



ELSEVIER

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

Proceedings of the Combustion Institute 30 (2005) 1101–1109

Proceedings
of the
Combustion
Institute

www.elsevier.com/locate/proci

Experimental and computational study of nonpremixed ignition of dimethyl ether in counterflow

X.L. Zheng^a, T.F. Lu^a, C.K. Law^{a,*}, C.K. Westbrook^b, H.J. Curran^c

^a Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA

^b Lawrence Livermore Laboratories, Livermore, CA 94550, USA

^c Department of Chemistry, National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland

Abstract

The ignition temperature of nitrogen-diluted dimethyl ether (DME) by heated air in counterflow was experimentally determined for DME concentration from 5.9% to 30%, system pressure from 1.5 to 3.0 atm, and pressure-weighted strain rate from 110 to 170 s⁻¹. These experimental data were compared with two mechanisms that were, respectively, available in 1998 and 2003, with the latter being a substantially updated version of the former. The comparison showed that while the 1998-mechanism uniformly over-predicted the ignition temperature, the 2003-mechanism yielded a surprisingly close agreement for all experimental data. Sensitivity analysis for the near-ignition state based on both mechanisms identified the deficiencies of the 1998-mechanism, in particular, the specifics of the low-temperature cool flame chemistry in effecting ignition at higher temperatures, as the fuel stream is being progressively heated from its cold boundary to the high-temperature ignition region around the hot-stream boundary. The 2003-mechanism, consisting of 79 species and 398 elementary reactions, was then systematically simplified by using the directed relation graph method to a skeletal mechanism of 49 species and 251 elementary reactions, which in turn was simplified further by using computational singular perturbation method and quasi-steady-state species assumption to a reduced mechanism consisting of 33 species and 28 lumped reactions. It was demonstrated that both the skeletal and reduced mechanisms mimicked the performance of the detailed mechanism with high accuracy.

© 2004 The Combustion Institute. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Dimethyl ether; Ignition; Reduced mechanism

1. Introduction

Dimethyl ether (DME), CH₃OCH₃, is an attractive alternate fuel and fuel additive for diesel engines. It is the simplest aliphatic ether, has no carbon-carbon bonds and, after methane, has the lowest possible carbon to hydrogen ratio

among hydrocarbon fuels. It has a high cetane number in the range of 55–60, and it does not tend to form particulates. The combination of high cetane number and a low boiling point of –25 °C facilitates mixing, ignition, and cold start [1].

There have been a number of kinetic studies on the pyrolysis and oxidation of DME [2–8]. In particular, Dagaut et al. [2] obtained jet-stirred reactor (JSR) results in the high temperature range of 800–1300 K. Pfahl and co-workers [3] measured the ignition delay times of stoichiometric mixtures

* Corresponding author. Fax: +1 609 258 6233.

E-mail address: cklaw@princeton.edu (C.K. Law).

behind reflected shocks at pressures of 13 and 40 bar and temperatures of 650–1300 K. These data were used by Curran et al. [4] to develop a detailed mechanism. Dagaut et al. [5] subsequently extended their JSR experiments to the lower temperature range of 550–1100 K and developed a reaction mechanism with 55 species and 331 reactions. Fischer et al. [6] and Curran et al. [7] studied both high-temperature pyrolysis and oxidation, and low temperature oxidation in a variable-pressure flow reactor (VPFR). Formic acid, which was not included in the previous mechanism [4], was found to be a major intermediate of DME oxidation at low temperatures. A mechanism of 78 species and 336 reactions, incorporating the chemistry leading to formic acid formation, was subsequently proposed. Most recently, Curran [8] updated the DME mechanism from [4–7] as part of a larger new propane reaction mechanism, reflecting improved thermochemistry and some newly re-evaluated reaction rates. The DME submechanism of Curran [8] was used in the calculations below and referred to as the 2003-mechanism.

