

Validation of reduced kinetic models for simulations of non-steady combustion processes

M.F. Ivanov¹, A.D. Kiverin¹, M.A. Liberman^{2,3,*} and A.E. Smygalina¹

¹ *Joint Institute for High Temperatures, Russian Academy of Science,
Izhorskaya 13, Bd. 2 Moscow 125412, Russia*

² *Nordita, KTH Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University,
Roslagstullsbacken 23, 10691 Stockholm, Sweden*

³ *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Dolgoprudnyi, 141700, Russia*

(Dated: June 20, 2021)

Abstract

In the present work we compare reliability of several most widely used reduced detailed chemical kinetic schemes for hydrogen-air and hydrogen-oxygen combustible mixtures. The validation of the schemes includes detailed analysis of 0D and 1D calculations and comparison with experimental databases containing data on induction time, equilibrium temperature, composition of the combustion products, laminar flame speed and the flame front thickness at different pressures. 1D calculations were carried out using the full gasdynamical system for compressible viscous thermal conductive multicomponent mixture. The proper choice of chemical kinetics models is essential for obtaining reliable quantitative and qualitative insight into unsteady combustion phenomena such as flame acceleration and stability, ignition, transition from deflagration-to-detonation (DDT) using a multidimensional and multiscale numerical modeling.

PACS numbers: 47.70.Pq, 82.33.Vx, 47.40.Rs

I. INTRODUCTION

Even in the combustion of small hydrocarbons, the chemical kinetics has large underlying reaction mechanisms, and for complex hydrocarbons, the number of chemical species can be up to several hundreds and elementary reactions up to several thousands. Accurate knowledge of the detailed reaction mechanisms is of great importance for understanding and a correct description of kinetically controlled transient combustion processes such as ignition and self-ignition processes (e.g. engine knock), flame extinction, or transition from deflagration-to-detonation. If, however, real three-dimensional (turbulent) flows with large temperature and density gradients are considered, we have to use reduced chemical schemes, since the use of detailed reaction mechanisms involves massive computing times which can be difficult and even impossible to implement. Development and exploitation of reliable detailed chemical kinetic models and identification of the important kinetic pathways and accurate kinetic-transport models remain among the major challenges in combustion science and technology being essential for the design of efficient and reliable engines and for controlling emissions. The availability of such models is essential for gaining scientific insight into important combustion phenomena including flame acceleration and stability, ignition processes, transition from deflagration-to-detonation (DDT) and for the design of advanced combustion engines. Therefore, there is great interest in simplified - reduced chemical reaction schemes consisting of not too large number of elementary reaction. Then the problem is to find criteria for option of a reliable detailed chemical kinetic model. A quintessential example of chain mechanisms in chemical kinetics and combustion science is the $H_2 - O_2$ mechanism, which has been a major topic of research for many decades.

Comprehensive numerical modeling of the unsteady combustion should include a reliable detailed chemical reaction scheme for the understanding of complex multiscale phenomena observed in experiments, since a one-step model does not reproduce even two distinct stages of the combustion reaction: induction stage and exothermal one. It was shown in numerous numerical studies (see e.g.¹⁻⁴ that in many cases both quantitative and qualitative features of the studying processes depends on the choice of chemical kinetics model. Moreover while studying unsteady processes such as flame acceleration, deflagration-to-detonation transition⁵ or flames within combustors^{6,7} one should use models correctly reproducing flame parameters in a wide range of pressures and temperatures.

There are different reduced kinetics schemes, which validation procedures usually use $0D$ and $1D$ calculations and experimental databases containing data on induction periods, equilibrium temperature and composition of the combustion products and laminar flame speeds. Usually, the ignition and combustion for verification databases are studied using the experimental setups far distinct from the setups used for transient processes studies. In some cases it may cause considerable differences between experimental data and those calculated using the chosen model. Almost all the listed parameters are defined by the thermodynamic equilibrium laws. The only evolutionary parameter is an induction period determining the duration of the endothermal stage. However, in some cases the duration of the exothermal stage may be also principal for the process definition as the scale of energy release determines the gasdynamical flows.

