the process becomes diffusion-limited. For $X_{H_2} > 0.30$, the slope of the $\phi$ curve is becoming less steep, and for $X_{H_2} > 0.40$ the change is not significant enough, and ignition is controlled by kinetics with pathways that are nearly identical to cause any notable variation of $T_{ign}$ with $X_{H_2}$.

Effect of $H_2$ Leakage. A concern of the proposed ignition methodology is that not all of the hydrogen used for the heat production is being
consumed over the catalyst. In order to investigate this, a series of experiments and numerical simulations were conducted. Figure 7 depicts the results of numerical simulations, in which H₂ was allowed to be present in the vitiated air stream in order to simulate the effect of potential H₂ leakage through the catalyst. The ignition states were determined for the X_{H₂} = 0.10 and 0.60 cases. The results show that there is a relatively small effect on T_{ign}, which is more apparent for the X_{H₂} = 0.10 case. This is reasonable, because H₂ leakage from the catalyst will have a greater effect on the local equivalence ratio within the ignition kernel for the lower X_{H₂} = 0.10 case. However, the variations of T_{ign} that are reported in Figure 7 are well within the uncertainty range of the experiments. It was subsequently determined by mass spectrometry measurements, that the H₂ mole fractions were less than 0.01 (i.e., 1%) for the entire range of experiments. This experimental evidence supports the argument that the equilibrium product assumption just downstream of the platinum screen is a physically sound one, and that the boundary conditions used in the numerical simulations closely resemble the experimental ones.

![Figure 7. Numerically determined effect of H₂ leakage through the platinum mesh on T_{ign} for X_{H₂} = 0.10 and 0.60. Simulations included the use of the GRI 3.0 mechanism (Smith et al., 2000).](image)
Effect of $H_2O$. The present results on non-premixed $H_2$ ignition were also compared with those of Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000), in order to further assess the validity of the proposed methodology. It was found that the $T_{\text{ign}}$'s determined in both the present experiments and simulations were on the average, 60–70 K higher than those measured by Law and coworkers (1995, 1996, 1998, 2000).

This was explained based on kinetics arguments. The use of the chemical energy of $H_2$/air flames as the heating source for ignition results in a slightly oxygen-depleted oxidizer, when compared to normal air, which also contains small amounts of $H_2O$. The presence of $H_2O$ results in the enhancement of the 3-body $H + O_2 + (H_2O) \rightarrow HO_2 + (H_2O)$ reaction, which has a termination effect on the radical production and suppresses ignition. This is illustrated numerically in Figure 8, where the mole fraction of $H_2O$ in the hot oxidizer stream is varied from 0 to 0.09. Results reveal a notable increase of $T_{\text{ign}}$ with the amount of $H_2O$ present in the oxidizer. It is also of interest to note, that there is about a 60 K difference in $T_{\text{ign}}$ between the normal air case and the vitiated air, which supports the argument on the observed differences in $T_{\text{ign}}$

![Figure 8](image-url)

Finally, an estimate of the uncertainty of the present experiments with respect to the H$_2$O concentration in the vitiated air can be made. Given that the maximum H$_2$ mole fraction measured downstream of the catalyst was found to be below 1%, the corresponding variation of the H$_2$O has to be at most 1% compared to its equilibrium value. Based on the results of Figure 8, 1% variation in the H$_2$O mole fraction results in a $T_{\text{ign}}$ variation that is well within the experimental uncertainty, i.e., less than 5–7 K.

**Effect of Total Vitiated Air Composition.** To assess the potential influence of errors introduced by the thermocouple measurements and the experimental scatter on the reported data, the effect of the total vitiated air composition on ignition was also investigated. This was achieved through perturbations of the total composition of the vitiated air by varying the temperature at which the equilibrium products are calculated by ±10%. The computed results are shown in Figure 9, and they reveal

![Graph showing variation of $T_{\text{ign}}$ vs. mole fraction of H$_2$ in fuel stream](image)

Figure 9. Variation of numerically determined $T_{\text{ign}}$ vs. $X_{\text{H}_2}$ for $K_{\text{str}} = 126\text{ s}^{-1}$ when vitiated air equilibrium products are calculated at ±10% of the measured vitiated air temperature. Simulations included the use of the GRI 3.0 mechanism (Smith et al., 2000).
that there is relatively minor change in $T_{\text{ign}}$ as a result of the overall temperature at which the equilibrium products are calculated.

**H$_2$-Enriched CO Ignition**

H$_2$-enriched CO ignition experiments were conducted for $X_{H_2}$ values ranging from 0.3 to 3% of H$_2$ in CO, and for $K_{\text{Stb}}$ varying between 150 and 260 s$^{-1}$. In these studies, no N$_2$ was present in the fuel stream, as CO ignites at higher temperatures compared to H$_2$ and our goal was to maintain the ignition temperatures to as low levels as possible as mentioned in a previous section. Figure 10 depicts the variation of $T_{\text{ign}}$ with $X_{H_2}$. Error bars represent the standard deviation of the experimental data scatter. As expected, $T_{\text{ign}}$ was found to decrease with $X_{H_2}$. The numerical simulations predict similar qualitative behavior, but notable differences between experimental and predicted $T_{\text{ign}}$'s exist. While the GRI 3.0 mechanism over-predicts the experimental $T_{\text{ign}}$'s, the Mueller et al. mechanism notably under-predicts them. Similarly to the H$_2$
ignition case, it was found that the effect of the strain rate on \( T_{\text{ign}} \) is minor for the range of \( K_{\text{fgb}} \) studied here.

Reaction path analysis revealed that the following reactions control the ignition process:

\[
\begin{align*}
R10 & \quad H + O_2 \leftrightarrow O + OH \\
R3 & \quad O + H_2 \leftrightarrow H + OH \\
R8 & \quad H + O_2 + (M) \leftrightarrow HO_2 + (M) \\
R31 & \quad OH + CO+ \leftrightarrow H + CO_2 
\end{align*}
\]

As expected, \( R31 \), which represents the main destruction pathway for CO, is of great importance. \( R10 \) and \( R3 \) are chain-branching pathways that compete with \( R8 \), the main chain termination pathway. These results are also in agreement with those of Fotache et al. (2000).

Effects of \( H_2O \). Similarly to what was reported in the previous section on \( H_2 \) ignition, the ignition temperatures recorded for \( H_2 \)-enriched CO versus vitiated air are also higher than those for ignition versus heated air (Fotache et al., 2000). The addition of \( H_2O \) to the hot oxidizer stream has a tendency to suppress ignition. Again, the presence of finite amounts of \( H_2O \) was found to enhance the 3-body \( H + O_2 + (H_2O) \leftrightarrow HO_2 + (H_2O) \) reaction, which depletes the H radical pool. The uncertainty of the \( H_2O \) concentration in the vitiated air is also less than 1% with an attendant variation for \( T_{\text{ign}} \) that is well within the experimental uncertainty, i.e., less than 5–7 K.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

A new experimental methodology has been advanced for studying flame ignition in counterflow configurations. It involves the use of vitiated air as the ignition source, which is produced by the oxidation of ultra-lean \( H_2/air \) flames on a platinum screen placed at the nozzle exit of one of the burners. This allows for the efficient variation of the temperature of the hot gases in a range that is of relevance to ignition. The vitiated air produced by ultra-lean \( H_2/air \) flames contains minor amounts of \( H_2O \).
technique is an alternative one to that of Law and coworkers, who instead used electrically heated air as the ignition source. The use of vitiated air eliminates the need for complex burner design and avoids problems associated with burner materials. As a result, it can be readily used to study ignition phenomena in environments, such as for example microgravity, in which the experimental times are short, and the availability of electrical power can be limited.

Non-premixed ignition of \( \text{H}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2 \)-enriched CO was studied. The obtained results are consistent with those determined by Law and coworkers, providing thus confidence to the proposed technique. The ignition results of \( \text{H}_2/\text{N}_2 \) mixtures revealed two distinct limits. For low \( \text{H}_2 \) concentrations the behavior was found to be diffusion-limited, while for high \( \text{H}_2 \) concentrations it was found to be kinetically controlled. The results on \( \text{CO}/\text{H}_2 \) demonstrated the anticipated sensitivity of CO ignition to \( \text{H}_2 \) addition. For both chemical systems insight was provided into the physico-chemical mechanisms controlling the ignition phenomena.
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Abstract

In the present study, extinction strain rates and ignition temperatures of a wide range of jet fuels were experimentally determined in the counterflow configuration under non-premixed conditions. Similar measurements were also made for single-component hydrocarbon fuels and surrogate fuels, and were compared with those obtained for the jet fuels. The experiments were conducted at atmospheric pressure and elevated temperatures. Comparing single-component hydrocarbon fuels, it was found that those with lower carbon number exhibit greater resistance to extinction and greater ignition propensity. The results for the jet fuels revealed that there is a large variation in both extinction and ignition limits. Jet fuels with similar extinction behavior were found to display a rather different ignition response. Two recently proposed JP-8 surrogates were also tested, and both the ignition and extinction states of a reference JP-8 fuel were not predicted satisfactorily. Both surrogates were found to exhibit a more robust combustion behavior compared to JP-8, as manifested by their increased ignition propensity and their increased resistance to extinction.
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1. Introduction

Jet fuels (JF) are mixtures of large numbers of hydrocarbons spanning a wide range of carbon numbers and chemical classifications. Typically, the carbon number ranges from C7-C16 (on the average C11-C12), and the chemical classifications from n-paraffins to aromatics. The defining characteristics of JFs are not necessarily their chemical compositions, but their physical properties such as density and boiling range. It is also known that the chemical composition of different batches of JFs can vary significantly from each other (e.g., [1]). The large number of complex hydrocarbons present in real JFs renders the modeling of their pyrolysis/oxidation characteristics a rather daunting task. Development of reliable surrogate fuels is the only option to develop kinetics models for simulating real combustors.
Surrogates have been developed for practical fuels based on chemical composition by matching properties, such as volatility, chemical class distribution, average molecular weight, H/C ratio, sooting tendency, heat release, flammability, and regression rate (e.g. [2–6]). This matching, however, is mostly based on physical properties and much less on the chemical properties of the real fuels. Ideally, matching chemical properties requires the study of phenomena that depend to great extent on kinetics in both homogenous systems and flames. Few past studies have considered flame phenomena (e.g. [7]).

In the present investigation, the ignition and extinction limits of non-premixed flames were experimentally determined for a wide range of liquid fuels in the well-controlled counterflow configuration. It is known that both flame ignition and extinction are rather sensitive to chemical kinetics (e.g., [8–10]). Thus, such data could be used to develop appropriate surrogates as well as reliable kinetics mechanisms.

2. Experimental approach

2.1. Configuration

The experiments involved the use of the counterflow configuration. Single planar non-premixed flames were established by counter-flowing a heated fuel/N₂ jet against an ambient-temperature O₂ jet. The extinction and ignition states were determined as functions of the fuel/N₂ mass ratio. The burner diameters used were D = 14 and 22 mm. The burner separation distance, L, was kept equal to D, i.e., L/D = 1.

2.2. Fuels tested

A wide range of liquid fuels was tested. Nine single-component hydrocarbons (SCH), namely n-C₃H₁₂, n-C₆H₁₄, n-C₇H₁₆, n-C₈H₁₈, iso-C₃H₁₈, n-C₅H₁₀, n-C₁₀H₂₂, n-C₁₂H₂₆, n-C₁₄H₃₀, and JP10 (exo-tetrahydrodicyclopentadiene C₁₀H₁₆) were included. Ten practical JFs shown in Table 1, and two published JP-8 surrogates, namely a 12-component (S12) [4] and a six-component (S6) [6] were also tested; details of the surrogates composition are shown in Table 2. The practical (petroleum distillate) fuels studied include JP-8 (standard military JF, MIL-DTL-83133E), three Jet-A fuels (ASTM D1655, similar to JP-8 but for commercial use in US), JP-7 fuel (specialty JF, low volatility/highly processed), two RP-1 fuels (kerosene rocket propellant, MIL-DTL-25576D), JP-10, a Fischer–Tropsch–derived JF manufactured by Synthroleum, and a coal-derived JF [11]. The distillate fuels were supplied by Wright–Patterson Air Force Base and are identified by a four-digit sample number and fuel type in the data that follows.

JP-8-3773 is a typical batch of JP-8 fuel. Jet-A-3638 and -3602 were selected to have levels of aromatics at either end of the distribution described above with 12 and 24%, respectively. Jet-A-4658 is an “average” Jet-A fuel composed by mixing in equal proportions five samples from different US manufacturers. JP-7 and RP-1 are fuels with low aromatic content and more well defined specifications than other JFs, so it was anticipated that these fuels would be consistent from batch-to-batch. As can be seen from Table 1, the JP-8 and the “composite blend” Jet-A fuels have similar composition to the average JF composition revealed in a recent world survey—roughly 60% n-iso-paraffins, 20% cyclo-paraffins (napthalenes) and 20% aromatics. Separate analyses have determined that JF’s average approximately 20% n-paraffins. Two synthetic fuels were tested, namely the Fischer–Tropsch jet fuel (4734) and one based on direct coal-liquefaction (4765), and they are primarily composed of iso-paraffins and naphthenes, respectively. Thus, the present experimental investigation includes the widest variation in fuel composition of any similar flame study to date.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paraffins (n+i)</th>
<th>Cycloparaffins</th>
<th>Dicycloparaffins</th>
<th>Tricycloparaffins</th>
<th>Alkylbenzenes</th>
<th>Indans/tetrals</th>
<th>Indenes</th>
<th>Naphthalene</th>
<th>Naphthenes</th>
<th>Acenaphthenes</th>
<th>Acenaphthylenes</th>
<th>Tricyclic aromatics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP-7</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-T</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4572</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4765</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3773</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4658</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet A blend</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet A</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet A</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

World survey average

Table 2
Surrogate fuel composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>% volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-Xylene</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iso-Octane</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylcyclohexane</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-Dodecane</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-Tetradecane</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetratin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-Xylene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iso-Octane</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylcyclohexane</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-Dodecane</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-Tetradecane</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetratin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyclo-Octane</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-Decane</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butylbenzene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetramethylbenzene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylnaphthalene</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-Hexadecane</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3. Fuel vaporization methodology

The vaporization of liquid fuels is a challenging process. Preferential evaporation is an important complication in multi-component fuels studies that could modify the gaseous fuel composition. On the other hand, using high temperatures to avoid preferential evaporation could result in fuel cracking. Additionally, if the supply lines downstream of the vaporization chamber are not sufficiently heated, condensation can occur.

To satisfy all the requirements, one must identify: (1) a minimum allowable temperature for effective phase change; (2) a maximum temperature and flow residence time that would favor fuel cracking, and (3) a minimum temperature that would result in condensation. To ensure that all fuel components are vaporized at the same rate, the vaporization chamber wall temperature needs to be maintained close to the boiling temperature of the heaviest component in the fuel mixture, that is approximately 300 °C for JFs. Fine droplets are injected into the chamber surrounded by a co-flowing heated N₂ jet as shown in Fig. 1. The chamber diameter is large enough to assure uniform mixing of the fuel vapor with N₂. The chamber wall temperature is the maximum in the entire flow system. The mixture temperature at the exit of the vaporization chamber is approximately 100 °C below the chamber’s wall temperature, but varies depending on the flow rate.

The extent of fuel cracking depends on both temperature and residence time. In the current configuration, the residence time from the point of fuel injection into the chamber to burner exit was determined to be 3–5 s. For a given flow rate, a change in the heating path results a non-monotonic extinction response for SCHs with carbon number greater than C₁₀ and for all JFs. The post-chamber temperatures at which such response was observed were found to be 200–300 °C. This suggests that there is finite amount of cracking when the fuel is exposed to these temperatures for 3–5 s. To avoid such non-monotonic behavior caused by partial fuel cracking, the post-chamber temperatures were kept below 200 °C for all experiments.

The burners were not heated, resulting thus in temperatures at the burner exit in the range of 110–130 °C, which is the boundary condition for the heated fuel-jet. Under such conditions, low fuel/N₂ mass fractions were considered to avoid condensation. For these low fuel/N₂ mass fractions, flames could only be sustained in the presence of O₂-enriched oxidizer. Similarly, Cooke et al. [7] reported that for JP-8/N₂ mass fractions of about 0.02, the minimum O₂ mole fraction in the oxidizer stream was 60% to sustain flames. In the present investigation, pure O₂ was used in both the ignition and extinction studies.

2.4. Determination of extinction and ignition limits

Upon the establishment of a non-premixed flame, the fuel flow rate was slowly reduced until extinction occurred while maintaining the flow rates of O₂ and N₂ constant at the respective burners. Extinction strain rates, Ke, were determined by measuring the maximum strain rate in the oxidizer stream using Digital Particle Image Velocimetry (DPIV) just before extinction occurred. Since the oxidizer stream was kept constant, the Ke was constant for all of the fuels. The ranges of Ke and fuel/N₂ mass ratio considered were 40–360 s⁻¹ and 0.05–0.1, respectively.

The ignition studies were performed by counterflowing the fuel/N₂ jet against ultra-lean H₂/O₂ flames whose temperature was controlled by varying the H₂ flow rate for small temperature changes and by adding trace amounts of CO for larger temperature changes. This approach allows for
the production of hot vitiated oxidizer that serves as the ignition source. Given that H2/O2 flames can be sustained at compositions with very low H2, it has been shown [12] that the composition of the vitiated oxidizer stream is dominated by O2 with small amounts of products such as H2O and CO2 and negligible amounts of radicals. It has also systematically shown [12] that such data are of fundamental value as they can be readily modeled by using the equilibrium product composition of the H2/CO/O2 mixture and the measured flame temperature as boundary conditions.