These studies were based on experimental data from homogeneous systems. There are very limited experimental data for inhomogeneous systems. For high-temperature oxidation, Daly et al. [9] measured the laminar flame speeds of DME/air in a spherical bomb, while Kaiser et al. [10] performed experimental and modeling studies of premixed atmospheric-pressure DME/air flames. However, there are no experimental data for ignition in diffusive systems suitable for the scrutiny of low- to intermediate-temperature chemistry. Consequently, there are three primary objectives of the present investigation. First, we have acquired high fidelity experimental data from nonpremixed ignition in a counterflow geometry, in which the strain rate provides a well-defined characteristic flow time. Second, we compare these data with existing DME mechanisms and subsequently identify the crucial reactions that control the ignition process. Through such a comparison, the 2003-mechanism was found to be capable of accurately simulating the experimental data acquired over diverse ignition conditions. Consequently, our third objective is to reduce this detailed mechanism to smaller ones using rigorously developed mathematical theories and numerical algorithms, with minimal compromise of fidelity and comprehensiveness, such that it can be more readily applied to complex simulations which are heavily CPU time-demanding.

2. Experimental and computational specifications

Detailed descriptions of the experimental equipment and technique are given in [11]. Briefly, the counterflow ignition apparatus consists of two

opposing 20 mm i.d. quartz tubes, which are separated by one tube diameter and housed in a variable pressure chamber. The cold DME/N₂ was issued from the bottom tube, flowing against the downward-directed airstream, which was electrically heated by a silicon carbide heater regulated by a proportional-integral-derivative temperature controller (J-Kem Model 250). The flow rates were adjusted by mass flow controllers (Teledyne Hastings) such that the stagnation surface was halfway between the quartz tubes. Ignition was achieved by gradually increasing the airstream temperature. The velocity field was measured by a two-component Laser Doppler Velocimetry (LDV) system with frequency shifting (Dantec), and the strain rate was determined as the axial velocity gradient on the oxidizer side of the stagnation plane. The ignition temperatures were measured by a K-type thermocouple with a bead diameter of about 180 μm , with correction for radiation/convection heat transfer [11]. This yielded an absolute error of ± 15 K for the ignition temperature. The repeatability of the experimental data was ± 2 –5 K.

Ignition calculations were performed using the flame continuation method developed by Nishioka et al. [12], with detailed transport and chemistry [13,14]. In conducting the simulation, we have used the mechanism of Curran et al. [4], hereafter referred to as the 1998-mechanism, and its very recently updated version, the 2003-mechanism [8]. In the simulation, the ignition S-curve was constructed by determining the steady state solution for different hot boundary temperatures assuming potential flow, and the peak CH₃ radical mole fraction was used to monitor the system response. The ignition temperature was defined as that of the hot boundary at the ignition turning point of the resulting S-curve. It is noted that previous ignition studies [11] have demonstrated that since ignition is mainly governed by the local velocity gradient immediately upstream of the mixing layer on the oxidizer side, the use of the simpler potential flow formulation adequately describes the ignition characteristics.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Ignition temperatures of DME

Figure 1 plots the ignition temperature as a function of DME mole fraction in nitrogen at 3 atm and a pressure-weighted strain rate of 150 s^{-1} [11,15]. It is seen that the ignition temperature monotonically decreases with increasing fuel concentration in the fuel jet. This is physically reasonable and is also in agreement with the behavior of hydrogen and hydrocarbon fuels previously investigated [11,16,17]. Furthermore, such dependence becomes stronger for lower fuel concentra-




Fig. 1. Effects of fuel mole fraction on ignition temperature.

tions. Finally, while the 1998-mechanism substantially over-predicts the ignition temperature, the 2003-mechanism agrees very closely with the experimental data.

The effect of pressure on the ignition temperature of DME is shown in Fig. 2. The maximum pressure investigated experimentally is 3 atm, being limited by the DME vapor pressure (about 5.6 atm) at room temperature. Results show that the ignition temperature decreases monotonically with increasing pressure, which is again physically reasonable, and that, similar to the comparison in Fig. 1, the 2003-mechanism yields a close agreement with the experimental data while the 1998-mechanism over-predicts the ignition temperature.

Studies on paraffinic hydrocarbons ignition [16,17] have shown that the ignition temperature increases with increasing strain rates as a consequence of the reduced residence time for reactants. For the same reason, the DME ignition temperature should exhibit the same dependence on the strain rate. Figure 3 shows the experimental ignition temperature as a function of pressure-




Fig. 2. Effects of pressure on ignition temperature.




