## Lecture 6

## Asymptotic Structure for Four-Step Premixed Stoichiometric Methane Flames

Previous lecture:

Asymptotic description of premixed flames based on an assumed one-step reaction.
$\rightarrow \quad$ basic understanding of the flame structure when a large sensitivity to temperature was built into the model.

There is no chemical basis for such a one-step assumption.
$\rightarrow$ results must be regarded with caution when conclusions are drawn about the dependence of the burning velocity on pressure and reactant concentrations, as well as flammability and extinction limits.

While numerical calculations based on full and reduced mechanisms are able to predict these properties, they contribute little to the understanding of the fundamental parameters that influence flame behavior.

Therefore there is a need to fill the gap between the numerical calculations based on mechanisms with elementary kinetics and asymptotic analysis based on assumed chemistry models.

The asymptotic description of stoichiometric methane-air flames based on a four step reduced mechanism, shall be presented in this lecture.

Since the basic chemical parameters were retained, this mechanism has been quite successful in describing the dependence of the burning velocity on pressure and preheat temperature.

A similar asymptotic analysis was also carried out for lean methane flames (Seshadri 1991).

This description may, with some modifications, also serve as a model for other hydrocarbon flames.

This will be shown by using analytical approximation formulas (Göttgens 1992) that are based on the asymptotic description of methane flames for flames of $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6}, \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}, \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{8}$ in air.

## The Four-Step Model for Methane-Air Flames

The four-step model for methane flames is

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
\text { I } & \mathrm{CH}_{4}+2 \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}
\end{array}\right) \mathrm{CO}+4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{CO}
$$

The principle rates governing these global reactions are

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \omega_{\mathrm{I}}=\omega_{11}, \quad \omega_{\mathrm{II}}=\omega_{9} \\
& \omega_{\mathrm{III}}=\omega_{5}, \quad \omega_{\mathrm{IV}}=\omega_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

They correspond to the elementary reactions

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
11 & \mathrm{CH}_{4}+\mathrm{H} & \rightarrow \mathrm{CH}_{3}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \\
9 & \mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{OH} & \rightleftharpoons \mathrm{CO}_{2}+\mathrm{H} \\
5 & \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{M} & \rightarrow \mathrm{HO}_{2}+\mathrm{M} \\
1 & \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{O}_{2} & \rightleftharpoons & \mathrm{OH}+\mathrm{O}
\end{array}
$$

We neglect the influence of the other reactions here in order to make the algebraic description more tractable.

Since OH and O appear in this formulation as reactants we need to express them in terms of the species in the four-step mechanism by using the partial equilibrium assumption for the reaction such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
2 \mathrm{O}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \rightleftharpoons \mathrm{OH}+\mathrm{H} \\
3 \mathrm{OH}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \rightleftharpoons \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\mathrm{H} \\
{[\mathrm{O}]=\frac{[\mathrm{H}][\mathrm{OH}]}{K_{2}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]}} \\
{[\mathrm{OH}]=\frac{\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right][\mathrm{H}]}{K_{3}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]}}
\end{gathered}
$$

where $K_{2}$ and $K_{3}$ are the equilibrium constants of reactions 2 and 3, respectively.

This leads to the following reaction rates of the global steps I-IV:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\omega_{\mathrm{I}} & =k_{11}\left[\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right][\mathrm{H}] \\
\omega_{\mathrm{II}} & =\frac{k_{9 f}[\mathrm{H}]}{K_{3}}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right] \\
\omega_{\mathrm{III}} & \left.=k_{5}[\mathrm{H}]\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right][\mathrm{M}]\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]-\frac{1}{K_{\mathrm{II}}}\left[\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right]\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]\right) \\
\omega_{\text {IV }} & =k_{1} \frac{[\mathrm{H}]}{\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]^{3}}\left(\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]^{3}-\frac{1}{K_{\mathrm{IV}}}[\mathrm{H}]^{2}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

which is explicit in terms of the concentrations of species appearing in the fourstep mechanism.

The equilibrium constants in these rates are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K_{3}=0.216 \exp (7658 / T) \\
& K_{\mathrm{II}}=0.035 \exp (3652 / T) \\
& K_{\mathrm{IV}}=1.48 \exp (6133 / T)
\end{aligned}
$$

We now want to go one step further and assume steady state of the radical H .

Adding reaction IV to I and III leads to the three steps

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}^{\prime} \mathrm{CH}_{4}+\mathrm{O}_{2} & =\mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{H}_{2}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \\
\mathrm{II}^{\prime} \mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} & =\mathrm{CO}_{2}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \\
\text { III }^{\prime} \mathrm{O}_{2}+2 \mathrm{H}_{2} & =2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}
\end{aligned}
$$

with the first three rates given at the previous slide.
$[\mathrm{H}]$ must now be determined from the steady state equation for H

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{I}}+\omega_{\mathrm{III}}=\omega_{\mathrm{IV}}
$$

This may be written as

$$
[\mathrm{H}]=\left[\mathrm{H}_{e q}\right]\left(1-\frac{k_{5}[\mathrm{M}]}{k_{1}}-\frac{k_{11}\left[\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right]}{k_{1}\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

where $\left[\mathrm{H}_{e q}\right]$ based on partial equilibrium of reaction IV

$$
\left[\mathrm{H}_{e q}\right]=K_{\mathrm{IV}}^{1 / 2} \frac{\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{1 / 2}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]^{3 / 2}}{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}
$$

The equation

$$
[\mathrm{H}]=\left[\mathrm{H}_{e q}\right]\left(1-\frac{k_{5}[\mathrm{M}]}{k_{1}}-\frac{k_{11}\left[\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right]}{k_{1}\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

shows an interesting structure:

At temperatures of 1400 K and above the second term in the brackets is small while the ratio $k_{11} / k_{1}$ is much larger than unity.

