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ABSTRACT

The increasing demand for energy and the need for reduction of greenhouse gases has necessitated the development of renewable sources such as biodiesel fuel. Methyl ester fuel burns more efficiently and has lower emissions of particulate matter, unburned hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide than fossil fuels. However, combustion of a methyl ester fuel results in increased nitrogen oxides (NO\textsubscript{x}) emissions relative to fossil fuels. This study is concerned with the formation of NO\textsubscript{x} in combustion of methyl formate, the simplest methyl ester molecule, under different flame conditions. Homogeneous ignition, freely propagating and diffusion flames of methane, methanol and methyl formate have been numerically simulated. To this end, recently developed chemical kinetic mechanism for methyl formate (Dooley 2009) has been identified and further developed to capture the production processes of pollutants. This is particularly important given that kinetics of combustion of methyl esters have not received much attention in existing literature. NO\textsubscript{x} concentration profiles for methyl formate in all configurations studied have been compared to those of methane/air and methanol/air flames which are well understood.

It has been established that, the thermal NO in the three fuels are produced in nearly the same amount (within the same order of magnitude), while the prompt NO production in methane is observed to have a significant difference (one order of magnitude higher) compared to those of methanol and methyl formate flames. For thermal NO, the rate-limiting step: \( \text{N}_2 + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{N} \), which has a high activation energy is the decisive reaction. \( \text{N}_2 \) and \( \text{O} \) are readily available in all the three fuels, hence the thermal NO production is nearly the same. In prompt NO, reaction: \( \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{N} \) is the determining step. A small amount of CH and subsequently N atoms in CH\textsubscript{3}OH and CH\textsubscript{3}OCHO explain the low values of NO concentration as compared to that for methane. In addition, NO concentration showed a high sensitivity to reaction: \( \text{NNH} + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NH} \).
+ NO in oxygenated fuels (CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO) as opposed to high sensitivity of reaction: CH + N$_2$ $\longrightarrow$ HCN + N seen in CH$_4$ flames. The low concentration of N atoms in oxygenated fuels makes the contribution through the reaction path that results in NNH being significant.

The NO formation in freely propagating and diffusion flames is mostly through prompt NO since the maximum flame temperatures attained are relatively low (approximately $\leq$2000 K). While the NO formation in a homogeneous system is mostly through thermal NO mechanism (Zel’ dovich mechanism) since they attained high flame temperatures (approximately between 2800 and 3200 K) due to high initial temperatures. It is observed that, NO concentration in a homogeneous system is significantly higher (by three orders of magnitude) than those in freely propagating and diffusion flames.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Literature Review

The increasing demand for energy and the need for reduction of greenhouse gases has necessitated the development of renewable sources such as biodiesel fuel. Both pure and diesel-blended methyl ester fuels burn more efficiently, due to the presence of oxygen atom in their structure, than pure fossil fuels. For instance, it has been shown that diesel blended with the croton megalocarpus methyl ester yields higher thermal efficiency [1]. Furthermore, several research works [2–4] have shown that combustion of methyl ester fuels in diesel engine result in lower emissions of particulate matter, unburned hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. However, combustion of methyl esters result in increased NO\textsubscript{x} emissions as compared to fossil fuels [3–5].

A typical biodiesel fuel has C14-C18 fatty acid methyl esters: methyl palmitate, methyl stearate, methyl oleate, methyl linoleate and methyl linolenate in different compositions. The chemical kinetics of these large carbon chain esters are complex. Their combustion processes contain hundreds of intermediate compounds thus making computation difficult. To tackle this problem, researchers have been using surrogate fuels (both single and multi-component) to represent a real fuel. Surrogate fuels are used to represent or approximate the combustion processes in biodiesel fuels. However, amongst suitable candidates for surrogate fuels are the esters. They, however, are of unknown chemical kinetics. Methyl formate has the simplest molecular structure (see Fig[1.1]) of all the methyl esters. Even though methyl formate does not have as high a molecular weight as a real biodiesel fuel, it has the essential chemical structural features of an ester. Hence it can be used to study
The formation of NO\textsubscript{x} in the combustion of methyl formate has been investigated under different flame conditions. An understanding of the chemical reaction pathways of NO\textsubscript{x} formation during fuel oxidation is very important in determining the reduction techniques to be employed in a combustion system. In a combustion system, NO is formed in four different ways; thermal NO at high temperature flame zone or post-flame zone, prompt NO at low temperature flame zone, NO formed from the N\textsubscript{2}O mechanism, and fuel NO produced by nitrogen portions in the fuel. The primary mechanism for thermal NO formation in a flame is attributed to extended Zel’dovich mechanism \cite{6};

\begin{align}
\text{O} + \text{N}_2 & \rightleftharpoons \text{NO} + \text{N}, \\
\text{N} + \text{O}_2 & \rightleftharpoons \text{NO} + \text{O}, \\
\text{N} + \text{OH} & \rightleftharpoons \text{NO} + \text{H}.
\end{align}

In this mechanism, reaction in Eq. (1.1) is the rate determining step for NO formation. Prompt NO formation in the flame zone is associated with the presence of CH radical which react with nitrogen. N atom from this reaction then forms NO through reactions in Eqs (1.2) and (1.3). HCN, the other product, reacts following various paths to form NCO and NH which subsequently form N atom responsible for NO formation. Fuel NO does
not play a role in engine combustion, because fuels for internal combustion engines contain negligible amounts of nitrogen.

The aim of this study is to investigate the chemical reaction pathways for the formation of NO\textsubscript{x} in methyl formate flames. The results are compared to those of methane and methanol flames. NO\textsubscript{x} formation in methane has been well understood, ranging from the development of mechanisms to the influence of flame types. Several mechanisms for NO\textsubscript{x} formation have been developed; Li and William mechanism [7], Leeds mechanism [8], GRI 3.0 mechanism [9], GDF-Kin\textsuperscript{\textregistered}3.0-NCN mechanism [10] and Konnov (version 0.6) [11]. The earlier versions of these mechanisms [7–9] use the reaction \( \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{HCN} + \text{N} \) and the subsequent reactions. In the current versions [10, 11], the reaction has been replaced with \( \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{NCN} + \text{H} \) and the subsequent reactions. Mechanisms with NCN route have been proven to have satisfying prediction of NO mole fraction profiles [12] in flames. The work of Li and Williams [7] showed that NO\textsubscript{x} formation in a two-stage methane-air flame strongly depend on the flame structure, the premixing equivalence ratio, and the mass fraction of water and carbon dioxide added in the air stream. Guo et al. [13] reported on NO\textsubscript{x} formation in counterflow methane-air triple flames. They observed that a triple flame produces more NO and NO\textsubscript{2} than the corresponding premixed flames due to the appearance of the diffusion flame branch where NO is mainly produced by the thermal mechanism. Naha et al. [14] investigated the effect of using different fuels on NO\textsubscript{x} formation in a counterflow partially premixed flame. They observed a significantly higher formation of CH radicals in n-heptane flame than that in methane flame which was responsible for the difference in NO\textsubscript{x} characteristics of the two fuels. The most recent studies of NO\textsubscript{x} formation in methane flames [11, 12] have been geared toward understanding the role of NCN radical in prompt-NO formation. Few studies [15] on NO\textsubscript{x} formation in methanol flames have been reported. The chemical kinetics of methyl formate have recently been
studied by Dooley et al. [16, 17]. The mechanism developed [16] has been validated in a wide range of conditions; a variable pressure flow reactor, shock tube facility and outwardly propagating flames. In a later investigation [17], Dooley et al. studied a series of burner stabilized flames at pressures of 22-30 Torr and equivalence ratios from 1.0 to 1.8 for flame conditions of 25-35% fuel to further validate their chemical kinetic reaction mechanism. To our knowledge, NO\textsubscript{x} formation pathways for methyl formate flames have never been reported. With the earlier reports [3, 5] that NO\textsubscript{x} formation in biodiesel fuel are higher than those of fossil fuel, it is important to understand how the NO\textsubscript{x} formation is affected by oxygenation in the fuel. Motivated by this consideration, the present study focuses on the analysis of dominant reactions responsible for NO\textsubscript{x} formation in methyl formate/air flame and the subsequent comparison to methane/air and methanol/air flames. Chemical kinetic analysis of the dominant pathways, concentration profiles and rate of production of key radical species will be used to explain the differences in NO\textsubscript{x} formation in the three flames.

1.2 Problem Statement

When a methyl ester fuel is used in a diesel engine, there is a high level of exhaust NO\textsubscript{x} emissions. Therefore, the aim is to determine the mechanism that leads to formation of NO\textsubscript{x} in methyl formate fuel in different reactants flow configurations.

1.3 Objectives

The main objective of the study is to investigate the effects of oxygenation on NO\textsubscript{x} formation in fuels. The specific objectives include:
1. To establish and build suitable chemical kinetic mechanism for NO\textsubscript{x} formation in methyl formate.

2. To establish the key reaction pathways for NO\textsubscript{x} formation in methyl formate flames.

3. To determine the influence of flow configuration on NO\textsubscript{x} formation; homogeneous mixtures and non-homogeneous mixtures (premixed and diffusion flames).

4. To verify the validity of the results by performing sensitivity analysis for NO\textsubscript{x} formation in methyl formate flames.

1.4 Thesis Overview

This study deals with the numerical simulations of methane/air, methanol/air, and methyl formate/air under different flow configurations; homogeneous system, freely propagating flame, and diffusion flame. These simulations have been done with an aim of establishing the influence of fuel oxidation on generation of nitrogen oxides (NO\textsubscript{x}).

In this thesis, a detailed literature review has been done in chapter 2. Different types of fuels are first reviewed, in which the complexity of computing a real fuel is emphasized. Thus, the importance of using a surrogate fuel, which is relatively simpler and easier to compute, is highlighted. The chemical kinetics of NO\textsubscript{x} formation is then reviewed. The various ways in which NO\textsubscript{x} forms in a combustion system are discussed in detail. Then, it is followed by a review on the combustion processes in various flow configurations, which have been considered in this study. Lastly, reviews on the detailed chemical kinetic mechanisms for the oxidation of methane, methanol and methyl formate fuels, as well as the thermodynamic and transport properties of species are presented. The mechanisms
that have reactions involving nitrogen compounds have also been discussed. This section is supplemented by Appendix A to C.

A chapter on the governing equations for chemically reactive flows, chapter 3, follows the literature review. The general conservation equations governing multi-component, chemically reacting, ideal gas mixtures are first presented. Then followed by the recast of these equations for the specific flow configurations; homogeneous system, freely propagating flame, and diffusion flame. The last section of the chapter presents the boundary conditions for each of the flow configuration.

The numerical solution method for the laminar, chemically reactive flow is presented in chapter 4. The finite difference schemes adopted for the discretization of the governing equations are discussed. In a reactive flow, the heat release associated with combustion processes results in steep gradients and strong curvature for the dependent variables profiles. Therefore, in order to reduce the temporal and spatial discretization errors, adaptive gridding method is required. The adaptive gridding method is thus discussed. Then the two methods; Modified Newton method and Euler method, used for solving the system of non-linear equations resulting from discretization is presented. Finally, the convergence criterion for the solutions is highlighted.

Presented in the next three chapters (chapter 5 to chapter 7) are the results and discussions for the different flow configurations. For each configuration, a comparison of NO concentration profiles and other radicals that are dominant in its formation is made. In addition, a plot of major and minor species concentration profiles, and temperature profiles is shown. Finally, the sensitivity of CH and NO concentrations to the reactions in the mechanism is presented.

Presented in chapter 8 is a summary of the main findings of this study while the recom-
mendations arising out of the study are given in chapter 9.
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Fuel Types

Organic fuels are made up of a mixture of different hydrocarbons of various group ($C_{n}H_{m}O_{z}$). Petroleum fuels - gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, kerosene - are pure hydrocarbon fuels. They contain carbon and hydrogen atoms which are combined in many ways to form different molecular compounds such as n-alkanes, branched alkanes, cycloalkanes, aromatics and others. The amounts of these molecular compounds in a given fuel differ greatly depending on the source of crude oil [18].

On the other hand, oxygenated hydrocarbon fuels such as alcohol, ketone, ether, aldehydes and esters contain oxygen atom(s) in their chemical structure. The presence of oxygen atoms in these fuels affects their combustion processes. Excess oxygen could result to a higher oxidation of nitrogen available and hence more NO$_x$ emissions.

A real fuel consists of several species which makes computation of its reaction difficult. For instance, a typical biodiesel fuel has several long chain fatty acid methyl esters, normally between long-chain carbon (C14) and (C18) which vary in compositions depending on the source. The chemical kinetics of these large carbon chain esters are complex. Therefore, a surrogate fuel is used to correctly predict the combustion properties of a fuel.

2.1.1 Surrogate Fuel

Surrogate fuels are used to represent or approximate the combustion behaviour of a fuel. A surrogate fuel should have properties which are similar to those of the real fuel to
be emulated. In order to formulate a surrogate fuel, physical and chemical properties of the components are closely matched to those of the real fuel. The selection of fuel surrogate components and compositions does not follow a particular algorithm. However, the components chosen are constrained by their physical and chemical properties.

A surrogate fuel can be classified either as single-component or multi-component. In a single-component formulation, a chemical component which has properties such as molecular structure, cetane number, viscosity, density, etc, similar to that of the real fuel is used. Studies such as those by Dooley et al. [16,17] have used this approach. On the other hand, a multi-component surrogate fuel consists of different components whose compositions are constrained by their physical and chemical properties to match those of the real fuel. Generally, there are no clear ways of defining the surrogate components and compositions. However, methodologies based on matching fuel’s properties; molecular structure, molecular weight, cetane number, hydrogen/carbon ratio, threshold soot index, viscosity, etc are generally accepted. In this study methyl formate (CH$_3$OCHO) is used to represent a biodiesel fuel. It has a simple structure with two C atoms. Even though methyl formate does not have a high molecular weight as a real biodiesel fuel, it has the essential chemical structural features of an ester.

\section{2.2 Combustion of Methyl Esters}

A methyl ester is an oxygenated fuel formed by the reaction of an alcohol (methanol) and vegetable or animal fat (triglyceride). A typical biodiesel fuel has over 90\% of its composition being five unique long-chain carbon (C16) and (C18) saturated and unsaturated methyl esters [19]: methyl palmitate, methyl stearate, methyl oleate, methyl linoleate and methyl linolenate. An ester can generally be represented as R-C(=O)O-CH$_3$, where R is
a saturated or unsaturated hydrocarbon. The presence of the ester moiety (the oxygen atoms attached to the carbon atom) make this fuel to have different combustion properties in relation to pure hydrocarbon fuel.