Fig. 3. Ignition temperatures of 30% DME in N_2 as a function of pressure-weighted strain rate under three different pressures. Experiments shown as symbols and calculations (2003-mechanism) as lines.

weighted strain rate for 30% DME in N_2 under three different pressures, while Fig. 4 shows the dependence at 3 atm for three DME concentrations. It is seen that, for both cases, the agreement between experiment and calculation is again very close. Moreover, the ignition temperature increases with increasing strain rate as expected, and the effects of strain rate, pressure, and fuel concentration on ignition do not seem to be strongly coupled. As illustrated in Figs. 3 and 4, varying pressure from 2 to 3 atm, or the DME concentration from 5.9% to 30%, mainly shifts the ignition temperature curves downward, without affecting the qualitative trend.






Fig. 4. Ignition temperatures versus pressure-weighted strain rate for different DME mole fractions in N_2 at 3 atm. Experiments shown as symbols and calculations (2003-mechanism) as lines.



3.2. Comparison of the 1998- and 2003-mechanisms

The two DME reaction mechanisms used in the present model calculations are derived from the same primary author [4,8], and it is very clear from the results shown in Figs. 1 and 2 that computed results using the newer mechanism are considerably better than those using the older version, and the differences are especially pronounced at lower temperatures. Furthermore, the excellent agreement between experimental and computed results using the newer mechanism in Figs. 1–4 suggests that it is, in general, more accurate than its predecessor. Accordingly, we have used the 2003-mechanism for most of the remaining calculations in this work. At the same time, we have made a careful analysis of the changes made to the mechanism from the initial to the final version to provide a form of sensitivity analysis of the mechanism to better understand the influences of the different parts of the mechanism on DME ignition. We have supplemented this analysis with further, more formal sensitivity analysis as well.


The overall reaction path analysis described by Curran et al. [4] applies quite well to the present results. DME is primarily consumed by H atom abstraction by the OH and H radicals. However, at the somewhat elevated pressures and intermediate temperatures in this study, abstraction of H atoms from DME by HO₂ and CH₃O₂ through



is also quite important. Curran et al. [7] pointed out that these abstraction reactions accelerate DME ignition because their products, H₂O₂ and CH₃O₂H, readily decompose at temperatures about 1000 K to produce two radicals each,




providing chain branching from the consumption of HO₂ and CH₃O₂. This effect is in contrast to the major alternative pathways for their consumption, such as






which, when followed by R3 above, is a sequence that results in two OH radicals from two HO₂ radicals for chain propagation. A major difference between the older DME mechanism and the present one is that the rates of R1 and R2 above are 1.68 times faster in the present mechanism [6,7]. Since the levels of HO₂ and CH₃O₂ decrease rapidly as temperature increases above 1000–1100 K, these reaction paths are most important at lower temperatures and are responsible for preferentially

accelerating the lower temperature portions of Figs. 1 and 2 where the two mechanisms disagree most.

The CH₃OCH₂ radicals begin to decompose at temperatures above about 1000 K in this work, while at lower temperatures they add to molecular oxygen




This reaction is fast in both the forward and reverse directions in the present conditions, and the equilibrium is strongly temperature dependent, favoring CH₃OCH₂O₂ until the temperature reaches about 800 K. At temperatures below this level, a sequence of reactions produces considerable reactivity through



These “cool flame” reactions, made possible because R6 has produced the first species in the sequence, provides two OH radicals and another complex radical in the form of OCH₂OCHO, and is therefore quite a strong chain branching sequence. Most of the OH radicals then react with DME and produce even more chain branching and reactivity. If the heat produced by these reactions could be removed rapidly enough, this sequence would completely consume the fuel via an isothermal chain reaction.

As in cool flames for many other fuels, temperature increase interferes with this low-temperature chain branching reaction sequence. Competing reactions with greater temperature sensitivity compete with reactions (R6)–(R8) and disrupt their progress. For example, β-scission decomposition of CH₂OCH₂O₂H through



competes with R8 but produces only one OH radical, so this alternative pathway provides only chain propagation and, in comparison with (R8)–(R10), retards ignition. The decomposition reaction R11 is exothermic and has an activation energy of about 80 kJ/mol [8] while the addition reaction R8 has no activation energy barrier, so increasing temperature will steadily increase the contribution of the decomposition pathway and reduce the overall reactivity.

Similarly, the equilibria for the two O₂ addition reactions R6 and R8 are strongly temperature dependent, and as the temperature increases above about 750 K, the equilibrium in both reactions shifts towards dissociation back to O₂ and

the radical. This shift very effectively shuts off the low temperature branching pathways and is the source of the “negative temperature coefficient” (NTC) regime for this system. In this regard, we note that another important change between the 1998- and 2003-mechanisms was a recalculation of the thermochemistry of many of the species, which changed the equilibrium constants of many of these addition reactions.