Widely accepted standard numerical procedures for ignition parameters and for flame speed calculations are based on the $0D$ solution and on the $1D$ solution of the eigenvalue problem, which is distinguished mathematically from the computational gasdynamics setup used for transient combustion simulations. However instead of solving the eigenvalue problem one may use other approaches to simplify full reactive gasdynamics model (as e.g. it was done in⁸). On the other hand to simulate a transient problem one should validate the codes and models describing the real process involving pressure gradients, compressibility, convection, turbulence etc. Therefore it is important to get the solution of basic problems using more general models which are planned to be used in the simulation of multidimensional unsteady problems.

In the present paper we evaluate different widely used kinetic schemes for hydrogen-air and hydrogen-oxygen combustion⁹⁻¹³ using the full gasdynamical models including standard transport model¹⁴ for laminar flame characteristics. The analysis takes into account the correlations between evolutionary parameters (induction period and duration of exothermal stage) and gasdynamical ones (laminar flame speed and its thickness) for hydrogen-air and hydrogen-oxygen mixtures at different initial pressures.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is the formulation of the problem and numerical method. In Section 3 we perform calculations of the chemical time scales and gasdynamical parameters of the laminar flame in hydrogen-air mixtures. Section 4 presents analysis of the hydrogen-oxygen flames. In Section 5 we formulate conclusions about the applicability of the chosen kinetic schemes in numerical simulations of the transient combustion

processes.

II. PROBLEM SETUP

The governing equations are the one-dimensional time-dependent, multi-species reactive Navier-Stokes equations including the effects of compressibility, molecular diffusion, thermal conduction, viscosity and chemical kinetics for the reactive species with subsequent chain branching, production of radicals and energy release.

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho u)}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\rho D_i \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial x} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial t} \right)_{ch}, \quad (2)$$

$$\rho \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) = - \frac{\partial P}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial \sigma_{xx}}{\partial x}, \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial E}{\partial x} \right) = \\ & - \frac{\partial (Pu)}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (\sigma_{xx} u) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\kappa(T) \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right) \\ & + \sum_k \frac{h_k}{m_k} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\rho D_k(T) \frac{\partial Y_k}{\partial x} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$P = R_B T n = \left(\sum_i \frac{R_B}{m_i} Y_i \right) \rho T = \rho T \sum_i R_i Y_i, \quad (5)$$

$$\varepsilon = c_v T + \sum_k \frac{h_k \rho_k}{\rho} = c_v T + \sum_k h_k Y_k, \quad (6)$$

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{4}{3} \mu \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \right) \quad (7)$$

Here we use the standard notations: P , ρ , u , are pressure, mass density, and flow velocity, $Y_i = \rho_i/\rho$ - the mass fractions of the species, $E = \varepsilon + u^2/2$ - the total energy density, ε - the internal energy density, R_B - is the universal gas constant, m_i - the molar mass of i -species,

$R_i = R_B/m_i$, n - the molar density, σ_{ij} - the viscous stress tensor, $c_v = \sum_i c_{vi}Y_i$ - is the constant volume specific heat, c_{vi} - the constant volume specific heat of i-species, h_i - the enthalpy of formation of i-species, $\kappa(T)$ and $\mu(T)$ are the coefficients of thermal conductivity and viscosity, $D_i(T)$ - is the diffusion coefficients of i-species, $(\partial Y_i/\partial t)_{ch}$ - is the variation of i-species concentration (mass fraction) in chemical reactions.

The equations of state for the reactive mixture and for the combustion products were taken with the temperature dependence of the specific heats and enthalpies of each species borrowed from the JANAF tables and interpolated by the fifth-order polynomials^{11,15}. The viscosity and thermal conductivity coefficients of the mixture were calculated from the gas kinetic theory using the Lennard-Jones potential¹⁴.

The system of gas dynamics equations is solved using Lagrange-Euler method¹⁶, which was modified and approved by authors solving numerous 1D, 2D and 3D problems (see e.g.³⁻⁶. The system of chemical kinetics equations is solved with the aid of Gear method.

III. HYDROGEN-AIR MIXTURE

Usually the verification of the reduced kinetic schemes covers the data on induction periods and equilibrium composition of the products and their temperature. The later are pure thermodynamical characteristics and are more or less in a good agreement with experimental data. In turn these parameters together with transport coefficients determine the laminar flame speed. To reproduce transient processes such as e.g. flame acceleration, ignition, etc. which are accompanied by compression and shock waves, one should take into account parameters such as induction periods and periods of exothermal reaction, which determine the chemical time scales competing with transport time scales in establishing the flame front - the zone of energy release which in fact determines the evolution of the flame. Nevertheless, the even more important thing is the necessity of understanding and reproducing the pressure dependence of flame parameters. Here we present analysis of these parameters given by the different kinetic schemes for H_2/O_2 and H_2 -air mixtures.