Over the last decade, the research on the combustion characteristics of methyl esters as well as biodiesel fuels have been intensified. Several kinetics models for both small-chain and long-chain methyl esters have been developed. These include: detailed chemical kinetic mechanism for methyl formate [20–22], methyl butanoate [21], methyl hexanoate and methyl heptanoate [23], methyl-5-decenoate and methyl-9-decenoate [24], methyl stearate and methyl oleate [25]. Recently, Westbrook et al. [26] developed a mechanism for the five major components of soy biodiesel and rapeseed biodiesel fuel. These mechanisms usually have numerous chemical species taking part in enormous reactions, for instance, Naik et al. [25] chemical reaction mechanism has 3500 species taking part in 17,000 chemical reactions. These detailed mechanisms can only be used to model fuels in zero dimensional homogenous transient system. It is impractical to implement them in one and two dimensional flame codes due to computational limitation. However, a skeletal (reduced) mechanism can be derived from the detailed mechanism, such as those used by Sarathy et al. [27] and Valeri et al. [28].

The kinetics models described in the preceding paragraph have been used to study several aspects of methyl esters combustion: intermediate species production; ignition and extinction; the effects of saturation; and the effects of molecular structure. The intermediate species produced during the combustion of esters have been identified by several researchers [17,27,29]. These intermediates are mostly low molecular weight oxygenated compounds such as, methanol, formaldehyde, ketones, ethyl formate, etc. The studies also reveal that unsaturated methyl esters are important intermediate species in the combustion of saturated fatty acid methyl esters. Seshadri et al. [30] used a skeletal mechanism
to study the ignition and extinction of methyl decanoate. The reduced mechanism showed that low temperature chemistry is of little importance under counter flow conditions. The effects of the presence and position of the double bond on combustion characteristics have been investigated [24,31,32]. Bax et al. [31] studied the oxidation of a blend containing n-decane and a large unsaturated esters (methyl oleate) in a jet stirred reactor. The results were compared to those of oxidation of a blend of n-decane and methyl palmitate performed under similar conditions. They established that unsaturated ester (methyl oleate) is slightly less reactive than saturated ester (methyl palmitate) in the low temperature region whereas the opposite trend is observed in the negative temperature coefficient (NTC) region. Wang et al. [32] investigated three model biodiesel fuels: methyl butanoate, methyl crotonate and methyl decanoate in a laminar premixed and non-premixed flames. They compared the results with those of n-alkanes of similar carbon number in order to assess the effect of saturation, the length of carbon-chain and the presence of the ester group. They established that the presence of the ester group has a retarding effect on the overall mixture reactivity.

Exhaust emissions of methyl esters combustion in an engine have been studied experimentally. Several research works [2–4] have shown that combustion of methyl ester fuels in diesel engine result in lower emissions of particulate matter, unburned hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. However, combustion of methyl esters result in increased NO\textsubscript{x} emissions as compared to fossil fuels [3–5]. Kinetics models for NO\textsubscript{x} formation in esters do not exist in literature.
2.3 Chemical Kinetics of NO\textsubscript{x} Formation

In a combustion system, there are four mechanisms for NO\textsubscript{x} formation; thermal NO, prompt NO, NO formed from the N\textsubscript{2}O mechanism, and fuel NO produced by nitrogen portions in the fuel. These mechanisms are mainly controlled by flame temperature, oxidant concentration and the length of the residence time in the high temperature flame region.

Thermal NO formation occurs at high temperature flame zones or post-flame zones. Extended Zel’dovich mechanism [6], given by reactions shown in Eqs. (1.1)-(1.3), governs the thermal NO formation.

Prompt NO formation occurs at low temperature flame zones. It is normally associated with the presence of CH radical which could react either as [33];

\[ \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{HCN} + \text{N} \tag{2.1} \]

or

\[ \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{NCN} + \text{H} \tag{2.2} \]

The N atom resulting from the reaction shown in Eq. (2.1) forms NO through reactions [1.2] and [1.3]. HCN reacts through various paths to form NCO and NH which subsequently forms N atom responsible for NO formation. NCN in reaction shown in Eq. (2.2) can react with different species, forming HCH, CN, NCO and NO.

NO formed from N\textsubscript{2}O mechanism occurs at lean air-fuel mixtures, low temperatures (below 1500 K) and at high pressures (above 10 atm) [6, 33]. The main reaction for this NO formation is the oxidation of N\textsubscript{2}O;
\[ \text{N}_2\text{O} + \text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{NO} + \text{NO} \quad (2.3) \]

Fuel NO does not play a role in engine combustion, because fuels for internal combustion engines contain negligible amounts of nitrogen.

## 2.4 Laminar Premixed Flames

A typical flame structure of a premixed flame is given on Fig. 2.1 [34]. Temperature increases from initial temperature of the unburnt gases, \( T_0 \), to the ignition temperature, \( T_b \) (onset of chemical reactions) and then to a maximum temperature where its gradient become zero. The maximum temperature attained is the flame temperature. Temperature profile is an important parameter in flame characterization into three regions: Preheat zone, reaction zone and product zone. Preheat zone is a diffusion dominated zone. Temperature gradient and species concentration gradient result in diffusion of heat and radical species.
from the reaction zone to the preheat zone. As a result, temperature rise from \( T_0 \) to \( T_b \) is always maintained and the flame becomes self sustaining. The reaction zone is characterized by a thin region of very fast chemistry followed by a much wider region of slow chemistry. It is in this region that prompt NO formation occurs because of the presence of the radicals. The temperature is a maximum at the product zone and thermal NO plays a significant role in NO\(_x\) formation. It is expected that there is maximum NO\(_x\) formation in this region because of high flame temperature [14].

### 2.5 Laminar Diffusion Flames

In a non-premixed flame, there is no prior mixture of fuel and air before combustion. There is a continuous variation of the mixture fraction (equivalence ratio, \( \phi \)), from fuel side at \( \phi \rightarrow \infty \) to pure air at \( \phi = 0 \). The most common configurations are parallel flow jets of the unmixed reactants and opposed flows. A typical opposed flow configuration is shown in Fig. 2.2 [35].

A diffusion flame can be established between the two nozzles, and normally located where the mixture fraction is stoichiometric. Combustion products spread to both sides of the flame while fuel and oxygen have to diffuse against those streams in order to mix and react. Fig. 2.2a shows a flame located at the air side of stagnation plane. In this case, the stoichiometric condition requires more air than fuel. On the other hand, a flame would be located at the fuel side of stagnation flame, if the stoichiometric condition require more fuel than air [35]. The temperature peaks at the position of the flame (at the stoichiometric value of fuel/air mixture). It is in this region of maximum temperature that the NO\(_x\) formation is expected to be high.
2.6 Ignition

Ignition in a combustible mixture can be achieved either through spontaneous ignition or by an external energy. In this study, spontaneous ignition in which a fuel is brought into a state which can ignite by rise in temperature and pressure, is considered. In a laboratory environment, ignition is studied using a shock tube apparatus, which is illustrated in the next section.

2.6.1 Shock Tube Apparatus

A typical shock tube equipment is illustrated in Fig. 2.3 [36]. The high pressure tube is filled with helium gas at an arbitrary high pressure (say 2-3 MPa), while the low pressure tube is filled with dry air at an arbitrary low pressure (say 30-40 kPa).

On breaking the polyester film between both tubes with a cutter, a shock wave with a high Mach number propagate through the low pressure air. Behind the shock wave reflected from
the tube end, the air is compressed to high pressures and heated to high temperatures. The propagating velocity of the incident shock is measured by observing the passage instants of the shock front at several piezoelectric pressure transducers set at different positions on the low pressure tube.

Every time the incident shock is reflected from the end of the low pressure tube, the liquid fuel is injected into the air behind the reflected shock waves through an injection nozzle mounted at the end of the shock tube. The induction period of hot ignition in the mixture is measured by observing the ignition with a photomultiplier set on the tube axis outside the end of the shock tube through a filter. The induction period is taken as the period from the arrival and reflection of the incident shock at the tube end (plexiglass window) to the detection of light emission of ignition by the photomultiplier.

2.6.2 Ignition Delay Time

Ignition delay time is the period between the completion of reactants mixing and the instant at which thermal runaway occurs. Ignition processes in a homogenous mixture can be explained using two theories; thermal explosion theory and chain-branching kinetic theory. In thermal explosion theory, ignition occurs when heat production exceeds the heat losses on the combustion chamber walls. In case of chain-branching kinetics, there
is a delay with constant temperature. Chain reaction involves initiation, propagation, branching and termination reactions. Ignition occurs when enough radicals (such as O, H, OH, HO\textsubscript{2}, and CH\textsubscript{3}) [37, 38] have been produced which release enough heat to cause a temperature rise. Ignition delay time depends on the number and kind of existing carbon-hydrogen compounds hence it differs from one fuel to another. In a diesel engine, it affects the amount of fuel/air mixture formed before ignition and hence rate of heat release. Rate of heat release in turn determines the peak combustion temperature which has a direct relation with NO\textsubscript{x} formation.

2.7 Detailed Reaction Mechanisms

A chemical kinetic reaction mechanism of a fuel is a collection of several elementary reactions necessary to describe an overall reaction process. It involves reactions of both reactants, reactive intermediate species and products. The rate parameters for each elementary reaction is presented in the reaction mechanism. The rate parameters is as defined by Arrhenius equation (see Appendix A). These include pre-exponential factor, exponent and activation energy in the specific rate constant for a reaction.

To compute the combustion characteristics of a fuel, its kinetic model is required. This can either be a detailed or reduced kinetic reaction mechanism. Several kinetic models for methyl esters combustion have been discussed in section 2.2.

2.8 Thermodynamic Properties

The thermodynamic properties required for the simulations of homogeneous system, laminar, freely propagating and laminar diffusion flames are the frozen specific heat capacities
at constant pressure of the pure species $i$, $c_{pi}$, the frozen specific heat capacity at constant pressure of the gas mixture, $c_p$, and the enthalpy, $h_i$, for pure species $i$.

The polynomial curve fits of NASA type are used to calculate the thermodynamic properties [39, 40]. Specifically, the properties are given as follows:

- **Molar heat capacity at constant pressure, $C_{pi}$**:

  \[
  \frac{C_{pi}}{R_0} = a_1 + a_2 T + a_3 T^2 + a_4 T^3 + a_5 T^4. \tag{2.4}
  \]

- **Molar enthalpy, $H_i$**:

  \[
  \frac{H_i}{R_0} = a_6 + a_1 T + \frac{a_2}{2} T^2 + \frac{a_3}{3} T^3 + \frac{a_4}{4} T^4 + \frac{a_5}{5} T^5. \tag{2.5}
  \]

- **Molar entropy, $S_i$**:

  \[
  \frac{S_i}{R_0} = a_7 + a_1 \ln T + a_2 T + \frac{a_3}{2} T^2 + \frac{a_4}{3} T^3 + \frac{a_5}{4} T^4. \tag{2.6}
  \]

Here $a_1 - a_7$ are polynomial coefficients. The thermodynamic database has two sets of polynomial coefficients; the first set is for the high temperature range (1000-6000 K), and the second set for the low temperature range of (300-1000 K). The molar quantities $C_{pi}$, $H_i$ and $S_{pi}$ are related to the respective mass-based quantities through $C_{pi} = c_{pi} W_i$, $H_i = h_i W_i$ and $S_i = s_i W_i$. The mass-based mixture frozen specific heat capacity, enthalpy and entropy are given by

\[
C_p = \sum_{i=1}^{N} Y_i c_{pi}, \quad h = \sum_{i=1}^{N} Y_i h_i, \quad s = \sum_{i=1}^{N} Y_i s_i. \tag{2.7}
\]
2.9 Transport Properties

The transport properties required for the simulations of laminar, freely propagating and laminar diffusion flames are the dynamic viscosity, $\mu$, of the gas mixture, the thermal conductivity, $\lambda$, of the gas mixture, and the ordinary mixture-averaged and thermal diffusion coefficients for species $i$, $D_i$, and $D_T$, respectively.

If a global overall one-step or two-step reactions are taken to represent the combustion chemistry, then simple relationships between $\mu$, $\lambda$ and the $D_i$ can be derived [39] by assuming constant Lewis numbers, $L_i$, for all species,

$$L_i = \frac{\lambda}{\rho c_p D_i} = \text{constant}_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N,$$

and a constant Prandtl number,

$$Pr = \frac{\mu c_p}{\lambda} = \text{constant}. \quad (2.9)$$

However, when a detailed chemical kinetic mechanism is used to represent the combustion chemistry (as in the case in this thesis), then a more detailed formulation of transport properties is required. A detailed modeling of molecular transport data as presented in [39] can be summarized as follows:

- Dynamic viscosity of species $i$, $\mu_i$:

$$\mu_i = \frac{5 \sqrt{\pi m_i K_B T}}{16 \pi \sigma_i^2 \Omega^{(2,2)*}},$$

where $\sigma$ is the Lennard-Jones collision diameter, $m_i$ is the mass of the molecule, $K_B$ is the Boltzmann constant, $\Omega^{(2,2)*}$ is collision integral, which is a function of the
reduced temperature, $T^*$, and dipole moment, $\delta^*$. The quantities $T^*$ and $\delta^*$ are given as; $T^* = T_i^* \equiv (K_B T/\epsilon_i)$ and $\delta^* = \delta_i^* \equiv (1/2)(d_i^2/\epsilon_i \sigma_i^3)$, here $d_i$ is the dipole moment of species $i$, $\epsilon_i$ is its Lennard-Jones potential well depth.

- Dynamic viscosity of the mixture, $\mu$:

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \mu_i + \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i/\mu_i)} \right). \tag{2.11}$$

- Thermal conductivity of species $i$, $\lambda_i$:

$$\lambda_i = \frac{\mu_i}{W_i} \left(f_{\text{trans}} C_{v,\text{trans}} + f_{\text{rot}} C_{v,\text{rot}} + f_{\text{vib}} C_{v,\text{vib}}\right), \tag{2.12}$$

where $f_{\text{trans}}$, $f_{\text{rot}}$ and $f_{\text{vib}}$ are the species’ translational, rotational and vibrational degrees of freedom, respectively, and $C_{v,\text{trans}}$, $C_{v,\text{rot}}$, $C_{v,\text{vib}}$ are the respective contribution to the molar heat capacity at constant volume, $C_v$, of species $i$.

- Thermal conductivity of the mixture, $\lambda$:

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \lambda_i + \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i/\lambda_i)} \right). \tag{2.13}$$

- Binary diffusion coefficient, $D_{ij}$:

$$D_{ij} = \frac{3}{16} \sqrt{\frac{2 \pi K_B^3 T^3}{W_{ij}}} \frac{p \pi \sigma_{ij}^2 \Omega^{(1,1)^*}}{}, \tag{2.14}$$

Besides the quantities defined before, $W_{ij} = 2W_i W_j/(W_i + W_j)$ is the reduced molar mass for the pair of species ($i$, $j$), and $\sigma_{ij}$ is the average collision diameter. The
mixture average diffusion coefficient, \( D_i \) is given as

\[
D_i = \frac{1 - Y_i}{\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} (X_i / D_{ij})}.
\]  

(2.15)

- Thermal diffusion coefficient of species \( i \), \( D_{Ti} \):

\[
D_{Ti} = \frac{\Theta_i D_i}{X_i}.
\]  

(2.16)

where \( \Theta_i \) is the thermal diffusion ratio of species \( i \).

The thermodynamic and transport properties for the species, which are in CHEMKIN format are obtained from Princeton University kinetic model databases [41] and GRI-Mech 3.0 databases [9].