It is important to remember in this experimental configuration that the fuel is initially at low temperature as it enters the flame region and is heated steadily by the opposing flow of heated air. For a given sample of fuel, its reactivity will be determined by the time-varying local concentration of oxygen, the time-dependent temperature, and the reaction pathways that are accessible under those conditions. For example, a sample that ignites at 1000 K in Fig. 1 or 2 will have experienced some time at every intervening temperature, and some amount of reaction will have affected its composition. Diffusion of species from other regions in the flame will also affect the species concentrations at every location. With increasing strain rate, reactants will spend less time in each temperature and composition interval, so reaction pathways at each stage will have a proportionally smaller effect. Fuel that is consumed early in the flame at lower temperatures by the cool flame kinetic processes therefore reduces the amount of time required at higher temperatures to complete fuel consumption and reach ignition. This is very much analogous to the influence of the same cool flame kinetics on engine knock in spark-ignition engines; fuel consumption that occurs at lower temperatures makes it easier to reach ignition in the time available from the experimental configuration. As noted earlier, the strain rate sets a limit to the time available for the fuel to ignite, and increasing the strain rate reduces that time available, which then means that the mixture requires a higher temperature to compensate for that smaller residence time to ignite.

Similarly, the reactivity and the corresponding amount of fuel consumption that occurs in the low temperature, cool flame regime increases as the fuel concentration increases. This is true because the CH_3OCH_2 radical, produced directly from the DME fuel, is the initial step in the low temperature reaction R6 pathway that leads to low temperature reactivity, so richer mixtures react more rapidly than leaner mixtures in this temperature regime. Therefore, the richer reactive mixture requires less residence time at a given temperature (or equivalently, less temperature at a given residence time or strain rate) to complete the process of fuel consumption as the fuel concentration increases, and it therefore ignites at lower temperatures, as shown in Fig. 1.

Figure 5 shows the computed ignition S-curves using the 1998- and the 2003-mechanisms, for sit-




Fig. 5. Calculated S-curves for 30% DME in N_2 mixture with 150 s^{-1} strain rate and 3 atm, using both mechanisms.

uations which showed the greatest differences between the two mechanisms, with 30% DME in N_2 , 3 atm, and a strain rate of 150 s^{-1} . It is seen that there is a dramatic difference between the two mechanisms at about 640 K, which is in the NTC region. The 2003-mechanism has a significantly higher reactivity there and exhibits a turning point rather than the inflection point that is associated with the results of the 1998-mechanism. Figure 5 therefore provides a good indication of the major differences between the two mechanisms, which can be summarized by pointing out that the newer mechanism provides a much more detailed and accurate description of the lower temperature kinetics of these mixtures than does the older 1998-mechanism. This is due to several important changes in reaction rates that increase the importance of the lower temperature regime, as well as changes in thermochemistry that affect the equilibrium constants and therefore reverse reaction rates of key reactions in the low temperature regime. All of these modifications were the result of careful and thoughtful incremental changes in the theory, and the benefits of that attention are evident in the present model predictions and the agreement with the experimental results. It should be noted that none of the present experimental results were available when the mechanism refinements were performed, and the present experiments are therefore a powerful confirmation of those refinements. We should also point out that most of these DME mechanism refinements were already present in the mechanisms of [6,7].

We carried out two detailed sensitivity analyses to help understand the features of the reaction mechanisms. Two locations at which to carry out these sensitivity analyses were selected, using the S-curve shown in Fig. 5. One examined the region close to the ignition temperatures with 30%

DME in N_2 , 3 atm, and the strain rate k of 150 s^{-1} , using values of T_{ign} of 1039 K for the 1998-mechanism and 942 K for the 2003-mechanism. The sensitivity coefficients are defined as $-\partial \ln T_{\text{ign}} / \partial \ln A_i$, where T_{ign} is the ignition temperature and A_i is the pre-exponential factor for the i th reaction rate expression. The computed sensitivity coefficients are plotted in Fig. 6. A positive value means that increasing the rate coefficient accelerates ignition and vice versa. The values are normalized by the largest value at ignition from both mechanisms. The second sensitivity analysis examined conditions in the NTC region around 640 K; due to space limitations, we will not discuss these results, which are generally consistent with those near the ignition point.