Figure 1 shows induction periods and exothermal stage durations dependencies on initial temperature for stoichiometric hydrogen-air mixture at 1atm calculated using different chemical schemes⁹⁻¹³ One can observe almost linear curves intersecting the induction period dependencies - these curves represent an exothermal stage duration which determines the




FIG. 1. Induction periods and exothermal stage durations dependencies on initial temperature of stoichiometric hydrogen-air mixture at 1atm. Experimental data are from^{17,18}.

time scale of energy release inside the reaction zone.

We analyzed here 7 schemes by Agafonov¹², GRI group¹³, Konnov¹⁰, O Conaire⁹ and Warnatz¹¹. The schemes¹² and¹¹ are presented in two variants with different models for three-body collisions. This factor gives negligible difference in the induction periods at normal pressure but may affect the time scales of energy release as it can be seen from Fig. 1. Despite rather sensible differences in the low temperature region almost all the kinetic schemes reproduce quite close values of the induction periods at normal conditions. Among the analyzed schemes one can clearly extract three main groups of kinetic schemes reproducing almost the same values of the induction periods: 1) Agafonov-1 and Konnov, 2) Agafonov-2 and O Conaire, 3) two variants of Warnatz schemes and GRI scheme. The better agreement with an experimental data belongs to the second group together with quite sensible differences between members of the group. Further we will use only four schemes: one from the first group, one from the third, one and two from the second one. The calculations of the laminar flame speeds U_f at normal pressure (1atm) for different equivalent ratio of hydrogen-air mixture for four schemes are presented in Figure 2.

The parameters of laminar flame for stoichiometric hydrogen-air mixture at different pressures, calculated for kinetic schemes⁹⁻¹² are shown in Table 1 together with available




FIG. 2. Laminar flame speed dependence on equivalent ratio of hydrogen-air mixture. Experimental data are from^{19–21}.

experimental values (Refs.) and calculations from the original papers where the kinetic schemes were presented and validated by their authors. One can see that all these chemical schemes give close values for thermodynamic parameters and for induction times within accuracy (10 ÷ 15)%. The main differences are for low temperature values of induction period. However, in many cases this part is not essential if endothermic induction time is larger than characteristic gasdynamic time of the problem.

More essential difference appears for induction time calculated using different kinetic schemes at elevated pressures. The induction time calculated using different schemes at $P = 2.5, 5,$ and 8.8atm are shown in Figures 3. The corresponding parameters of laminar flame are presented in the Table 1 together with the data for 1atm . It is seen from Fig. 3 that considerable difference from the experimental values for the induction period emerges in the low temperature region at pressure greater then 2.5atm as three-body collisions are essential.

From Table 1 it is seen that the distinctions in laminar flame speed also rise with the pressure. The velocity-pressure dependence calculated using different kinetic schemes and experimental data together with analytical correlations are presented in Figure 4.

One can see that some of the correlations obtained from the analysis of the experimental




FIG. 3. Induction periods and exothermal stage durations dependencies on initial temperature of

Table 1

Parameters of laminar H_2 -air flame given by the schemes ([9-12] at $P = 1, 5, 10$ bar

Scheme	$U_f, \text{m/s}$	L_f, mm	Θ	T_b, K	H_2	H_2O	H	Le
$P(\text{bar})$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
OCon	2.02 (2.00 [9])	0.437	6.19	2168.7	0.0094	0.3328	0.00082	1.197
Kon 0.5	2.06 (2.03 [22])	0.462	6.07	2134.9	0.0131	0.3271	0.00168	1.193
Warn 1	2.09 (2.00 [23])	0.398	6.05	2128.9	0.0134	0.3267	0.00176	1.193
Agaf 1	2.25	0.405	6.06	2132.6	0.0160	0.3233	0.00213	1.192
Ref.	2.13 [15] 2.35 [24]	-	-	2138 [11]	0.017 [11]	0.320 [11]	0.002 [11]	-
$P(\text{bar})$	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
OCon	1.41	0.099	6.26	2210.5	0.0043	0.3400	0.00017	1.198
Kon 0.5	1.84	0.103	6.21	2198.7	0.0047	0.3397	0.00020	1.195
Warn 1	1.58	0.095	6.22	2200.2	0.0044	0.3402	0.00017	1.195
Agaf 1	1.72	0.096	6.21	2196.8	0.0050	0.3395	0.00017	1.195
$P(\text{bar})$	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
OCon	0.76	0.071	6.28	2215.9	0.0036	0.3412	0.00012	1.198
Kon 0.5	1.29	0.078	6.24	2205.7	0.0034	0.3415	0.00011	1.195
Warn 1	0.83	0.072	6.26	2205.2	0.0034	0.34015	0.00011	1.195
Agaf 1	0.95	0.074	6.25	2202.6	0.0041	0.3408	0.00011	1.195