It follows that $\left[\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right] /\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]$ must be much smaller than unity, if $[\mathrm{H}]$ is to remain real.

This will be used to develop an asymptotic description of the inner layer below but also shows that the equation cannot be valid in the preheat zone upstream of the inner layer where $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ is entirely consumed.

The structure of the flame


From

$$
[\mathrm{H}]=\left[\mathrm{H}_{e q}\right]\left(1-\frac{k_{5}[\mathrm{M}]}{k_{1}}-\frac{k_{11}\left[\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right]}{k_{1}\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

it follows that $[\mathrm{H}]$ vanishes in the preheat zone which is therefore chemically inert.

A further approximation that will reduce the three step mechanism

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{I}^{\prime} \mathrm{CH}_{4}+\mathrm{O}_{2}=\mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{H}_{2}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} \\
\mathrm{II}^{\prime} \mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}=\mathrm{CO}_{2}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \\
\mathrm{III}^{\prime} \mathrm{O}_{2}+2 \mathrm{H}_{2}=2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}
\end{gathered}
$$

effectively to a two-step mechanism is the assumption of partial equilibrium of II.

Assuming $\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]$ and $\left[\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right]$ to be known this leads to a coupling between $[\mathrm{CO}]$ and $\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]$ of the form

$$
[\mathrm{CO}]=\alpha^{\prime}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right], \quad \alpha^{\prime}=\frac{\left[\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right]}{\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]} K_{\mathrm{II}}(T)
$$

By introducing partial equilibrium of reaction II one assumes that the effective rate coefficient $k_{9 f} / K_{3}$ in

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{II}}=\frac{k_{9 f}[\mathrm{H}]}{K_{3}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]}\left([\mathrm{CO}]\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]-\frac{1}{K_{\mathrm{II}}}\left[\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right]\left[\mathrm{H}_{2}\right]\right)
$$

tends to infinity while the term in parenthesis tends to zero and $\omega_{\text {II }}$ remains finite.

Since $\omega_{\mathrm{II}}$ is undefined, the rate $\omega_{\text {II }}$ must be eliminated from the balance equations.

In order to show this the balance equations for the three-step mechanism are written in operator form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Species } \quad \mathrm{L}_{i}\left(Y_{i}\right) \equiv \rho_{u} s_{L} \frac{\mathrm{~d} Y_{i}}{\mathrm{~d} x}-\frac{1}{\mathrm{Le}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\left(\frac{\lambda}{c_{p}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} Y_{i}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right)=W_{i} \sum_{l=I^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{II} I^{\prime}} \nu_{l l} \omega_{l} \\
& \text { Temperature } \mathrm{L}_{T}(T) \equiv \rho_{u} s_{L} \frac{\mathrm{~d} T}{\mathrm{~d} x}-\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\left(\frac{\lambda \mathrm{~d} T}{c_{p}} \mathrm{dx}\right)=\frac{1}{c_{p}} \sum_{l=I^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{II}{ }^{\prime}} Q_{l} \omega_{l} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In terms of the variable $\Gamma_{i}=Y_{i} / W_{i}$ the balance equations for the concentrations are written

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}\right) & =-\omega_{\mathrm{I}} & \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{CO}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CO}}\right) & =\omega_{\mathrm{I}}-\omega_{\mathrm{II}} \\
\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}\right) & =\omega_{\mathrm{I}}+\omega_{\mathrm{III}} & \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}\right)=\omega_{\mathrm{I}}-\omega_{\mathrm{II}}+2 \omega_{\mathrm{III}} . \\
\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}\right) & =\omega_{\mathrm{I}}+\omega_{\mathrm{II}}-2 \omega_{\mathrm{III}} & & \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}\right)=\omega_{\mathrm{II}} .
\end{array}
$$

The rate $\omega_{\text {II }}$ may be eliminated from

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}\right) & =-\omega_{\mathrm{I}} & \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{CO}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CO}}\right) & =\omega_{\mathrm{I}}-\omega_{\mathrm{II}} \\
\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}\right) & =\omega_{\mathrm{I}}+\omega_{\mathrm{III}} & \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}\right) & =\omega_{\mathrm{I}}-\omega_{\mathrm{II}}+2 \omega_{\mathrm{III}} \cdot \\
\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}\right) & =\omega_{\mathrm{I}}+\omega_{\mathrm{II}}-2 \omega_{\mathrm{III}} & & \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}\right)=\omega_{\mathrm{II}} .
\end{array}
$$

by combining the balance equations of $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ with that of CO

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{CO}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CO})}=2 \omega_{\mathrm{I}}-2 \omega_{\mathrm{III}}\right.\right. \\
& \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}\right)-\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{CO}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CO}}\right)=2 \omega_{\mathrm{III}} \\
& \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}\right)+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{CO}}\left(\Gamma_{\mathrm{CO}}\right)=\omega_{\mathrm{I}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We will anticipate that in the thin reaction layers to be considered below, the diffusive terms dominate for the same reason as in the thin reaction zone for the one-step model.

Therefore we will neglect the convective terms in

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Species } \quad \mathrm{L}_{i}\left(Y_{i}\right) \equiv \rho_{u} s_{L} \frac{\mathrm{~d} Y_{i}}{\mathrm{~d} x}-\frac{1}{\mathrm{Le}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\left(\frac{\lambda}{c_{p}} \frac{\mathrm{~d} Y_{i}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right)=W_{i} \sum_{l=I^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{II} I^{\prime}} \nu_{i l} \omega_{l} \\
& \text { Temperature } \mathrm{L}_{T}(T) \equiv \rho_{u} s_{L} \frac{\mathrm{~d} T}{\mathrm{~d} x}-\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\left(\frac{\lambda}{c_{p} \mathrm{~d} T} \mathrm{c}_{l}\right)=\frac{1}{c_{p}} \sum_{l=I^{\prime}}^{\mathrm{III}} Q_{l} \omega_{l} .
\end{aligned}
$$

for the thin reaction zones and consider only the diffusive terms.