Overall, the 1998-mechanism shows much less sensitivity to the low temperature oxidation sub-mechanism, which is consistent with the significant differences between the S-curves in Fig. 5 in this region. The results for the 2003-mechanism show that, even though the ignition temperature has a fairly high value of 942 K, the majority of the sensitivity comes from the low temperature kinetics. This indicates immediately that the fuel consumed in the low temperature regime makes it possible for the mixture to ignite at a lower temperature than would be the case in the absence of this low temperature reactivity. The 1998-mechanism is in some ways a valuable comparison since, as seen in Fig. 5, it produces considerably less low temperature reactivity and therefore does not ignite until a temperature of 1039 K, about 100 K higher than that predicted with the newer reaction mechanism.

In Fig. 6, most of the large positive and negative sensitivity coefficients can be quite easily understood in view of the discussions above. The largest positive and the largest negative values are for the two reactions competing for $\text{CH}_2\text{O}-\text{CH}_2\text{O}_2\text{H}$; when it adds to O_2 , the chain branching low temperature sequence is fully engaged, and when it decomposes to formaldehyde and OH, the chain branching is disabled. Several of the most sensitive reactions are those converting




Fig. 6. S-curve sensitivity results at ignition for 30% DME in N_2 mixture at a strain rate of 150 s^{-1} and 3 atm, using both mechanisms.

HO_2 and CH_3O_2 into $\text{OH} + \text{OH}$ and $\text{CH}_3\text{O} + \text{OH}$ via H atom abstraction reactions with DME (reactions R1 and R2) and CH_2O , followed by reactions R3 and R4. Some of the major negative sensitivities involve reactions of HO_2 that compete with the branching sequence by not permitting the HO_2 to be converted to H_2O_2 . Another interesting competition is for CH_3OCH_2 ; like $\text{CH}_2\text{O}-\text{CH}_2\text{O}_2\text{H}$, when CH_3OCH_2 decomposes thermally, it retards ignition, and when it adds to O_2 , it accelerates ignition.

Overall, the excellent agreement between experimentally determined ignition temperatures, including absolute temperature values as well as parametric trends, and results computed using the newer 2003-mechanism all indicate that the new mechanism is a precise analytical tool for the analysis of these nonpremixed systems. In addition to the large-scale results, there are some fine-structured phenomena that the new mechanism reveals, particularly the low temperature reactivity summarized in the sensitivity analysis as well as in the S-curves in Fig. 5. With all of these features nicely reproduced in the new mechanism, the next challenge is to be able to provide all of this wealth of detail in a greatly reduced form suitable for inclusion in complex fluid dynamical models of practical combustion, which is the subject of Section 4.

4. Skeletal and reduced mechanisms

4.1. Mechanism reduction using DRG and CSP

In general, mechanism reduction can be conducted at two levels of detail. At the first level, unimportant species and thereby the associated unimportant reactions are identified, based on some rational criteria, and discarded from the detailed mechanism, yielding a so-called skeletal mechanism. At the second level, quasi-steadiness and partial equilibrium assumptions are, respectively, imposed on certain species and reactions of the skeletal mechanism, hence yielding the final, reduced mechanism of an even smaller size.

Various mathematical theories and computational algorithms have been developed for both levels of reduction [21]. For the present study, we shall adopt the directed relation graph (DRG) method [19] for skeletal reduction, and the computational singular perturbation (CSP) method [20] to obtain the final reduced mechanism. Briefly, the DRG method is capable of abstracting the couplings among the species and of identifying the strongly coupled species groups. The strongly coupled species which are isolated from the mechanism kernel can thus be eliminated in groups. The skeletal mechanism obtained with the DRG has errors bounded by a user specified small value [18]. To obtain a valid skeletal mech-

anism over a sufficiently wide range of parameters such as pressure, temperature, equivalence ratio, and residence time, a group of points in the parametric space can be sampled from typical applications such as the homogeneous systems involving perfectly stirred reactor (PSR) and auto-ignition. The use of the PSR is expected to capture the high-temperature chemistry relevant for burning and extinction, while auto-ignition should describe low temperature through moderately high-temperature ignition chemistry. Given a sufficiently wide range of pressures, equivalence ratios, and initial temperatures, the sampled data points should cover most of the typical conditions under which the mechanism is to be applied.