data are quite distinct from the obtained calculations and from each other not only quantitatively but even qualitatively. One of the most recent is the correlation obtained in²⁵. It agree well with several experimental data points and shows a qualitative velocity-pressure dependence close to the obtained numerically using different schemes.

IV. HYDROGEN-OXYGEN MIXTURE

The difference in time scales and corresponding difference in flame width become even more noticeable when it is calculated using different kinetic schemes for highly reactive mixtures as e.g. hydrogen-oxygen. Correspondingly, the larger distinction is found for the flame speeds. Figure 5 shows induction periods and exothermal stage durations dependencies




FIG. 4. Laminar flame speed-pressure dependence for stoichiometric hydrogen-air mixture. Experimental data are from^{21,25–27}.

on initial temperature calculated for stoichiometric hydrogen-oxygen mixture at 1atm for different chemical schemes^{9–13}. The main difference in the induction time given by different schemes is again in the region of low temperature (see comment to Fig. 1).

Figure 6 shows velocity-pressure dependence of laminar flame calculated for chemical schemes^{9–12}. It is interesting to notice that experimental data of the velocity-pressure dependence can be approximated as $U_f \propto P^{\frac{2}{2}-1}$ well known from classical combustion theory³¹ with overall reaction order 2.74 presented in³². The approximation is shown by the dotted line in Figure 6. It should be also noted that there are almost no qualitative difference in the velocity-pressure dependencies in the hydrogen-oxygen scheme. It may be caused by the constant behavior of the overall reaction order. In hydrogen-air mixture the overall reaction order changes with the pressure and the difference rises with the nitrogen dilution as it shown in³³.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The objective of the present study was to evaluate different reduced chemical kinetic schemes with the purpose to understand their applicability and reliability for numerical




FIG. 5. Induction periods and exothermal stage durations dependencies on initial temperature of stoichiometric hydrogen-oxygen mixture at 1atm.

modeling of the complex multiscale phenomena of unsteady multidimensional combustion, which is typically characterized by a flow with large gradients of temperature and pressure. While speed of sound and therefore characteristic hydrodynamic time scales do not depend on pressure, the induction time, especially at the temperature range (1000 ÷ 1200)K is considerably sensitive to pressure. This and different pressure dependencies given by different reduced schemes must be taken into account while modeling unsteady combustion processes. Comparison of different kinetic models and criteria of their agreement with experimental data for the velocity-pressure dependence and width of the flame probably proved to be an effective guide for option of the most reliable kinetic model. To what extend the range of the model applicability should be considered as trustable is not certain due to the lack of available experimental data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The computations were performed on resources provided by the Swedish National Infrastructure for Computing (SNIC) at the Center for Parallel Computers at the Royal Institute




FIG. 6. Laminar flame speed-pressure dependence for stoichiometric hydrogen-oxygen mixture. Experimental data is taken from^{29,30}.

of Technology in Stockholm and the National Supercomputer Centers in Linköping.