This suggests that the concentrations should be scaled with the Lewis numbers.

We introduce the non-dimensional variables

$$
\begin{gathered}
X_{i}=\frac{Y_{i} W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} u} W_{i}} \quad, \quad x_{i}=\frac{X_{i}}{L \mathrm{e}_{i}}, \\
T^{*}=\frac{T-T_{u}}{T_{b}-T_{u}} \quad, \quad x^{*}=\rho_{u} s_{L} \int_{0}^{x} \frac{c_{p}}{\lambda} \mathrm{~d} x \\
\omega_{l}^{*}=\frac{\lambda W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}} \omega_{l}}{c_{p} Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} u}(\rho v)_{u}^{2}} \quad, \quad Q_{l}^{*}=\frac{Q_{l} Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} u}}{c_{p}\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right) W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and redefine the parameter $\alpha^{\prime}$

$$
\alpha=\alpha^{\prime} \frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}}{\mathrm{Le} \mathrm{CO}_{\mathrm{CO}}}
$$

With $x_{\mathrm{CO}}=\alpha x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}$ one obtains the following balance equations of the two-step mechanism (the asterisks will be removed from here on)

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}} & =-\omega_{\mathrm{I}} \\
-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} x_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}} & =-\omega_{\mathrm{I}}-\omega_{\mathrm{III}} \\
-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}} & =\frac{2}{1+\alpha}\left(\omega_{\mathrm{I}}-\omega_{\mathrm{III}}\right) \\
-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} x_{\mathrm{CO}}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}} & =\frac{2 \alpha}{1+\alpha}\left(\omega_{\mathrm{I}}-\omega_{\mathrm{III}}\right) \\
-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} x_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}} & =\frac{2 \alpha}{1+\alpha} \omega_{\mathrm{I}}+\frac{2}{1+\alpha} \omega_{\mathrm{III}} \\
-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} x_{\mathrm{CO}}}{d x^{2}} & =\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha} \omega_{\mathrm{I}}+\frac{2 \alpha}{1+\alpha} \omega_{\mathrm{III}}
\end{aligned}
$$

The stoichiometric coefficients are those of the two global reactions

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{I}^{\prime \prime} \quad \mathrm{CH}_{4}+\mathrm{O}_{2}=\frac{2}{1+\alpha}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}+\alpha \mathrm{CO}\right)+\frac{2 \alpha}{1+\alpha} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha} \mathrm{CO}_{2}, \\
& \text { III }^{\prime} \quad \mathrm{O}_{2}+\frac{2}{1+\alpha}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}+\alpha \mathrm{CO}\right)=\frac{2}{1+\alpha} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\frac{2 \alpha}{1+\alpha} \mathrm{CO}_{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the combination $\mathrm{H}_{2}+\alpha \mathrm{CO}$ appears as an intermediate which is formed in I' and consumed in III".

The rates of these reactions are still the same as of I and III in the four-step mechanism.

If the balance equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{I}^{\prime \prime} \quad \mathrm{CH}_{4}+\mathrm{O}_{2}=\frac{2}{1+\alpha}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}+\alpha \mathrm{CO}\right)+\frac{2 \alpha}{1+\alpha} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha} \mathrm{CO}_{2}, \\
& \text { IIII }^{\prime} \quad \mathrm{O}_{2}+\frac{2}{1+\alpha}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}+\alpha \mathrm{CO}\right)=\frac{2}{1+\alpha} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\frac{2 \alpha}{1+\alpha} \mathrm{CO}_{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

are used to determine $x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}$ and $x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}$, all other concentrations and the temperature can be determined deriving the following coupling equations in addition using the corresponding temperature equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathrm{d}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}}\left[(1+\alpha) x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+4 x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}-2 x_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}\right]=0 \\
& \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}}\left[x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+2 x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}+x_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}\right]=0 \\
& \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}}\left[x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}+x_{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}\right]=0 \\
& \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}}\left[\left(q_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+\alpha q_{\mathrm{CO}}\right) x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}+T\right]=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the reduced heats of reaction are

$$
\begin{aligned}
q_{\mathrm{H}_{2}} & =\frac{1}{2} \frac{Q_{\mathrm{III}}}{Q}=0.3116 \\
q_{\mathrm{CO}} & =\frac{\left(\frac{1}{2} Q_{\mathrm{III}}+Q_{\mathrm{II}}\right)}{Q}=0.3479
\end{aligned}
$$

where $Q$ is the heat of reaction of the global step

$$
\mathrm{CH}_{4}+2 \mathrm{O}_{2}=\mathrm{CO}_{2}+2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} .
$$

In the following we approximate both $q_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}$ and $q_{\mathrm{CO}}$ by $q=0.33$ for simplicity.

## The Asymptotic Structure of Stoichiometric Methane-Air Flames

Flame structure of the
two-step mechanism

It contains three layers

1. a chemically inert preheat zone of order 1 upstream,

2. an thin inner layer of order $\delta$ in which the fuel is consumed and the intermediates $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ and CO are formed according to the global step I",
3. a thin oxidation layer of order $\varepsilon$ downstream where $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ and CO are oxidized according, to the global step III".

At first the inner layer shall be analyzed.


We will denote quantities at the inner layer with a subscript 0 but the inner layer temperature as $T^{0}$.
In this layer all concentrations except that of the fuel, which is depleted may be assumed constant to leading order.