In CSP, the time scales of independent modes are summed to an indicator weighed by sufficiently large radical pointers, the reciprocal of which can be defined as the time scale of the species. A critical time scale, say the auto-ignition time for ignition phenomena, is selected to normalize the time scales of species, such that the time scale of major species controlling the overall reaction rate of the system is normalized to unity. Species are considered to be QSS if their normalized time scales are smaller than a specified critical value, α .

4.2. Skeletal and reduced mechanism for DME ignition

Applying DRG to the updated mechanism for DME, which consists of 79 species and 398 elementary reactions, it was found that there exist jumps in the number of species at certain values of ϵ . These jumps are due to the elimination of strongly coupled species groups. The species within such groups therefore cannot be separated by specifying different threshold values. In the present study, we selected the criterion $\epsilon = 0.1$, and obtained a skeletal mechanism consisting of 49 species. The species constituting this skeletal mechanism are: H, H₂, O, O₂, OH, H₂O, N₂, HO₂, H₂O₂, Ar, CO, CO₂, CH₂O, HCO, HO₂, CHO, O₂CHO, HOCHO, OCHO, HOCH₂O, CH₃OH, CH₂OH, CH₃O, CH₃O₂H, CH₃O₂, CH₄, CH₃, CH₂, CH₂[S], CH, C₂H₆, C₂H₅, C₂H₄, C₂H₃, C₂H₂, CH₂CO, HCCO, CH₃OCH₃, CH₃OCH₂, CH₃OCH₂O₂, CH₂OCH₂O₂H, CH₃OCH₂O₂H, CH₃OCH₂O, O₂CH₂OCH₂O₂H, HO₂CH₂OCHO, OCH₂OCHO, HOCH₂OCO, CH₃OCHO, CH₃OCO, and CH₂OCHO. By eliminating each elementary reaction which contains any eliminated species, 251 elementary reactions were retained for the skeletal mechanism.

The 49-species skeletal mechanism developed above was reduced further by using CSP to identify the QSS species. By using again PSR and auto-ignition as the data sources, the time scales for each species was calculated for each data point, with their characteristic time scales being those of the extinction and ignition times, respec-

tively. The minimum normalized time scale of each species was taken as its characteristic time scale because it describes approximately its worst case characteristic time. A species is assumed to be a QSS species if its worst case normalized time scale is shorter than the specified threshold value, α . In the present study, we selected α to be around 0.01, which is comparable to the hydrogen kernel species such as O and H. However, to retain the comprehensiveness and capability of predicting hydrogen enriched applications, the radicals O and H were not included in QSS species set. This yielded a reduced mechanism consisting of 26 lump steps and 31 species including N₂ and Ar. We call this 26-step mechanism, which assumes the following species in quasi steady state: HCO, HOCH₂O, CH₂OH, CH₃O, CH₂, CH₂[S], CH, C₂H₅, C₂H₃, CH₃OCH₂, CH₃OCH₂O₂, CH₂O-CH₂O₂H, CH₃OCH₂O, O₂CH₂OCH₂O₂H, OCH₂OCHO, and CH₃OCO.

We have found further that CH₃OCH₂ and CH₃OCH₂O₂ are moderately important species in that CH₃OCH₂ and CH₃OCH₂O₂ control the most important pathway of fuel consumption. Hence by releasing these two species from being QSS, we have a 28-step reduced mechanism that consists of 28 lumped steps and 33 species.

To demonstrate the accuracy of the derived skeletal and reduced mechanisms, Fig. 7 shows the calculated ignition temperature of counterflow ignition at 3 atm and various DME mole fractions. The skeletal mechanism agrees excellently with the detailed mechanism while the 26-step reduced mechanism slightly differs from the detailed one. However, the 28-step reduced mechanism again achieves an extremely close agreement with the detailed mechanism. This state of close agreement was found for all concentration, temperature, and pressure parametric ranges investigated, including predictions of the PSR and




Fig. 7. Comparison of the computed results using detailed, 49-species skeletal, 26-step and 28-step reduced mechanisms for the counterflow ignition temperatures with various DME mole fractions.

auto-ignition [22]. The validity of the reduced mechanism is therefore established.