* m.liber@nordita.org

- ¹ U. Maas, J. Warnatz, *Combust. Flame* **74** (1988) 53-69. .
- ² T. M. Sloane, P.D. Ronney, *Combust. Sci. Technol.* **88** (1993) 1-13.
- ³ M. A. Liberman, A. D. Kiverin, M. F. Ivanov, *Phys. Rev.* **E 85** (2012) 056312-16.
- ⁴ A. D. Kiverin, D. R. Kassoy, M. F. Ivanov, M. A. Liberman, *Phys. Rev.* **E 87** (2013) 033015(10).
- ⁵ M. F. Ivanov, A. D. Kiverin, I. S. Yakovenko, M. A. Liberman, *Int. Journal of Hydrogen Energy* **38** (2013) 16427-16440.
- ⁶ M. A. Liberman, M.F. Ivanov, D.M. Valiev, L.-E. Eriksson, *Combust. Sci. Technol.* **178**, (2006) 1613-1647.
- ⁷ X. J. Gu, D. R. Emerson, D. Bradley, *Combust. Flame, Combust. Flame* **133** (2003) 63-74.
- ⁸ P.L. Stephenson, R.G. Taylor, *Combust. Flame* **20** (1973) 231-244.
- ⁹ M. O Conaire, H. J. Curran et al., *Int. Journal of Chemical Kinetics* **36(11)** (2004) 603-622.
- ¹⁰ A. A. Konnov, *Khim. Fiz.* **23(8)** (2004) 5-28.

- ¹¹ J. Warnatz, U. Maas, R.W. Dibble, *Combustion. Physical and chemical fundamentals, modeling and simulations, experiments, pollutant formation*, Springer, 2001.
- ¹² A. Y. Kusharin, G. L. Agafonov, O. E. Popov, B. E. Gelfand, *Combust. Sci. Technol.* **135** (1998) 1-6.
- ¹³ GRI-Mech 3.0, available at < http://www.me.berkeley.edu/gri_mech/ >
- ¹⁴ J. O. Hirschfelder, C. F. Gurtiss, R. B. Bird, *Molecular theory of gases and liquids*, Wiley, New York, 1964.
- ¹⁵ B.J. McBride, S. Gordon, M.A. Reno, NASA Technical Memorandum 4513, 1993.
- ¹⁶ O. M. Belotserkovsky, Yu. M. Davydov, *Coarse-particle method in hydrodynamics*, Russian Publ. Inc. Nauka, Mir, Moscow, 1982.
- ¹⁷ M. Slack, A. Grillo, *Investigation of Hydrogen-Air Ignition Sensitized by Nitric Oxide and by Nitrogen Dioxide*, Grumman Research Department Report RE-537, 1977.
- ¹⁸ E. Schultz, J. Shepherd, *Validation of Detailed Reaction Mechanisms for Detonation Simulation*, Report No. FM99-5, Graduate Aeronautical Laboratories, 2000.
- ¹⁹ D. R. Dowdy, D. B. Smith et al., *Proc. Combust. Inst.* **23** (1991), 325-332.
- ²⁰ J. Grumer, E.B. Cook, T.A. Kubala, *Combust. Flame* **3** (1995) 437-446.
- ²¹ T. Iijima, T. Takeno, *Combust. Flame* **65** (1986) 35-43.
- ²² A.D. Snyder, J. Robertson, D.L. Zanders, G.B. Skinner, *Shock Tube Studies of Fuel-Air Ignition Characteristics*, Technical Report AFAPL-TR-65-93, 1965.
- ²³ K.A. Bhaskaran, M.C. Gupta, T.H. Just, *Combust. Flame* **21** (1973) 45-48.
- ²⁴ R.T.E. Hermanns, A.A. Konnov et al., *Energy and Fuels* **21** (2007) 1977-1981.
- ²⁵ E. Hu, Z. Huang, J. He, H. Miao, *Int. Journal of Hydrogen Energy* **34** (2009) 8741-8755.
- ²⁶ Y.N. Shebeko et al., *Combust. Flame* **102** (1995) 427-437.
- ²⁷ X. Qin, H. Kobayashi, T. Niioka, *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science* **21** (2000) 58-63.
- ²⁸ K.T. Aung, M.I. Hassan, G.M. Faeth, *Combust. Flame* **112** (1998) 1-15.
- ²⁹ J.T. Agnew, L.B. Graiff, *Combust. Flame* **5** (1961) 209-219.
- ³⁰ W.A. Strauss, R. Edse, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* **7** (1958) 377-385.
- ³¹ Y.B. Zeldovich, G.I. Barenblatt, V.B. Librovich, G.M. Makhviladze, *The Mathematical Theory of Combustion and Explosion*, Plenum, New York, 1985.
- ³² M. Kuznetsov, M. Liberman, I. Matsukov, *Combust. Sci. Technol.* **182** (2010) 1628-1644.
- ³³ F.N. Egolfopoulos, C.K. Law, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* **23** (1991) 333-340.