Introducing

$$
[\mathrm{H}]=\left[\mathrm{H}_{e q}\right]
$$

into

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{I}}=k_{11}\left[\mathrm{CH}_{4}\right][\mathrm{H}]
$$

leads to

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{I}}=\mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{I}} x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}\left(1-\frac{x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\delta}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

Where the Damköhler number is

$$
\mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{I}}=\frac{\rho_{0}^{2}}{\rho_{u}^{2} s_{L}^{2}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p 0}} \frac{\left(K_{\mathrm{IV}} X_{\mathrm{O}_{2}} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3}\right)_{0}^{1 / 2}}{X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}} k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right)
$$

The small parameter $\delta$ was defined as

$$
\delta=\frac{k_{1}\left(T^{0}\right) X_{\mathrm{O}_{2}, \mathrm{O}}}{k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right) \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}
$$

It denotes the ratio of the rate coefficients of reaction I and II

Thereby it describes the competition of these two reactions in producing and consuming H-radicals according to the global steps IV and I.

Since it happens that the reaction rate $k_{1}$ is typically smaller than $k_{11}$, and since also $X_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}$ in the inner layer $X_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}<1, \delta \approx 0.1$ and sufficiently small for an asymptotic expansion.

If $\delta$ is small, since $\omega_{I}$ must be real it follows from

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta & =\frac{k_{1}\left(T^{0}\right) X_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}, 0}{k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right) \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}}^{4}} \\
\omega_{\mathrm{I}} & =\mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{I}} x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}\left(1-\frac{x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\delta}\right)^{1 / 2}
\end{aligned}
$$

the term in paranthesis that $x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}$ must not exceed the value of $\delta$.

The flame structure shows that the fuel is of order 1 in the preheat zone but decreases rapidly towards the inner layer.

In the inner $x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}$ is then of order $\delta$ and one may introduce the scaling

$$
y=\frac{x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\delta}
$$

and the stretched variable

$$
\zeta=\frac{x}{\delta}
$$

Introducing these into $\quad-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} x_{\mathrm{CH}}}{\mathrm{d} x^{2}}=-\omega_{\mathrm{I}}$,
it leads to the differential equation that governs the structure of the inner layer

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} y}{\mathrm{~d} \zeta^{2}}=\left(\delta^{2} \mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{I}}\right) y(1-y)^{1 / 2} .
$$

The downstream boundary condition of this equation is

$$
y=0 \quad \text { as } \quad \zeta \rightarrow+\infty
$$

since reaction I is irreversible.

The matching with the preheat zone should, as for the one-step asymptotic problem, provide the second boundary condition.

The solution for the fuel concentration in the preheat zone is

$$
x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}=1-\exp \left(\operatorname{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}} x\right)
$$

which leads to the expansion $x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}=-x$ around $x=0$.

It is shown in (Peters 1987), however, that the inner layer and the preheat zone are separated by an additional thin layer, the radical consumption layer.

$$
y=0 \quad \text { as } \quad \zeta \rightarrow+\infty
$$

In this layer the steady state approximation for the H -radical breaks down.

This layer occurs at $y=1, \zeta=-1$ in terms of the inner layer variables.

Since the fuel is not consumed in this radical layer the slope of the fuel concentration is continuous and matching across this layer leads to

$$
y=1, \quad \frac{\mathrm{~d} y}{\mathrm{~d} \zeta}=-1 \quad \text { at } \quad \zeta=-1 .
$$

With the boundary conditions

$$
y=0 \quad \text { as } \quad \zeta \rightarrow+\infty
$$

and

$$
y=1, \quad \frac{\mathrm{~d} y}{\mathrm{~d} \zeta}=-1 \quad \text { at } \quad \zeta=-1
$$

the equation

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} y}{\mathrm{~d} \zeta^{2}}=\left(\delta^{2} \mathrm{D} \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{I}}\right) y(1-y)^{1 / 2} .
$$

can be integrated once to obtain the eigenvalue

$$
\delta^{2} \mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{I}}=\frac{15}{8}
$$

With

$$
\delta^{2} \mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{I}}=\frac{15}{8}
$$

one could now determine the burning velocity $s_{L}$ if the temperature $T^{0}$ and all other properties at the inner layer were known.

In order to determine these, the structure of the oxidation layer also must be resolved. In the oxidation layer $x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}=0 \$$ and therefore $\omega_{\mathrm{I}}=0$.

The temperature varies only slowly in this layer and since the activation energy of $k_{5}$ is small, temperature variations may be neglected.

Since most of the chemical activity takes place in the vicinity of the inner layer, all properties shall be evaluated at $x=0$.

Choosing $x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}$ as the dependent variable in the oxidation layer and scaling it in terms of a new variable $z$ as

$$
x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}=\frac{\varepsilon z}{(1+\alpha) q}
$$

one may use the coupling relations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}}\left[(1+\alpha) x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+4 x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}-2 x_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}\right] & =0,
\end{aligned} \begin{aligned}
\mathrm{d} x^{2} & \left.x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+2 x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}+x_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}\right]=0 \\
\frac{\mathrm{~d}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}}\left[x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}+x_{\mathrm{CO}_{2}}\right] & =0,
\end{aligned} \frac{\frac{\mathrm{~d}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}}\left[\left(q_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+\alpha q_{\mathrm{CO}}\right) x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}+x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}+T\right]=0}{}
$$

to show that the downstream boundary conditions are satisfied by

$$
x_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}=\varepsilon z / 2 q, \quad T=1-\varepsilon z
$$

In these expansions $\varepsilon$ is the small parameter related to the thickness of the oxidation layer.