5. Concluding remarks

In the present investigation, we have successfully acquired data of high quality on the ignition temperature of nitrogen-diluted DME by counter-flowing heated air over extensive ranges in the DME concentration, system pressure, and flow strain rate. These data not only are of practical utility, but they are also useful in the partial validation and development of kinetic mechanisms. With the latter objective in mind, we have demonstrated that the recent, 2003-mechanism of Curran [8] is a significant improvement over its 1998 version [4], providing a very close agreement with the present experimental data. By comparing the results obtained by using both mechanisms, we have also identified the important roles of the low temperature kinetics in achieving the improvement. The evolutionary nature of the ignition process as the cold fuel stream approaches the hot oxidizer stream is recognized as an integral aspect of the ignition process, in particular, the influence of the cool flame chemistry in generating radicals in the colder part of the flow that are used in effecting ignition further downstream near the hot boundary. The utility of the present counter-flow ignition experiment, which probes a narrow range of 950–1250 K where many practical ignition phenomena occur [20], is also noted.

As an additional contribution, we have also systematically derived a skeletal mechanism with 49 species and 251 elementary reactions, and a reduced mechanism with 33 species and 28 steps. Both mechanisms preserve the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the detailed mechanism, and are more amenable for implementation in computations involving complex flows.

Acknowledgments

This work at Princeton University was supported by the Army Research Office under the technical monitoring of Dr. D. Mann and by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under the technical monitoring of Dr. Julian M. Tishkoff. The work at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory was carried out under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No.

Comments

T. Berces, Hungarian Academy of Science—Budapest, Hungary. What do you mean by the improvement of thermo-chemistry? Is it the use of a new improved thermo-chemical database or that you obtained new data from ab initio calculations?

W-7405-ENG-48, and was supported by the DOE Office of Transportation Technologies, Gurpreet Singh and John Garbak, program managers.

References

- [1] P.C. Meurer, T.H. Fleisch, in: *Proceedings of the Conference Program International Congress Engine and the Environment*. Graz, Austria, August 24–25, 1995.
- [2] P. Dagaut, J.C. Boettner, M. Cathonnet, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 26 (1996) 627–632.
- [3] U. Pfahl, K. Fieweger, G. Adomeit, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 26 (1996) 781–789.
- [4] H.J. Curran, W.J. Pitz, C.K. Westbrook, P. Dagaut, J.C. Boettner, M. Cathonnet, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 30 (1998) 229–241.
- [5] P. Dagaut, C. Daly, J.M. Simmie, M. Cathonnet, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 27 (1998) 361–369.
- [6] S.L. Fischer, F.L. Dryer, H.J. Curran, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 32 (2000) 713–740.
- [7] H.J. Curran, S.L. Fischer, F.L. Dryer, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 32 (2000) 741–759.
- [8] H.J. Curran, *Unpublished Proceedings of the European Combustion Meeting*, 2003. Available from: <http://www-cms.llnl.gov/combustion/combustion_home.html>.
- [9] C.A. Daly, J.M. Simmie, J. Wurmel, N. Djebaili, C. Paillard, *Combust. Flame* 125 (4) (2001) 1329–1340.
- [10] E.W. Kaiser, T.J. Wallington, M.D. Hurley, J. Platz, H.J. Curran, W.J. Pitz, C.K. Westbrook, *J. Phys. Chem. A* 104 (35) (2000) 8194–8206.
- [11] C.G. Fotache, T.G. Kreutz, D.L. Zhu, C.K. Law, *Combust. Sci. Technol.* 109 (1–6) (1995) 373–394.
- [12] M. Nishioka, C.K. Law, T. Takeno, *Combust. Flame* 104 (3) (1996) 328–342.
- [13] R.J. Kee, F.M. Rupley, J.A. Miller, Report No. SAND 89-8009B, Sandia National Laboratories, 1989.
- [14] R.J. Kee, J. Warnatz, J.A. Miller, Report No. SAND 83-8209, Sandia National Laboratories, 1983.
- [15] T.G. Kreutz, C.K. Law, *Combust. Flame* 104 (1–2) (1996) 157–175.
- [16] C.G. Fotache, H. Wang, C.K. Law, *Combust. Flame* 117 (4) (1999) 777–794.
- [17] J.D. Blouch, C.J. Sung, C.G. Fotache, C.K. Law, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 27 (1998) 1221–1228.
- [18] T.F. Lu, C.K. Law, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 30 (2004).
- [19] T.F. Lu, Y. Ju, C.K. Law, *Combust. Flame* 126 (1–2) (2001) 1445–1455.
- [20] C.K. Westbrook, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 28 (2000) 1563–1577.
- [21] C.K. Law, C.J. Sung, H. Wang, T.F. Lu, *AIAA J.* 41 (9) (2003) 1629–1646.
- [22] T.F. Lu, PhD thesis, Princeton University, 2004.