2.10 Conclusion

The development of combustion chemistry for methyl esters as well as biodiesel fuels have been advanced in the last decade. Several kinetics models for both small-chain and long-chain methyl esters have been developed. These kinetics models have been used to study several aspects of methyl esters combustion: intermediate species production; ignition and extinction; the effects of saturation; and the effects of molecular structure. Exhaust emissions of methyl esters combustion in an engine have been studied experimentally. However, no kinetic models have been developed for the studies of NO\(_x\) formation in esters.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 GOVERNING EQUATIONS

3.1 Introduction

The governing equations for the system are the conservation of mass, species, momentum and energy for a multi-component reacting flow. This chapter presents the general conservation equations for such a system. Subsequently, conservation equations for particular configurations investigated in this study; one dimensional (1D) laminar premixed flame, 1D laminar diffusion flame, and homogeneous reactor, are presented.

3.2 Governing Equations

3.2.1 General Governing Equations

The conservation equations governing multi-component, chemically reacting, ideal gas mixtures have been derived and are available in literature [35, 42, 43]. They are summarized below:

- Mass conservation equation:
  \[ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) = 0. \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

- Momentum conservation equation:
  \[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} = -\frac{(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{P})}{\rho} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} Y_i f_i, \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)
where $\mathbf{P}$ is stress tensor given as:

$$
\mathbf{P} = \left[ p + \left( \frac{2}{3} \mu - k \right) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}) \right] \mathbf{U} - \mu \left[ (\nabla \mathbf{v}) + (\nabla \mathbf{v})^T \right]. \tag{3.3}
$$

- Species conservation equation for a species $i$:

$$
\frac{\partial (\rho Y_i)}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot [\rho Y_i (v_0 + \bar{V}_i)] = w_i \quad i = 1, ..., N. \tag{3.4}
$$

- Energy conservation equation:

$$
\rho \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \rho \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla u = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{P} : (\nabla \mathbf{v}) + \rho \sum_{i=1}^{N} Y_i f_i \cdot V_i. \tag{3.5}
$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ is stress tensor 3.3 and heat flux vector, $\mathbf{q}$ is

$$
\mathbf{q} = -\lambda \nabla T + \rho \sum_{i=1}^{N} h_i Y_i V_i + RT \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \frac{X_i D_{T,i}}{W_i D_{ij}} \right) (V_i - V_j) + \mathbf{q}_R. \tag{3.6}
$$

In Eqs (3.1)-(3.6), $t$ is time, $D_{ij}$ is binary diffusion coefficient for species $i$ and $j$, $f_i$ is external force per unit mass on species $i$, $k$ is bulk viscosity coefficient, $N$ is total number of chemical species, $p$ is hydrostatic pressure, $\mathbf{q}_R$ is radiant heat flux vector, $R$ is universal gas constant, $T$ is temperature, $u$ is internal energy per unit mass for the gas mixture, $\mathbf{U}$ is unit tensor, $\mathbf{v}$ is velocity vector, $\mathbf{v}_0$ is flow velocity (mass weighted average velocity), $\lambda$ is thermal conductivity, $\mathbf{q}_R$ is the radiant heat flux, $\mu$ is coefficient of dynamic viscosity, the superscript $T$ denotes the transpose of the tensor, $\rho$ is mass density and $D_{T,i}$, $h_i$, $V_i$, $w_i$, $W_i$, $X_i$ and $Y_i$ are thermal diffusion coefficient, specific enthalpy, diffusion velocity, rate of production by chemical reactions, molecular weight, mole fraction and mass fraction of species $i$ respectively.
Equations (3.1)-(3.2) and (3.5) comprise \( N+5 \) equations in the \( N+5 \) unknowns, \( Y_i, \rho, u \) and \( v_0 \). The functions \( f_i, P, q, \bar{V}_i \) and \( w_i \) must be related to the other dependent and independent variables for the system to form a closed set of equations.

### 3.2.2 Governing Equations for Laminar, One-Dimensional, Premixed, and Freely Propagating Flames

**Assumptions**

1. One dimensional freely propagating flame.

2. Low Mach number (deflagration) flame.

3. Thermodynamic part of the pressure is taken as spatially uniform.

4. The effect of viscous dissipation is neglected.

5. Body forces are neglected.

6. Dufour and Soret effects are neglected.

In view of assumptions 1-6, Eqs (3.1)-(3.6) can be recast [35], thus

- **Mass conservation equation:**

  \[
  \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{A} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\rho V_x A) = 0. \tag{3.7}
  \]

- **Species conservation equation for a species \( i \):**

  \[
  \rho \left( \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial t} + V_x \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial x} \right) = -\frac{1}{A} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\rho Y_i V_x A) + w_i \quad i = 1, ..., N. \tag{3.8}
  \]
• Energy conservation equation:

\[
\rho c_p \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + V_x \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right) = \frac{1}{A} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \lambda A \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right) - \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_{pi} \rho Y_i V_i - \sum_{i=1}^{N} h_i w_i + \frac{dp}{dt} - \frac{1}{A} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (A \mu) + A_s h_s (T - T_s) \cdot
\]

(3.9)

• Equation of state:

\[
p = \rho RT \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( Y_i / W_i \right).
\]

(3.10)

Besides the quantities defined before, in Eqs (3.7)-(3.10) \( x \) is the spatial coordinate, \( A \) is the spatially varying cross sectional area, \( V_x \) is the velocity in the \( x \) directions, \( p \) is the thermodynamic pressure, \( \rho Y_i V_i \) is the diffusion flux, \( c_{pi} \) denote the mass-based constant pressure specific heat capacity for species \( i \), \( c_p \) is the mixture’s frozen specific heat capacity at constant pressure, \( h_s \) is the heat transfer coefficient between gas and solid phase, \( A_s \) is the local wetted surface area per unit void volume.

Equations (3.7)-(3.10) represent a system of \( N + 3 \) equations for \( N + 3 \) unknowns; \( \rho, V_x, T, Y_1, ..., Y_N \), hence it is closed and can be solved.

The fluid mechanical part of pressure, \( p' \), is considered an additional unknown. It is governed by the momentum equation:

\[
\rho \left( \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial t} + V_x \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial x} \right) = -\frac{\partial p'}{\partial x} + \frac{4}{A} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( A \mu \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial x} \right).
\]

(3.11)

Equation (3.11) is solved once a solution has been obtained for Eqs (3.7)-(3.10). However, the \( N + 4 \) equations are solved simultaneously.
3.2.2.1 Boundary Conditions

The cold boundary (unburnt mixture) is located infinitely far upstream, while the hot boundary (burnt mixture) is located infinitely far downstream. For a computational domain \([y_u, y_b]\) (where \(y_u\) and \(y_b > y_u\) is the location of the cold and hot boundary respectively) and a given \(p(t)\), then the computational boundary can be given as

\[
T = T_u, \quad Y_i = Y_{iu} \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, ..., N \quad \text{at} \quad y = y_u, \quad (3.12)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial y} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, ..., N \quad \text{at} \quad y = y_b, \quad (3.13)
\]

and

\[
T = T_0 \quad \text{at} \quad y = y_0, \quad (3.14)
\]

where Eq. (3.14) fixes the flame at \(y = y_0\) (a frame of reference that moves with the flame speed, \(S_L\)) and \(y_0\) is approximated as

\[
y_0 = y_u + (y_b - y_u)/3. \quad (3.15)
\]

3.2.3 Governing Equations for Laminar, Counterflow, Diffusion Flames

Assumptions

1. Two dimensional planar configuration.

2. Low Mach number (deflagration) flame.

3. Thermodynamic part of the pressure is taken as spatially uniform.
4. The effect of viscous dissipation is neglected.

5. Body forces are neglected.

6. Dufour and Soret effects are neglected.

7. The flame is embedded in a thin boundary-layer.

In view of assumptions 1-6, Eqs (3.1)-(3.6) can be recast [35], thus

• Mass conservation equation:

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\rho V_x) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\rho V_y) = 0. \tag{3.16}
\]

• Momentum conservation equations:

\[
\rho \left( \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial t} + V_x \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial x} + V_y \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial y} \right) = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\tau_{xx}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\tau_{xy}) \right], \tag{3.17}
\]

\[
\rho \left( \frac{\partial V_y}{\partial t} + V_x \frac{\partial V_y}{\partial x} + V_y \frac{\partial V_y}{\partial y} \right) = -\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} + \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\tau_{xy}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\tau_{yy}) \right], \tag{3.18}
\]

where Eqs (3.17) and (3.18) represent conservation of momentum in the x and y directions respectively. The components of the viscous part of the stress tensor is given by

\[
\tau_{xx} = \mu \left( \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial x} \right) - \left( \frac{2}{3}\mu - k \right) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}), \quad \tau_{xy} = \mu \left( \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial V_y}{\partial x} \right), \tag{3.19}
\]

\[
\tau_{yy} = \mu \left( \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial V_y}{\partial y} \right) - \left( \frac{2}{3}\mu - k \right) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}), \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = \frac{\partial V_x}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial V_y}{\partial y}.\]
• Energy conservation equation:

\[
\rho c_p \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + V_x \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} + V_y \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \right) - \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_p \rho Y_i U_i \\
- \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_p \rho Y_i V_i - \sum_{i=1}^{N} h_i w_i + \frac{dp}{dt} - \nabla \cdot q_R. \tag{3.20}
\]

• Species conservation equation for a species \(i\):

\[
\rho \left( \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial t} + V_x \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial x} + V_y \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial y} \right) = - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\rho Y_i U_i) - \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\rho Y_i V_i) + w_i \quad i = 1, ..., N. \tag{3.21}
\]

• Equation of state:

\[
p = \rho RT \sum_{i=1}^{N} (Y_i/W_i). \tag{3.22}
\]

Besides the quantities defined before, in Eqs (3.16)-(3.22), \(y\) denotes the longitudinal coordinate and \(x\) denotes the traverse (parallel to the stagnation plane) coordinate, \(V_x\) and \(V_y\) denote the velocity component in the \(x\) and \(y\) directions respectively, and \(U_i\) and \(V_i\) denote the diffusion velocity component for species \(i\) in the \(x\) and \(y\) directions respectively.

Assumption 7 requires the use of the boundary layer theory approximations. The principle here is that the temperature and species composition are assumed to depend on only one independent variable; i.e, the coordinate perpendicular to the stagnation plane (\(y\) coordinate). In addition, the velocity component in \(y\) direction, \(V_y\) is also assumed to be dependent on only \(y\) coordinate. Similarity equations are derived [44] by defining a stream function,

\[
\psi(x, y, t) = x G(y, t),
\]
so that the accumulative-convective operator, $L_1$, is given by

$$L_1(\phi) = \frac{\partial (\rho \phi)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho V_y \phi)}{\partial y} + \rho G \phi,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.23)

where the function $G(y, t) = V_x / x$ is a scaled velocity.

In terms of accumulative-convective operator, $L_1$, similarity equations for mass, momentum, energy and species (Eqs (3.16), (3.17), (3.20) and (3.21)) can be written as

$$L_1(1) = 0,$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.24)

$$L_1(G) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \mu \frac{\partial G}{\partial y} \right) - \rho G^2 + P'(t),$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.25)

$$c_p L_1(T) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \right) - \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_p \rho Y_i V_i - \sum_{i=1}^{N} h_i w_i + \frac{dp}{dt} - \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial y},$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.26)

$$L_1(Y_i) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\rho Y_i V_i) + w_i \hspace{0.5cm} i = 1, \ldots, N.$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.27)

The term in $P'$ appearing in the momentum equation (3.25) represents a temporal forcing term defined by

$$P'(t) \equiv \rho_\infty \left( \frac{da}{dt} + a(t^2) \right),$$

where $a$ is the strain rate which is prescribed.

### 3.2.3.1 Boundary Conditions

The assumptions for fully infinite formulation are

1. The flame is thin compared to the dimensions of stagnating-flow region between two opposed nozzles.

2. The flame is located within the thin viscous boundary layer which is embedded in
the outer, non-viscous and vorticity-free stagnating flow.

The boundary conditions are to be applied at the edges of the boundary layer (infinitely far away from the stagnation plane). At the right edge (air stream), the boundary conditions are

\[ G - a(t) = T - T_\infty = Y_i - Y_{i,\infty} = 0 \quad \text{as} \quad y \to \infty. \]  

(3.28)

At the left boundary (fuel stream), the boundary conditions are

\[ G - a(t) \left( \frac{\rho_{+\infty}}{\rho_{-\infty}} \right) = T - T_{-\infty} = Y_i - Y_{i,-\infty} = 0 \quad \text{as} \quad y \to -\infty. \]  

(3.29)

Here, the subscripts \(-\infty\) and \(\infty\) are used to identify conditions or quantities in the fuel and air streams respectively.

At the stagnation plane, \(y = 0\),

\[ V_y = 0. \]  

(3.30)

It has been assumed that the stagnation point is located at \(y = 0\).

### 3.2.4 Governing Equations for Ignition in a Homogeneous Reactor

Homogeneous ignition delay is governed by single point transient (zero-dimensional time dependent) equations. When the reactor volume, \(V\), is given as a constant or as a function of time, the following equations apply:

- Species conservation equation:

\[ \rho \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial t} = w_i. \]  

(3.31)
• Energy conservation equation:

\[ \rho c_v \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \frac{p}{V} \frac{dV}{dt} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} u_i w_i + \frac{Q}{V}. \]  

(3.32)

• Equation of state:

\[ p = \rho RT \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \frac{Y_i}{W_i} \right), \]  

(3.33)

where \( c_v = \sum_{i=1}^{N} Y_i c_{vi} \) (specific heat at constant volume), \( V \) is the reactor volume and \( Q \) is the rate at which heat is transferred across the reactor. Pressure \( p \) is a function of time and has to be determined as part of the solution. An ordinary differential equation for \( p(t) \), is derived from the equation of state (3.33). Differentiating Eq. (3.33) with respect to time gives

\[ \frac{dp}{dt} = \rho R \left( \frac{dT}{dt} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \frac{Y_i}{W_i} \right) + T \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{W_i} \frac{dY_i}{dt} \right). \]  

(3.34)

Substituting for \( \rho R = p/T \sum_{i=1}^{N} (Y_i/W_i) \) in Eq. (3.34) results in

\[ \frac{1}{p} \frac{dp}{dt} = \frac{1}{T} \frac{dT}{dt} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{W}{W_i} \frac{dY_i}{dt}, \]  

(3.35)

where

\[ W = 1/\sum_{i=1}^{N} (Y_i/W_i). \]  

(3.36)

Using Eq. (3.32) for \((1/T)(dT/dt)\) in Eq. (3.35) gives

\[ \frac{1}{p} \frac{dp}{dt} = -\frac{p}{\rho c_v TV} \frac{dV}{dt} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{u_i w_i}{\rho c_v T} + \frac{Q}{\rho c_v TV} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{W}{W_i} \frac{dY_i}{dt}. \]  

(3.37)
Since $C_p - C_v = R$ and $C_p/C_v = \gamma$, Eq. (3.37) can be recast, thus

$$\frac{1}{p} \frac{dp}{dt} + \frac{\gamma - 1}{V} \frac{dV}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{w_i}{\rho} \left( \frac{W}{W_i} - \frac{u_i}{c_v T} \right) + \frac{Q}{\rho c_v TV}. \quad (3.38)$$

For a constant volume case, the terms that have $dV/dt$ become zero. Species equation (3.31), energy equation (3.32) and pressure equation (3.38) are solved numerically for given initial values of $Y_1, ..., Y_N, T, p$ and constant volume $V$.