Introducing $\quad x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}=\frac{\varepsilon z}{(1+\alpha) q} \quad$ and $\quad \omega_{\text {III }}=2 q D a_{\text {III }} \varepsilon^{3} z^{3}$
into

$$
\omega_{\text {III }}=k_{5}[\mathrm{H}]\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right][\mathrm{M}]
$$

leads to

$$
\omega_{\text {III }}=2 q \mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{III}} \varepsilon^{3} z^{3},
$$

where the Damköhler number of reaction III is defined as

$$
\mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{III}}=\frac{\rho_{0}^{2}}{\rho_{u}^{2} s_{L}^{2}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p 0}}\left(\frac{K_{\mathrm{IV}} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{3} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3}}{2^{5}(1+\alpha)^{3}}\right)_{0}^{1 / 2} \frac{k_{5}[\mathrm{M}]}{q^{4} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} .
$$

The concentration of the third body in reaction 5 may be determined approximately by using the third body efficiencies evaluated at the burnt gas conditions.

This leads to

$$
[\mathrm{M}]=\frac{1.6 p}{\mathcal{R} T}
$$

which introduces a pressure dependence of $\mathrm{Da}_{\text {III }}$ and will finally determine the pressure dependence of the burning velocity.

Introduction of a stretched coordinate

$$
\eta=\frac{2 q x}{\varepsilon}
$$

then leads with $\omega_{\mathrm{I}}=0$ from

$$
-\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{2}}=\frac{2}{1+\alpha}\left(\omega_{\mathrm{I}}-\omega_{\mathrm{III}}\right)
$$

to the governing equation of the oxidation layer

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} z}{\mathrm{~d} \eta^{2}}=\left(\varepsilon^{4} \mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{III}}\right) z^{3}
$$

This suggests the definition

$$
\varepsilon=\mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{III}}^{-1 / 4}
$$

It turns out that for $p \geq 1 \mathrm{~atm} \varepsilon$ is smaller than unity but typically larger than $\delta$.

Even though $\delta$ is not very small, we will consider it as small enough to justify an asymptotic description of the oxidation layer.

The downstream boundary condition of equation

$$
\eta=\frac{2 q x}{\varepsilon}
$$

is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} z}{\mathrm{~d} \eta^{2}}=\left(\varepsilon^{4} \mathrm{Da}_{\text {III }}\right) z^{3} . \\
& z=0 \text { for } \eta \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

since reaction III is irreversible.

The upstream boundary condition must be determined from jump conditions across the inner layer.

Since the fuel is depleted and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is formed in the inner layer following reaction I", the stoichiometry of this reaction also determines the change of slopes of the $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ in comparison of those of the fuel.

This is written as

$$
\left.\frac{\mathrm{d} x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right|_{0-}-\left.\frac{\mathrm{d} x_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right|_{0+}=\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\left(\left.\frac{\mathrm{~d} x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right|_{0-}-\left.\frac{\mathrm{d} x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right|_{0+}\right)
$$

Since the thickness of the preheat zone is of order 1 and that of the oxidation layer of order $\varepsilon$ the upstream slope of the $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ concentration can be neglected compared to the downstream slope

$$
\left.\left.\frac{\mathrm{d} x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right|_{0+} \ll \frac{\mathrm{d} x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~d} x}\right|_{0-}
$$

It then follows with $x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}=\frac{\varepsilon z}{(1+\alpha) q} \quad$ and $\quad \eta=\frac{2 q x}{\varepsilon}$
that the upstream boundary condition of $\frac{\mathrm{d}^{2} z}{\mathrm{~d} \eta^{2}}=\left(\varepsilon^{4} \mathrm{D} \mathrm{a}_{\text {III }}\right) z^{3}$ reads

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} z}{\mathrm{~d} \eta}=-1 \quad \text { at } \quad \eta=0
$$

Then the solution is

$$
z=\frac{2^{1 / 2}}{2^{1 / 4}+\eta}
$$

with

$$
z_{0}=2^{1 / 4} \quad \text { at } \quad \eta=0
$$



The profile shows a very slow decrease of $z$ towards $\eta \rightarrow \infty$.


This may explain why in numerically and experimentally obtained concentration and temperature profiles the downstream conditions are approached only very far behind the flame.

## An Analytic Expression for the Burning Velocity

The result

$$
z_{0}=2^{1 / 4} \quad \text { at } \quad \eta=0 .
$$

may now be used in

$$
x_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}=\frac{\varepsilon z}{(1+\alpha) q}
$$

and

$$
\omega_{\mathrm{III}}=2 q \mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{III}} \varepsilon^{3} z^{3}
$$

to determine the quantities required in

$$
\mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{I}}=\frac{\rho_{0}^{2}}{\rho_{u}^{2} s_{L}^{2}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p 0}} \frac{\left(K_{\mathrm{IV}} X_{\mathrm{O}_{2}} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3}\right)_{0}^{1 / 2}}{X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}} k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right) .
$$

and thereby the burning velocity $s_{L}$.

By dividing $(\operatorname{rref}\{7.23\})$

$$
\mathrm{Da}_{\mathrm{I}}=\frac{\rho_{0}^{2}}{\rho_{u}^{2} s_{L}^{2}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p 0}} \frac{\left(K_{\mathrm{IV}} X_{\mathrm{O}_{2}} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3}\right)_{0}^{1 / 2}}{X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}} k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right)
$$

by

$$
\eta=\frac{2 q x}{\varepsilon}
$$

one can eliminate $s_{L}$ and obtain a relation of the form

$$
\frac{k_{1}^{2}\left(T^{0}\right)}{k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right) k_{5}\left(T^{0}\right) /\left(\mathcal{R} / T^{0}\right)}=1.5 p \frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}
$$

Here the universal gas constant must be used as $\mathcal{R}=82.05 \mathrm{~atm} \mathrm{~cm} 3 / \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{K}$ in order to be consistent with the units of the reaction rates and the pressure.

The equation

$$
\frac{k_{1}^{2}\left(T^{0}\right)}{k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right) k_{5}\left(T^{0}\right) /\left(\mathcal{R} / T^{0}\right)}=1.5 p \frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}
$$

Shows that with the rate coefficients fixed, the inner layer temperature is function of the pressure only.