Ignition was achieved by establishing H2/CO/O2 premixed flame midway between the nozzle and the stagnation plane, and by subsequently increasing the fuel flow rate in the fuel/N2 stream until ignition is observed. The peak temperature of the H2/CO/O2 flame was measured with a thermocouple, and is reported as the ignition temperature, Tign. The ranges of Tign and fuel/N2 mass ratio considered in this study were approximately 1000–1100 °C and 0.045–0.065, respectively.

3. Results and discussion

Experimental results obtained for all fuels will be presented in Tables for completeness and clarity. Graphical presentation will be used only for selected conditions.

Table 3 depicts $K_{ext}$ as a function of fuel/N2 mass ratio for all fuels; for the $K_{ext} = 60, 78$, and $97 \text{ s}^{-1}$ cases, $D = 22 \text{ mm}$ was used, while for the $K_{ext} = 155, 223, 290$, and $357 \text{ s}^{-1}$ cases, $D = 14 \text{ mm}$ was used. Comparison of the SCHs reveals that for the same $K_{ext}$ SCHs with smaller carbon number extinguish at lower fuel/N2 mass ratio, i.e., they have greater resistance to extinction. It can be seen that n-C5H12 is the most resistant while n-C14H30 is the least resistant one. There is, however, less separation between the various fuels extinction response at low strain rates than at higher ones. Non-premixed burning is diffusion-controlled and given that the lighter molecules are more diffusive, they result in more intense burning. The effect of strain rate can also be explained based on a rather similar argument. At high strain rates, the fuel concentration gradients just before the reaction zone are steeper compared to low strain rates. Thus, the importance of mass diffusion is more apparent and there are notable differences as the fuel molecular weight increases. At low strain rates these differences become less distinct.

Comparing n-C8H18 and iso-C8H18 flames, the former are more resistant to extinction. This finding illustrates the importance of the branched nature of the carbon chain on the flame response. Comparing JFs to the SCHs, JF-flames are less resistant to extinction compared to SCHs. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>$K_{ext}$ (s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n-C5H12</td>
<td>0.0571 0.0597 0.0613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C6H14</td>
<td>0.0572 0.0599 0.0627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C7H16</td>
<td>0.0572 0.0601 0.0625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C8H18</td>
<td>0.0580 0.0609 0.0635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iso-C4H10</td>
<td>0.0601 0.0625 0.0646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C9H20</td>
<td>0.0575 0.0610 0.0635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C10H22</td>
<td>0.0574 0.0609 0.0633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C12H26</td>
<td>0.0625 0.0662 0.0696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C14H30</td>
<td>0.0629 0.0661 0.0705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP-7</td>
<td>0.0674 0.0706 0.0755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP-8</td>
<td>0.0687 0.0712 0.0739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP-10</td>
<td>0.0673 0.0704 0.0745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet-A-3602</td>
<td>0.0648 0.0686 0.0735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet-A-3638</td>
<td>0.0644 0.0672 0.0722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet-A-4658</td>
<td>0.0647 0.0680 0.0731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP-1-3642</td>
<td>0.0654 0.0691 0.0732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP-1-4572</td>
<td>0.0643 0.0682 0.0723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCL-4765</td>
<td>0.0651 0.0680 0.0743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT-4734</td>
<td>0.0628 0.0656 0.0701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>0.0620 0.0650 0.0684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>0.0631 0.0660 0.0685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The uncertainty in fuel/N2 mass ratio is 2.5% and in $K_{ext}$ is 3.5%.
flame extinction characteristics of $n$-C$_{12}$H$_{26}$ and $n$-C$_{14}$H$_{30}$ are close to the JFs suggesting that they may be good candidates in surrogate fuel development. For the fuel/N$_2$ mass ratio range considered, the flame extinction characteristics of the different JFs are in general similar. While there are some systematic differences between the JFs, no fuel was clearly identified as the least resistant to extinction.

Figure 2 depicts $K_{ext}$ for flames resulting from the three different batches of Jet-A. Similar extinction behaviors are observed, with the higher aromatic-content Jet-A-3602 flames being slightly less resistant to extinction than the low aromatic-content Jet-A-3638. The flames of the average Jet-A-4658 exhibit an extinction behavior between the flames of the other two batches of Jet-A at low strain rates, but they are the easiest to extinguish at high strain rates. This suggests that the greater the aromatic content of the fuel is the lower is the resistance to extinction.

Figure 3 depicts $K_{ext}$ for the two synthetic fuels. FT-4734 flames are far more resistant to extinction than the DCL-4765 flames. Comparing the purely n-+i-paraffin fuel to the purely cyclo-paraffin fuel reveals that the saturated alkanes have greater resistance to extinction than the ring structured alkanes.

The results of Fig. 4 reveal that flames of the two JP-8 surrogates (S6 and S12) are more resistant to extinction compared to JP-8 and Jet-A-4658. Though those surrogates were compiled by matching the chemical class distribution of JP-8, they both contain a large number of lighter compounds compared to JP-8. The high diffusivities of those smaller molecules cause the flames of both surrogates to be more resistant to extinction compared to JP-8 and Jet-A-4658. For S6, 50% of the mixture by volume has a carbon number of 10 or smaller, while only 20% has a carbon number of 14; the approximate average carbon number of JP-8 is 12. Comparing S6 and S12 flames, it can be seen that the extinction behavior is very similar. Thus, the inclusion of a large amount of small hydrocarbons in a surrogate will result in a fuel that may not mimic satisfactorily the flame behavior of the real fuel.

The difference in extinction characteristics cannot be only attributed to the chemical composition. Since JP-7 contains nearly no aromatics and JP-8 about 20% aromatics, JP-8 would be expected to be less resistant to extinction, which however is not the case. The average molecular weight of the two fuels is also different. With the
average molecular weights of JP-7 and JP-8 being 170 and 152, respectively, the increased average diffusivity of JP-8 counters the effect of chemical composition.

The $T_{\text{ign}}$ for all fuels are shown in Table 4 as a function of the fuel/N$_2$ mass ratio. The data were obtained with $D = 14$ mm at a constant global strain rate of 194 s$^{-1}$, determined by dividing the burner exit velocity by L/2; strain rate effects will be assessed in future investigations. For the 998 °C flame the equivalence ratio, $\phi$, was 0.0782 with a H$_2$/CO molar ratio of 3.548, for the 1050 °C flame $\phi = 0.0825$ with a H$_2$/CO molar ratio of 2.343, and for the 1101 °C flame $\phi = 0.0859$ with a H$_2$/CO molar ratio of 1.609.

When considering uncertainty many fuels have very similar ignition characteristics, but as all fuels were tested against the same ignition source their relative performance can be assessed. Among the SCHs, the lighter the fuel is the easier it is for a flame to ignite. This is, again, reasonable given that the lighter molecules are more diffusive and their transport into the ignition kernel (residing on the oxidizer side) is facilitated. There is only a small difference between the ignition conditions of low carbon number fuels C$_5$-C$_7$, but there is a notable difference between the larger fuels such as C$_9$-C$_{14}$. Comparing fuels of different chemical class reveals that the iso-C$_9$H$_{18}$ flames are much harder to ignite than the n-C$_9$H$_{18}$ flames, as expected. It is also seen that iso-C$_9$H$_{18}$ flames are only slightly easier to ignite compared to n-C$_{12}$H$_{26}$ flames. All JF flames are harder to ignite than n-C$_{12}$H$_{26}$ except JP-10, which has a significantly smaller molecular mass than n-C$_{12}$H$_{26}$. JP-10 is lighter than n-C$_{12}$H$_{26}$ but is still much harder to ignite, demonstrating that napthenic compounds have reduced ignition propensity compared to n-paraffins. The JFs have similar ignition propensity as n-C$_{14}$H$_{30}$.

There is a large range of $T_{\text{ign}}$s for the different JF's with JP-10 and JP-8 flames exhibiting the greatest and lowest ignition propensity, respectively. The DCL-4765 flames are just slightly harder to ignite than n-C$_9$H$_{26}$, and are the second easiest to ignite compared to all JFs. It is of interest to note that while flames of DCL-4765 and JP-10 are the easiest to ignite, they have reduced resistance to extinction as reported earlier and that both fuels consist largely of cycloalkanes. Flames of low-aromatic fuels, namely RP-1s, JP-7, FT-4734, and Jet-A-3638, exhibit similar ignition characteristics. As expected, flames of the three high-aromatic fuels, JP-8 and the two batches of Jet-A, are the hardest to ignite. Figure 5 depicts the difference in ignition characteristics among the three batches of Jet-A. As expected, the fuels with higher aromatic content exhibit reduced ignition propensity.

The ignition behavior of two synthetic fuels is shown in Fig. 6, and the difference between a n+I-paraffin fuel and a cyclo-paraffin fuel is apparent. In contrast to extinction characteristics, the cyclo-paraffins have greater ignition propensity than the n+i-paraffins. This suggests that there is a different order of reactivity from an ignition and extinction point of view. Flames of cyclo-paraffin compounds were found to exhibit extinction

### Table 4

$T_{\text{ign}}$ vs fuel/N$_2$ mass ratio for all fuels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Fuel/N$_2$ mass ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>{9}$H$</em>{12}$</td>
<td>0.0498</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>{10}$H$</em>{14}$</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.0485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>{11}$H$</em>{16}$</td>
<td>0.0503</td>
<td>0.0486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>{12}$H$</em>{18}$</td>
<td>0.0511</td>
<td>0.0486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iso-C$<em>{9}$H$</em>{18}$</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>0.0538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>{9}$H$</em>{20}$</td>
<td>0.0517</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>{10}$H$</em>{22}$</td>
<td>0.0537</td>
<td>0.0518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>{11}$H$</em>{26}$</td>
<td>0.0564</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>{12}$H$</em>{30}$</td>
<td>0.0580</td>
<td>0.0561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP-7</td>
<td>0.0582</td>
<td>0.0555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-8</td>
<td>0.0607</td>
<td>0.0579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP-10</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>0.0540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet-A-3602</td>
<td>0.0603</td>
<td>0.0575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet-A-3638</td>
<td>0.0580</td>
<td>0.0546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet-A-4658</td>
<td>0.0600</td>
<td>0.0572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP-1-3642</td>
<td>0.0575</td>
<td>0.0555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP-1-4572</td>
<td>0.0585</td>
<td>0.0562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCL-4765</td>
<td>0.0567</td>
<td>0.0548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT-4734</td>
<td>0.0583</td>
<td>0.0557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>0.0574</td>
<td>0.0547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>0.0578</td>
<td>0.0552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The uncertainty in fuel/N$_2$ mass ratio is 2.5% and in $T_{\text{ign}}$ is ±20 °C.
behavior that is between that of \( n+i \)-paraffins and aromatics, but it appears that flames of \( i \)-paraffins are less likely to ignite than those of \( c \)-paraffin compounds. The results for SCHs reveal that flames of \( n \)-paraffins are far easier to ignite than \( i \)-paraffins, and that \( n \)-paraffins are the easiest of all compounds to ignite. This suggests that the \( i \)-paraffin content of FT-4734 inhibits ignition compared to the purely \( c \)-paraffin fuel of DCL-4756.

Figure 7 depicts \( T_{\text{ign}} \) of flames of JP-8, Jet-A-4658, and the S6 and S12 surrogates. Flames of S6 and S12 exhibit, again, similar ignition responses (S6 flames ignite only slightly easier than S12), which however, are different compared to the JP-8 flames that are distinctly harder to ignite compared to both S6 and S12. The smaller average molecular weight of the surrogates result in flames with stronger burning characteristics compared to JP-8, as manifested by their greater resistance to extinction and their greater ignition propensity.

4. Concluding remarks

Extinction strain rates and ignition temperatures of a wide range of liquid fuels were determined in the counterflow configuration under non-premixed conditions. Single component hydrocarbons, practical jet fuels, and their surrogates were tested and the results were compared to assess their relative performance. The reported experimental flame data are the first ones to be reported for such a wide range of jet fuel and large liquid hydrocarbons, and they are essential towards the development of reliable surrogate fuels and the attendant kinetics models.

It was found that the fuels with lower carbon number result in flames that are more resistant to extinction compared to the ones with higher carbon number. The difference in the extinction characteristics of \( n-C_{8}H_{18} \) and \( iso-C_{8}H_{18} \) flames demonstrates the importance of branched nature of hydrocarbons on the flame response. Results showed that the jet fuel flames exhibit a rather wide range of resistance to extinction, which in general was found to be close to \( n-C_{4}H_{10} \). Flames of the two JP-8 surrogates have similar extinction characteristics, with both being more resistant to extinction compared to JP-8.

Flames of fuels with lower carbon number were also determined to ignite easier than the ones with higher carbon number. Comparing \( n-C_{8}H_{18} \) and \( iso-C_{8}H_{18} \) flames revealed that the branched nature of the fuel has a greater effect on ignition than extinction, with the ignition characteristics of \( iso-C_{8}H_{18} \) flames being similar to \( n-C_{4}H_{10} \) flames. Jet fuel flames exhibit a large range of ignition temperatures with JP-10 being the easiest and JP-8 being the hardest to ignite. Flames of proposed JP-8 surrogates ignite more readily compared to JP-8.

Comparing all data reveals certain hierarchy for both extinction and ignition characteristics. In terms of extinction, flames of \( n \)-paraffins were found to be the most resistant to extinction followed by \( i \)-paraffins, then \( c \)-paraffins, then aromatics. In terms of ignition, flames of \( n \)-paraffins were found to be the easiest to ignite followed by \( c \)-paraffins, then \( i \)-paraffins, then aromatics. The general flame response due to chemical classification could be used in surrogate fuel development.

Surrogate fuels that have been generated by considering the physical properties and chemical classification of the real fuels, do not necessarily match their transport properties. Choosing lower
molecular weight surrogate constituents with relatively known kinetics may result in falsification of the real fuel's transport properties, which could notably affect the flame response.
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Comments

Jerry Lee, UTRC-UTC, USA. Jet-8 may consist of HC ranging from C6 to C16. Thus, each component class may exhibit very different dew and condensation temperature (of fixed pressure). Did you test your setup to make sure that, after vaporization to transportation of the vaporized fuel to the burner, you have the same mixture (i.e., the heavier HC did not condense out)? Also, that no significant decomposition occurred before reaching the reactor?

The surrogate model you used was formulated mostly to reproduce the thermo-physical properties specified for Jet-8; not quite its chemical kinetics characteristics. How would you modify these surrogate models to better reproduce your ignition extinction data?

Reply. Special attention was paid on the (fuel) heating path of these heavy fuels. More specifically, the temperatures prevailing along the heating path were restricted within two limits. The lower limit is imposed by the requirement that the fuel is maintained in the gaseous phase while the upper limit by the requirement that the fuel is not thermally decomposed. Extensive discussion regarding this issue is provided in the paper.

Developing a surrogate by matching all physical and burning characteristics of a real fuel is not possible. Thus, decisions have to be made regarding the targets that typically depend on the application. In terms of flame properties, predicting laminar flame speeds is required in order to assure that the surrogate closely reproduces the heat release rate of the real fuel. Additionally, close prediction of ignition and extinction limits is also essential in view of high-speed applications.

Modifications of the surrogates to better reproduce any fundamental property needs to be done in a comprehensive manner. More specifically, such modifications need to be made by varying the concentrations of certain components (for example, aromatics to predict ignition) in a way that the surrogate fuel also predicts data obtained in homogeneous systems, such as shock tubes and flow reactors. Finally, it is mentioned in the paper that mass diffusivities need to also be considered in surrogate fuel development using flame data.

Ronald S. Sheinson, Naval Research Laboratory, USA. There are a variety of fire extinction performance test standards utilized by different entities and countries that use different commercial "standard" fuels that are in fact continually changing mixtures, such as hydrocarbon source dependent or seasonally modified refinery cuts. Relating performance and rankings from different test standards can be a difficult task. Similarly, ignition properties for safety or engine behavior can be affected by "standard" fuel composition differences. This work helps address understanding real world fuel properties.

Could you expand on the significance and influence of differing physical properties such as transport properties of the various components on liquid hydrocarbon mixture behavior?

Reply. The effects of transport properties on the burning of liquid hydrocarbon mixtures depend on the application and prevailing conditions. For example,
during the development of surrogate fuels by utilizing experimental data obtained in laminar flames, transport properties could have a notable effect on non-premixed flames and somewhat less on premixed flames, as combustion theory dictates. Parallel studies performed by our research group as well as others, have shown that for both non-premixed and premixed flames the sensitivities of fundamental flame properties on transport coefficients could be of the same order or even larger compared to those on the kinetics. One also has to consider that existing theories for computing transport coefficients may not be reliable for those long, nonspherical, large molecules. On the other hand, the effect of molecular transport on burning in engines under the presence of turbulence may be reduced as turbulent mixing plays a dominant role instead. However, modeling an engine using the kinetics of a surrogate fuel whose kinetics have been compromised by unquantified effects of diffusion in laminar flames could reduce the value of the simulations in engines.
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Abstract

Reaction kinetics of H$_2$ and CO mixtures are examined experimentally and computationally under mixture and reaction conditions of immediate interest to synthesis gas combustion. Shock-tube ignition delay times are obtained for five CO-H$_2$-air mixtures (equivalence ratio $\phi = 0.5$) over the pressure range of 1 to 20 atm and temperatures from 950 to 1330 K. The influence of synthesis gas composition variations on flame ignition and propagation is also examined. Two types of experiments are carried out for H$_2$/CO/CO$_2$ mixtures with air. Laminar flame speeds are determined in the twin-flame counterflow configuration using Digital Particle Image Velocimetry. Ignition temperatures are determined by counterflowing a vitiated air jet against a premixed fuel/air jet. Computationally, detailed modeling of the experiments is performed, using a recently developed H$_2$/CO reaction model. Numerical simulations show generally good agreement with experimental data.