Reply. The only significant change to the thermo-chemistry that was included in the updates of the Curran 2003 mechanisms from the 1998 and 2000 DME mechanisms was that we changed the heat of formation for the HO₂ radical from about 3.5–3.0 kcal/mol. This then af-

affected reverse rates for reactions involving the HO₂ radical through the principle of detailed balance. While at the Symposium, discussions with leading experts such as David Golden indicated that the most recent opinions of this heat of formation are that it is close to 2.88 kcal/mol, so our modification brings this much closer to its currently accepted value. We expect to further modify that parameter to its more recent value of 2.88 kcal/mol in our next mechanism updates.



Frederick L. Dryer, Princeton University, USA. The Curran et al. 1998 mechanism that you discuss here pre-dates that developed by Fischer et al. [1], which included substantial revisions based upon new data, particularly low and intermediate temperature flow reactor experiments appearing in Curran et al [2]. Some of the rate constant adjustments from Curran 1998 to Curran 2003 that you discuss here were in fact made in Fischer et al. The Curran 2003 mechanism is apparently related to the Fischer et al. 2000 mechanism, as it was extracted from a propane mechanism, which included essentially the Fischer et al. 2000 mechanism with some additional updates of reaction rate and thermo-chemical parameters.

1. Are the reactions and species involved in Fischer et al. 2000 and Curran 2003 the same or different?
2. Is Curran 2003 validated against the same targets used originally in Fischer et al. 2000?
3. Is Curran 2003 validated against any experimental reaction system data or does it include any new published elementary rate constants that have appeared since the development of Fischer et al.?
4. How do Fischer et al. 2000 predictions compare with those using Curran 2003 and your data?
5. Do any of the specific input parameter updates in Curran 2003 affect the comparisons with your data that are sensitive to the low and intermediate temperature kinetics?

References

- [1] S.L. Fischer, F.L. Dryer, H.J. Curran, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 32 (2000) 713–740.
- [2] H.J. Curran, S.L. Fischer, F.L. Dryer, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.* 32 (2000) 741–759.

Reply. Professor Dryer's comment and five questions illustrate the fact that modern chemical kinetic reaction

mechanisms are constantly evolving as new experimental and theoretical information becomes available. All of the DME reaction mechanisms noted by Prof. Dryer have been the products primarily of one of us (HJC) in a sequence of modeling studies over the past 10 years, each of which involved mechanism updates of varying impact on DME oxidation predictions. As noted in the text of the paper, the only significant change from the Curran 1998 paper that affected the present calculations for DME oxidation was to restore the A-factors for the H-atom abstraction reactions of HO₂ and CH₃O₂ with DME from their original, incorrect values of 1×10^{13} used in the Curran 1998 mechanism to values of 1.68×10^{13} based on analysis by Ray Walker. The same reaction rates had already been corrected in the Fischer et al. and Curran et al. papers in 2000 and were left intact for the Curran 2003 mechanism. In addition, the 2003 mechanism was tested against the experimental results used to validate the Fischer et al. 2000 and Curran et al. 2000 papers, with virtually identical agreement, as expected. The 2003 mechanism was used for the present study rather than the Fischer et al. 2000 mechanism because it had become the mechanism that contained all of our best current thinking on all of the different species it contained.

The major mechanism improvements made between the 2000 and 2003 mechanisms involved the H₂/O₂, methane and propane oxidation submechanisms. The H₂/O₂ modifications were validated through extensive comparisons with experimental results for hydrogen oxidation in Connaire, Curran et al. (*Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, in press, 2004) and the propane submechanism was used with excellent results in the laminar flame inhibition studies by Korobeinichev et al. The impact of these changes on low and intermediate temperature kinetics in general should be minor; the updates are for species (H₂, CH₄, and C₃H₈) that usually have little low temperature reactivity and they are small modifications rather than revolutionary alterations. Continued model validations for methane and other fuels at all temperatures are in progress, as is the seemingly never-ending process of mechanism improvement. The complete DME mechanism used in this work is being posted on the web page cited in the paper.

Finally, in response to Prof. Dryer's specific inquiry in Item 4, we have carried out selected calculations based on the 2000 mechanism of Fischer et al., and found equally good agreement with our experimental data.