It does not depend on the preheat temperature, the dilution of the fuel concentration in the unburnt mixture and thereby the adiabatic flame temperature.

After some algebraic manipulations the expression for the burning velocity reads

$$
s_{L}^{2}=\frac{8}{15} \frac{k_{1}^{2}}{k_{11}} \frac{1}{k^{4} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}, u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p_{0}}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{5} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3} K_{\mathrm{IV}}\left(T^{0}\right)}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}{ }^{5}\left(1+\alpha_{0}\right)^{3}}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{T_{u}^{2}\left(T_{b}-T^{0}\right)^{4}}{T_{0}^{2}} \frac{\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{4}}{}
$$

where $\quad z_{0}=2^{1 / 4}$ at $\eta=0 \quad$ and $\quad \omega_{\text {III }}=2 q D a_{\text {III }} \varepsilon^{3} z^{3}$
were used to relate $\varepsilon$ to the difference between $T_{b}$ and $T^{0}$

$$
\varepsilon z_{0}=\frac{T_{b}-T^{0}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}
$$

Burning velocity $s_{L}^{2}=\frac{8}{15} \frac{k_{1}^{2}}{k_{11}} \frac{1}{q^{4} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}, u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p_{0}}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{5} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3} K_{\mathrm{IV}}\left(T^{0}\right)}{\left.\operatorname{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} 2^{5}\left(1+\alpha_{0}\right)^{3}}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{T_{u}^{2}}{T_{0}^{2}} \frac{\left(T_{b}-T^{0}\right)^{4}}{\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{4}}}\right.$

Pressure

$$
\frac{k_{1}^{2}\left(T^{0}\right)}{k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right) k_{5}\left(T^{0}\right) /\left(\mathcal{R} / T^{0}\right)}=1.5 p \frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}
$$

For an undiluted flame with $T_{u}=300 \mathrm{~K}$ as a function of $T^{0}$ choosing $p=1 \mathrm{~atm}$ one obtains a laminar burning velocity of $54 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$ for stoichiometric methane flames.


This value is satisfactory in view of the many approximations that were made and the few kinetic rates that were retained.

In fact, it is seen from

$$
\frac{k_{1}^{2}\left(T^{0}\right)}{k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right) k_{5}\left(T^{0}\right) /\left(\mathcal{R} / T^{0}\right)}=1.5 p \frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}
$$

and

$$
s_{L}^{2}=\frac{8}{15} \frac{k_{1}^{2}}{k_{11}} \frac{1}{q^{4} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}, u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p_{0}}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{5} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3} K_{\mathrm{IV}}\left(T^{0}\right)}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}{ }^{25}\left(1+\alpha_{0}\right)^{3}}^{3}}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{T_{u}^{2}\left(T_{b}-T^{0}\right)^{4}}{T_{0}^{2}} \frac{\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{4}}{}
$$

that only the rates of reactions 1,5 , and 11 influence the burning velocity in this approximation.

## A further consequence of equation

$$
s_{L}^{2}=\frac{8}{15} \frac{k_{1}^{2}}{k_{11}} \frac{1}{q^{4} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}, u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p_{0}}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{5} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3} K_{\mathrm{IV}}\left(T^{0}\right)}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4} 2^{5}}{ }^{5}\left(1+\alpha_{0}\right)^{3}}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{T_{u}^{2}\left(T_{b}-T^{0}\right)^{4}}{T_{0}^{2}} \frac{\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{4}}{}
$$

is that the burning velocity vanishes as $T^{0}$ reaches $T_{b}$.

With $T_{b}=2320 \mathrm{~K}$ the pressure is larger than approximately 20 atm .


Different values of $T_{b}$ would been obtained for a diluted or preheated flame.

The fact that at a fixed pressure $T^{0}$ is fixed by the rate of rate coefficients points towards the possibility to explain flammability limits at least in terms of dilution for stoichiometric flames:

If the amount of fuel is so low that in the unburnt mixture the corresponding adiabatic flame temperature is lower than $T_{0}$, a premixed flame cannot be established.

## Relation to the Activation Energy of the One-step Model

Using the burning velocity expression from the preceding lecture

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho_{u} s_{L} & =\sqrt{2 \frac{B \rho_{b}^{2} \lambda_{b} \mathcal{R}^{2} T_{b}^{4}}{c_{p}\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{2} E^{2}} \exp \left(-\frac{E}{\mathcal{R} T_{b}}\right) S} \\
S & =\frac{\nu_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}^{\prime} Y_{\mathrm{O}_{2}, b}}{M_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}+\frac{\nu_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{\prime} Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}, b}}{M_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}+\frac{2 \nu_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{\prime} \nu_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}^{\prime} c_{p} \mathcal{R} T_{b}^{2}}{(-\Delta H) E}
\end{aligned}
$$

one may plot the burning velocity in an Arrhenius diagram over $1 / T_{b}$.

Then in the limit of a large activation energy the slope in this diagram is given

$$
\frac{d \ln s_{\mathrm{L}}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d}\left(1 / T_{\mathrm{b}}\right)}=-\frac{E}{\mathcal{R}} \quad \text { or } \quad \frac{\mathrm{d} \ln \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{L}}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} \ln T_{\mathrm{b}}}=\frac{E}{\mathcal{R} T_{b}}
$$

Applying this form to

$$
s_{L}^{2}=\frac{8}{15} \frac{k_{1}^{2}}{k_{11}} \frac{1}{q^{4} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}, u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p_{0}}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{5} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3} K_{\mathrm{IV}}\left(T^{0}\right)}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}} 2^{5}\left(1+\alpha_{0}\right)^{3}}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{T_{u}^{2}}{T_{0}^{2}} \frac{\left(T_{b}-T^{0}\right)^{4}}{\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{4}}
$$

with $T^{0}$ fixed leads to

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} \ln s_{L}^{2}}{\mathrm{~d} \ln T_{b}}=\frac{4 T_{b}}{T_{b}-T^{0}}-\frac{4 T_{b}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}
$$