### 3.2.4.1 Initial Conditions

The initial values of $Y_1, ..., Y_N, T, p$ and constant volume $V$ are to be prescribed. Initial values of mass and specific volume are computed by the code through the relations $m = \rho_0 V$ and $v_0 = 1/\rho_0$. 
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 NUMERICAL SOLUTION METHOD

4.1 Introduction

The governing equations (3.7)-(3.10), (3.24)-(3.27) and (3.31)-(3.33) in chapter three consist of first and second order partial differential equations, solution of which requires application of numerical methods. In this regard, the unknown dependent variables, viz, temperature, velocity, species mass fraction, density, and species mole fraction, are determined at selected grid points in the computational domain. Presented in this chapter are: discretization of partial differential equations; finite difference schemes adopted; and the solution method for discretized equations. The order of accuracy and truncation errors, which result from the finite difference scheme adopted are also discussed.

4.2 Discretization of the Governing Equations

The governing equations for freely propagating flame (3.7)-(3.10), laminar counterflow flame (3.24)-(3.27) and homogeneous system (3.31)-(3.33) have been discretized using finite difference scheme, as adopted in COSILAB [45]. The computational domain have been divided into a non-uniform mesh as shown in Fig. 4.1. The distance between two consecutive grid points in the same direction changes. The generation of a non-uniform mesh is discussed in the section on adaptive selection of grid points.

The PDEs are approximated by finite difference method, consecutively yielding a system of algebraic equations, which are solved for all unknown dependent variables at discrete grid points. In the next section, the finite difference scheme adopted in this thesis is discussed.
4.2.1 Finite Difference Schemes

In this thesis various terms in the governing equations have been approximated using different finite difference schemes.

The first-order spatial derivatives in freely propagating and diffusion flames are approximated using a hybrid scheme [44]. The hybrid differencing scheme combines both the central and the one-sided differencing (upwind) schemes. For a dependent variable, say \( T \), at grid point \( j \), the second-order accurate central-difference scheme is

\[
\left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right)_j = \frac{h_{j-1}}{h_j(h_j + h_{j-1})} T_{j+1} + \frac{h_j - h_{j-1}}{h_j h_{j-1}} T_j - \frac{h_j}{h_{j-1}(h_j + h_{j-1})} T_{j-1} - \frac{h_j h_{j-1}}{6} \left( \frac{\partial^3 T}{\partial x^3} \right)_j + \text{HOT,}
\]

where \( \text{HOT} \) is an abbreviation for high-order terms. The leading truncation error term is second-order. The truncation error is reduced when the number of grid points is increased.
The first-order accurate one-sided differencing scheme are

- Forward difference:
  \[
  \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right)_j = \frac{T_{j+1} - T_j}{h_j} + O(h_j).
  \]  
  \[ (4.2) \]

- Backward difference:
  \[
  \left( \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right)_j = \frac{T_j - T_{j-1}}{h_{j-1}} + O(h_{j-1}).
  \]  
  \[ (4.3) \]

If one-sided scheme is employed, then upwinding is achieved. In both expressions, the leading term in the local truncation error is first-order.

The second-order spatial derivatives in freely propagating and diffusion flames are approximated by second-order accurate central differences scheme;

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \lambda \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right)_j = \frac{2}{h_j + h_{j-1}} \left[ \frac{\lambda_{j+1/2}(T_{j+1} - T_j)}{h_j} - \frac{\lambda_{j-1/2}(T_j - T_{j-1})}{h_{j-1}} \right] - \frac{h_j - h_{j-1}}{3} \left( \frac{\partial^3 T}{\partial x^3} \right)_j + HOT,
\]  
  \[ \text{Error term} \]  
  \[ (4.4) \]

where \( \lambda = \lambda(x, t, u) \) is given by

\[
\lambda_{j-1/2} = \lambda \left( \frac{x_{j-1} + x_j}{2}, t, \frac{u_{j-1} + u_j}{2} \right) \quad j = 1, \ldots, N,
\]  
  \[ (4.5) \]

and \( u \) denotes a vector of unknown dependent variables. The leading truncation error term is first-order but vanishes when the spacing between the grid points is uniform, making it a second-order accurate. The expression shows that the truncation error is reduced by either refining the grid or having the grid points approximately equally spaced.

The time derivatives in the governing equations for all flames considered in this thesis are
discretized using backward-Euler finite difference approximation:

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{T_j^m - T_j^{m-1}}{\Delta t} + 0(\Delta t), \quad m = 1, 2, \ldots \quad (4.6)$$

A time marching technique is used to solve the governing equations for all flames. The time dependent version of the governing equations are first integrated with respect to time in steps starting with initial specified profiles, which should satisfy the equations at time level $m=0$ with $t=t^0 \equiv 0$. The solutions to the governing equations are then sought at the subsequent time levels $(m = 1; t = t^1), (m = 2; t = t^2), \ldots$, with $0 = t^0 < t^1 < t^2 < \ldots < t^m < \ldots$, where the superscript $m$ is used to identify quantities at time level $m$. The integration is complete when either a specified time level $m_{\text{max}}$ or time $t_{\text{max}}$ is reached.

4.3 Adaptive Selection of Grid points

The computation of engineering problems, and more so reactive flows, requires the use of adaptive selection of grid points. This method of grid points selection assigns them automatically to where they are most needed in the computational domain. In a reactive flow, the heat release associated with combustion processes results in steep gradients and strong curvature for the dependent variables profiles. Therefore, in order to reduce the temporal and spatial discretization errors, adaptive gridding method is required.

The procedures for the adaptive computation of steady reactive-flow problems is outlined in [46]. At any fixed time level $m$, the mesh $M^m$ is distributed equally on the interval $[x_1^m, x_B^m]$ with respect to a non-negative weight function $W^m$ and a constant $C^m$. $W^m$ is selected such that

$$\int_{x_j^m}^{x_{j+1}^m} W^m \, dx = C^m \quad j = 1, \ldots, B^m - 1, \quad (4.7)$$
or in discrete form,

\[ \Delta x^m_j W^m = C^m \quad j = 1, \ldots, B^m - 1, \quad (4.8) \]

where \( \Delta x^m_j = x^m_{j+1} - x^m_j \), and \( B \) is the number of grid points.

This condition makes the grid interval to be small where the weight function is large, and vice versa. The weight function is chosen as a measure of the solution gradient \( \partial U / \partial x \) and/or \( \partial^2 U / \partial x^2 \). Thus the grid points will be closely spaced in the region of steep gradient, and widely spaced in region of low gradient. A weight function that is based on first derivative of the solution, \( \partial U / \partial x \), treats the regions near extrema, i.e., where \( \partial U / \partial x = 0 \), to be similar to low gradient regions. To avoid this problem, second derivative of the solution, \( \partial^2 U / \partial x^2 \), is incorporated into the weight function. This approach concentrate grid points even in regions of high curvature of the solution curve.

The size of adjacent mesh interval is controlled from varying rapidly by locally bounding the mesh at any time level \( m \) through;

\[ R^{-1} \leq h_b / h_{b-1} \leq R, \quad b = 2, \ldots, B - 1, \quad (4.9) \]

where \( R \) is a constant greater than one.

### 4.4 Solution of Discretized Equations

The governing equations (PDEs) are discretized into a system of differential algebraic equations in the form:

\[ A(U) \frac{dU}{dt} = F(U), \quad (4.10) \]
where $\mathbf{U}$ is the overall vector for the unknown dependent variables, given by:

$$
\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}_1, ..., \mathbf{u}_b)^T,
$$

(4.11)

$\mathbf{u}_b$ is the vector of dependent variables at each grid point $b$, $b = 1, ..., B$, and $\mathbf{F}$ is the overall vector function whose components represent the governing equations in residual form with the exclusion of terms involving time-derivatives of the dependent variables. $\mathbf{F}$ is given as

$$
\mathbf{F} = (\mathbf{f}_1, ..., \mathbf{f}_b)^T,
$$

(4.12)

$\mathbf{f}_b$ is the local vector function at each grid point $b$, $b = 1, ..., B$.

The differential algebraic system of equation (4.10) is solved by either Modified Newton method or Euler method.

Modified Newton method can be applied to steady and time-dependent problems. When applied to unsteady problems, it has been found \cite{47} to be very robust and, relatively, weakly sensitive towards the initial profiles. For steady-state problems with sufficiently good initial guesses, this method has been found to converge fast. The weakness of the method is its crude first-order differencing of the time derivatives, and the availability of only a limited time-step size control.

Euler method is applied to unsteady problems. This method is suitable for the solution of stiff differential algebraic system.
4.5 Accuracy of the Results

The accuracy of the results computed is dictated by the magnitude of the errors introduced during the computation process. The first error is introduced through the approximation of the PDEs into algebraic equation (discretization/truncation errors). The truncation error depends on the grid spacing and derivatives of the variable. For the case of upwind scheme and the backward Euler technique applied to first-order derivatives, a first-order accuracy is achieved. When central difference scheme is applied to a second-order derivative in a uniform mesh, approximation which are second-order, $O(h^2)$ accurate are obtained. However, if a non-uniform grid is used (as in the case in this thesis), one order of accuracy is lost. A systematic refinement of non-uniform grids gives a rate of reduction of truncation error that has the same order as for a uniform grid. Numerical accuracy is enhanced by having many grid points in the region of high gradient and having the grid points which are approximately equally spaced. This is achieved by applying adaptive selection of grid points technique.

Another error is introduced through the numerical method adopted. This error is normally specified to allow the convergence of the solution. A solution is considered to have converged when a steady state has been reached. When the dependent variables do not change from one time step to another, then steady state has been achieved. A commonly used convergence criterion, which represents the time rate of change of the variable considered is given by

$$
\varepsilon = \frac{U_{k+1} - U_k}{\Delta t}
$$

where $\varepsilon$ is the convergence criterion for variable $U$. 
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4.6 Computation Code (COSILAB)

The computation of various flames governed by equations (3.7)-(3.10), (3.24)-(3.27) and (3.31)-(3.33) is implemented in the RUN1DL code in the software package COSILAB [45]. In order to solve a particular flame type using COSILAB, a detailed or reduced chemical kinetic model of the fuel is required. In addition, a thermodynamic and transport properties data for all species appearing in the chemical kinetic model are required. A homogenous system is zero dimension and does not require transport properties. The chemical kinetic models and properties data for different fuels are available in literature. COSILAB accepts reaction mechanisms, transport and thermodynamic data compatible to the international standard format originally put forward by Sandia National Laboratory. It has the following components: A graphical user interface, in which a flame can be set up and computed; a graph-digitizer for the generation of initial flame structures; reaction-pathway analysis option; sensitivity analysis option; and graphing, editing and export facilities for the computed results, including data saving in Excel and Matlab.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 HOMOGENEOUS SYSTEM

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we present and discuss results for ignition delay times, species concentration and temperature profiles for methane/air, methanol/air, and methyl formate/air mixtures modeled in an adiabatic homogeneous reactor. In combustion systems, a homogeneous transient system is used to study the chemical kinetics and combustion properties of the mixtures. Generally, homogeneous transient systems are classified into two: A constant pressure reaction model; and a constant volume reaction model. We have considered a constant volume case, which represent conditions of mixtures in a shock tube apparatus use for experimenting ignition delay times in fuels.

5.2 Ignition in a Shock Tube

In a laboratory environment, ignition can be studied using either a shock tube or rapid compression machine. The later is a single piston stroke apparatus, which compress the mixture in the combustion chamber to pressure and temperature similar to those at post compression condition in an engine. A shock tube apparatus is used to study the combustion kinetics; measure individual elementary reaction rates, ignition delay times, and other combustion properties at high temperatures. The operating principle of a shock tube is described above in section 2.6.1.
5.2.1 Modeling Details for Ignition in a Shock Tube

The experimental conditions behind a reflected shock in a shock tube can be modeled as an adiabatic homogeneous mixture with constant internal energy and constant volume. In this numerical computation, methane/air, methanol/air, and methyl formate/air stoichiometric mixtures have been studied at constant volume of 200 cm$^3$, low pressure of 2.7 atm, and temperature ranging from 1000 K to 1950 K. The numerical simulations of these fuels have been done using the RUN1DL code in the software package COSILAB [45].

For this configuration and the subsequent (freely propagating and diffusion flames), methane and methanol flames are computed using GRI-Mech 3.0 reaction mechanism [9] (see Appendix C), while methyl formate flame is computed by combining the Dooley et al. [16] oxidation mechanism (see Appendix A) with the Leeds NOx oxidation mechanism [8] (see Appendix B). GRI-Mech 3.0 reaction mechanism has been validated and tested in previous investigations [14, 48]. Dooley et al. oxidation mechanism has also been validated in a wide range of conditions; a variable pressure flow reactor, shock tube facility, outwardly propagating flames and burner stabilized flames [16, 17]. Similarly, Leeds NOx oxidation mechanism has been validated in flow reactors, perfectly stirred reactors and low pressure laminar flames by Hughes et al. [49].

5.3 Results and Discussions

A comparison of ignition delay time in methane/air, methanol/air, and methyl formate/air stoichiometric mixtures at pressure of 2.7 atm and temperature range 1000 K to 1950 K is shown in Fig. 5.1. For lack of the exact experimental conditions from the other researchers, our model’s ignition delay times are compared to those which are closely related. For
instance, for a stoichiometric homogeneous mixture of methane at an initial temperature of 1667 K, Seery and Bowman [50] obtained an ignition delay time of 160 µs for a pressure of 2.04 atm, while we have obtained 110 µs for a pressure of 2.70 atm. Ignition delay time reduces with increase in initial pressure [51], therefore, our ignition delay time value is consistent. Similarly, for a homogeneous mixture of methanol at an equivalence ratio of 0.75 and an initial temperature of 1667 K, Seiser et al. [52] obtained an ignition delay time of 70 µs for a pressure of 1.74 atm, while we have obtained 25 µs for a pressure of 2.70 atm. For a stoichiometric homogeneous mixture of methyl formate at an initial temperature of 1667 K, our ignition delay time (10 µs) agrees well with that of Dooley et al. [16] (10 µs from the model and 15 µs from the experiment).

Under all the conditions tested, methane have higher ignition delay times as compared to methanol and methyl formate. This reveals a trend of reduction of ignition delay time with increase in fuel oxygenation.