Keywords: CO/H$_2$ Oxidation Kinetics, Shock Tube Ignition, Flame Ignition, Flame Propagation
1. Introduction

The use of synthesis gas (syngas) in Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) applications offers a highly efficient, low-emission alternative to the direct combustion of coal in power generation. Syngas is usually produced from steam reforming of coal or other condense-phase hydrocarbon fuels. They contain mainly carbon monoxide and hydrogen. Depending on the coal used and the post processing technique, syngases can have wide ranges of composition variations. While some of them contain CO and H\textsubscript{2} only, large amounts of CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}O may be present in others. These composition variations pose some problems in combustor design and emission controls. Because the flame properties of a particular syngas can be strongly sensitive to the variation in the CO\textsubscript{2} dilution [1], the batch-to-batch composition variations can lead to a range of problems, including local flame extinction and incomplete combustion, which usually cannot be predicted \textit{a priori}. Reliable kinetic models, that can accurately predict the ignition and flame properties of an arbitrary syngas, are can therefore be valuable in combustor design and operation.

Early shock-tube investigations of CO-H\textsubscript{2} oxidation sought to determine the oxidation rates of CO-O\textsubscript{2} with minimal H\textsubscript{2} addition [2-5]. Subsequent studies have extended the mixture and shock conditions to even wider ranges [6-9]. The flame properties of mixtures of CO and H\textsubscript{2} with air have been extensivly studied, experimentally and numerically. Previous flame studies have concentrated on laminar flame speeds and extinction strain rates (e.g., [1,10,11]). On more than one occasions, the auto-ignition of CO-H\textsubscript{2} mixtures has also been studied in Rapid Compression Machines at high pressures [12,13]. Detailed kinetic models have been proposed and validated generally based on flow reactor and laminar flame speed experiments of CO-H\textsubscript{2}-O\textsubscript{2} mixtures [14-16]. These mixtures are designed to provide better insight into the oxidation kinetics of CO-H\textsubscript{2} mixtures. They usually do not cover the range of composition variations found in syngases. In particular, the roles of CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}O on the combustion properties of H\textsubscript{2}-CO mixtures remain poorly understood.

The goal of the current investigation was to initiate the development of a comprehensive shock-tube and flame experiment database for syngas combustion, and to systematically test a previously optimized H\textsubscript{2}-CO-O\textsubscript{2} reaction mechanism [15] on a wide range of shock tube-and flame data. Undiluted fuel-air mixtures containing CO-H\textsubscript{2} fuel blends with hydrogen content from 5 to 80% were studied behind reflected shock waves at conditions of immediate interest to syngas applications: elevated pressures (1 - 20 atm) and fuel-lean...
stoichiometry [17,18]. The flame properties considered include flame ignition and propagation. It should be noted that while laminar flame speed is a useful property, as it is free of parameters or mechanisms external to the mixture, ignition, as well as extinction, limits are more sensitive to reaction kinetics compared to laminar flame speed [19,20]. Experimental and modeling results of flame ignition limits and laminar flame speeds are presented for H₂-CO-CO₂ mixtures, which are typical to dry syngases.

2. Experimental approaches

2.1 Shock tube experiments

They were conducted using the facility described elsewhere [21]. Briefly, the shock tube, made of stainless steel, has a driver section 3.5 meters in length and 7.62 cm in diameter and a driven section 10.7 meters in length with a 16.2-cm inner diameter. All experiments were performed behind the reflected shock wave. The reaction progress was followed by emission from OH⁺ chemiluminescence from the $A^2Σ^+ \rightarrow X^2Π$ transition. A CaF₂ optical port on the endwall of the shock tube allowed for optical access. The ultraviolet emission was collected from a CaF₂ optical port on the endwall of the shock tube with a Hamamatsu 1P21 photomultiplier tube (PMT) fitted with a narrow-band filter centered at 310±5 nm. A PCB 134A pressure transducer, located at the endwall, and five fast-response (<1 µs) PCB 113A pressure transducers and four Fluke model PM6666 time-interval counters monitored the incident-shock speed at various locations along the shock tube.

The principal objective of the current shock experiments was to examine the effect of pressure behind reflected shock waves $p_s$ on the ignition delay times of five CO-H₂-air mixtures (equivalence ratio $\phi = 0.5$). The $p_s$ values, investigated herein, ranged from 1 to 20 atm for three of these mixtures. The ignition delay time was determined as the onset of OH⁺ chemiluminescence. Fig. 1 shows typical pressure and emission traces as measured from the endwall of the shock tube. Further details and the complete set of shock-tube experiments are beyond the scope of this paper and are presented in Kalitan et al. [18].
2.1 Flame experiments

They were conducted in the following manner. First, for fuel-lean flames the total reaction of a dry syngas with oxygen is defined as follows:

$$\phi [\alpha \text{H}_2 + (1-\alpha)\text{CO} + \gamma \text{CO}_2] + \frac{1}{2} \text{O}_2 \leftrightarrow \phi [\alpha \text{H}_2\text{O} + (1-\alpha + \gamma)\text{CO}_2] + \frac{1-\phi}{2} \text{O}_2,$$

where \(\alpha\) characterizes the \(\text{H}_2\)-to-CO ratio, and \(\gamma\) is the level of \(\text{CO}_2\) dilution. The coefficients for \(\text{H}_2\) and \(\text{CO}\) are constrained such that they sum to unity. A particular dry syngas can be entirely characterized by three independent parameters \(\phi, \alpha, \text{ and } \gamma\). Since the parameter space of \(\phi, \alpha, \text{ and } \gamma\) is rather wide, special considerations are made so that the experimental mixtures are designed to offer a maximum amount of experimental information for a given set of experiments.

Dry syngases typically have \(\alpha/(1-\alpha) = 0.4\) to 1.0 with a nominal value equal to 0.7. For \(\text{CO}_2\)-containing mixtures, \(\gamma/(1-\alpha)\) typically ranges from 0 to 0.67 with a nominal value of 0.25. We employ a \(2^2\) factorial design plus the nominal point to give a total of 5 different mixtures [22]. This approach effectively covers the entire composition space of dry syngases. The current paper reports the results for 4 of such mixtures as shown in Table 1.

Flame ignition temperatures and laminar flame speeds were determined in the counterflow configuration at ambient pressure. Flame ignition was achieved by counterflowing a fuel-air mixture against a hot jet of vitiated air, resulting from an ultra-lean \(\text{H}_2\)-air mixture catalytically oxidized on a platinum screen. This experimental approach and its validity have been discussed in a previous publication [23]. The platinum screen was supported on a ceramic disk 1 mm above the bottom burner. The ceramic disk is made of 99.9% aluminum oxide, chosen here because it is non-porous, can withstand fast temperature loading (thermal shock), and has a low thermal conductivity (to minimize heat loss in the radial direction). The separation distance between the platinum screen and the top burner is 1 cm, equal to the diameter of burner nozzles. A pilot flame provided the initial energy required to activate the \(\text{H}_2\)-air mixture on the platinum screen. By varying \(\phi\) of the \(\text{H}_2\)-air mixture the temperature of the platinum screen can range from 400-900 °C, which spans the entire range required for the current experiment. The platinum screen locks the flame at the exit of the burner and the oxidation on its surface results in vitiated air composed largely of hot \(\text{O}_2, \text{N}_2\), minor
amounts of \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \), and negligible amounts of radicals to have an effect on the ignition kernel \cite{24}. The temperatures were determined using a K-type thermocouple placed at the center of the flow. The ignition temperature, \( T_{\text{ign}} \), was defined as the highest temperature in the flowfield at the state of ignition, and it is essentially the temperature measured just downstream of the platinum screen. All temperatures were corrected for radiation in a manner described in \cite{24}.

There are two sources of uncertainty associated with the reported \( T_{\text{ign}} \)'s. The first is the \( \pm 20 \text{ K} \) that is inherent and constant for all fine-wire thermocouples. The second is that caused by the location of the thermocouple with respect to the platinum screen. Efforts were made to bring the thermocouple junction as close as possible to the screen in order to record the maximum temperature of the catalyzed oxidation of \( \text{H}_2 \). At the same time care was taken to avoid contact between the junction and the screen that could alter the nature of both. As a result, measurements taken at different times are susceptible to some variability of the thermocouple location and the attendant measured temperature, which is estimated to be of the order of 10 to 15 K.

The laminar flame speeds \( S' \) were determined using the stagnation flame method \cite{10,25}. Using the Digital Particle Image Velocimetry (DPIV) \cite{26}, a reference flame speed, \( S_{\text{ref}} \), was determined at a given strain rate, \( K \), defined as the maximum absolute value of the axial velocity gradient along the centerline. Subsequently, the variation of \( S_{\text{rel}} \) with \( K \) was graphically recorded, and \( S' \) determined through linear extrapolation to zero stretch.
3. Numerical Approach

The detailed kinetic model used for the simulations was taken from Davis et al. [15]. The model contains 12 species and 30 elementary reactions, and was optimized against a large number of fundamental H$_2$ and H$_2$-CO combustion data. In a recent high-pressure shock tube study [9], it was found that capturing the peculiar temperature dependence for the reaction

$$\text{OH} + \text{HO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{OH},$$

as described by Hippler et al. [27], was critical to model the data over the pressure range of 25 to 450 atm. This temperature dependence causes $k_{15}$ to drop suddenly as the temperature is increased to above 1100 K. For $T > 1300$ K, $k_{15}$ rises sharply again. Consequently the bi-modified Arrenhius expression of $k_{15}$ in [15] was revised to

$$k_{15} = \frac{1.41 \times 10^{18} \ T^{-1.76} e^{-30/T} + 1.12 \times 10^{25} \ T^{-2.23} e^{-15538/T} + 5.37 \times 10^{70} \ T^{-16.72} e^{-16558/T}}{\ T \ T \ T \ T \ T \ T \ T}$$

$$+ \frac{1.0 \times 10^{136} \ T^{-40} e^{-17314/T} + 2.51 \times 10^{12} \ T^2 e^{-20331/T}}{\ T \ T \ T},$$

to account for the peculiar temperature dependence, using kinetic data from a large number of studies [27-35] and over the temperature range of 298 to 1600 K. This revision led to no change in model applicability with respect to all optimization and validation targets considered in [15].

Laminar flame speeds were calculated using the PREMIX one-dimensional flame code [36]. The opposed-jet configuration was simulated along the stagnation streamline by solving the quasi-one-dimensional conservation equations of mass, momentum, energy, and species concentration (e.g., [37]). In previous studies [15,19], the transport data of H$_2$ and H were revised on the basis of more recent quantum chemistry calculations and direct numerical integration of the collision integrals. The Sandia Transport subroutines [38] were revised accordingly to account for the newly updated diffusion coefficients. These revised database and subroutines are used here along with the multi-component transport formulation and thermal diffusion of all species considered.

The ignition state was numerically determined by starting with a non-reacting solution and by successively solving the governing equations with increasing values of the vitiated air temperature. The composition of the vitiated air is determined by an equilibrium calculation. In order to capture the turning-point behavior at ignition, the code was modified to impose a one-point continuation with respect to the H-
atom profile (e.g., [39,40]). A predetermined increment in the H-atom concentration was imposed at the point of its maximum gradient on the side closest to the hot jet. This new boundary condition replaces the burner-exit temperature of the hot jet. Progressive steady-state solutions were obtained until a turning point is observed on the response curve of maximum H mass fraction, \( Y_{11} \), versus the temperature of the hot jet. \( T_{tn} \) is defined to be the temperature at this turning point.

4. Results and Discussion

The following section contains two types of analysis. The first compares the ignition delay time data with those predicted by the detailed kinetic model of \( \text{H}_2-\text{CO} \) oxidation. The second describes the comparisons for laminar flame speeds and flame ignition data.

As described earlier shock-tube experimental data were collected for a range of reflected-shock temperatures (900 K < \( T_5 \) < 1330 K) with pressures near one atmosphere and at elevated pressures of, approximately, 2 and 15 atm. Figures 2 through 4 depict the comparisons of experimental and computed ignition delay times. In most cases, the kinetic model is in excellent agreement with the experimental data. The only exceptions are that the model tends to predict much longer ignition delay times at 2 atm and lower temperatures.

Experimental \( S' \)’s of the current study are compared to literature data. Figure 5(a) depicts that the \( S' \)’s of the current study are in close agreement with the data reported by McLean et al. [11] for 50%\( \text{H}_2 \)-50%\( \text{CO} \)-air mixtures (mixture B with \( \alpha = 0.5 \) and \( \gamma = 0 \)). At \( \phi = 0.62 \), for example, the current study yielded \( S' = 53 \text{ cm/s} \), whereas McLean et al. reported a value of 50 cm/s. Figure 5 also shows the variation of \( S' \) with the equivalence ratio for 50%\( \text{H}_2 \)-50%\( \text{CO} \)-air mixtures with different levels of \( \text{CO}_2 \)-dilution. As expected, the flame speed is influenced by \( \text{CO}_2 \) dilution and the thermal effect resulting from its large specific heat. As the level of \( \text{CO}_2 \) dilution (\( \gamma = 0.5 \)) increases, \( S' \) of the same \( \text{H}_2-\text{CO} \) mixture decreases by 50 to 70%, depending on \( \phi \). In general, the reaction model is in good agreement with the experimental data.

The variation of \( S' \) with \( \phi \) for mixtures E and F is shown in Fig. 6. Again the effect of \( \text{CO}_2 \) dilution is evident. Compared to the results shown in Fig. 5, the smaller difference in \( S' \) is the result of a smaller
difference in the level of CO\(_2\) dilution. The agreement between the experiment and model is similar to that of Fig. 5.

Results of the sensitivity analysis show that the flame speeds are the most sensitive to the rate coefficients of

\[ \text{CO} + \text{OH} \leftrightarrow \text{CO}_2 + \text{H} \]

\[ \text{H} + \text{O}_2 (+\text{M}) \leftrightarrow \text{HO}_2 (+\text{M}) \]

and

\[ \text{HO}_2 + \text{H} \leftrightarrow \text{OH} + \text{OH}. \]

A recent study [41] showed that above 600 K the bi-exponential rate expression of Davis et al. [15] is fully supported by available experimental kinetic data and the results of a RRKM/master equation analysis carried out in that study. Therefore the discrepancy between model and experiments seen in Figs. 5 and 6 cannot be resolved by uncertainties in the rate coefficient of CO + OH \(\leftrightarrow\) CO\(_2\) + H.

The dilution and thermal effects of CO\(_2\) do not lead to appreciable changes in \(T_{\text{ign}}\), as seen in Fig. 7, comparing mixtures A and B and in Fig. 8 for mixtures E and F. The reported uncertainty bars represent the standard one of \(\pm 20\) K. The uncertainty associated with the thermocouple location is reflected by the slight data scatter for each set of conditions.

Despite the fact that the dilution leads to a lower concentration of H\(_2\) and CO in the fuel jet, and the thermal effect causes slower conductive heating of the fuel mixture, the \(T_{\text{ign}}\)'s with and without CO\(_2\) dilution remain within experimental uncertainty. However, on the average the presence of CO\(_2\) results in somewhat lower \(T_{\text{ign}}\)'s, as expected. The numerical simulations also predict the minor effect of CO\(_2\) dilution on \(T_{\text{ign}}\). At a lower level of CO\(_2\) dilution (i.e., mixtures E and F in Fig. 8), the measured \(T_{\text{ign}}\)'s do not differ notably, as expected. The computed \(T_{\text{ign}}\)'s also differ minimally. In addition, \(T_{\text{ign}}\) neither exhibits a strong dependence on the equivalence ratio, nor does it depend on the CO-to-H\(_2\) ratio in the unburned mixture, as all data cluster around 1050 K.

The lack of sensitivity of \(T_{\text{ign}}\) with respect to the mixture composition indicates that, for the conditions reported in Figs. 7 and 8, the ignition process is rather immune to both reactant diffusion towards and the kinetics within the ignition kernel. This is anticipated, as H\(_2\) is characterized by both fast kinetics and high
diffusivity. The ignition kernel resides right next to the hot boundary, as dictated by the Arrhenius kinetics. Thus, and “fuel” has to cross the stagnation plane and reach the kernel through diffusion against the convection of the vitiated air. Under such conditions, the H₂ diffusive transport towards the kernel overwhelms that of CO for all conditions considered. Thus, for all cases ignition will take place at nearly the same conditions, as the transport of H₂ is not a rate-limiting process. As a result, similar Tᵥm's are realized.

Analogous results have been reported in non-premixed H₂-air ignition studies [23,42], in which the effect of H₂ diffusion has been shown to be important only under extreme conditions of ultra-low H₂ concentration in the inert-diluted fuel stream.