Since the second of the terms is much smaller then the first, one obtains with

$$
\varepsilon z_{0}=\frac{T_{b}-T^{0}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}
$$

when $T^{0}$ approaches $T_{b}$ and $\varepsilon$ is small

$$
\frac{E}{R T_{b}}=\frac{4 T_{b}}{T_{b}-T_{u}} \frac{1}{\varepsilon z_{0}}
$$

Therefore the Zeldovich number

$$
\mathrm{Ze}=\frac{E\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)}{\mathcal{R} T_{b}^{2}}
$$

introduced in the previous lecture may be expressed as

$$
\mathrm{Ze}=\frac{E\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)}{R T_{b}^{2}}=\frac{4}{\varepsilon z_{0}}
$$

In the one-step model the thickness of the reaction zone was of the order of the inverse of the Zeldovich number.

This corresponds for the two-step model for methane flames to the thickness of the oxidation layer.

Therefore the oxidation layer seems to play a similar role in hydrocarbon flames as the reaction zone in one-step asymptotics.

Values of the Zeldovich number for lean to stoichiometric methane flames, obtained by asymptotic analysis in Seshadri 1991.

The Zeldovich number measures the sensitivity of the burning velocity to perturbations of the maximum temperature.


This sensitivity increases when the mixture becomes leaner and the pressure increases.

The flame will then become very sensitive to heat loss and flame stretch effects.

## Analytic Approximations of Burning Velocities for Lean $\mathbf{C H}_{4}, \mathbf{C}_{2} \mathbf{H}_{6}, \mathbf{C}_{2} \mathbf{H}_{4}$,

## $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$, and $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{8}}$ Flames

The burning velocity expression

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s_{L}^{2}=\frac{8}{15} \frac{k_{1}^{2}}{k_{11}} \frac{1}{q^{4} X_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}} \frac{Y_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}, u}}{W_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}} \frac{\lambda_{0}}{c_{p_{0}}}\left(\frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{5} \mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{H}_{2}}^{3} K_{\mathrm{IV}}\left(T^{0}\right)}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}} 2^{5}\left(1+\alpha_{0}\right)^{3}}\right)^{1 / 2} \frac{T_{u}^{2}\left(T_{b}-T^{0}\right)^{4}}{T_{0}^{2}} \frac{\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{4}}{} \\
& \frac{k_{1}^{2}\left(T^{0}\right)}{k_{11}\left(T^{0}\right) k_{5}\left(T^{0}\right) /\left(\mathcal{R} / T^{0}\right)}=1.5 p \frac{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{CH}_{4}}}{\mathrm{Le}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

presented may be generalized by writing an approximation formula for burning velocities as

$$
s_{L}=Y_{\mathrm{F}, u}^{m} A\left(T^{0}\right) \frac{T_{u}}{T^{0}}\left(\frac{T_{b}-T^{0}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}\right)^{n} \quad \text { and } \quad p=P\left(T^{0}\right)
$$

where the functions $A\left(T^{0}\right)$ and $P\left(T^{0}\right)$ are determined by fitting numerical or experimental data and the values $m=1 / 2$ and $n=2$ would correspond to the previous expressions for premixed methane flames.
$p=P\left(T^{0}\right)$ assumes that the inner layer temperature is a function of pressure only, and it does not depend, for instance, on the equivalence ratio.

This is a fairly crude approximation as may be seen when inner layer temperatures obtained from asymptotic analysis (Seshadri 1991) are plotted together with the adiabatic temperatures as a function of the equivalence ratio.


If the structure $\mathrm{o} p=P\left(T^{0}\right)$ hydrocarbon fuel is similar to that of methane, these exponents should not differ very much from these numbers.

Since $A\left(T^{0}\right)$ and $B\left(T^{0}\right)$ contain essentially the temperature dependence due to rate coefficients, we express them in Arrhenius form

$$
A\left(T^{0}\right)=F \exp \left(-G / T^{0}\right) \quad P\left(T^{0}\right)=B \exp \left(-E / T^{0}\right)
$$

This concept was tested by Göttgens 1992.

The basis of the approximation was a data set of $197,223,252,248$, and 215 premixed flames for $\mathrm{CH}_{4}, \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6}, \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}, \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{8}$, in the range between $p=1 \mathrm{~atm}$ and $40 \mathrm{~atm}, T_{u}$ between 298 K and 800 K , and the fuel-air equivalence ratio between $\phi=0.4$ and 1.0.

A nonlinear approximation procedure was employed, yielding the following values for the coefficients:

| fuel | $B[$ bar $]$ | $E[\mathrm{~K}]$ | $F[\mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}]$ | $G[\mathrm{~K}]$ | $m$ | $n$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | 3.1557 e 8 | 23873.0 | 22.176 | -6444.27 | 0.565175 | 2.5158 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ | 56834.0 | 11344.4 | 37746.6 | 1032.36 | 0.907619 | 2.5874 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ | 3.7036 e 5 | 14368.7 | 9978.9 | 263.23 | 0.771333 | 2.3998 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ | 4.3203 e 6 | 18859.0 | 1900.41 | -506.973 | 0.431345 | 2.1804 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{8}$ | 2.2502 e 6 | 17223.5 | 1274.89 | -1324.78 | 0.582214 | 2.3970 |

The approximation was surprisingly the best for $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$, yielding a standard deviation for $s_{L}$ of $2.3 \%$, followed by $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ with $3.2 \%, \mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{8}$ with $6.2 \%$, and $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ with $7.4 \%$.