Figure 5.1: Ignition delay times for methane/air, methanol/air and methyl formate/air mixtures at pressure of 2.7 atm
Figure 5.2: Temperature profiles for the three mixtures at the initial temperature of 1300 K and pressure of 2.7 atm

Figure 5.3: NO concentration profiles for the three mixtures at the initial temperature of 1300 K and pressure of 2.7 atm

Shown in Figs. 5.3-5.6 are the species concentration profiles for NO and other minor species related to its formation. Methane/air mixture has a significantly higher concentration of
profiles of immediate precursor species - CH and HCN- for prompt NO formation. Then, we would expect a significantly higher NO forming in methane than the oxygenated fuels, however, this is not the case. A slight difference is seen in the NO concentration profiles
Figure 5.6: CH and HCN concentration profiles for the three mixtures at the initial temperature of 1300 K and pressure of 2.7 atm for the three flames. This means that under these conditions the NO is formed mostly through the high temperature thermal NO reactions, since the temperatures are quite high (up to a maximum of approximately 2900 K as shown in Fig 5.2). The reaction between nitrogen molecule and oxygen atom in Zel’dovich mechanism: \( \text{N}_2 + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{N} \) has a high activation energy, for instance a value of 318.4 KJ/mol in Leeds NOx oxidation mechanism (see Appendix B). Therefore, the reaction proceeds sufficiently fast at high temperatures and hence it is the rate-limiting step for NO formation. Other reactions with high activation energy which involve nitrogen molecule and other radicals are \( \text{CH}_2 + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{NH} \) (309.69 KJ/mol) and \( \text{N}_2 + \text{C} \rightarrow \text{CN} + \text{N} \) (187.90 KJ/mol). At low temperatures, N formation route is initiated through the reaction: \( \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{N} \), while at high temperatures N is formed through both this reaction and the high activation energy reactions mentioned before.

The plots of NO concentration profiles for the three fuels mixtures at different temperatures, Fig. 5.7, reveal a similar trend. The rate of increase of NO concentration with temperature
(a) At initial temperature of 1500 K  
(b) At initial temperature of 1950 K

Figure 5.7: NO concentration profiles for the three mixtures at pressure of 2.7 atm

is proportional in the three fuels. This trend is expected because as initial temperature is increased, the final temperature attained by mixture is also increased.

N$_2$O and NO$_2$ are produced in relatively small amounts in all the three fuels (see Fig. 5.8). Equilibrium concentration for N$_2$O is the same in CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO flames. However, it is attained at different points in time in each flame (due to difference in ignition delay time). A slightly higher equilibrium concentration for N$_2$O is observed in CH$_4$. N$_2$O is formed through reaction: N$_2$ + O + M → N$_2$O + M and consumed through reactions:

N$_2$O + O → NO + NO, N$_2$O + H → N$_2$ + OH and N$_2$O + OH → N$_2$ + HO$_2$ [49].

These reactions are sensitive to temperature and they have significant impact at high temperatures.

A comparison of NO$_2$ concentration profiles is shown in Fig. 5.8b. A slightly higher equilibrium concentration for NO$_2$ is observed in CH$_3$OH flame, while CH$_4$ and CH$_3$OCHO attained the same equilibrium concentrations. NO$_2$ is mainly formed from the consumption of NO at low temperature through reaction: HO$_2$ + NO → NO$_2$ + OH, while at high
temperature it is formed through reaction: $\text{OH} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{H}$ [33]. The flames’ temperatures attained are high, hence the reaction involving the attack of OH on NO atom is relevant. The comparison of OH concentration profiles, Fig. 5.5a, show a similar behavior with the observed NO$_2$ concentration profiles.

### 5.4 Conclusions

NO formations in methane/air, methanol/air, and methyl formate/air stoichiometric mixtures in a homogeneous system have been discussed in this chapter. The NO concentration profiles for the three mixtures exhibit small differences in terms of magnitude. It has been established that NO formation in high temperatures is mostly through thermal NO reactions by Zel’dovich mechanism. The rate-limiting step in the Zel’dovich mechanism: $\text{N}_2 + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{N}$ is the decisive reaction for NO formation at high temperature. The availability of the O atoms and nitrogen molecules in all three fuels considered result in a
similar amount of NO formed. The small difference in the production of NO is attributed
to the different maximum temperatures attained by these mixtures and the prompt NO
formation. It has also been established that at high temperatures, N formation route is
different from that at low temperatures. At high temperatures the rate-limiting steps: $N_2$
+ O $\rightarrow$ NO + N (KJ/mol), $CH_2 + N_2 \rightarrow HCN + NH$ (309.69 KJ/mol) and $N_2 + C \rightarrow$
CN + N (187.9 KJ/mol), involving high activation energy, dictate its formation. Hence, a
small difference (within the same order of magnitude) is observed in the N concentration
profiles in these mixtures as compared to that for freely propagating and diffusion flames
which attained relatively low temperatures.
CHAPTER SIX

6.0 FREELY PROPAGATING FLAMES

6.1 Introduction

Flames considered in this chapter are laminar, one-dimensional premixed, freely propagating. They are free from external disturbances which may be imposed by the presence of near-by walls and flame-anchoring devices such as burner-nozzles and rods. These flames are valuable research tools for investigating flame properties of a fuel. These flames can be realized in tubes and channels with sufficiently large radius and width, respectively, in spherical and tubular geometries with sufficiently large flame radius, and in burner-stabilized geometries with sufficiently large flame stand-off distance. Major species concentrations, minor species concentrations, temperature profiles, as well as NO concentration profiles for CH$_4$/air, CH$_3$OH/air, and CH$_3$OCHO/air stoichiometric, freely propagating flames are presented in this chapter. Also presented, are the sensitivity analysis of the CH and NO concentrations for the fuels’ oxidation.

6.2 Flow Configuration

We consider a flame front which propagates from right to left as shown in Fig. 6.1. The cold fuel-air mixture enters the computational domain through the left boundary, and hot combustion products exit the domain through the right boundary.

The flame is fixed inside the computational domain at some point $y_0$ so that the flame is steady in a frame of reference that moves with the flame speed. The computational domain, $[y_l, y_r]$, where $y_l$ and $y_r$ are the $y$-locations of the left and right boundaries, respectively, is
chosen as [-0.2, 1.2]. All the three flames have a constant pressure of 1 bar, a cold boundary temperature of 300 K, and zero temperature and species concentration profiles at the right boundary. The flames are fixed at $y_0 = 0.147554$ mm with the fixed temperature, $T_0$, being $T_0 = 400$ K. Fuel-air mixtures for the different fuels at the left boundary are stoichiometric ($\phi=1$). The numerical simulations of these flames have been done using the RUN1DL code in the software package COSILAB [45].

6.3 Results and Discussions

6.3.1 Flame Structures

Major species concentration and temperature profiles for methane/air, methanol/air and methyl formate/air freely propagating flames are presented in Figs. 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4, respectively. For the flames fixed at the same reference point ($y_0 = 0.147554$ mm and $T_0 = 400$ K), CH$_3$OH has a steeper temperature gradient as compared to CH$_4$ and CH$_3$OCHO temperature profiles. However, CH$_4$ flame attained a higher maximum temperature of 1980 K and flame speed of 38.29 cm/s with CH$_3$OH flame attaining 1961 K, a flame speed of 40.86 cm/s and CH$_3$OCHO flame attains 1935 K and a flame speed of 34.39 cm/s. The mole fraction of inert gas N$_2$ decreases from the onset of the flame throughout to the
product zone for all flames. The reduction is more intense in CH$_3$OCHO flame. This is probably explained by the total number of moles of the products present in a complete combustion for the three flames and the attack of N$_2$ molecule by O$_2$ molecule at high temperature.

\[
\text{CH}_4 + 2 \text{O}_2 + 7 \cdot 52 \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + 2 \text{H}_2\text{O} + 7 \cdot 52 \text{N}_2 \tag{6.1}
\]

\[
\text{CH}_3\text{OH} + 1 \cdot 5 \text{O}_2 + 5 \cdot 64 \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + 2 \text{H}_2\text{O} + 5 \cdot 64 \text{N}_2 \tag{6.2}
\]

\[
\text{CH}_3\text{OCHO} + 2 \text{O}_2 + 7 \cdot 52 \text{N}_2 \rightarrow 2 \text{CO}_2 + 2 \text{H}_2\text{O} + 7 \cdot 52 \text{N}_2 \tag{6.3}
\]

![Figure 6.2: Methane/air freely propagating flame structure, $\phi = 1$](image)

The total number of moles for reactants and products in CH$_4$ stoichiometric combustion as shown in Eq. (6.1), is the same, 10.52 moles. Hence, the mole fraction of N$_2$ gas remained the same in the reaction and product zones. For methane flame the mole fraction, $X_{N2}$, in the product side is expected to be 0.7148, same as for the fuel side. However, a lower figure has been obtained. The reduction of mole fraction of N$_2$ in methane flame in the
product side is only explained by consumption through attack by oxygen and other radicals at high temperature. While for CH$_3$OH stoichiometric combustion as shown in Eq. (6.2),

$$
\text{CH}_3\text{OH} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{heat}
$$
the total number of moles for reactants is 8.14, and the products is 8.64 moles. Therefore, the expected mole fraction of \( \text{N}_2 \) is 0.692875 in the reaction zone and 0.652778 in the product zone. Similarly, the further reduction of \( \text{N}_2 \) in this flame is through consumption by oxygen and other radicals. The same explanation applies to \( \text{CH}_3\text{OCHO} \) flame, which has 0.7148 mole fraction of \( \text{N}_2 \) in the reactant side and an expected 0.6528 mole fraction in the product zone for the stoichiometric reaction.

### 6.3.2 Generation of \( \text{NO}_x \)

NO concentration profiles for \( \text{CH}_4/\text{air}, \text{CH}_3\text{OH}/\text{air}, \) and \( \text{CH}_3\text{OCHO}/\text{air} \) flames are shown in Fig. 6.6a. The minor species concentrations (O, OH, H, H\(_2\), CH, CH\(_2\), CH\(_3\), and N), which are also dominant precursors for NO formation, are presented in Figs. 6.6b-6.10b. The active radicals in the flame zone-O, OH, H and H\(_2\)-for the three flames compares well
within the same order of magnitude. Generally, the occurrence of these species except H$_2$, starts at point 0.40 mm of the flame. However, H$_2$ is found far upstream of the reaction zone. For all the flames investigated, the profiles of these species exhibit similar shapes, with only little variation for the maximum concentrations. CH$_3$OH/air, and CH$_3$OCHO/air flames exhibit the same behaviour, as far as the combustion intermediates concentration profiles (CH, CH$_2$, CH$_3$, and N) preceding NO formation is concerned.

A significantly higher NO concentration profile was observed for CH$_4$ flame as compared to CH$_3$OH/air, and CH$_3$OCHO/air flames. This correlates well with the comparison of the dominant immediate precursor for prompt NO formation, CH. According to Li and William [7], methyl CH$_3$ radical is the main source of CH radical in methane/air flame. Its combustion path proceeds through C$_2$ from C$_2$H$_6$ through C$_2$H$_5$, C$_2$H$_4$, C$_2$H$_3$, C$_2$H$_2$, CH$_2$ and finally to CH. Assuming the same reaction paths for methanol and methyl formate combustion, then there is low production of CH because of the small quantities of CH$_3$ produced in these flames. CH radical formed is then consumed by N$_2$ to form N in the
Figure 6.7: O and OH concentration profiles for the three flames
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Figure 6.8: H and H₂ concentration profiles for the three flames
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Figure 6.9: CH and CH₂ concentration profiles for the three flames

Figure 6.10: CH₃ and HCN concentration profiles for the three flames
Figure 6.11: \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) and \( \text{NO}_2 \) concentration profiles for the three flames

reaction;

\[
\text{CH}_4 + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{N}
\]  

(6.4)

N atom resulting from reaction in Eq. (6.4) forms NO through extended Zel’dovich reactions in Eqs (6.5) and (6.6). HCN reacts through various paths to form NCO and NH which subsequently form N atom responsible for NO formation.

\[
\text{N} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{O}
\]  

(6.5)

\[
\text{N} + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{H}
\]  

(6.6)

A comparison of \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) in the three fuels is shown in Fig. 6.11a. A higher maximum \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) concentration profile is observed in \( \text{CH}_3\text{OCHO} \) flame. Almost the same amount in the maximum concentration is observed in \( \text{CH}_3\text{OH} \) and \( \text{CH}_4 \). \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) is formed through reaction:

\[
\text{N}_2 + \text{O} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{N}_2\text{O} + \text{M}
\]

and consumed through reactions: \( \text{N}_2\text{O} + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{NO}, \text{N}_2\text{O} \)
+ H → N₂ + OH and N₂O + OH → N₂ + HO₂ [49]. The N₂O consumption reactions are sensitive at high temperatures, hence do not have significant impact at relatively low temperatures attained by these flames. The higher amount of N₂O in CH₃OCHO can be linked to a higher peak concentration of O atom observed in its flame, Fig. 6.7a, which reacts with N₂ and a third body to form N₂O. The concentration of O atom is just as high in CH₃OH as in CH₃OCHO, hence the amount of N₂O concentration is expected to be high in its flame. However, a lower concentration of N₂O observed in CH₃OH is attributed to its high amount of OH and H atoms, Figs. 6.7b and 6.8a, respectively, which consume N₂O to form other species.

Shown in Fig 6.11b is a comparison of NO₂ in the three fuels. The axial location of the peak concentration for NO₂ in the three fuels is at low temperature region. Its concentration is higher in CH₃OH followed closely by CH₄, and a significant low value in CH₃OCHO. It is mainly formed from the consumption of NO at low temperature through reaction: HO₂ + NO → NO₂ + OH as shown in sensitivity analysis in section 6.3.4. The concentrations of NO₂ observed in CH₃OH and CH₃OCHO are consistent with HO₂ concentrations profiles.
However, a small amount of HO$_2$ is observed in CH$_4$. HO$_2$ is formed in the region where the temperature is approximately between 500 K - 1200 K, in which the reaction: R’OOH $\rightleftharpoons$ Alken + HO$_2$ is dominant in its formation [33]. R’OOH is easily formed in oxygenated fuels than pure hydrocarbon, thus explaining the low concentration of HO$_2$ in methane. It is important to note, that the NO atom that react with HO$_2$ diffuses from the high temperature flame zone [6] to the low temperature zone.

### 6.3.3 The Effect of Fuel/Air Mixture on NO Formation

The variation of fuel/air mixture in the different fuels investigated, was done to establish its impact on NO formation. Presented in Figs. 6.13-6.15 are results for each of the flames, while Figs. 6.18-6.20 compares NO formation at each equivalence ratio experimented ($\phi = 0.7$ to $\phi = 1.3$). For methane flame, the NO formation increases with increase in equivalence ratio (shown in Fig 6.17). Methanol and methyl formate flames show a similar behavior, the NO formation increases with increase in equivalence ratio up to $\phi = 1.1$, and starts decreasing with further increase in equivalence ratio. The role of temperature in NO formation is clearly demonstrated in these NO profiles. As depicted in Fig. 6.16 the maximum temperature attained by; methane/air is 2010 K at $\phi = 1.15$, methanol/air is 1973 K at $\phi = 1.1$, and methyl formate/air is 1964 K at $\phi = 1.2$. NO mole fraction profiles have direct correlation with temperature profiles.