Sensitivity analysis shows that Tᵥm is sensitive only to reactions of H₂, i.e.,

\[
\begin{align*}
H + O₂ & \leftrightarrow O + OH \\
HO₂ + H & \leftrightarrow OH + OH \\
OH + H₂ & \leftrightarrow H + H₂O \\
O + H₂ & \leftrightarrow H + OH \\
HO₂ + OH & \leftrightarrow H₂O + H.
\end{align*}
\]

The lack of sensitivity to the chain terminating reaction H + O₂ (+M) ↔ HO₂ (+M) suggests that the role of CO₂ cannot be kinetic, since kinetically the presence of CO₂ can only increase the rate of chain terminating reactions due to its relatively large Chaperon efficiency.
5. Concluding Remarks

We carried out an experimental and computational study of ignition delay times of H$_2$-CO oxidation in air behind reflected shock waves and H$_2$-CO-CO$_2$-air flames. Shock-tube ignition delay times were obtained for five CO-H$_2$-air mixtures (equivalence ratio $\phi = 0.5$) over the pressure range of 1 to 20 atm and temperatures from 950 to 1330 K. Laminar flame speeds and flame ignition temperatures were measured for dry syngas like mixtures over an equivalence ratio range of 0.5 to 1.0. The variations of mixture composition are designed with a statistical factorial method and represent the composition variations of actual syngases. These experimental data were compared with the results of detailed numerical simulations using a recently optimized kinetic model of H$_2$ and H$_2$-CO combustion.

The kinetic model was found to result in reasonably good agreement with the experimental data. The model captures the pressure dependence of the ignition delay times. It also reproduces the anticipated sensitivity of laminar flame speed with respect to CO$_2$ dilution. The flame ignition temperature was found to be relatively insensitive to CO$_2$ dilution, H$_2$-to-CO ratio, and equivalence ratio.
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Table 1. Mixture compositions of flame experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixture</th>
<th>$\alpha/(1-\alpha)$</th>
<th>$\gamma/(1-\alpha)$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure Captions

Figure 1. Pressure and OH* emission traces measured at the end wall of the shock tube for a 7%H\textsubscript{2}-10.4%CO-air mixture ($T_s = 1148$ K, $p_s = 1.05$ atm).

Figure 2. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines) ignition delay times of H\textsubscript{2}-CO-air mixtures behind reflected shock waves.

Figure 3. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines) ignition delay times of H\textsubscript{2}-CO-air mixtures behind reflected shock waves.

Figure 4. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines) ignition delay times of H\textsubscript{2}-CO-air mixtures behind reflected shock waves.

Figure 5. Variation of laminar flame speed with equivalence ratio for 50% H\textsubscript{2}-50%CO fuel mixtures ($\alpha = 0.5$, a: $\gamma = 0$; b: $\gamma = 0.1$ and 0.2, c: $\gamma = 0.33$). Symbols are experimental data; lines are results of numerical simulations.

Figure 6. Variation of laminar flame speed with equivalence ratio for H\textsubscript{2}-CO fuel mixtures ($\alpha = 0.41$) with $\gamma = 0$ and 0.146. Experiments (symbols) are from this work.

Figure 7. Variations of flame ignition temperature in the counterflow configuration with equivalence ratio. Symbols: experimental data; lines: numerical simulations (solid line: $\gamma = 0$; dashed line: $\gamma = 0.33$).

Figure 8. Variations of ignition temperature in the counterflow configuration with equivalence ratio. Symbols: experimental data; lines: numerical simulations (solid line: $\gamma = 0$; dashed line: $\gamma = 0.146$. The two lines are indistinguishable from each other).
Figure 1. Pressure and OH* emission traces measured at the end wall of the shock tube for a 7%H₂-10.4%CO-air mixture ($T_3 = 1148$ K, $p_3 = 1.05$ atm).

Figure 2. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines) ignition delay times of H₂-CO-air mixtures behind reflected shock waves.
Figure 3. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines) ignition delay times of H₂-CO-air mixtures behind reflected shock waves.

Figure 4. Experimental (symbols) and computed (lines) ignition delay times of H₂-CO-air mixtures behind reflected shock waves.
Figure 5. Variation of laminar flame speed with equivalence ratio for 50% H$_2$-50%CO fuel mixtures ($\alpha = 0.5$, a: $\gamma = 0$; b: $\gamma = 0.1$ and $0.2$, c: $\gamma = 0.33$). Symbols are experimental data; lines are results of numerical simulations.

Figure 6. Variation of laminar flame speed with equivalence ratio for H$_2$-CO fuel mixtures ($\alpha = 0.41$) with $\gamma = 0$ and 0.146. Experiments (symbols) are from this work.
Figure 7. Variations of flame ignition temperature in the counterflow configuration with equivalence ratio. Symbols: experimental data; lines: numerical simulations (solid line: $\gamma = 0$; dashed line: $\gamma = 0.33$).

Figure 8. Variations of ignition temperature in the counterflow configuration with equivalence ratio. Symbols: experimental data; lines: numerical simulations (solid line: $\gamma = 0$; dashed line: $\gamma = 0.146$. The two lines are indistinguishable from each other).
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Abstract

Compared to those for gaseous fuels, fundamental flame studies for liquid fuels are less extensive. The reasons are the experimental difficulty in handling the liquid phase and the complexity of kinetics stemming from the structure of liquid fuel molecules. However, such fuels are important in power generation, transportation, and propulsion. In this investigation, a systematic study has been conducted on the extinction of mixtures of methanol, ethanol, n-heptane, and iso-octane with air. The experiments were performed in the counterflow configuration and the extinction strain rates were determined through the use of digital particle image velocimetry. The introduction of the liquid fuel into the air was achieved through a liquid fuel feeder. The liquid flow rates were determined through the use of a high-precision pump. The experiments were conducted at ambient pressure and temperature and the maximum achievable equivalence ratios were limited by the attendant vapor pressure of each liquid fuel. The experiments were numerically simulated using detailed descriptions of chemical kinetic and molecular transport. A number of kinetic mechanisms were tested against the experimentally determined extinction strain rates. The mechanisms were also tested against literature data of laminar flame speeds. It was found that while most mechanisms satisfactorily predict laminar flame speeds, the experimental and predicted extinction strain rates can differ by factors of as much as 2 to 3. Under certain conditions, distinct differences were identified in the kinetic pathways that control the phenomena of propagation and extinction. Additionally, it was found that the sensitivity of laminar flame speeds and extinction strain rates to diffusion could be of the same order as that to kinetics.

Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
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1. Introduction

The use of the stagnation flow configuration has been essential for the determination of fundamental flame properties such as laminar flame speeds, $S_f$.

extinction strain rates, $K_{ext}$, and thermal and concentration structures [1–3]. The accurate determination of these properties is very important, as they can be used for the partial validation of chemical kinetics. This approach has been extensively used for gaseous fuels. $S_f$ has been the most commonly determined property for a number of reasons. First, it is in its own right a very important property of a combustible mixture and it is free of any influences caused by mechanisms that are external to the mixture. Sec-
This is a result of the complexities that the liquid phase introduces into the experimentation and also the fact that the chemical kinetics of liquid fuels are far more complex and less understood than those of gaseous fuels. Furthermore, the kinetics of these lower-molecular-weight gaseous fuels constitute important subsets of the kinetics of the heavier liquid fuels. Consequently, the kinetics of the former must be validated first. Using the counterflow configuration, $S_\text{u}^0$'s of mixtures of methanol and ethanol with air have been determined by Egolfopoulos, Law, and co-workers in the early 1990s [7,8], while $S_\text{u}^0$'s of mixtures of C$_7$-C$_8$ hydrocarbons with air have been recently determined by Davis and Law [9].

This work is the first step of an ongoing effort initiated by the authors' group to quantify fundamental flame properties of practical liquid fuels. The approach includes the determination of $K_{\text{ext}}$'s for methanol/air, ethanol/air, n-heptane/air, and iso-octane/air mixtures and the use of such information to validate chemical kinetics mechanisms.

$K_{\text{ext}}$ was chosen to be studied over $S_\text{u}^0$ for two reasons. First, while $K_{\text{ext}}$ can be determined directly, $S_\text{u}^0$ in most cases cannot. This is because in order for a flame to be stabilized and measured, a stabilization mechanism is required. The stabilization mechanism introduces an influence that is external to the mixture, such as the strain rate in the stagnation flow method [2]. Typically, extrapolations or extensive data processing are required to determine $S_\text{u}^0$, which is the propagation speed of a steady, one-dimensional, planar, adiabatic, laminar flame.

Second, it is expected that since both propagation and extinction are high-temperature phenomena, they must be controlled by similar kinetics. This has been shown to be the case by sensitivity analysis performed in a recent study of ethylene/air flames [10]. Furthermore, it has been shown [11,12] that C$_1$-C$_2$ kinetic mechanisms that closely predict $S_\text{u}^0$ of methane/air flames also satisfactorily predict experimentally determined $K_{\text{ext}}$ for such flames.

In view of these considerations, the main goal of this investigation was to provide archival experimental $K_{\text{ext}}$ data for practical alcohol and liquid hydrocarbon fuels and to compare them with predictions derived from detailed numerical simulations. Through these comparisons, various published chemical kinetics mechanisms were tested against extinction data for the first time. Additionally, the thesis that flame propagation and extinction are controlled by similar kinetics was further assessed. This is an important point, as in large-scale simulations of practical combustors the semidetailed or reduced kinetics models that are used have been typically validated against $S_\text{u}^0$ data only. However, if the extinction response of the flamelets, which are typically induced by fluid mechanics and/or heat loss influences, is not predicted accurately, the fidelity of such simulations is compromised.

2. Experimental approach

The experiments involve the use of the counterflow technique, which allows for the establishment of a single planar flame. A single flame results by counterflowing a fuel/air jet against an opposing air or nitrogen jet, with both jets injected at ambient temperature. For fuel-lean mixtures air was used, while for near-stoichiometric and fuel-rich mixtures nitrogen was used to avoid the formation of an additional non-premixed flame downstream of the premixed flame. This single-flame configuration was preferred over the symmetric twin-flame one [1], because for the same equivalence ratio, $\phi$, this configuration results in lower $K_{\text{ext}}$ compared to the twin-flame one. As a result, lower Reynolds numbers are required, thus minimizing the effect of intrinsic instabilities that are present in the flow system, and that can potentially affect the flame topology and response.

The measurements were taken using digital particle image velocimetry (DPIV) for the determination of the axial velocity profile along the stagnation streamline of the counterflow [13]. The flow was seeded by 0.3-µm-diameter silicon oil droplets that were produced by a nebulizer similarly to Hirasawa et al. [14]. The absolute value of the maximum pre-flame velocity gradient is defined as the imposed (local) strain rate, $K$. $K_{\text{ext}}$ cannot be directly measured if one considers the fact that measurements are not possible in the extinction state and, therefore, extrapolations may be needed. This problem was circumvented, however, by establishing flames in states very close to extinction, determining the prevailing $K$, and subsequently achieving extinction through a minor reduction (increment) of the fuel flow rate for fuel-lean (fuel-rich) flames. It has been shown both experimentally and numerically that the value of the (local) strain rate is minimally affected through this slight reduction (increment) of the fuel flow rate. Thus, the measured value of $K$ for a slightly richer (leaner) $\phi$ compared to that at the state of extinction for fuel-
lean (fuel-rich) flames is a very close representation of that at the extinction state, i.e., of $K_{\text{ext}}$. This approach provides a "direct" measurement of $K_{\text{ext}}$ that can be used with confidence in validating chemical kinetics mechanisms.

Another important point in these experiments was the introduction of the liquid fuel into the airflow and maintaining it in the gaseous phase. An approach similar to that of Davis and Law [9] was adopted and the schematic is shown in Fig. 1. A precision-volume flow pump is used to accurately control the flow rate of the liquid fuel, which is then sprayed into a heated vaporization chamber with a heated air coflow. The liquid fuel vaporizes into the airflow and mixes within the chamber. The mixture is then cooled to ambient temperature and delivered to the burners. Condensation does not occur in the system, as the partial pressure of the fuel is maintained below the vapor pressure at the prevailing temperature. Heating of the air and the vaporization chamber is required to ensure rapid and effective vaporization, to prevent any possible condensation at cold spots, and to decrease the response time of the system. This system allows fuels that are normally liquid at room temperature to be maintained and tested in the gaseous phase. The maximum achievable $\phi$ is limited by the vapor pressure of each fuel.

Four liquid fuels were tested, namely methanol, ethanol, $n$-heptane, and iso-octane. At atmospheric pressure and an ambient temperature of 300 K, $n$-heptane and iso-octane are limited to a maximum $\phi$ of about 2.7, while methanol and ethanol are limited to a maximum $\phi$ of about 0.95. $K_{\text{ext}}$'s of mixtures of all four fuels with air were determined for the entire achievable $\phi$-range for each fuel. $S_{\phi}^u$ values were taken from recent literature and were compared with numerical predictions. More specifically, the $S_{\phi}^u$'s for methanol/air and ethanol/air mixtures were taken from Refs. [7,8], respectively, while those for $n$-heptane/air and iso-octane/air mixtures were taken from Ref. [9].

3. Numerical approach

The numerical simulation of the counterflow configuration was conducted by solving the conservation equations of mass, momentum, species concentrations and energy along the stagnation streamline. The code is based on the original formulation of Kee and co-workers [15] for a twin-flame configuration and has been subsequently modified to allow for asymmetric flame configurations by accounting for independent boundary conditions at the exits of the two opposing burners [11,16]. Additional modifications have also been made to account for the effect of thermal radiation from CH$_4$, H$_2$O, CO$_2$, and CO at the optically thin limit [11]. The code is integrated with the CHEMKIN [17] and Sandia Transport [18] subroutine libraries.

The extinction condition is achieved by first establishing a vigorously burning flame for a given $\phi$ at a relatively low $K$ and by subsequently increasing the flow velocities at the burner exits that increase the strain rate to the point of extinction. At the extinction state the response of any flame property to the strain rate is characterized by a turning-point behavior that introduces a singularity if the strain rate is considered as the independent variable. The code has been also modified to allow capturing this singular behavior and allow, thus, the accurate determination of $K_{\text{ext}}$ [19]. More specifically, a two-point continuation approach was implemented by imposing a predetermined temperature or species mass fraction, at two points in the flow field, so that the strain rate is solved for, rather than imposed as a boundary condition. Locations where the temperature or species concentrations have maximum slopes are chosen as the two points, following the recommendations of Nishioka et al. [20].

It should be noted that while the experiments involved the determination of $\phi$ at extinction for a range of $K$'s, the simulations involved the determination of $K$ at extinction, i.e., $K_{\text{ext}}$, for a range of $\phi$'s. However, the two approaches are equivalent, as $K_{\text{ext}}$ is a single-value function of $\phi$ for the conditions studied herein. Additionally, plug flow boundary conditions were considered at the burner exits in accordance with what was determined experimentally for near-extinction conditions.

The experimental results were simulated using a number of kinetic mechanisms summarized in Table 1. The mechanisms of Fischer et al. [21] (hereafter referred to as "FDC00"), Held and Dryer [22] (here-
Table 1
Kinetic mechanisms used to simulate present and literature experimental data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Tested fuels</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>Validation against data obtained in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FDC00 [21]</td>
<td>CH₃OH</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Flow reactors, shock tubes, stirred reactors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C₂H₅OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD98 [22]</td>
<td>CH₃OH</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Static reactors, flow reactors, shock tubes, laminar flame speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHD03 [23,24]</td>
<td>CH₂OH</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Laminar flame speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN99 [25]</td>
<td>C₂H₅OH</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>Ignition delays, flow reactors, laminar flame speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL98 [9]</td>
<td>n-C₇H₁₆</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Flow reactors, laminar flame speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iso-C₈H₁₈</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL98 (rev)</td>
<td>n-C₇H₁₆</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iso-C₈H₁₈</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS96 [28]</td>
<td>iso-C₈H₁₈</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Laminar flame speeds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
CH₂CHO reactions involved in DL98 (revised) mechanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>A (cm³(n⁻¹) mol⁻¹(n⁻¹) s⁻ⁿ)</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>E (cal/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₃ + O₂ = CH₂CHO + O</td>
<td>3.000E+11</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₃ + HO₂ = CH₂CHO + OH</td>
<td>1.000E+13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO + H = CH₂CO + H</td>
<td>5.000E+12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO + H = CH₃ + HCO</td>
<td>9.000E+13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO + H = CH₂CO + H₂</td>
<td>2.000E+13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO + O = CH₂CO + OH</td>
<td>2.000E+13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO + OH = CH₂CO + H₂O</td>
<td>1.000E+13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>20000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO + O₂ = CH₂CO + HO₂</td>
<td>1.400E+11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO + O₂ = CH₂O + CO + OH</td>
<td>1.800E+10</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO = CH₃ + CO</td>
<td>7.800E+41</td>
<td>9.147</td>
<td>46900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂CHO + H + M = CH₃HCO + M</td>
<td>-9.147</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.200E+39</td>
<td>-7.297</td>
<td>4700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toc</td>
<td>0.558900</td>
<td>4350000</td>
<td>7244.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhanced third body efficiencies: H₂/2.0 H₂O/6.0 CH₄/2.0 CO/1.5 CO₂/2.0 C₂H₆/3.0 C₂H₅/3.0 C₂H₄/3.0

Note: n is the reaction order.

* Pressure-dependent reaction with multiple reaction rates for different pressure regimes; the rate constants for atmospheric pressure are shown.

Laminar flame speeds were numerically determined using the Premix code [29] to simulate freely propagating flames (FPF).