These deviations may be considered extremely small in view of the fact that such a large range of equivalence ratios, pressures and preheat temperatures has been covered with an approximation formula containing only six coefficients.

A closer look at the exponents $m$ and $n$ shows that $m$ is close to $1 / 2$ for $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{8}$, but close to unity for $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$.

This suggests that the asymptotic model for these flames should differ from the one for $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ in some important details.

The exponent $m$ lies around 2.5 and thereby sufficiently close to 2 for all fuels.

Burning velocities for methane calculated from

$$
s_{L}=Y_{F u}^{m} A\left(T^{0}\right) \frac{T_{u}}{T^{0}}\left(\frac{T_{b}-T^{0}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}\right)^{n} \quad \text { and } \quad p=P\left(T^{0}\right)
$$

are plotted as a function of equivalence ratio for different pressures at $T_{u}=298 \mathrm{~K}$ and compared with the values obtained from the numerical computations.

Generally the largest derivations from the numerical computations occur around $\phi=1$.


Burning velocities for methane calculated from

$$
s_{L}=Y_{F u}^{m} A\left(T^{0}\right) \frac{T_{u}}{T^{0}}\left(\frac{T_{b}-T^{0}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}\right)^{n} \quad \text { and } \quad p=P\left(T^{0}\right)
$$

The pressure and unburnt temperature variation of $s_{L}$ at stoichiometric mixture are plotted for propane.


## Example

From the approximation

$$
s_{L}=Y_{\mathrm{F}, u}^{m} A\left(T^{0}\right) \frac{T_{u}}{T^{0}}\left(\frac{T_{b}-T^{0}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}\right)^{n}
$$

calculate in comparison with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho_{u} s_{L} & =\sqrt{2 \frac{B \rho_{b}^{2} \lambda_{b} \mathcal{R}^{2} T_{b}^{4}}{c_{p}\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{2} E^{2}} \exp \left(-\frac{E}{\mathcal{R} T_{b}}\right) S} \\
S & =\frac{\nu_{\mathrm{F}}^{\prime} Y_{\mathrm{O}_{2}, b}}{M_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}+\frac{\nu_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{\prime} Y_{\mathrm{F}, b}}{M_{\mathrm{F}}}+\frac{2 \nu_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{\prime} \nu_{\mathrm{F}}^{\prime} c_{p} \mathcal{R} T_{b}^{2}}{(-\Delta H) E} .
\end{aligned}
$$

those activation energy, which describes the change of the reaction rate as function of the change in $T_{b}$.
Thereby $T_{u}$ and $T^{0}$ should be considered constant.

## Solution

If one writes

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho_{u} s_{L} & =\sqrt{2 \frac{B \rho_{b}^{2} \lambda_{b} \mathcal{R}^{2} T_{b}^{4}}{c_{p}\left(T_{b}-T_{u}\right)^{2} E^{2}} \exp \left(-\frac{E}{\mathcal{R} T_{b}}\right) S} \\
S & =\frac{\nu_{\mathrm{F}}^{\prime} Y_{\mathrm{O}_{2}, b}}{M_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}+\frac{\nu_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{\prime} Y_{\mathrm{F}, b}}{M_{\mathrm{F}}}+\frac{2 \nu_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{\prime} \nu_{\mathrm{F}}^{\prime} c_{p} \mathcal{R} T_{b}^{2}}{(-\Delta H) E} .
\end{aligned}
$$

approximately as

$$
\left(\rho_{u} s_{L}\right)^{2}=\text { const } \exp \left(-E / \mathcal{R} T_{b}\right)
$$

and logarithmizes this expression

$$
2 \ln \left(\rho_{u} s_{L}\right)=\ln (\text { const })-\frac{E}{\mathcal{R} T_{b}},
$$

one can determine the activation energy by differentiation with respect to $1 / T_{b}$.

This leads to

$$
\frac{E}{\mathcal{R}}=-2 \frac{\mathrm{~d} \ln \left(\rho_{u} s_{L}\right)}{\mathrm{d}\left(1 / T_{b}\right)}=2 T_{b}^{2} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} T_{b}}\left(\ln \left(\rho_{u} s_{L}\right)\right)
$$

Using this in

$$
s_{L}=Y_{F, u}^{m} A\left(T^{0}\right) \frac{T_{u}}{T^{0}}\left(\frac{T_{b}-T^{0}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}\right)^{n}
$$

for $\rho_{u}=$ const, it follows

$$
2 T_{b}^{2} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{~d} T_{b}}\left(\ln \left(\rho_{u} s_{L}\right)\right)=\frac{2 n T_{b}}{T_{b}-T_{0}}-\frac{2 n T_{b}}{T_{b}-T_{u}}
$$

Therefore one obtains for the Zeldovich number Ze

$$
\mathrm{Ze}=n\left(\frac{T_{b}-T_{u}}{T_{b}-T_{0}}-1\right)
$$

Here, following

$$
p=P\left(T^{0}\right)
$$

$T^{0}$ is only dependent on pressure, while $T_{b}$ following

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T_{b}(Z)=T_{u}(Z)+\frac{Q_{\mathrm{ref}} Y_{\mathrm{F}, 1}}{c_{p} \nu_{\mathrm{F}}^{\prime} W_{\mathrm{F}}} Z, \quad Z \leq Z_{s t}, \\
& T_{b}(Z)=T_{u}(Z)+\frac{Q_{\mathrm{ref}} Y_{\mathrm{O}_{2}, 2}}{c_{p} \nu_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{\prime} W_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}(1-Z) \quad Z \geq Z_{s t}
\end{aligned}
$$

depends both on $T_{u}$ and on the fuel-air ratio $\phi=1 / \lambda$.

If the difference $T_{b}-T_{0}$ is small compared with $T_{b}-T_{u}$, the second term in the parenthesis can be neglected..