A significant dependency on temperature for methane/air NO formation as compared to the other flames is revealed in Figs. 6.18-6.20. This is attributed to the contribution of both prompt NO and thermal NO mechanism to the total NO formed in this particular flame. At low equivalence ratios, temperature profiles decreases. Hence, the contribution by thermal NO become less significant. As the equivalence ratio is increased, temperature...
Figure 6.13: NO mole fraction profiles for various equivalence ratios of methane/air freely propagating flame

Figure 6.14: NO mole fraction profiles for various equivalence ratios of methanol/air freely propagating flame
Figure 6.15: NO mole fraction profiles for various equivalence ratios of methyl formate/air freely propagating flame

Figure 6.16: Maximum temperature attained by flames at different equivalence ratios
Figure 6.17: NO concentration at y = 1.2 mm for different equivalence ratios

increases and the contribution by thermal NO becomes dominant. It is observed that increase in equivalence ratio does not increase the NO profiles significantly for methanol and methyl formate flames as it does for methane flame. The relevance of reaction; CH + N₂ → HCN + N, as seen in the next section, explains this observation. In methanol and methyl formate flames, there is less production of CH radical as compared to methane flame. This results in less amount of N atom, which is responsible for thermal NO formation through Zel’dovich mechanism (O + N₂ → NO + N, N + OH → NO + H and N + O₂ → NO + O). The Zel’dovich reactions are strongly dependent on temperature. As a result, methane NO profiles are higher at high temperatures. On the contrary, methanol and methyl formate NO mole fraction profiles (whose main source is reaction; NNH + O → NH + NO as identified in the next section) are lower at high temperature.
Figure 6.18: Comparison of NO mole fraction profiles for the three flames at $\phi = 0.7$ and $\phi = 0.8$

Figure 6.19: Comparison of NO mole fraction profiles for the three flames at $\phi = 0.9$ and $\phi = 1.1$
6.3.4 Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity analysis is carried out to predict the effect of variations of the rate constants on the dependent variables. It is obtained by calculating the first-order sensitivity coefficients of the dependent variable, $\partial U/\partial K_k$, $k = 1, ..., l$. Here $U$ denotes the vector of the unknown dependent variables, $K_k$ denotes the rate constant for an elementary reaction $k$, and $l$ denotes the total number of elementary reactions. The first order sensitivities are normalized to get the relative sensitivities or sensitivities coefficients, $S^k$. In this thesis, the local sensitivities of mole fraction of CH and NO have been performed with respect to the rate constants of elementary reactions.

6.3.4.1 Sensitivity of CH concentration in flames

The sensitivity of CH concentration towards the most important reactions in methane freely propagating flame is shown in Fig. 6.21. The graph shows that the dominant reaction is
H + O₂ → O + OH. This is a very important chain branching step in every combustion process where H atoms are present [53]. The other reactions which have high positive sensitivity at the production zone of CH (between 0.44 mm to 0.76 mm with peak at 0.57 mm as shown in Fig. 6.9a) are OH + CH₃ → CH₂(S) + H₂O and OH + CO → H + CO₂. Therefore, from these reactions it is evident that OH and CH₃ are the most dominant radicals responsible for the CH production. Reactions which have high negative sensitivity at CH production zone are H + O₂ + H₂O → HO₂ + H₂O, OH + CH₄ → CH₃ + H₂O and H + CH₄ → CH₃ + H₂. Apparently, at the CH consumption zone (0.57 mm to 0.76 mm) the reactions which have positive sensitivity change to negative sensitivity and vice versa with the exception of reactions involving H abstraction in CH₄. These reactions also show that the consumption of CH₃ by OH, HO₂ and O promote the generation of CH. The generation of H radical increases CH production while the H consumption decreases...
its production. The plot also reveals that CO, H₂, CH₂(S), HCO, HO₂ and CH₃O are the other radicals which play an active role in the production and consumption of CH radical.

Figure 6.22: The sensitivity of CH concentration for a methanol/air freely propagating flame, φ = 1

Sensitivity analysis of CH concentration in methanol freely propagating flame is presented in Fig. 6.22. Apart from H + O₂ → O + OH reaction, the other reactions which have high positive sensitivity at the CH production zone (0.40 mm to 0.48 mm as shown in Fig. 6.9a) are H + HO₂ → 2OH, OH + CO → H + CO₂ and HCO + H₂O → H + CO + H₂O. Reactions: H + CH₃OH → CH₂OH +H₂ and HCO + O₂ → HO₂ + CO have high negative sensitivity at CH production zone. It is also important to note that the sensitivities of all these reactions change sign at the CH peak concentration position. OH, H and HCO are the dominant radicals which play an active role in the production and consumption of CH radical in this flame. Unlike in methane flame, CH₃ does not play a significant role in CH production in a methanol flame. As shown in Fig. 6.10a.
methanol flame has a low CH₃ production as compared to the other flames. This explains the relatively small amount of CH in a methanol flame.

Figure 6.23: The sensitivity of CH concentration for a methyl formate/air freely propagating flame, φ = 1

Sensitivity analysis of CH concentration in methyl formate flame is shown in Fig. 6.23. Just like in the other two flames, H + O₂ → O + OH is the dominant reaction sensitive to the production of CH. Other reactions which have a bigger influence positively at CH production zone (0.42 mm to 0.50 mm as shown in Fig. 6.9a) are CO + OH → CO₂ + H and HCO + M → H + CO + M. Reactions: H + OH + M → H₂O + M and H + CH₂OCHO → CH₃OCHO have high negative sensitivity at CH production zone. Similar to methanol flame, OH, H and HCO are the dominant radicals which play an active role in the production and consumption of CH radical in this flame. In particular, H radical dominates most of these reactions, with its generation promoting CH production and its consumption decreasing CH production. The plot also shows that CH₃ does not play a
6.3.4.2 Sensitivity of NO concentration in flames

The sensitivity of NO concentration towards the most important reaction in a methane flame is presented on Fig. 6.24. The most influential reaction with high positive sensitivity in NO production zone (0.16 mm to 1.2 mm as shown in Fig. 6.6a) is \( \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{N} \). This reaction is considered to be the dominant initiation reaction responsible for NO formation in flames [7,14]. The other reactions which have positive sensitivity are \( \text{CH} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{CH}_2 \), \( \text{H} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{O} + \text{OH} \) and \( \text{OH} + \text{CH}_3 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2(S) + \text{H}_2\text{O} \). On the other hand, the reactions which have greater negative influence are \( \text{HO}_2 + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{OH} \), \( \text{CH} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{O} + \text{HCO} \) and \( \text{O} + \text{CH}_3 \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{O} \). It is interesting to note that all these reactions have dominance effects even in the low temperature part of the flame zone.
where NO are produced at slow rate (as early as at -0.064 mm). At this zone, $\text{HO}_2 + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{OH}$ is the reaction which has high consumption of NO to form NO$_2$. This is also seen in Fig. 6.11b where NO$_2$ is formed earlier than NO in the flame zone.

![Figure 6.25: The sensitivity of NO concentration for a methanol/air freely propagating flame, $\phi = 1$](image)

The sensitivity of NO concentration in a methanol flame is shown in Fig. 6.25. The plot shows a very interesting behaviour about the sensitivity of the reactions; highly sensitive at very low temperatures. This result in two regions of the flame zone where the rate constants of reactions are very sensitive; first region between -0.2 mm to 0.10 mm and the second region between 0.1 mm to 0.50 mm. Although the formation of NO in this flame starts at 0.30 mm, the first region sensitivity could indicate the formation and consumption of the precursor radicals responsible for NO formation. $\text{NNH} + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{NO}$ is the only reaction which has positive dominance throughout the flame zone. This reaction has been identified by Hughes et al. [6, 49] as the most sensitive in NO formation in H$_2$/air.
flame. The first region is characterized by reactions: \( H + HO_2 \rightarrow O_2 + H_2, 2OH \rightarrow O_2 + H_2O_2 \), \( HCO + O_2 \rightarrow HO_2 + CO \) and \( H + O_2 + H_2O \rightarrow HO_2 + H_2O \) being most dominant on the positive side. The reactions which have the most positive influence in NO production in the second region are \( H + O_2 \rightarrow O + OH, OH + CO \rightarrow H + CO_2 \) and \( HCO + H_2O \rightarrow H + CO + H_2O \). All these reactions have antagonistic effects on both regions. It is also important to note that \( HO_2 + NO \rightarrow NO_2 + OH \) reaction contribute negatively to the production of NO in a methanol flame at low temperatures. Most of these reactions which have great influence in the low temperature region involve \( HO_2 \) radical. \( HO_2 \) radical is produced at low temperatures \( T < 900 \) K through hydrogen abstraction from the fuel via relatively slow reaction with oxygen [33].

Figure 6.26: The sensitivity of NO concentration for a methyl formate/air freely propagating flame, \( \phi = 1 \)

The sensitivity of NO concentration in a methyl formate flame is presented on Fig. 6.26. Just like NO formation in a methanol flame, the behaviour of the these sensitivity divide
the flame into two regions; first region between -0.2 mm to 0.10 mm and the second region between 0.1 mm to 0.70 mm. Also $\text{NNH} + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{NO}$ and $\text{N}_2 + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{N}$ are the only reactions which have positive influence throughout the flame zone. Reactions: $\text{H} + \text{OH} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{M}$, $\text{HO}_2 + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{O}_2$ and $\text{HCO} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{H}_2$ have high positive sensitivity in the first region. While reactions: $\text{CO} + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}$, $\text{H} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{O} + \text{OH}$ and $\text{HCO} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{CO} + \text{M}$ have dominant positive sensitivity in the second region. It is also noted that $\text{HO}_2 + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{OH}$ reaction contribute negatively to the production of NO in a methyl formate flame at low temperatures.

### 6.4 Conclusions

Small amount of NO concentration in the oxygenated fuels ($\text{CH}_3\text{OH}$ and $\text{CH}_3\text{OCHO}$) is observed. The sensitivity analysis of NO concentration reveals that its production in methanol and methyl formate flames is mainly from reaction; $\text{NNH} + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{NO}$, as opposed to the well known sources of NO in flames (Zel’dovich mechanism; $\text{O} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{N}$, $\text{N} + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{H}$ and $\text{N} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{O}$). This is attributed to the small amount of N radicals present in these flames. This is as a result of prediction of small amount of CH and CH$_3$ by methyl formate and methanol mechanism, which initiates the reactions responsible for N formation. The Zel’dovich reactions are strongly dependent on temperature. As a result, methane NO profiles, whose formation is contributed by both prompt and thermal NO, are higher at high temperatures. On the contrary, methanol and methyl formate NO mole fraction profiles are lower at high temperature.
CHAPTER SEVEN

DIFFUSION FLAMES

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, two dimensional planar, laminar, counterflow diffusion flames are considered. A fully infinite computational domain between two opposed nozzles (one ejecting pure fuel and the other pure air) has been used for all diffusion flames studied. For this case, a diffusion flame is assumed to be embedded in a thin boundary layer, which is as a result of stagnating flow between two opposing streams of fuel and air. Major species, temperature, NO and minor species (NO\textsubscript{2}, CH, CH\textsubscript{3}, O, OH, HCN, N, N\textsubscript{2}O and NNH) concentration profiles relating to its formation in methane, methanol and methyl formate flames are presented and discussed. Compared in the last section of this chapter are the formations of NO in the three configuration: homogeneous system, freely propagating and diffusion flames.

7.2 Flow Configuration and Model Details

The flow configuration considered is as shown in Fig. 2.2a in section 2.4, with the fuel and air side positioned at left and right hand side respectively. The temperature of both the fuel and air stream is taken as 300 K. The flames are computed at a constant pressure of 1 bar and a strain rate of 50 s\textsuperscript{-1}. At the fuel nozzle, pure fuel concentration (mole fraction of 1) is specified, while at the air nozzle, the mole fractions concentration of O\textsubscript{2} and N\textsubscript{2} are specified using the air standard composition. The numerical simulations of these flames have been done using the RUN1DL code in the software package COSILAB [45].
7.3 Results and Discussions

7.3.1 Flame Structures

Presented in Figs. 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 are the temperature and major species profiles for methane/air, methanol/air and methyl formate/air diffusion flames respectively. The plot depicts that, the flames are established at the air side; approximately at 2.8 mm, 2.5 mm and 1.8 mm from the stagnation plane (taken as the point where velocity, \( V_y = 0 \)) for methane, methanol and methyl formate flames respectively. This is as expected, since the stoichiometric mixtures of these fuels and air require more air than fuel. Fuel diffuses across the stagnation plane and the flame is established at the point where the mixture fraction is stoichiometric.

![Figure 7.1: Methane/air diffusion flame structure](image-url)
Figure 7.2: Methanol/air diffusion flame structure

Shown in Fig. 7.4 is a comparison of temperature profiles for the three diffusion flames. The diagram shows that, the temperature profiles have similar shapes with a slight difference for peak amount and position. Methanol is observed to have a slightly higher peak temperature, followed by the peaks of methane and methyl formate. In methane flame, the mole fractions of reactants (CH$_4$ and O$_2$) fall to near zero values at the axial location corresponding to the position of peak temperature occurrence. In methanol and methyl formate flames, the mole fraction of O$_2$ fall to near zero values at the axial position corresponding to peak temperature position, while the mole fractions of fuels fall to near zero values at position different from that of O$_2$ (1.8 mm and 1.5 mm from temperature peak position for CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO respectively). It is interesting to note, that these positions correspond to the positions where CO peaks in these particular fuels. Also a significant difference (approximately 3 times higher) is observed in the maximum concentration of
Figure 7.3: Methyl formate/air diffusion flame structure

CO in CH₃OH and CH₃OCHO flames compared to that of CH₄ flame. At the point where fuel falls to zero, it has been consumed to radical and other products; CO amongst them. For instance, Dooley et al. [17] identified reactions: CH₃OCHO $\rightarrow$ CH₃OH + CO and CH₃OCHO $\rightarrow$ CH₄ + CO₂ to account for 38% and 3% of fuel consumption respectively. The CO is then converted to CO₂ at this region due to presence of oxygen. The presence of N₂ deep on the fuel side for all flames studied is as a result of its diffusion across the stagnation plane.

7.3.2 Generation of NOₓ

Shown in Figs. 7.5-7.9 are the species concentration profiles for NO and other minor species related to its formation. A comparison of NO production in the three flames is shown in Fig. 7.5a. The plot reveals a significantly high NO mole fraction concentration in CH₄.
flame as compared to those for CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO flames. The difference is explained in the next paragraph by looking at the concentration profiles of the dominant species responsible for prompt and thermal NO formation in each of the flames.

A comparison of O and OH atoms for the three flames is shown in Fig. 7.6. The graph shows similar curves for both O and OH in the different fuels with slight difference in the peak amount and position. These radicals play a significant role in both prompt and thermal NO formation through Zel’dovich mechanism [7,14]. Therefore, a small difference in the NO production is expected from these fuels. However, the big difference observed is attributed to a small amount of prompt NO predicted for CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO flames due to low values of CH produced in their flame zones (Fig. 7.7a). This is also consistent
Figure 7.5: NO and NNH concentration profiles for the three diffusion flames with the low values of HCN and N atoms observed in these flames, CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO, as depicted in Fig. 7.8. The source of these radicals is through reaction: CH + N$_2$ → HCN + N and the other subsequent reactions.