To compare the controlling mechanisms for FPFs and near-extinction flames (NEF), integrated reaction path and sensitivity analyses were performed. While the standard CHEMKIN-based codes [29] do allow automated sensitivity analysis of $S_0^c$ and all temperature and species concentrations to all reaction rate constants, this is not the case for $K_{ext}$. This, however, could be achieved by realizing, as described earlier, that $K_{ext}$ becomes a dependent variable when the aforementioned two-point continuation approach is invoked. As a result it is possible to perform rigorous sensitivity analysis with respect to rate constants for $K_{ext}$ at the exact location that is determined experimentally, i.e., where it reaches its maximum value in the hydrodynamic zone. This approach to performing sensitivity analysis on $K_{ext}$ was introduced for the

after referred to as "HD98"), and Li et al. [23,24] (hereafter referred to as "LHD03") were used to model methanol/air mixtures; LHD03 is a modified version of the HD98 mechanism, optimized to better predict $S_0^c$'s of methanol/air flames. The Marinov [25] (hereafter referred to as "MRN99") and the FDC00 mechanisms were used to model ethanol/air flames. To model n-heptane/air and iso-octane/air flames the Davis and Law [9] mechanism (hereafter referred to as "DL98") and its revised version, DL98 (revised), were used. The DL98 (revised) was derived from the original DL98 with the addition of CH₂CHO and its kinetics. The added, to the DL98, kinetics of CH₂CHO were taken from Wang et al. [26,27] and are listed in Table 2. Iso-octane/air flames were also modeled using the Pitsch et al. [28] (hereafter referred to as "PPS96") mechanism. PPS96 is a greatly reduced mechanism that was compiled to predict $S_0^c$ of iso-octane/air mixtures.
first time by the authors, in a recent study on the extinction of \( \text{H}_2/\text{air} \) flames [30].

In summary, assessing the ability of all mechanisms to predict \( K_{\text{ext}} \)'s, after having been optimized to closely predict experimental values of \( S'_w \), was one of the main goals of this investigation.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Experimental results on extinction strain rates

\( K_{\text{ext}} \)'s of mixtures of methanol, ethanol, \( n \)-heptane, and iso-octane with air are shown in Fig. 2 as functions of \( \phi \). As mentioned earlier, at unburned mixture temperature 300 K, only lean methanol/air and ethanol/air flames could be established and measured due to their low vapor pressure, while for \( n \)-heptane/air and iso-octane/air flames the measurements were extended well into the fuel-rich domain. For all data reported in this investigation, the experimental uncertainty was determined to be less than 2% in \( \phi \) and less than 4% in \( K_{\text{ext}} \). It should be also noted that the experiments were performed for \( \phi \)'s that are neither ultralean nor ultrarich. Thus, the effect of radiation on the flame response is negligible, as has been shown to be the case for mixtures that are not near to their flammability limits [11]. Additionally, soot was not formed in the reported experiments.

Comparing the \( K_{\text{ext}} \)'s of all four fuels, the alcohols appear to be more resistant to extinction than the hydrocarbons for the same \( \phi \). Also, the methanol/air and the ethanol/air mixtures exhibit rather similar extinction characteristics for the range of \( \phi \)'s tested. The \( K_{\text{ext}} \)'s of \( n \)-heptane/air mixtures exceed those of iso-octane/air mixtures for all \( \phi \)'s tested, except for the more fuel-lean concentrations. These findings have implications for flame stability; \( K_{\text{ext}} \) is a measure of flame stability, because flames that are more resistant to extinction result in more stable combustion, given that local extinction is less likely to occur. Thus, mixing alcohols with hydrocarbons to formulate alternative fuels for spark ignition engines (SIE) could improve the overall engine performance.

4.2. Numerical predictions of extinction strain rates

Fig. 3 depicts the experimental and predicted \( K_{\text{ext}} \)'s for methanol/air mixtures. FDC00 underpredicts the experimental \( K_{\text{ext}} \) by a factor of 3! The kinetics described by FDC00 becomes so slow at the state of extinction as \( \phi \) decreases that solutions for \( \phi < 0.7 \) were not possible. However, flames with \( \phi < 0.6 \) were experimentally established. The \( K_{\text{ext}} \) data are slightly underpredicted by HD98 for \( \phi < 0.75 \) and the agreement is much closer for \( \phi > 0.75 \). LHD03 underpredicts \( K_{\text{ext}} \) by factors that are slightly smaller than those of FDC00. LHD03 is a modified version of HD98 and has been optimized to predict \( S'_w \)'s of methanol/air mixtures. The two mechanisms are, in general, very similar. Three reaction rates were modified (R10, R15, R16), one reaction was removed (R18), one duplicate reaction was added (R5), and one third-body collision efficiency was modified (R11). The R index refers to the reactions shown in Table 3: details of the modifications to HD98 that resulted in LHD03 are shown in Table 4. The present results reveal that modifications in the original mechanism (HD98) that could be casually considered as "minor" caused a large change in the predicted \( K_{\text{ext}} \).
predicts the experimental data by almost a factor of 2 at worst, and by a factor of approximately 1.7 for near-stoichiometric flames. DL98 (revised) at worst underpredicts the experiments by a factor of less than 1.5 and on average predicts the experiments more closely by about 15%, compared to DL98. This improvement resulted from the addition of 1 species and 11 reactions, only 3 of which have a notable effect on the burning response of n-heptane/air mixtures, i.e., reactions R24, R25, and R26. Both DL98 and DL98 (revised) predict the maximum $K_{\text{ext}}$ to be at $\phi = 1.22$, while the experimental $K_{\text{ext}}$ peaks at about $\phi = 1.08$. 

Table 3
List of reactions discussed in the text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction #</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Mechanisms containing reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$ and CO reactions</td>
<td>R1 H + O$_2$ = O + OH</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 O + H$_2$ = H + OH</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 H + OH + M = H$_2$O + M</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 H$_2$ + OH = H$_2$O + H</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5 HO$_2$ + OH = H$_2$O + O$_2$</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6 HO$_2$ + H = OH + OH</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7 HO$_2$ + H = H$_2$ + O$_2$</td>
<td>All but PPS96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8 HO$_2$ + HO$_2$ = H$_2$O$_2$ + O$_2$</td>
<td>All but PPS96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9 CO + OH = CO$_2$ + H</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10 CO + O + M = CO$_2$ + M</td>
<td>All but PPS96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11 HCO + M = H + CO + M</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12 HCO + O$_2$ = CO + HO$_2$</td>
<td>All but PPS96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13 HCO + H = CO + H$_2$</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14 CH$_2$ + O$_2$ = CO + H$_2$O</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), MRN99, FDC00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol reactions</td>
<td>R15 CH$_2$O + OH = HCO + H$_2$O</td>
<td>All but PPS96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16 CH$_2$O + HO$_2$ = HCO + H$_2$O$_2$</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), FDC00, HD98, LHD03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17 CH$_2$OH + O$_2$ = CH$_2$O + HO$_2$</td>
<td>MRN99, FDC00, HD98, LHD03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18 CH$_3$O + H = CH$_3$ + OH</td>
<td>MRN99, HD98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19 CH$_3$O + M = CH$_3$O + H + M</td>
<td>All but PPS96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20 CH$_3$O + O$_2$ = CH$_2$O + HO$_2$</td>
<td>All but PPS96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21 CH$_3$OH + H = CH$_3$OH + H$_2$</td>
<td>MRN99, FDC00, HD98, LHD03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22 CH$_3$OH + OH = CH$_3$O + H$_2$O</td>
<td>MRN99, HD98, LHD03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R23 CH$_3$OH + OH = CH$_3$OH + H$_2$O</td>
<td>MRN99, FDC00, HD98, LHD03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-C$<em>7$H$</em>{16}$/iso-C$<em>8$H$</em>{18}$ reactions</td>
<td>R24 CH$_3$CHO + H = CH$_3$ + HCO</td>
<td>DL98 (rev), MRN99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25 CH$_3$CHO = CH$_3$ + CO</td>
<td>DL98 (rev), MRN99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R26 C$_2$H$_3$ + O$_2$ = CH$_2$CHO + O</td>
<td>DL98 (rev), MRN99, FDC00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R27 C$_2$H$_3$ + M = C$_2$H$_2$ + H + M</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), MRN99, FDC00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R28 C$_2$H$_6$ + OH = CH$_2$H$_2$ + H$_2$O</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), MRN99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R29 iso-C$_4$H$_8$ + O = iso-C$_4$H$_7$ + OH</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), PPS96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_5$/C$_3$H$_4$ loop reactions</td>
<td>R30 C$_3$H$_5$ + H = C$_3$H$_4$ + H$_2$</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), PPS96, MRN99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R31 C$_3$H$_5$ + OH = C$_3$H$_4$ + H$_2$O</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), MRN99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R32 C$_3$H$_5$ + O = C$_3$H$_4$HCO + H</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), MRN99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R33 C$_3$H$_5$ + O$_2$ = C$_3$H$_4$ + HO$_2$</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), PPS96, MRN99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R34 C$_3$H$_4$ + H = C$_3$H$_3$</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), PPS96, MRN99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R35 C$_3$H$_4$ + O = CH$_2$O + C$_2$H$_2$</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R36 C$_3$H$_4$ + O = CO + C$_2$H$_4$</td>
<td>DL98, DL98 (rev), MRN99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R37 C$_3$H$_4$ + OH = CHO + C$_2$H$_4$</td>
<td>PPS96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4 depicts the experimental and predicted $K_{\text{ext}}$'s for ethanol/air mixtures. Both FDC00 and MRN99 underpredict the experimental $K_{\text{ext}}$ by nearly a factor of 2, with the predictions of FDC00 being slightly higher than those of MRN99. Similarly to methanol/air flames, solutions for very fuel-rich concentrations were not possible.

The experimentally determined and numerically predicted $K_{\text{ext}}$'s for n-heptane/air mixtures are depicted in Fig. 5. The DL98 and DL98 (revised) mechanisms were used in the numerical simulations. For conditions that are not very fuel-rich, DL98 under-
Table 4
List of reactions included in LHD03 that differ from HD98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Modified reaction rates</th>
<th>Modified third body efficiencies of H₂O and CO₂</th>
<th>Additional reaction</th>
<th>Removed reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH₂O + OH = HCO + H₂O</td>
<td>3.430E+09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂O + HO₂ = HCO + H₂O₂</td>
<td>2.000E+12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO + O + M = CO₂ + M</td>
<td>1.800E+10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.550E+24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂/2.5 H₂O/12 CO/1.9 CO₂/3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO + M = H + CO + M</td>
<td>0.186E+18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂/2.5 H₂O/3.0 CO/1.9 CO₂/3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO₂ + OH = H₂O + O₂</td>
<td>5.000E+16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₁O + H = CH₃ + OH</td>
<td>3.200E+13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n is the reaction order.

* Duplicate reaction.

Fig. 4. Variation of experimental and computed K_{ext}'s with \( \phi \) for ethanol/air flames using the FDC00 and MRN99 mechanisms.

Fig. 6 depicts the experimentally determined \( K_{ext} \) values for iso-octane/air mixtures, along with the numerical predictions. The PPS96, DL98, and DL98 (revised) mechanisms were used. All three mechanisms fail to predict the experimental data, especially for lean mixtures, for which they underpredict the experimental data by a factor of 2 or more, with the DL98 (revised) exhibiting relatively better agreement with the experiments. All mechanisms predict the experimental data more closely under fuel-rich conditions. All mechanisms tested also predicted that \( K_{ext} \) peaks at a notably greater \( \phi \) than in the experiments. The experimental \( K_{ext} \) peaks around \( \phi = 1.15 \), while DL98 and DL98 (revised) predict a peak at approxi-mately \( \phi = 1.25 \), and PPS96 at about \( \phi = 1.30 \). Overall DL98 (revised) exhibits a 10% improvement over the range of \( \phi \) tested compared to DL98.

Of all seven mechanisms tested, only one of them, the HD98 mechanism, came close to reproducing the experimental \( K_{ext} \) data. With few exceptions, all mechanisms were found to underpredict the experimental \( K_{ext} \) by factors as large as 2 to 3. Furthermore, they all predicted excessively weak burning under fuel-lean conditions, to the point where convergence was not possible even though flames could be experimentally established. It is of interest to note that the HD98 mechanism was subsequently optimized to predict \( S_{\text{th}}'s \) of methanol/air flames, which led to...
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Fig. 6. Variation of experimental and computed $K_{\text{ext}}$'s with $\phi$ for iso-octane/air flames using the PPS96, DL98, and DL98 (revised) mechanisms.
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Fig. 7. Variation of experimental and computed $S_\mu$'s with $\phi$ for methanol/air flames using the FDC00, HD98, and LHD03 mechanisms. The experimental data were taken from Ref. [7].
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the LHD03 mechanism. However, this optimization to predict $S_\mu$ more closely caused a rather notable underprediction of the experimental $K_{\text{ext}}$ by LHD03, as reported in Fig. 3. Based on this observation and the fact that most of the mechanisms have been tested only against $S_\mu$, the ability of all mechanisms to simultaneously predict $S_\mu$'s and $K_{\text{ext}}$'s was further assessed and is discussed next.

4.3. Comparisons of phenomena of laminar flame propagation and extinction

Fig. 7 depicts numerical predictions and Ref. [7] $S_\mu$ data for methanol/air mixtures. While HD98 notably overpredicts the experimental data, LHD03 closely predicts them except for fuel-lean conditions, and FDC00 slightly underpredicts them.

Integrated reaction path analyses revealed that all three mechanisms have similar combustion paths for methanol; the percentage consumption paths for the HD98 and LHD03 mechanisms, both NEFs and FPFs, are shown in Fig. 8 for a $\phi = 0.769$ methanol/air flame. The reaction path analysis showed that the combustion pathways for NEFs and FPFs are nearly identical and that each mechanism favored slightly different paths. For example, the FDC00 mechanism (not shown in Fig. 8) was found to favor the $H_2$ production directly from methanol via R21, compared to the other two mechanisms. R21 accounts for over 50% of the methanol consumption for FDC00, but under 10% for HD98 and LHD03.

Comparison of the reaction path analysis results obtained for LHD03, which closely predicts $S_\mu$, and for HD98, which closely predicts $K_{\text{ext}}$, revealed that relatively minor changes in a mechanism can lead to significant changes in the prediction of global flame properties. The main difference between the two mechanisms is in the $HO_2$ chemistry. The LHD03 mechanism places greater importance on the $HO_2$ chemistry by decreasing the third-body efficiencies of $H_2O$ and $CO_2$ for reaction R11. The reduction of the R11 rate favors the consumption of $HCO$ through R12, which produces more $HO_2$. The $HO_2$ chemistry has also been modified by adding reaction R5, which shifts almost 30% of the consumption of $HO_2$ toward...
the production of H$_2$O. This has a negative effect on the overall reactivity of the flame because it slows down the rate of R6, which produces two OH radicals that are important to the overall branching. Thus, LHD03 predicts weaker burning characteristics than HD98. This weakening allows LHD03 to predict $S'_u$ more closely than HD98. However, LHD03 fails to predict $K_{ext}$. This indicates that validations against $S'_u$’s are not sufficient for a mechanism and its reduced versions to be used in large-scale simulations, because other high-temperature flame phenomena are not necessarily predicted.

The logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $S'_u$ and $K_{ext}$ to reaction-rate constants for a $\phi = 0.769$ methanol/air flame computed using the LHD03 mechanism are shown in Fig. 9. (The authors chose the term “logarithmic sensitivity coefficient” over the term “normalized sensitivity coefficient,” which is properly defined in Ref. [29]. A similar discussion can be also found in Ref. [30].) It can be seen that while the reactions that largely affect $S'_u$ and $K_{ext}$’s are the same, the sensitivities of $K_{ext}$ are approximately twice as great as for $S'_u$. The latter indicates the greater influence of kinetics on the phenomenon of extinction as compared to propagation. It is apparent that the observed qualitative similarities of the sensitivities of $S'_u$ and $K_{ext}$ do not point to a rate or rates that could be responsible for the failure of the kinetics to predict both phenomena. On the other hand, the quantitative differences of the sensitivity coefficients, which are uniformly described by a factor of 2, could be considered as a potential source of the observed discrepancies between the two phenomena. However, such improvements of rate constants could only be achieved via rigorous global mechanism optimization [4,26], rather than individual rate-constant modifications.

The relative performance of the mechanisms between the two different flame phenomena is summarized as follows: FDC00 underpredicts $S'_u$ by about 25% and it underpredicts $K_{ext}$ by almost 300% for the range tested. Note that the flame-temperature difference between NEF and FPF at $\phi = 0.769$ is only 138 K. Comparing LHD03 and HD98, it can be seen that modifying a mechanism to decrease $S'_u$ by 30% reduces the predicted $K_{ext}$ by 60%, i.e., by a factor of 2, which is consistent with the sensitivity results shown in Fig. 9.

Fig. 10 depicts numerical predictions using FDC00 and MRN99 and Ref. [8] $S'_u$ data for ethanol/air mixtures. It can be seen that both FDC00 and MRN99 predict rather closely the experimental $S'_u$’s, and that there is on average less than 10% difference between the predicted values and the experimental data for both mechanisms. Similarly to methanol/air flames, integrated reaction path analysis revealed that there are only minor differences between the pathways for NEFs and FPFs as predicted by the two mechanisms. Similarly to methanol/air flames, the sensitivity analysis revealed that the two phenomena share similar sensitivity values, with the sensitivities of $K_{ext}$ being greater than those of $S'_u$ by approximately a factor of 2.

From the analysis performed for methanol/air and ethanol/air FPFs and NEFs, it is apparent that the kinetic mechanisms that were tested exhibit similar reaction paths and sensitivities for both the phenomena of propagation and extinction, and that no reaction was identified as responsible for the observed discrepancies.
There are several points to be made here. First, the analysis was performed based on mechanisms that were developed based on $S^0$ predictions. Thus, if species are missing and/or rate constants have not been optimized to account for phenomena other than laminar flame propagation, it is possible that the reaction path and/or sensitivity analyses performed were falsified and they could not accurately identify the causes responsible for the poor prediction of $K_{\text{ext}}$.

While the authors were reluctant to attempt rate constant modifications, the effect of adding species to a mechanism that has been compiled based on $S^0$ predictions was assessed and is discussed next.

Fig. 11 depicts numerical predictions using DL98 and DL98 (revised) and Ref. [9] $S^0$ data for $n$-heptane/air mixtures. While both mechanisms accurately predict $S^0$ for $\phi < 1.0$, they slightly underpredict $S^0$ for $\phi > 1.0$. The DL98 (revised) was an improvement for predicting $S^0$ of $n$-heptane/air mixtures as well as $K_{\text{ext}}$, as shown earlier in Fig. 5. For example, the addition of $\text{CH}_2\text{CHO}$ and its kinetics improved the predictions of $S^0$ by 9% for $\phi = 1.0$ compared to DL98. However, Fig. 5 depicts that the prediction of $K_{\text{ext}}$ was improved by nearly 25% for $\phi = 1.0$, i.e., a factor of 3 improvement over that for $S^0$. Reducing a mechanism to speed up the processing time is notable underpredict them for $\phi > 1.0$. The DL98 (revised) is an improvement over the DL98, but only by 4% on average. The modification improved the prediction of $K_{\text{ext}}$ by 10% on average, as discussed earlier.

Fig. 12 depicts numerical predictions using PPS96, DL98, and DL98 (revised) and Ref. [9] $S^0$ data for iso-octane/air mixtures. While all three mechanisms closely predict the experiments for $\phi < 1.0$, they notably underpredict them for $\phi > 1.0$. The DL98 (revised) is an improvement over the DL98, but only by 4% on average. The modification improved the prediction of $K_{\text{ext}}$ by 10% on average, as discussed earlier.

Integrated reaction path analysis revealed, again, relatively minor differences between NEFs and FPFs for iso-octane/air mixtures. This is shown in Fig. 13, in which only the “lower section” of the hydrocarbon oxidation chain is shown, due to its considerable size and the fact that all of the fuel con-
A loop exists between the oxidation of both n-heptane/air and iso-octane/air flames. The sensitivity of $K_{\text{ext}}$ to the response of this loop is rather large. This point is further supported by the fact that R30 constitutes the main loop-initiating step. Additionally, R32 exhibits notable positive sensitivity, as it is a consumption path of $C_9H_5$ that bypasses the $C_9H_5 \Rightarrow C_4H_4$ loop. The presence of this loop slows down the rate of consumption of the main fuel to CO$_2$ and H$_2$O, thus increasing the time between fuel consumption and heat release. This effect is more profound for NEFs for which residence time considerations at the state of extinction are crucial. This is not the case for FPFs, for which the flame is allowed to fully consume all intermediate species.

### 4.4. Diffusion effects

While typical analyses of computed flames are usually limited to chemical kinetics effects, it is also of interest to assess diffusion effects, which have been shown to be very important for highly diffusive fuel molecules such as H$_2$ [30]. In the present investigation, the fuel molecules are large and the effect of their diffusivities could also be important. To test this thesis, the mass diffusivities of all fuels was perturbed in the numerical simulations of both $S_u$ and $K_{\text{ext}}$. Similarly to the approach taken in Ref. [29], the logarithmic sensitivities of $S_u$ and $K_{\text{ext}}$ to the mass diffusivities were calculated using the following equations, in which the superscripts 1 and 2 correspond to the unperturbed and perturbed values, respectively, for both the independent (i.e., fuel diffusivities) and the dependent (i.e., $S_u$ and $K_{\text{ext}}$) variables:

$$\frac{(2S_u - 1)S_u}{(2 - 1)(2 - 1)} = \frac{(2K_{\text{ext}} - 1)K_{\text{ext}}}{(2 - 1)(2 - 1)}$$

The sensitivities of $S_u$ and $K_{\text{ext}}$ to the fuel diffusivities were then compared to the ones attendant on the main branching reaction R1 and the results are shown in Table 5.

For both lean iso-octane/air and n-heptane/air flames, $S_u$ exhibits a small negative sensitivity to diffusion, with values that are an order of magnitude less than the sensitivity to R1. On the other hand, the effect of diffusion on $K_{\text{ext}}$ appears to be notably greater and of the same order compared to that of R1.
Table 5
Logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $S'_{O}$ and $K_{e}$ to the rate of the main branching reaction $R_1$ and to the fuel diffusivity for methanol/air, ethanol/air, $n$-heptane/air, and iso-octane/air mixtures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>$\phi$</th>
<th>Sensitivity to $R_1$</th>
<th>Sensitivity to fuel diffusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iso-octane</td>
<td>DL98</td>
<td>$S'_{O}$</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$K_{e}$</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$-Heptane</td>
<td>DL98</td>
<td>$S'_{O}$</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$K_{e}$</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol</td>
<td>FDC00</td>
<td>$S'_{O}$</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$K_{e}$</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methanol</td>
<td>FDC00</td>
<td>$S'_{O}$</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$K_{e}$</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar results are shown for lean ethanol/air flames, with the exception that the sensitivity of $S'_{O}$ to diffusion is rather similar in magnitude to that to $R_1$. For lean methanol/air flames it can be seen that the magnitudes of the sensitivities of $S'_{O}$ to diffusion and $R_1$ are very close, while that of $K_{e}$ to $R_1$ is an order of magnitude greater than for diffusion.

Negative sensitivities of $S'_{O}$ to diffusion coefficients have been also reported in Ref. [29]. In the absence of stretch, as is the case of FPFs, it can be shown [30] that if the fuel diffusivity, say, increases by a certain amount, the diffusive layer of the fuel increases at a greater rate, thus reducing the fuel diffusive flux into the reaction zone. As a result, the burning intensity of these fuel-lean flames is reduced. This is not the case, though, for stretched flames at their extinction states, for which an increase of the diffusivity of the heavier fuels effectively reduces the mixture’s Le number. This in turn augments the gain of fuel flux relative to the heat loss out of the flame zone. For the case of methanol/air flames whose Le number is close to one, this effect is less profound.

The results presented in Table 5 clearly suggest that the effect of uncertainties of diffusion coefficients cannot be overlooked, as this could compromise the value of kinetic rates that are validated against experimental data on flame propagation and extinction.

5. Concluding remarks

A systematic study was conducted on the experimental and numerical determination of $K_{e}$’s of mixtures of methanol, ethanol, $n$-heptane, and iso-octane with air under atmospheric temperature and pressure. The experiments involved the use of the counterflow configuration, a high-precision liquid fuel feeder, and a digital particle image velocimetry system for the accurate measurement of flow velocities. The numerical simulations of the experiments involved the use of seven recent kinetic mechanisms that have been validated against data obtained in flow, static, and stirred reactors, shock tubes, and $S'_{O}$’s.

Results showed that for the same equivalence ratio, the alcohol flames are more resistant to extinction than $n$-heptane and iso-octane flames under fuel-lean conditions. Comparisons between experimentally determined and computed $K_{e}$’s revealed that mechanisms that closely predict $S'_{O}$’s fail to predict $K_{e}$’s by factors as large as 2–3, suggesting that while propagation and extinction are both high-temperature phenomena, the controlling kinetics may notably differ. This finding also reveals that validating a mechanism in flames against $S'_{O}$’s only is not sufficient for describing the global flame response.

Through the aid of detailed sensitivity and reaction path analyses, further insight was provided into the mechanisms controlling NEFs and FPFs. The reaction path analysis revealed that the species consumption is rather similar for NEFs and FPFs. However, it was found that the sensitivities to kinetics are notably higher for NEFs than for FPFs. Furthermore, for $n$-heptane/air and iso-octane/air flames a set of reactions were identified that had dominant sensitivities for NEFs but not for FPFs.

The effect of diffusion was also assessed and sensitivity coefficients of $S'_{O}$ and $K_{e}$ to the fuel diffusivity were determined for all fuels and compared to the ones obtained for the main branching reaction, $H + O = OH + O$. Results showed that under certain conditions, the sensitivities to diffusion could be of the same order as those to kinetics. Thus, validation of kinetics against fundamental flame phenomena without considering the effects of the uncertainties of diffusion coefficients could compromise the fidelity of the rate constants that are derived from flame studies.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by AFOSR (Grant FA9550-04-1-0006) under the technical supervision of Dr. Julian M. Tishkoff. The discussions on the ki-
netics aspects of this work with Professor Hai Wang are greatly appreciated.

References

Diffusion and kinetics effects on the ignition of premixed and non-premixed flames
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Abstract

The relative importance of molecular transport and chemical kinetics on flame ignition was investigated through detailed numerical simulations. The study was conducted in stagnation-type flows for atmospheric, laminar premixed and non-premixed iso-C₈H₁₈, n-C₇H₁₆, and H₂ flames. Ignition of premixed flames was studied by: (1) increasing the temperature of a N₂ jet counterflowing against a fuel/air jet, (2) increasing the temperature of a solid wall against which a fuel/air jet was injected. Ignition of non-premixed flames was studied by increasing the temperature of an air jet counterflowing against a fuel-containing jet. The simulations were performed along the stagnation streamline, and included detailed descriptions of chemical kinetics, molecular transport, and radiative heat transfer. Sensitivity analyses of the ignition temperatures to the diffusion coefficients of the reactants as well as to the kinetics were performed. Results revealed that premixed flame ignition is rather sensitive to the fuel diffusivity in the opposed-jet configuration, and notably less in the jet-wall. This is due to the diffusive transport that is required to convey the reactants towards the ignition kernel in the opposed-jet. It was found that the two approaches result in similar ignition temperatures only for fuel-rich cases and that the ignition temperatures tend to be lower as the equivalence ratio increases in the opposed-jet configuration. However, the ignition temperatures were found to depend mildly on the equivalence ratio in the jet-wall configuration. The sensitivity of ignition to diffusion in non-premixed systems was found to also be notable, especially for cases in which the fuel is highly diluted by an inert. For both premixed and non-premixed flames, the sensitivity of ignition to diffusion coefficients was found to be of the same order or larger than that to kinetics. This is important when flame ignition data are used to validate kinetics, as rate constants could be potentially falsified.
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1. Introduction

The effects of molecular transport and chemical kinetics on flames have been recognized decades ago (e.g., [1]). However, the combustion community has been rather inclined to use flame data to validate chemical kinetics, by implicitly assuming that the transport coefficients are accurately represented by existing theories, such as for example that of Chapman–Enskog. However, such theories are based on several assumptions that may introduce uncertainties in the calculation of transport coefficients. For example, the assumption of spherical geometry...
although mathematically convenient, could be challenged for large and highly linear molecules such as, for example, the important primary reference fuels \( \text{n-C}_7\text{H}_{16} \) and \( \text{iso-C}_8\text{H}_{18} \). On the other hand, uncertainties associated with transport properties in highly diffusive systems such as for example \( \text{H}_2/\text{air} \) mixtures, could also have a first order effect on the predicted flame response. The effect of the molecular diffusion model has also been shown to be important in turbulent combustion [2] and comparable to that of switching between two different kinetic mechanisms. Thus, ignoring without justification the effects of diffusion when kinetics are validated against flame data, could result in the falsification of rate constants.

Past studies have assessed the effects of preferential diffusion (Lewis number effects) (e.g., [3]) and thermal diffusion (thermally driven, non-Fickian, Ludwig-Soret drift) (e.g., [4]) on the flame response. The effect of molecular diffusion on flame structure, propagation, and extinction (e.g., [5–12]) has also been investigated. Some recent studies on the effects of molecular diffusion on the extinction of \( \text{CH}_4/\text{air} \) [10] and \( \text{H}_2/\text{air} \) [11] flames revealed discrepancies in predicted flame properties anywhere between 20% and 40% depending on the transport model selected. The effects of kinetics and diffusion on ignition have also been addressed (e.g., [13–15]) either directly or indirectly (through the effect of strain rate), but not as systematically compared to flame propagation and extinction.

Based on these considerations, the main goal of this study was to numerically investigate the relative importance of chemical kinetics and molecular transport on the ignition of laminar, atmospheric, premixed and non-premixed \( \text{iso-C}_8\text{H}_{18} \), \( \text{n-C}_7\text{H}_{16} \), and \( \text{H}_2 \) flames in two stagnation-type flows, namely the opposed-jet and jet-wall configurations. They both have been widely used in the past (e.g., [16–20]) to study various flame phenomena. The stagnation flow configurations considered in this study are well-controlled environments in which the effect of molecular transport can be systematically augmented or minimized, as it will be discussed. The fuels chosen are of practical importance and have diffusivities that are notably different compared to \( \text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{N}_2 \).

### 2. Numerical approach

The simulations were conducted by solving the quasi-one-dimensional conservation equations of mass, momentum, species concentrations, and energy along the stagnation streamline (e.g., [21–23]). The effect of thermal radiation from \( \text{CH}_4 \), \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \), \( \text{CO}_2 \), and \( \text{CO} \) was also included at the optically thin limit (e.g., [22]). The code was integrated with the CHEMKIN [24] and Sandia Transport [25] subroutine libraries.

Four kinetics models were used in the simulations:

1. Davis and Law [26] mechanism for \( \text{iso-C}_8\text{H}_{18} \) (hereafter referred to as “DL98”);
2. Pitsch et al. [27] mechanism for \( \text{iso-C}_8\text{H}_{18} \) (hereafter referred to as “PPS96”); PPS96 is a greatly reduced mechanism compiled to predict laminar flame speeds of \( \text{iso-C}_8\text{H}_{18}/\text{air} \) mixtures;
3. Liu et al. [16] mechanism for \( \text{n-C}_7\text{H}_{16} \) (hereafter referred to as “LHCP04”);
4. Davis et al. [28] mechanism for \( \text{H}_2 \) (hereafter referred to as “DJWE05”).

Three configurations were considered (Fig. 1):

(i) A fuel/air jet counterflowing against a \( \text{N}_2 \) jet. A premixed flame was ignited by increasing the injection temperature of the \( \text{N}_2 \)-jet boundary, \( T_{\text{inj},\text{N}_2} \). The value of \( T_{\text{inj},\text{N}_2} \) resulting in flame ignition was defined as the ignition temperature, \( T_{\text{ign}} \). The momenta of both jets were kept constant by adjusting the velocity boundary conditions while \( T_{\text{inj},\text{N}_2} \) is increased, to keep the stagnation plane (SP) at the center of the domain. A separation distance of 20 mm between the nozzles was used.

(ii) A fuel/air jet impinging on an inert stagnation-wall. Increasing the wall temperature, \( T_{\text{wall}} \), a premixed flame was ignited. The original opposed-jet code had been modified allowing for the no-slip velocity boundary conditions at the wall [17]. The value of \( T_{\text{wall}} \) resulting in flame ignition was defined as \( T_{\text{ign}} \). A separation distance of 10 mm between the nozzle and the wall was used.

(iii) A fuel or fuel/\( \text{N}_2 \) jet counterflowing against an air jet. A non-premixed flame was ignited by increasing the temperature of the air-jet boundary, \( T_{\text{inj},\text{air}} \). The value of \( T_{\text{inj},\text{air}} \) resulting in flame ignition was defined as \( T_{\text{ign}} \). Similarly to (i), the velocity boundary conditions were adjusted while \( T_{\text{inj},\text{air}} \) was increased to

![Fig. 1. Schematics of the stagnation flow configurations.](image-url)
keep the SP at the center of the domain. A separation distance of 20 mm between the nozzles was used.

For the studies of premixed flame ignition in configurations (i) and (ii), the fuel/air mixture was injected at 300 K since all fuels considered, including iso-C₈H₁₈ and n-C₇H₁₆, could exist in the gaseous phase [19] at 300 K including fuel-rich flammable mixtures. However, for the studies of non-premixed flame ignition of iso-C₈H₁₈ and n-C₇H₁₆ in configuration (iii), the fuel/N₂ jet was injected at 450 K that would maintain the fuels in the gaseous phase under all conditions considered; the H₂/N₂ jet was injected at 300 K similarly to the premixed case.

For the ignition of premixed flames, the imposed global strain rate, \( K_{gib} \), was in the range of \( 20 \leq K_{gib} \leq 50 \text{ s}^{-1} \) for iso-C₈H₁₈/air and n-C₇H₁₆/air, and \( 55 \leq K_{gib} \leq 330 \text{ s}^{-1} \) for H₂/air, and was varied with equivalence ratio, \( \phi \). Those values of \( K_{gib} \) were determined by imposing velocities at the nozzle exit that were slightly higher than the attendant laminar flame speeds. Thus, steady flames could be established upon maintaining the lowest possible strain rate for each \( \phi \). More specifically, the Karlovitz numbers, \( K_{a} \), were determined to be \( K_{a} \sim O(10^{-1} - 10^{-3}) \). Under such conditions it has been demonstrated that the premixed flame structure is relatively immune to the variations of the strain rate [29]. This was also confirmed in the present simulations by imposing small but finite strain-rate variations and the effect on \( T_{\text{ign}} \) was found to be minor. For the non-premixed flame ignition the imposed strain rates were chosen to be one to two orders of magnitude less than the attendant extinction values, assuring again small sensitivity of \( T_{\text{ign}} \) on the strain rate.