NO concentration profiles in CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO flames are sensitive to reaction: NNH + O → NH + NO (see section 6.3.4). This reaction favours the production of NO in these flames because its activation energy is zero, hence at low temperatures it proceeds fast. Also the production of NNH in CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO flames, Fig. 7.5b, are within the same range as that for CH$_4$.

N$_2$O concentration profile comparison is presented in Fig. 7.9a. The plot shows that CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO flames have almost the same quantities of N$_2$O in terms of mole fraction, which are slightly higher than that of CH$_4$. N$_2$O is formed through reaction: N$_2$ + O + M → N$_2$O + M. This reaction take place with collision with a third body M which lowers its activation energy as compared to Zel’dovich rate limiting step: N$_2$ + O → NO + N [33]. Hence, it proceeds at low temperatures and high pressures. This is the
Figure 7.6: O and OH concentration profiles for the three diffusion flames

Figure 7.7: CH and CH$_3$ concentration profiles for the three diffusion flames
Figure 7.8: HCN and N concentration profiles for the three diffusion flames

Figure 7.9: N\textsubscript{2}O and NO\textsubscript{2} concentration profiles for the three diffusion flames
Figure 7.10: HO$_2$ concentration profiles for the three diffusion flames

main source of NO in lean combustion after reacting with O [33], which is analogous to the slightly higher concentration observed in oxygenated fuels.

Shown in Fig. 7.9b is a comparison of NO$_2$ in the flames. NO$_2$ is mainly formed from the consumption of NO at low temperature through reaction: HO$_2$ + NO $\rightarrow$ NO$_2$ + OH as shown in sensitivity analysis in section 6.3.4. At high temperature it is formed through reaction OH + NO $\rightarrow$ NO$_2$ + H. The peak concentration value for NO$_2$ is higher in CH$_4$ flame, followed by CH$_3$OH flame and is lowest in CH$_3$OCHO flame. The peak concentration is on the air side for all flames (1.8 mm, 1.9 mm and 2.2 mm from temperature peak position for CH$_4$, CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO respectively). These correspond to the location of the peak position of HO$_2$ (Fig. 7.10), dominant species responsible for their formations. The amount of HO$_2$ for each of the flames is also consistent with NO$_2$ produced.
7.4 Comparison of NO Formation in Different Flow Configurations

Table 7.1 compares NO production in homogeneous system, freely propagating and diffusion flames. A significantly higher NO formation in homogeneous system is observed compared to those in diffusion and freely propagating flames. Homogenous system attained high temperatures due to high initial temperatures. Hence, NO is formed mostly through temperature dependent thermal NO mechanism. A temperature difference of 66, 111 and 26 K between the diffusion and freely propagating flames result in an increase of 7.69, 6.63 and 3.89 times in NO production for CH₄, CH₃OH and CH₃OCHO respectively. Similarly, a temperature difference of 950, 949 and 965 K between the homogeneous system and freely propagating flames result in an increase of 446, 1163 and 1144 times in NO production for CH₄, CH₃OH and CH₃OCHO respectively. Generally, it can be seen that a small increase in temperature bring a significant increase in NO production.

Table 7.1: A comparison of maximum NO formed in different flow configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel</th>
<th>Homogeneous system</th>
<th>Freely propagating</th>
<th>Diffusion flame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum $X_{NO}$</td>
<td>Maximum $X_{NO}$</td>
<td>Maximum $X_{NO}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($10^{-2}$)</td>
<td>[PPM]</td>
<td>[PPM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₃OH</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₃OCHO</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 Conclusions

NO formations in methane/air, methanol/air, and methyl formate/air diffusion flames have been discussed in this chapter. A significantly higher peak amount of NO is formed in CH₄ flame; approximately 3.23 and 6 times higher than those of CH₃OH and CH₃OCHO flames.
respectively. This is mainly attributed to the fact that, the temperatures attained by diffusion flames (approximately 2000 K for initial temperature of 300 K) favours the formation of prompt NO. The dominant immediate precursor species for prompt NO formation, i.e, CH, HCN and N, are predicted in significantly small quantities in CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO flames compared to that in CH$_4$. Therefore, the observation of small quantities of NO formed in CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO is justified.
CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSIONS

Numerical simulations of NO\textsubscript{x} production in CH\textsubscript{4}, CH\textsubscript{3}OH and CH\textsubscript{3}OCHO under three different flame configurations: homogenous system; freely propagating flame; and diffusion flame; have been investigated.

It has been established that, under the different flow configurations considered, CH\textsubscript{4} has high amount of total NO present in the flame region as compared to the oxygenated fuels (CH\textsubscript{3}OH and CH\textsubscript{3}OCHO). The difference in the amount of NO produced by each fuel differ under different configurations. A significant difference (one order of magnitude higher) is observed in CH\textsubscript{4} under freely propagating and diffusion flames as compared to oxygenated fuels. In homogenous system the difference in the amount of NO produced by the three fuels is within the same order of magnitude.

NO production in combustion system is mainly controlled by temperature. Maximum flame temperatures of approximately (1930 K - 1980 K) are observed for the three fuels in freely propagating flames. Under these temperatures, NO is produced mainly through prompt-NO. The maximum total NO produced in this flame type is to the order of \(10^{-5}\) for CH\textsubscript{4} and \(10^{-6}\) for CH\textsubscript{3}OH and CH\textsubscript{3}OCHO. In prompt NO, reaction: \(\text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{N}\) is the determining step. A small amount of dominant immediate precursor species CH and subsequently N atoms in CH\textsubscript{3}OH and CH\textsubscript{3}OCHO explain the low values of NO concentration as compared to that for CH\textsubscript{4}. In addition, NO concentration showed a high sensitivity to reaction: \(\text{NNH} + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{NO}\) in oxygenated fuels (CH\textsubscript{3}OH and CH\textsubscript{3}OCHO) as opposed to high sensitivity of reaction: \(\text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{N}\) seen in CH\textsubscript{4} flames. The low concentration of N atoms in oxygenated fuels makes the contribution through the reaction path that results in NNH being significant.
Maximum flame temperatures of approximately (1960 K - 2050 K) are observed for the three fuels in diffusion flames. The maximum total NO produced in this flame type is to the order of $10^{-4}$ for CH$_4$ and $10^{-5}$ for CH$_3$OH and CH$_3$OCHO. Just like in the freely propagating flames, the temperatures attained by diffusion flames favour the production of NO mainly through prompt-NO. Therefore, the same argument applies.

In homogenous system, maximum flame temperatures of approximately (2900 K - 2930 K) are observed for the three fuels. The maximum total NO produced in this flame type is to the order of $10^{-2}$ for all fuels. Under these temperatures, thermal NO reaction by Zel’dovich mechanism is the dominating source of NO. The rate-limiting step in the Zel’dovich mechanism: $N_2 + O \rightarrow NO + N$ is the decisive reaction for NO formation at high temperature. The availability of the O atoms and nitrogen molecules in all three fuels considered result in a similar amount of NO formed. The small difference in the production of NO is attributed to the different maximum temperatures attained by these mixtures and the prompt NO formation.
CHAPTER NINE

RECOMMENDATIONS

The low values of total NO predicted for oxygenated fuels in freely propagating and diffusion flames could still be investigated further. The maximum temperatures attained by these flames favours the production of NO mainly through prompt-NO. Though the chemical kinetics model for methyl formate developed by Dooley et al. [16] (used in this thesis) have been widely validated for the intermediates species (CH$_3$OH, CH$_2$O, CH$_4$, CH$_3$, C$_2$H$_4$, C$_2$H$_2$ and CH$_3$CHO), there is need to quantitatively measure the immediate prompt-NO precursor species CH and N. In addition, the contribution to the total NO through other species apart from N atom such as NNH could be studied.

In our analysis we have used Leeds NO mechanism, in which the initiation route for prompt-NO is CH + N$_2$ $\rightleftharpoons$ HCN + N, to predict NO formation. The alternative initiation route for prompt-NO formation: CH + N$_2$ $\rightleftharpoons$ NCN + H, which have been proposed [10,11], can also be implemented on a methyl formate mechanism. This could improve the NO prediction.

Though a sensitivity analysis was performed to ascertain the accuracy of predicted NO production, a quantitative measurement of NO in a methyl formate flame is desired to further validate the results.
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APPENDIX A

Methyl Formate Oxidation Chemistry

The mechanism of the first 76 elementary reactions for methyl formate oxidation developed by Dooley et al. [16] is given in table A.1. The full mechanism has 269 species taking part in 1583 homogeneous reactions. The rate of production of the chemical species $w_i$, involved in the mechanism is given as

$$w_i = W_i \sum_{k=1}^{l} (v_{i,k}'' - v_{i,k}') K_k \prod_{j=1}^{N} \left( \frac{\rho Y_j}{W_j} \right)^{v_{j,k}'} i = 1, ..., N;$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.1)$$

where the rate constant is defined by Arrhenius equation:

$$K = AT^\alpha \exp(-E/RT);$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.2)$$

and $l$ is the number of elementary reactions in the mechanism, $v_{i,k}'$ and $v_{i,k}''$ are the stoichiometric coefficients of species $i$ in reaction $k$, $k = 1, ..., l$, for reactants and products respectively, $K_k$ is the specific rate constant for reaction $k$, $AT^\alpha$ and $E$ is pre-exponential factor and activation energy in the specific rate constant respectively, $W_i$ and $W_j$ is molecular weight of species $i$ and $j$ respectively, $Y_j$ is mass fraction for species $j$, $\rho$ is mixture density, and $R$ is universal gas constant. The forward and backward reactions are treated separately.
Table A.1: Methyl formate oxidation chemistry developed by Dooley et al. 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>$A$ (cm$^3$/mol s)</th>
<th>Exponent $E$ (cal/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 H+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ O+OH</td>
<td>3.547E+015</td>
<td>-4.06E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 O+H2 $\leftrightarrow$ H+OH</td>
<td>5.080E+004</td>
<td>2.67E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 H2+OH $\leftrightarrow$ H2O+H</td>
<td>2.160E+008</td>
<td>1.51E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 O+H2O $\leftrightarrow$ OH+OH</td>
<td>2.970E+006</td>
<td>2.02E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 H2+M $\leftrightarrow$ H+H+M</td>
<td>4.577E+019</td>
<td>-1.40E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 H2+AR $\leftrightarrow$ H+H+AR</td>
<td>5.840E+018</td>
<td>-1.10E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 H2+HE $\leftrightarrow$ H+H+HE</td>
<td>5.840E+018</td>
<td>-1.10E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 O+O+M $\leftrightarrow$ O2+M</td>
<td>6.165E+015</td>
<td>-5.00E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 O+O+AR $\leftrightarrow$ O2+AR</td>
<td>1.886E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 O+O+HE $\leftrightarrow$ O2+HE</td>
<td>1.886E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 O+H+M $\leftrightarrow$ OH+M</td>
<td>4.714E+018</td>
<td>-1.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 H+OH+M $\leftrightarrow$ H2O+M</td>
<td>3.800E+022</td>
<td>-2.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 H+O2(+M) $\leftrightarrow$ HO2(+M)</td>
<td>1.475E+012</td>
<td>6.00E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 HO2+H $\leftrightarrow$ H2+O2</td>
<td>1.660E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 HO2+H $\leftrightarrow$ OH+OH</td>
<td>7.079E+013</td>
<td>-1.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 HO2+O $\leftrightarrow$ O2+OH</td>
<td>3.250E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 HO2+OH $\leftrightarrow$ H2O+O2</td>
<td>2.890E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 HO2+HO2 $\leftrightarrow$ H2O2+O2</td>
<td>4.200E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 HO2+HO2 $\leftrightarrow$ H2O2+O2</td>
<td>1.300E+011</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 H2O2(+M) $\leftrightarrow$ OH+OH(+M)</td>
<td>2.951E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 H2O2+H $\leftrightarrow$ H2O+OH</td>
<td>2.410E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 H2O2+H $\leftrightarrow$ HO2+H2</td>
<td>4.820E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 H2O2+O $\leftrightarrow$ OH+HO2</td>
<td>9.550E+006</td>
<td>2.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 H2O2+OH $\leftrightarrow$ HO2+H2O</td>
<td>1.000E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 H2O2+OH $\leftrightarrow$ HO2+H2O</td>
<td>5.800E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 CO+O(+M) $\leftrightarrow$ CO2(+M)</td>
<td>1.800E+010</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 CO+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ CO2+O</td>
<td>2.530E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 CO+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ CO2+OH</td>
<td>3.010E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 CO+OH $\leftrightarrow$ CO2+H</td>
<td>2.229E+005</td>
<td>1.89E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 HCO+M $\leftrightarrow$ H+CO+M</td>
<td>4.748E+011</td>
<td>6.59E-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 HCO+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ CO+HO2</td>
<td>7.580E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 HCO+H $\leftrightarrow$ CO+H2</td>
<td>7.236E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 HCO+O $\leftrightarrow$ CO+OH</td>
<td>3.020E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 HCO+OH $\leftrightarrow$ CO+H2O</td>
<td>3.020E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 HCO+O $\leftrightarrow$ CO2+H</td>
<td>3.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 HCO+HO2 $\leftrightarrow$ CO2+OH+H</td>
<td>3.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 HCO+CH3 $\leftrightarrow$ CO+CH4</td>
<td>2.650E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions</td>
<td>A (cm$^3$/mol s)</td>
<td>Exponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 HCO+HCO $\leftrightarrow$ H2+CO+CO</td>
<td>3.00E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 HCO+HCO $\leftrightarrow$ CH2O+CO</td>
<td>3.00E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 HCO+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ O2CHO</td>
<td>1.20E+011</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 CH2O+O2CHO $\leftrightarrow$ HCO+HO2CHO</td>
<td>1.99E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 HO2CHO $\leftrightarrow$ CH2O+CO+H2</td>
<td>5.01E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 H+CO2+M $\leftrightarrow$ OCHO+M</td>
<td>7.50E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 CH2O+M $\leftrightarrow$ HCO+H+M</td>
<td>3.30E+039</td>
<td>-6.30E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 CH2O+M $\leftrightarrow$ CO+H2+M</td>
<td>3.10E+045</td>
<td>-8.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ HCO+H2</td>
<td>5.74E+007</td>
<td>1.90E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 CH2O+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ CH2O+O2CHO</td>
<td>1.230E+006</td>
<td>3.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 CH2O+HO2 $\leftrightarrow$ HCO+HO2</td>
<td>4.110E+004</td>
<td>2.50E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 CH2O+CH3 $\leftrightarrow$ HCO+CH4</td>
<td>8.430E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 CH2O+HO2 $\leftrightarrow$ CH2O+H2</td>
<td>1.810E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 CH2O+CH3 $\leftrightarrow$ HCO+CH4</td>
<td>3.430E+009</td>
<td>1.18E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>1.990E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 CH2O+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ CH2O+H2</td>
<td>3.120E+006</td>
<td>3.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 CH2O+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ CH2O+H2</td>
<td>7.50E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 CH2O+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ CH2O+H2</td>
<td>3.30E+045</td>
<td>-8.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>5.74E+007</td>
<td>1.90E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 CH2O+O2 $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>8.430E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>1.990E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>3.120E+006</td>
<td>3.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>7.50E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>3.30E+045</td>
<td>-8.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>5.74E+007</td>
<td>1.90E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>8.430E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>1.990E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>3.120E+006</td>
<td>3.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>7.50E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>3.30E+045</td>
<td>-8.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>5.74E+007</td>
<td>1.90E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>8.430E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>1.990E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>3.120E+006</td>
<td>3.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>7.50E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>3.30E+045</td>
<td>-8.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>5.74E+007</td>
<td>1.90E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>8.430E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 CH2O+H $\leftrightarrow$ CH3+H2</td>
<td>1.990E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...........Continue to 1583$^{rd}$ reaction
APPENDIX B

Nitrogen Oxidation Chemistry

The mechanism of the first 63 elementary reactions for nitrogen oxidation developed by Hughes et al. [8] is given in table B.1. The full mechanism has 43 species taking part in 164 homogeneous reactions. The rate of production of the chemical species \( i \) is given by Eq. A.1, whereby the rate constant is defined by Eq. A.2.