The ignition response exhibits a turning-point behavior as \( T_{\text{ign}} \) or \( T_{\text{wall}} \) increases. Introducing a one-point continuation [30,31] into the original code captured this singular behavior, as shown in Fig. 2. Starting the simulations from a non-ignited state, a pre-determined species concentration increment was imposed at the location where the species concentration exhibits a maximum slope. This serves as a new boundary condition replacing \( T_{\text{ign}} \) for the opposed-jet or \( T_{\text{wall}} \) for the jet-wall configuration, upon which the "S-curves" are single-valued. It should be mentioned that n-C₇H₁₆ may in certain circumstances exhibit a two-stage ignition [16] however, for the cases studied and for the kinetic mechanism used this was not the case and one-stage high-temperature ignition was observed.

Sensitivity analysis was performed to assess the effects of diffusion coefficients and chemical kinetics on \( T_{\text{ign}} \). A "brute force" approach was implemented for the determination of the sensitivities to diffusion. The mass diffusivity of each species \( i \) to the mixture, \( D_{m,i} \), was perturbed by small amounts and then \( T_{\text{ign}} \) was determined. Subsequently, a logarithmic sensitivity coefficient (LSC) was formulated as \( \text{LSC} = \frac{\partial \ln T_{\text{ign}}}{\partial \ln D_{m,i}} \). LSC's of \( T_{\text{ign}} \) to diffusivities were determined through \( \pm 10\% \) perturbation of the fuel diffusivity to the mixture for all \( \phi \)'s and of the mass diffusivity of O₂ to the mixture for fuel-rich mixtures only. One should note that perturbation of the mass diffusivity of a reactant also affects the thermal diffusivity of that particular reactant, as thermal diffusivity is dependent upon mass diffusivity.

LSC's of \( T_{\text{ign}} \) to kinetics were determined rigorously by the code, given that \( T_{\text{ign}} \) is a dependent variable when the aforementioned one-point continuation approach is invoked. As a result it is possible to perform rigorous sensitivity analysis with respect to rate constants for \( T_{\text{ign}} \) similarly to previous studies on flame extinction [11,19].

3. Results and discussion

Figure 3 depicts the LSC's of \( T_{\text{ign}} \) to the reactant diffusivities for premixed iso-C₈H₁₈/air (DL98 and PPS96) and n-C₇H₁₆/air (LHCP04) mixtures in both the opposed-jet (i) and jet-wall (ii) configurations. The variation of \( \phi \) was in the range \( 0.65 \leq \phi \leq 1.35 \) and that of \( K_{gib} \) was \( 20 \leq K_{gib} \leq 50 \text{ s}^{-1} \).

Results indicate that ignition is substantially more sensitive to the fuel transport in the opposed-jet configuration compared to the jet-wall for both fuels. This is due to the fact that in the opposed-jet configuration, ignition occurs close to the hot (N₂) boundary, as the Arrhenius kinetics dictate. Thus, the fuel diffusion against
the opposing convection after it crosses the SP becomes the controlling factor. This is not the case in the jet-wall configuration as both reactants are transported primarily by convection to the ignition kernel that is located at the immediate vicinity of the wall. For the hydrocarbons considered, the fuel is the largest molecule in the flowfield and its diffusion across the SP becomes the rate-controlling process in the opposed-jet configuration for low $\phi$'s. At higher $\phi$'s, the LSC's are lower because the fuel concentration gradient increases and, thus, its diffusive transport is not anymore the rate-controlling process.

Figure 4 depicts LSC's of $T_{\text{ign}}$ to the reactant diffusivities for $\text{H}_2/\text{air}$ (DJWE05) mixtures in both the opposed-jet (i) and jet-wall (ii) configurations. The variation of $\phi$ was in the range $0.50 \leq \phi \leq 3.00$ and that of $K_{\text{det}}$ was $55 \leq K_{\text{det}} \leq 330 \text{ s}^{-1}$. For $\text{H}_2/\text{air}$ mixtures, $O_2$ is the largest molecule in the flowfield and the ignition process is limited by its transport to the kernel. Hence, comparing the results of Figs. 3 and 4, which have the same scales, reveals that the sensitivity of $T_{\text{ign}}$ to the $O_2$ diffusivity is substantially larger for $\text{H}_2/\text{air}$ mixtures.

It is also of interest to note that while the LSC's to the fuel diffusivity are negative for hydrocarbon/air they are positive for $\text{H}_2/\text{air}$ mixtures in the opposed-jet configuration. This indicates that as the $\text{H}_2$ diffusivity increases $T_{\text{ign}}$ increases, i.e., ignition is inhibited. This is physically sound given that the process of ignition largely depends on the relative magnitude of the diffusive transport of fuel and $O_2$ towards the ignition kernel, which is located close to the hot ($N_2$) boundary. For the case of $n$-$\text{C}_6\text{H}_{14}$ and $\text{iso-C}_8\text{H}_{18}$, the fuel diffusivity is smaller than $O_2$ and the fuel transport is the rate-limiting process. Thus, increasing the fuel diffusivity promotes ignition, i.e., $T_{\text{ign}}$ decreases. For the case of $\text{H}_2$, the diffusive transport of $O_2$ is instead the rate-limiting process, given its notably lower diffusivity compared to $\text{H}_2$. Thus, increasing the $\text{H}_2$ diffusivity is equivalent of further reducing the rate of transport of $O_2$ relative to $\text{H}_2$, which in turn inhibits ignition, i.e., $T_{\text{ign}}$ increases.

The results shown in Fig. 3 also reveal that for $\text{iso-C}_8\text{H}_{18}/\text{air}$ flames the LSC's to the fuel diffusivity calculated using the DL98 mechanism, assume small but positive values in the jet-wall configuration. It was found that as the fuel diffusivity increases its concentration increases within the ignition kernel, enhancing thus termination reactions between the fuel and radicals that tend to inhibit ignition. Comparing the opposed-jet and the jet-wall configurations, it is apparent that when the later is used to investigate premixed flame ignition, the effect of reactant diffusion is minimized so that the kinetics can be validated with greater degree of confidence as compared to the opposed-jet.

It is also of interest to note that the values of the LSC's reported in Figs. 3 and 4 are as high as 0.22. While such values can be considered as rather small for flame propagation and extinction, this is not the case when ignition temperatures are considered. For example, for $T_{\text{ign}}$ in the range 900–1700 K, which is of relevance to the present study, a 10% perturbation of the diffusivity of $n$-$\text{C}_7\text{H}_{16}$ results in a change of $T_{\text{ign}}$ of about 50 K for a $\phi = 0.65$ flame. A 50 K difference in $T_{\text{ign}}$ is
rather large given the exponential dependence of reaction rates on temperature. Thus, the uncertainties associated with the diffusivities need to be considered in ignition studies. This will be further discussed in a latter section.

Figure 5 depicts the values of \( T_{\text{ign}} \) for the iso-C\(_8\)H\(_{18}\)/air mixtures that were referenced in Fig. 3. It is apparent that the ignition occurs more readily for the jet-wall configuration as \( T_{\text{ign}} \)’s are lower compared to the opposed-jet by as much as 250 K under fuel-lean conditions. However, under fuel-rich conditions the \( T_{\text{ign}} \)’s determined in the two configurations are approaching each other as \( \phi \) increases, and nearly coincide at \( \phi = 1.35 \). For fuel-lean conditions in the opposed-jet configuration, the fuel diffusion to the ignition kernel, which is close to the hot (N\(_2\)) boundary, is the controlling factor. As \( \phi \) increases, the fuel’s transport to the kernel becomes more effective due to the larger concentration gradient, and as a result the effect of the fuel diffusivity on ignition diminishes. Thus, the ignition becomes kinetically controlled and the choice of the reacting configuration has a second order effect. The LSC’s reported in Fig. 3 also support this argument, as their kinetics that are rather fast compared to hydrocarbons at large rates towards the ignition kernel. Therefore, the effect of the fuel diffusivity on ignition becomes notable.

As \( \phi \) increases in the opposed-jet but stays relatively constant in the jet-wall configuration. This is reasonable given that for the opposed-jet configuration, ignition occurs more readily at higher \( \phi \)’s, as discussed in the previous paragraph, and thus \( T_{\text{ign}} \) is lower. For the jet-wall configuration, the effect of \( \phi \) on \( T_{\text{ign}} \) is largely kinetic and not diffusive. Furthermore, the \( T_{\text{ign}} \) values calculated by two kinetic mechanisms differ as much as 100 K for the same configuration, with DL98 resulting in lower values.

The effect of the reactant diffusivities on \( T_{\text{ign}} \) for non-premixed flames (configuration (iii)) was also assessed, by considering a fuel/N\(_2\) jet impinging on a heated air jet. The cases of 100% and 5% fuel mole fraction in the fuel stream were considered and the results are shown in Fig. 6. Comparing to the ignition of premixed flames in the opposed-jet configuration, the LSC’s to the fuel diffusivity are lower. Comparing the undiluted (100% fuel) and highly diluted (5% fuel) cases it can be seen that the LSC’s increase with the N\(_2\)-dilution. This is expected; ignition is largely controlled by kinetics for low N\(_2\)-dilution and fuel diffusion for high N\(_2\)-dilution of the fuel stream.

Note that the reported LSC’s for the hydrocarbons are finite even for the undiluted case. However, this is not the case for undiluted H\(_2\) flames for which the LSC’s on both H\(_2\) and O\(_2\) are excessively small. Under such conditions H\(_2\) is supplied at the maximum possible concentration and diffuses at large rates towards the ignition kernel. Thus, ignition is controlled by the H\(_2\) oxidation kinetics that are rather fast compared to hydrocarbons, and as a result the effect of diffusion is minor. For the diluted (5% fuel) case, the effect of reactant diffusion on ignition becomes notable.

Figure 7 depicts the LSC’s of \( T_{\text{ign}} \) to kinetics for lean, stoichiometric, and rich premixed iso-C\(_8\)H\(_{18}\)/air flames by utilizing DL98, in both the opposed-jet and the jet-wall configurations. The sensitivity of \( T_{\text{ign}} \) to the main chain-branching reaction \( \text{H} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{O} \) (R1) is apparent, especially in the opposed-jet configuration. However, the analysis reveals that other reactions are as important. In the opposed-jet configuration...
these are $C_3H_4 + O \rightarrow CH_2O + C_2H_2$ (R2) and $CO + OH \rightarrow CO_2 + H$ (R3). In fact, reaction R2 exhibits higher sensitivity than R1 for fuel-lean cases. As $\phi$ increases, ignition becomes more sensitive to R1. As expected, R1 and R2 exhibit negative LSC's, i.e., increasing their rates results in lower $T_{ign}$ i.e., ignition is promoted. A similar analysis was also performed for the non-premixed cases, undiluted and inert-diluted, and only R1 was found to have considerable LSC (~0.05). Thus, these cases were not included in Fig. 7.

Comparisons of the results shown in Figs. 3 and 4 and those in Fig. 7 reveal that the LSC's of ignition to the reactant diffusivities could be comparable and even larger than those to kinetics. For example the LSC's to the diffusivity of iso-$C_4H_10$ are indeed larger than those to the kinetics for fuel-lean mixtures.

To assess the effect of the kinetic mechanism, a similar analysis was conducted by using PPS96 and the results are shown in Fig. 8. Based on this mechanism, reaction $C_4H_8 + OH \rightarrow CHO + C_2H_2$ (R4) exhibits the highest LSC that is similar to R1 in the opposed-jet. The sensitivity of $T_{ign}$ to the main chain-termination reaction $H + O_2 + M \rightarrow HO_2 + M$ (R5) was found to be positive, as expected. Comparing the results shown in Figs. 3 and 8 reveals that, the LSC's to the iso-$C_4H_10$ diffusivity are larger than those to kinetics, similarly to what was found using DL98. This suggests that the finding regarding the relative magnitude of LSC's to diffusion and kinetics holds regardless of the kinetic mechanism used.

Figure 9 depicts the LSC's of $T_{ign}$ to kinetics for premixed and non-premixed $n-C_7H_{16}$/air flames. For premixed flames both the opposed-jet and jet-wall configurations were considered. Two reactions involving HCO, namely $HCO + M \rightarrow CO + H + M$ (R6) and $HCO + O_2 \rightarrow CO + HO_2$ (R7) exhibit the largest negative and positive LSC, respectively. LSC's for non-premixed flames are consistently lower than those for premixed flames.

Figure 10 depicts LSC's for premixed and non-premixed $H_2$ flames. As expected, in both configurations R1 and R5 exhibit the largest negative and positive sensitivities, respectively. Sensitivities
for non-premixed flames were found to be comparable to the premixed flames. Similarly to hydrocarbons, comparing the results of Figs. 4 and 10 reveals that the LSC's to reactant diffusivities can be of the same order or larger compared to those to kinetics.

It is important to acknowledge that the kinetic mechanisms used to model flame ignition for both n-C<sub>7</sub>H<sub>16</sub> and iso-C<sub>8</sub>H<sub>18</sub> have not been developed based on or tested against flame ignition data. Additionally, they are rather simplified to accurately predict the details of ignition of these complex fuels. Kinetic mechanisms that could provide a more accurate prediction of ignition would contain hundreds of species and thousands of reactions. Such simulations would be excessively costly, but they would not alter the basic conclusions of the present study. This can be justified by the fact that similar results were obtained by using three hydrocarbon mechanisms that are rather different and some of them notably more simplified than others. For both fuels and by using all three mechanisms it was shown that ignition could be as sensitive to diffusion as it is on kinetics.

### 4. Concluding remarks

The effects of molecular diffusion and chemical kinetics on the ignition of premixed and non-premixed iso-C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>18</sub>, n-C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>22</sub>, and H<sub>2</sub> flames were numerically determined by using three different reacting configurations and four kinetic mechanisms. All fuels tested have distinctly different diffusivities compared to O<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>.

Results revealed that the ignition of premixed flames could be notably more sensitive to the fuel diffusivity in the opposed-jet and much less in the jet-wall configuration. This was attributed to the reduced role of diffusion in the jet-wall configuration in which the reactants are transported into the ignition kernel largely by convection. It was found that the two configurations result in similar ignition temperatures only for fuel-rich cases. Furthermore, the ignition temperatures were found to decrease as the equivalence ratio increases in the opposed-jet but remain nearly constant in the jet-wall configuration. The sensitivity of the ignition temperature to the fuel diffusivity was determined to be negative for hydrocarbons and positive for H<sub>2</sub>, indicating that ignition is promoted or inhibited as the fuel diffusive flux increases for hydrocarbons and decreases for H<sub>2</sub>, respectively. The sensitivity of ignition to diffusion was also found to be important in non-premixed systems, even for undiluted cases for which ignition is largely controlled by kinetics.

Comparisons of the sensitivity coefficients to kinetics and diffusion revealed that the effect of diffusion on ignition could be of the same order or greater compared to kinetics. This is important given that experimental results on flame ignition are utilized to compile and/or optimize kinetic mechanisms. Unless the effect of diffusion is either accounted for or minimized, the derived kinetics information could be falsified.
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Abstract

The lean flammability limits of CH₄/air and C₃H₈/air mixtures were numerically determined for a wide range of pressures and unburned mixture temperatures in order to assess the near-limit flame behavior under conditions of relevance to internal combustion engines. The study included the simulation of freely propagating flames with the inclusion of detailed descriptions of chemical kinetics and molecular transport, radiative loss, and a one-point continuation method to solve around singular points as the flammability limit is approached. Results revealed that both pressure and unburned mixture temperature have significant effects on the lean flammability limit as well as the attendant limit flame temperature. Specifically, the lean limit was found to first increase and then decrease with pressure, while the limit temperature decreases with pressure in general, and can be reduced to values as low as 900 K under engine-like conditions. Through sensitivity and species consumption path analyses it was further shown that the chain mechanisms that control the near-limit flame response critically depend on the thermodynamic state of the mixture. Thus, mechanisms that are identified as important at near-atmospheric conditions may not be relevant at higher pressures and unburned mixture temperatures. In particular, the response of near-limit flames was found to resemble the homogeneous explosion limits of hydrogen/oxygen mixtures in that while at low pressures the main branching and termination reactions are respectively H + O₂ → OH + O and H + O₂ + M → HO₂ + M, at the elevated pressures relevant to internal combustion engines the system branching is controlled by the HO₂-H₂O₂ kinetics. Potential avenues for extending the lean operation limits of internal combustion engines are suggested based on the understanding gained herein.

© 2006 Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of The Combustion Institute.
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1. Introduction

The term “flammability limit” has been loosely used to describe the concentration limits beyond which flame propagation is not possible. A more formal definition [1] involves the failure of propagation of the ideal one-dimensional, steady, laminar, planar, nearly adiabatic flame, hereafter referred to as the Ideal One-Dimensional Flame (IODF).

Spalding [2] first assessed the influence of thermal radiation on flames by incorporating volumetric heat loss in the IODF model, with the...
use of one-step chemistry. A turning-point behavior was identified as the heat loss parameter was increased. This formulation and finding, while conceptually powerful, could not be confirmed over the years, for two reasons: the IODF model cannot be established in the laboratory and the simplified nature of the formulation, involving constant properties and one-step chemistry, cannot be substantiated quantitatively.

Experimentsally, “flammability limits” have been determined through the use of the standard flame tube (e.g., [3-4]) and/or the spherical bomb (e.g., [5]). Although the flammability limit, \( \phi_{\text{limit}} \) (the technique involves determining the extinction strain rate, \( K_{\text{ext}} \), by systematically varying the mixture’s equivalence ratio, \( \phi \), and the subsequent determination of \( \phi_{\text{limit}} \) through linear extrapolation to \( K_{\text{ext}} = 0 \)).

In subsequent studies (e.g., [7-15]) further insight was acquired into the concept of flammability limits through experiments at normal and reduced gravity as well as detailed numerical simulations. In particular, by simulating the IODF using detailed descriptions of chemical kinetics and thermal radiation, failure of flame propagation was identified at low fuel concentrations in [8], while Spalding’s turning point behavior was reproduced in [9] and as such allows for the quantitative determination of \( \phi_{\text{limit}} \). Indeed, the numerical values were shown to agree well with the empirical ones within experimental and modeling uncertainties. Law and Egolfopoulos [9] also attempted to unify the separate concepts of flame extinction through heat loss and kinetic limitation by noting that near-limit flames are particularly sensitive to chain mechanisms. Thus, by adopting the concept of the flammability exponent \( \alpha \), advanced in [7] and defined as the logarithmic sensitivity coefficient of the rate of the main termination reaction, \( w_T \), on the rate of the main branching reaction, \( w_b \), at the location of the maximum rate of the branching reaction through the relation \( w_T \sim w_b^\alpha \), it was found that \( \alpha \) assumed a value close to unity as the turning-point limit is approached, in agreement with the postulate of [7]. The usefulness of this concept was also highlighted in the plenary paper on chemical kinetics by Miller [16] at the 26th Symposium.

We further note that while this chain-thermal concept is general in nature, independent of the thermodynamic state of the mixture, the studies of the mixture at the 26th Symposium [9,19] were conducted for atmospheric and near-atmospheric conditions because prior interests were mostly motivated by safety considerations. It was particularly innovative that recently this concept has been insightfully applied in [17] to assess the flammability limits in the high-temperature and pressure environments of internal combustion engines. Specifically, by equating the maximum reaction rates of the important \( H_2O \)-branching and termination reactions, which are respectively

\[
\text{H} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{O} \quad \text{(R1)}
\]

\[
\text{H} + \text{O}_2 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{M} \quad \text{(R2)}
\]

it was found that, for \( \text{CH}_4/\text{air} \) and \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4/\text{air} \) flames in a 650K and 50 bar environment, the rate of R2 would exceed that of R1 when \( \phi \approx 0.6 \) with an adiabatic flame temperature around 1900K. Testing with both spark ignition and Diesel engines [17] also revealed that flame extinction and high unburned-hydrocarbon emissions result when the in-cylinder combustion temperature fall below a “critical” value of about 1900K. It was therefore suggested that these results impose a fundamental lean limit for the operation of internal combustion engines and a corresponding lower limit for which \( \text{NO}_x \) can be reduced through lean burning.

The present study was motivated by the practically important study of [17] to further examine the role of the flammability limit in the operation of internal combustion engines. In particular, we note that the limit condition identified in [17] was based on kinetic assessment instead of the more rigorous turning-point consideration allowing for radiative loss [8,9]. Furthermore, this assessment was obtained by equating the maximum rates of R1 and R2, and as such is different from the original criterion of [7] based on the flammability exponent being unity. Third, since the important branching and termination pathways at pressures as high as 50 bars could be substantially more involved than R1 and R2, a point also recognized in [17], a more comprehensive evaluation of the kinetic competition between branching and termination reactions may be needed. Indeed, through a more detailed study of the flammability states at high pressures and initial temperatures, it will be shown that the turning-point criterion results in a substantially wider range of lean operation, and that additional branching-termination channels involving the \( \text{HO}_2 \)-\( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) chemistry emerge under such high-pressure conditions, yielding useful insights into the constraints limiting the operational ranges of internal combustion engines.

The numerical specification, results, and discussions of the present study are sequentially presented in the following

2. Numerical approach

Freely propagating flames were computed using the Premix code [18] that was properly...
modified. The effect of thermal radiation from CO₂, H₂O, CO, and CH₄ at the optically thin limit was incorporated, similarly to previous studies, e.g., [8,9,11]. The code was also modified to allow for capturing the singular behavior around the turning point and allowing, thus, the accurate determination of φₜₚₚ. Similar to previous studies of stagnation-type flames, e.g., [19,20], a one-point continuation approach was implemented by imposing a predetermined temperature or mass fraction of a specific species, at one point in the flow field. Thus, the fuel concentration in the unburned mixture is solved for, rather than imposed as a boundary condition.

The code was integrated with the CHEMKIN [21] and Sandia Transport [22] subroutine libraries. The GRI 3.0 mechanism [23] was used to describe the oxidation of CH₄/air flames. For the modeling of C₃H₄/air flames, a C₁ mechanism compiled by Wang and co-workers [24, H. Wang, personal communications, 2003] was used. Both mechanisms predict closely various flame properties of CH₄/air and C₃H₄/air mixtures.

The mixture's equivalence ratio was varied from π = 1.0 to ultra-lean fuel concentrations at which the turning point behavior could be computed. Additionally, the unburned mixture's temperature, Tᵤ, was varied between 300 and 700 K and the thermodynamic pressure, p, between 1 and 50 atm; it is noted that the Tᵤ used in the radiation term as the far-field temperature [8,9,11] would vary accordingly from 300 and 700 K and was not set arbitrarily to 300 K for all cases.

Insight into the processes that control the near-limit flame behavior was obtained through the use of detailed sensitivity and integrated species consumption path analyses.

3. Results and discussion

Previous investigations (e.g., [8,9,11–15]) have shown that the inclusion of thermal radiation in the energy equation results in a non-monotonic temperature profile throughout the flame. It first increases from the unburned value and reaches a maximum, Tₚₑₚ, just downstream of the reaction zone. As a result of the radiative loss, it then slowly decreases towards Tᵤ. It has also been shown that, by comparing adiabatic and non-adiabatic flames, the effect of thermal radiation on the flame structure and global response becomes significant only for weakly burning flames at near-limit φ's, for example around φ ≈ 0.6 for CH₄/air mixtures at p = 1 atm and Tᵤ = 300 K.

At ultra-lean fuel concentrations, the presence of radiative loss eventually results in a turning-point behavior. This is shown in Figs. 1 and 2 for p = 1 atm CH₄/air and C₃H₄/air mixtures, respectively, with Tᵤ = 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 K; similar behavior was found at all other pressures considered, namely p = 5, 10, 20, and 50 atm. The turning-point then defines the flammability limit, φₜₚₚ, and the attendant Tₚₑₚ as the limit temperature, Tₚₑₚ, as schematically shown in Fig. 1. Figures 1 and 2 depict that φₜₚₚ decreases as Tᵤ increases, hence extends the flammable range. This is physically sound given that with increasing Tᵤ, extra enthalpy is added to the total energy of the mixture and becomes flammable at lower fuel concentrations. Additionally, it is seen that as Tᵤ increases, Tₚₑₚ decreases to as low as 1200 K at p = 1 atm and Tᵤ = 700 K. Note that the φₜₚₚ obtained at p = 1 atm and Tᵤ = 300 K for both CH₄/air and C₃H₄/air mixtures are in close agreement with the experimentally determined lean flammability limits (e.g., [6,12,15]).

Figures 3 and 4 depict the φₜₚₚ and Tₚₑₚ, respectively, for the CH₄/air mixtures as functions of p and Tᵤ while Figs. 5 and 6 show similar results for the C₃H₄/air mixtures. The results for φₜₚₚ reveal that, for a given p, φₜₚₚ decreases
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en that as $T_u$ increases $\phi_{\text{limit}}$ decreases, thus resulting in lower flame temperatures at the limit. It is also seen that for a given $T_u$, $T_{\text{limit}}$ decreases with $p$ for the higher $T_u$'s. For the lower $T_u$'s, $T_{\text{limit}}$ increases first between $p = 1$ and 5 atm, and subsequently decreases as $p$ increases. This behavior can be explained based on the combined effects of $\phi_{\text{limit}}$ and $p$ on $T_{\text{limit}}$. While increasing (decreasing) $\phi_{\text{limit}}$ increases (decreases) $T_{\text{limit}}$, increasing $p$ decreases $T_{\text{limit}}$ as a result of the attendant increase of the rate of the radiative loss; effects of $p$ on product dissociation are negligible for the low flame temperatures of near-limit mixtures. At low $T_u$'s and $p$'s, $\phi_{\text{limit}}$ increases with $p$ and its effect dominates that of $p$ on $T_{\text{limit}}$. Thus, $T_{\text{limit}}$ increases with $p$. For higher $T_u$'s and low $p$'s, the effect of $p$ in reducing $T_{\text{limit}}$ dominates that of $\phi_{\text{limit}}$. This is because higher $T_u$'s result in lower $T_{\text{limit}}$'s, and radiation effects are more profound for these lower flame temperatures (e.g., [9,11-15]). As a result, $T_{\text{limit}}$ decreases with $p$. For $p > 5$ atm, $\phi_{\text{limit}}$ decreases with $p$ and the two effects are synergistic in monotonically reducing $T_{\text{limit}}$

The most striking results shown in Figs. 4 and 6 are the very low $T_{\text{limit}}$'s that are realized at high $T_u$'s. In particular for $p = 50$ atm and $T_u = 700$ K, the computed values of $T_{\text{limit}}$ are as low as 900 K for $\text{C}_3\text{H}_8/\text{air}$ mixtures. This is to be contrasted with the reported experimental $T_{\text{limit}} \approx 1900$ K [17] for similar conditions. This finding suggests that using the flammability limit argument to explain experimentally observed engine behavior may not be sufficient and additional factors must be considered.

The original argument of [7,9], regarding the effect of the competition between $R1$ and $R2$, could be used to explain the near-limit behavior for low pressures, say $1 \leq p \leq 5$ atm. This competition for H radicals is analogous to the second explosion limit of homogeneous $\text{H}_2/\text{O}_2$ mixtures, and causes $\phi_{\text{limit}}$ to increase with $p$. However, at higher $p$'s the excessive production of $\text{HO}_2$ may...
result in additional branching channels similar to
those of the third explosion limit, and causes $\phi_{\text{lim}}$
to decrease with $p$. To examine such a possibility
the kinetic effects at the $\phi_{\text{lim}}$'s were assessed in
detail via sensitivity and integrated species con-
sumption path analyses for $p = 1, 5, 10$, and
50 atm and $T_u = 300$ and 700 K, to be discussed
next.

Figures 7 and 8 depict the logarithmic sensi-
tivity coefficients of the mass-burning rate on the
kinetics for limit CH$_4$/air mixtures at $p = 1$ atm
and 50 atm, respectively, while Figs. 9 and 10
show similar results for C$_3$H$_8$/air mixtures.

The sensitivity results for $p = 1$ atm, CH$_4$/air
(Fig. 7) and C$_3$H$_8$/air (Fig. 9) mixtures confirm
the previously reported results [7,9] that R1 and
R2 exhibit the highest positive and negative sensi-
tivities respectively, at least for $T_u = 300$ K. Sig-
ificant negative sensitivity is also exhibited by:

\[ HO_2 + OH \rightarrow O_2 + H_2O \]  

(R3)
as it results in OH consumption that is important
for the fuel and CO oxidation. At $T_u = 700$ K it is
seen that R3 has the highest negative sensitivity
for C$_3$H$_8$/air mixtures and is rather notable for
CH$_4$/air mixtures. Consequently, the current sim-
ulation suggests that, even for $p = 1$ atm, the
chain mechanism effects on near-limit flames can-
not be solely attributed to the R1-vs-R2 competi-
tion. The calculations reported in Refs. [7] and [9]
were performed using different kinetic mecha-
nisms that apparently predicted a more profound
effect of the R1-vs-R2 competition on the flamma-
ibility limits. This was also shown in the present
simulation, by formulating the flammability expo-

ponent based only on the rates of R1 and R2, and
their values were computed at the numerically
determined $\phi_{\text{lim}}$'s. It was found that while for
$T_u = 300$ K the flammability exponents at the
$\phi_{\text{lim}}$'s are in the range of 0.9-1.0, at higher $T_u$'s
these values were in the range of 0.75-1.0. This
is reasonable as considering that R1-vs-R2 com-
petition alone cannot adequately describe the
kinetic effects on the flammability limit.

The sensitivity results for the $p = 5$ atm CH$_4$/
air and C$_3$H$_8$/air mixtures revealed that while
the effect of R2 is notable for CH$_4$/air, its effect
is not direct on C$_3$H$_8$/air flames but is instead indi-
rect via R3 that utilizes HO$_2$ produced by R2 to
consume OH. It was also found that the import-
ance of R1 is reduced especially for C$_3$H$_8$/air
flames, and that reactions between the carbon-
containing species and HO$_2$ become important.

The sensitivity results for $p = 10$ atm CH$_4$/air
and C$_3$H$_8$/air mixtures revealed the initiation of
reaction pathways that resemble those controlling
the third explosion limit of homogeneous H$_2$/O$_2$
mixtures. More specifically, the excessive production of HO$_2$ via R2 leads eventually to H$_2$O$_2$ production, whose decomposition is an effective branching step as it produces two OH radicals that are crucial to the overall oxidation process. The sensitivities of reactions that involve consumption of carbon-containing species via HO$_2$ were also found to be significantly larger compared to those at the lower $p$'s. The third-limit like behavior becomes more prominent at $p = 50$ atm, as shown in Figs. 8 and 10 for CH$_4$/air and C$_3$H$_8$/air mixtures respectively. Under such high pressures, R4 has a dominant contribution to the system branching, so that the H/O$_2$ $\rightarrow$ HO$_2$ $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O$_2$ $\rightarrow$ OH pathway becomes the main OH-production channel. As a result, the lean flammability limits are extended to leaner fuel concentrations with lower $T_{\text{lim}}$'s. Calculations similar to those in [17] were also performed and the maximum rates of R1 and R2 were calculated for a wide range of conditions. As expected, their relative values do not correlate with the existence of the flammability limits. For example, for the $p = 1$ atm CH$_4$/air mixtures the maximum rate of R1 exceeds that of R2 at $\phi_{\text{lim}}$ by a factor of 5 for both $T_u = 300$ and 700 K. However, at $p = 50$ atm similar calculations revealed that the maximum rate of R2 exceeds that of R1 by two orders of magnitude at $\phi_{\text{lim}}$.

Integrated species consumption analysis provided further insight into the pathways that result in radical production. To illustrate this, the kinetic pathways resulting in the production of OH radicals were chosen. The analysis showed that for the CH$_4$/air limit flames at $p = 1$ atm, OH is mainly produced by R1 and to a lesser extent by R6 and to a lesser extent by R4 and becomes the main OH-production channel. As a result, the lean flammability limits are extended to leaner fuel concentrations with lower $T_{\text{lim}}$'s.

As pressure increases, the importance of R1 in OH production diminishes, and that OH is largely produced by R6 and to a lesser extent by R4 and R7. Similar results were determined for the C$_3$H$_8$/air limit flames. From the sensitivity and integrated species consumption results, the analogy between the near-limit flame behavior and the explosion limits of homogeneous H$_2$O$_2$ mixtures is apparent. As pressure increases first the competition between

Fig. 9. Sensitivity of the mass-burning rate on kinetics for limit CH$_4$/air flames, at $p = 1$ atm and $T_u = 300$ and 700 K.

Fig. 10. Sensitivity of the mass-burning rate on kinetics for limit C$_3$H$_8$/air flames, at $p = 50$ atm and $T_u = 300$ and 700 K.

462 R1 and R2 determines the limit flame response. but subsequently the HO₂-H₂O₂ kinetics become 463 the controlling mechanism of the radical production.

469 4. Concluding remarks

470 A detailed numerical investigation was conducted for near-limit laminar premixed CH₄/air 471 and C₂H₆/air flames, over a wide range of pressures and unburned mixture temperatures that 472 are of relevance to internal combustion engines. The simulations included the use of the Premix 473 code modified to allow for radiative losses, together with the one-point continuation to compute the turning-point behavior observed at near-limit concentrations. Such turning points define the numerically determined flammability limits, as they conform to their fundamental definition.

478 Results revealed that the lean flammability limits of both CH₄/air and C₂H₆/air mixtures as well 479 as the attendant limit flame temperatures vary significantly with both pressure and unburned mixture temperature. For a given pressure, it was found that the lean flammability limit decreases as the unburned mixture temperature increases. On the other hand, for a given unburned mixture temperature, the lean flammability limit first increases and subsequently decreases as pressure increases. The limit flame temperature was found to decrease with pressure in general, for the extreme conditions of 50 atm pressure and 700 K unburned mixture temperature, limit flame temperatures as low as 900 K were determined. Through the use of sensitivity and integrated species consumption analyses, the importance of the HO₂-H₂O₂ chemistry at such high pressures was demonstrated.

487 From practical considerations, the present study suggests that, upon ignition, sustainable burning in internal combustion engines is more robust than previously recognized. On the other hand, steady engine operation has not been achieved with the ultra-lean concentrations identified herein. Several possibilities can be suggested for such a disagreement, offering potential avenues for further investigation and optimization.

496 The first cause for the observed narrower limit is the facilitation of extinction due to the unavoidable turbulence and bulk aerodynamic stretching. Second, the fuel/air charge may not be well mixed, resulting in diffusion-controlled burning which is more susceptible to stretch-induced extinction. Third, the successful firing of an engine could be more critically controlled by the ignitability of the unburned mixture instead of the extinguishability of established flames. This is consistent with the hysteresis nature of combustion phenomena in that, for the same thermodynamic and aerodynamic state, ignition is more difficult to achieve than extinction. Consequently rational strategies towards extending the lean limit of engine operations should be focused on promoting mixture homogeneity as well as on enhancing ignition because flames will propagate once they are established, allowing of course the omnipresence of stretch.
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