Table B.1: The Leeds Nitrogen Chemistry Mechanism 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>( A (\text{cm}^3/\text{mol s}) )</th>
<th>Exponent</th>
<th>( E ) (cal/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 H2+CN ( \leftrightarrow ) HCN+H</td>
<td>1.930E+004</td>
<td>2.87E+000</td>
<td>1.6292E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CH4+N ( \leftrightarrow ) NH+CH3</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>2.3991E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CH4+CN ( \leftrightarrow ) HCN+CH3</td>
<td>9.030E+004</td>
<td>2.64E+000</td>
<td>-2.9797E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 O2+N ( \leftrightarrow ) NO+O</td>
<td>9.030E+009</td>
<td>1.00E+000</td>
<td>6.4968E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 O2+NH ( \leftrightarrow ) HNO+O</td>
<td>3.910E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.7880E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 O2+NH ( \leftrightarrow ) NO+OH</td>
<td>7.589E+010</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.5293E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 O2+NH2 ( \leftrightarrow ) HNO+OH</td>
<td>1.510E+012</td>
<td>-3.90E-001</td>
<td>3.6091E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 O2+NH2 ( \leftrightarrow ) H2NO+O</td>
<td>1.100E+018</td>
<td>-1.34E+000</td>
<td>3.3592E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 O2+CN ( \leftrightarrow ) NCO+O</td>
<td>7.230E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-4.1721E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 O2+NCO ( \leftrightarrow ) NO+CO2</td>
<td>1.720E+007</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-7.3358E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 CO+N2O ( \leftrightarrow ) CO2+N2</td>
<td>9.770E+010</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.7443E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CO2+N ( \leftrightarrow ) NO+CO</td>
<td>1.900E+011</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>3.3972E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 N2+CH ( \leftrightarrow ) HCN+N</td>
<td>1.570E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.7940E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 N2+CH2 ( \leftrightarrow ) HCN+NH</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>7.3984E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 NO+N2O ( \leftrightarrow ) N2+NO2</td>
<td>1.000E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>4.9666E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 NO+N2H2 ( \leftrightarrow ) N2O+NH2</td>
<td>3.000E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 NO+C ( \leftrightarrow ) CN+O</td>
<td>1.930E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 NO+C ( \leftrightarrow ) CO+N</td>
<td>2.890E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 NO+H ( \leftrightarrow ) N+OH</td>
<td>2.170E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>4.9487E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 N+OH ( \leftrightarrow ) NO+H</td>
<td>2.830E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 NO+CH ( \leftrightarrow ) CO+NH</td>
<td>1.200E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 NO+CH ( \leftrightarrow ) CN+OH</td>
<td>1.200E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 NO+CH ( \leftrightarrow ) HCN+O</td>
<td>9.600E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 NO+CH2 ( \leftrightarrow ) HOCN+H</td>
<td>1.390E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-1.0992E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 NO+CH2(S) ( \leftrightarrow ) HCN+OH</td>
<td>9.640E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions</td>
<td>A(cm$^3$/mol s)</td>
<td>Exponent</td>
<td>E (cal/mol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 NO+CH₃ $\rightleftharpoons$ HCN+H₂O</td>
<td>9.275E+011</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.6706E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 NO+CH₃ $\rightleftharpoons$ H₂CN+OH</td>
<td>9.275E+011</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.6706E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 NO+HO₂ $\rightleftharpoons$ NO₂+OH</td>
<td>2.090E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>-4.7790E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 NO+HO₂ $\rightleftharpoons$ HNO+O₂</td>
<td>2.000E+011</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.9857E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 NO+HCCO $\rightleftharpoons$ HOCN+CO</td>
<td>2.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 NO+N $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+O</td>
<td>4.280E+013</td>
<td>-4.50E-001</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 N₂+O $\rightleftharpoons$ NO+N</td>
<td>1.810E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>7.6089E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 NO+NH $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+OH</td>
<td>3.200E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.2715E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 NO+NH $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂O+H</td>
<td>4.162E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 NO+NH₂ $\rightleftharpoons$ NNH+OH</td>
<td>2.410E+015</td>
<td>-1.17E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 NO+NH₂ $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+H₂O</td>
<td>5.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 NO+NNH $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+HNO</td>
<td>5.480E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 NO+HNO $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂O+OH</td>
<td>9.710E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 NO+NH₂ $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂O+CO</td>
<td>1.390E+018</td>
<td>-1.73E+000</td>
<td>7.5508E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 NO+M $\rightleftharpoons$ N+O+M</td>
<td>3.625E+015</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.4830E+005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 NO₂+NO₂ $\rightleftharpoons$ NO+NO+O₂</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.9866E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 NO₂+H $\rightleftharpoons$ NO+OH</td>
<td>3.470E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.4695E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 NO₂+O $\rightleftharpoons$ NO+O₂</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>5.9976E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 NO₂+N $\rightleftharpoons$ NO+NO</td>
<td>8.070E+011</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 NO₂+N $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂O+O</td>
<td>1.000E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 NO₂+NH $\rightleftharpoons$ HNO+NO</td>
<td>1.000E+011</td>
<td>5.00E-001</td>
<td>3.9737E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 NO₂+NH $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂O+O₂</td>
<td>9.710E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 NO₂+NH₂ $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂O+H₂O</td>
<td>2.030E+017</td>
<td>-1.70E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 NO₂+CN $\rightleftharpoons$ NCO+NO</td>
<td>3.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 NO₂+M $\rightleftharpoons$ NO+O+M</td>
<td>3.133E+016</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>6.5558E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 N₂O+C $\rightleftharpoons$ CN+NO</td>
<td>3.120E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 N₂O+H $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+OH</td>
<td>4.370E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.8872E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 N₂O+O $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+O₂</td>
<td>1.000E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>2.8012E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 N₂O+O $\rightleftharpoons$ NO+NO</td>
<td>6.920E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>2.6621E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 N₂O+OH $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+HO₂</td>
<td>6.310E+011</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>9.9332E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 N₂O+N $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+NO</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.9866E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 N₂O+NH $\rightleftharpoons$ HNO+N₂</td>
<td>2.000E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>5.9594E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 N₂O+CN $\rightleftharpoons$ NCO+N₂</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 N₂O+M $\rightleftharpoons$ N₂+O+M</td>
<td>2.857E+015</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>5.9976E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 NH₃+H $\rightleftharpoons$ NH₂+H₂</td>
<td>5.420E+005</td>
<td>2.40E+000</td>
<td>9.9140E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 NH₃+O $\rightleftharpoons$ NH₂+OH</td>
<td>9.640E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>7.2904E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 NH₃+OH $\rightleftharpoons$ NH₂+H₂O</td>
<td>3.160E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>2.0072E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 NH₃+HO₂ $\rightleftharpoons$ NH₂+H₂O₂</td>
<td>2.510E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>2.3840E+004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.............Continueto 164th reaction
APPENDIX C

Small Chain Hydrocarbon Oxidation Chemistry

The mechanism of the first 57 elementary reactions for oxidation of small hydrocarbons developed by Smith et al. [9] is given in table C.1. The full mechanism has 53 species taking part in 325 homogeneous reactions. The rate of production of the chemical species $i$ is given by Eq. A.1 whereby the rate constant is defined by Eq. A.2.

Table C.1: GRI-Mech Version 3.0 7/30/99 in CHEMKIN-II format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>$A$ (cm$^3$/mol s)</th>
<th>Exponent</th>
<th>E (cal/mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2O+M $\rightarrow$ O2+M</td>
<td>1.200E+017</td>
<td>-1.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 O+H+M $\rightarrow$ OH+M</td>
<td>5.000E+017</td>
<td>-1.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 O+H2 $\rightarrow$ H+OH</td>
<td>3.870E+004</td>
<td>2.70E+000</td>
<td>6.2600E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 O+HO2 $\rightarrow$ OH+O2</td>
<td>2.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 O+H2O2 $\rightarrow$ OH+HO2</td>
<td>9.630E+006</td>
<td>2.00E+000</td>
<td>4.0000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 O+CH $\rightarrow$ H+CO</td>
<td>5.700E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 O+CH2 $\rightarrow$ H+HCO</td>
<td>8.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 O+CH2(S) $\rightarrow$ H2+CO</td>
<td>1.500E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 O+CH2(S) $\rightarrow$ H+HCO</td>
<td>1.500E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 O+CH3 $\rightarrow$ H+CH2O</td>
<td>5.060E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 O+CH4 $\rightarrow$ OH+CH3</td>
<td>1.020E+009</td>
<td>1.50E+000</td>
<td>8.6000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 O+CO(+M) $\rightarrow$ CO2(+M)</td>
<td>1.800E+010</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>2.3850E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 O+HCO $\rightarrow$ OH+CO</td>
<td>3.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 O+HCO $\rightarrow$ H+CO2</td>
<td>3.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 O+CH2O $\rightarrow$ OH+HCO</td>
<td>3.900E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>3.5400E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 O+CH2O H $\rightarrow$ OH+CH2O</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 O+CH3O $\rightarrow$ OH+CH2O</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 O+CH3OH $\rightarrow$ OH+CH2OH</td>
<td>3.880E+005</td>
<td>2.50E+000</td>
<td>3.1000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 O+CH3OH $\rightarrow$ OH+CH3O</td>
<td>1.300E+005</td>
<td>2.50E+000</td>
<td>5.0000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 O+C2H $\rightarrow$ CH+CO</td>
<td>5.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 O+C2H2 $\rightarrow$ H+HCCO</td>
<td>1.350E+007</td>
<td>2.00E+000</td>
<td>1.9000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 O+C2H2 $\rightarrow$ OH+C2H</td>
<td>4.600E+019</td>
<td>-1.41E+000</td>
<td>2.8950E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 O+C2H2 $\rightarrow$ CO+CH2</td>
<td>6.940E+006</td>
<td>2.00E+000</td>
<td>1.9000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 O+C2H3 $\rightarrow$ H+CH2CO</td>
<td>3.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 O+C2H4 $\rightarrow$ CH3+HCO</td>
<td>1.250E+007</td>
<td>1.83E+000</td>
<td>2.2000E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>A(cm³/mol s)</td>
<td>Exponent</td>
<td>E (cal/mol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 O+CH₂H₅ ⇄ CH₃+CH₂O</td>
<td>2.240E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 O+CH₂H₆ ⇄ OH+CH₂H₅</td>
<td>8.980E+007</td>
<td>1.92E+000</td>
<td>5.6900E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 O+HCCO ⇄ H₂+CO</td>
<td>1.000E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 O+CH₂CO ⇄ OH+HCCO</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>8.0000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 O+CH₂CO ⇄ CH₂+CO₂</td>
<td>1.750E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.3500E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 O₂+CO ⇄ O+CO₂</td>
<td>2.500E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>4.7800E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 O₂+CH₂O ⇄ HO₂+HCO</td>
<td>1.000E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>4.0000E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 H+HO₂+M ⇄ HO₂+M</td>
<td>2.800E+018</td>
<td>-8.60E-001</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 H+H₂O₂ ⇄ HO₂+O₂</td>
<td>2.080E+019</td>
<td>-1.24E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 H+O₂+H₂O ⇄ HO₂+H₂O</td>
<td>1.126E+019</td>
<td>-7.60E-001</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 H+O₂+N₂ ⇄ HO₂+N₂</td>
<td>2.600E+019</td>
<td>-1.24E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 H+O₂+AR ⇄ HO₂+AR</td>
<td>7.000E+017</td>
<td>-8.00E-001</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 H+O₂ ⇄ O+OH</td>
<td>2.650E+016</td>
<td>-6.70E-001</td>
<td>1.7041E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 2H+M ⇄ H₂+M</td>
<td>1.000E+018</td>
<td>-1.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 2H+H₂ ⇄ H₂</td>
<td>9.000E+016</td>
<td>-6.00E-001</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 2H+H₂O ⇄ H₂+H₂O</td>
<td>6.000E+019</td>
<td>-1.25E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 2H+CO₂ ⇄ H₂+CO₂</td>
<td>5.500E+020</td>
<td>-2.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 H+OH+M ⇄ H₂O₂+M</td>
<td>2.200E+022</td>
<td>-2.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 H+HO₂ ⇄ O₂+H₂</td>
<td>3.970E+012</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>6.7100E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 H+HO₂ ⇄ O₂+H₂</td>
<td>4.800E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>1.0680E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 H+HO₂ ⇄ 2OH</td>
<td>8.400E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>6.3500E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 H+H₂O₂ ⇄ HO₂+H₂</td>
<td>1.210E+007</td>
<td>2.00E+000</td>
<td>5.2000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 H+H₂O₂ ⇄ OH+H₂O</td>
<td>1.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>3.6000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 H+CH ⇄ C+H₂</td>
<td>1.650E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 H+CH₂(+M) ⇄ CH₃(+M)</td>
<td>6.000E+014</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 H+CH₂(S) ⇄ CH+H₂</td>
<td>3.000E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 H+CH₃(+M) ⇄ CH₄(+M)</td>
<td>1.390E+016</td>
<td>-5.34E-001</td>
<td>5.3600E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 H+CH₄ ⇄ CH₃+H₂</td>
<td>6.600E+008</td>
<td>1.62E+000</td>
<td>1.0840E+004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 H+HCO(+M) ⇄ CH₂O(+M)</td>
<td>1.090E+012</td>
<td>4.80E-001</td>
<td>-2.6000E+002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 H+HCO ⇄ H₂+CO</td>
<td>7.340E+013</td>
<td>0.00E+000</td>
<td>0.0000E+000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 H+CH₂O(+M) ⇄ CH₂OH(+M)</td>
<td>5.400E+011</td>
<td>4.54E-001</td>
<td>3.6000E+003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 H+CH₂O(+M) ⇄ CH₃O(+M)</td>
<td>5.400E+011</td>
<td>4.54E-001</td>
<td>2.6000E+003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

..........continue to 325th reaction