Biomass and Bioenergy 108 (2018) 307–311

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Biomass and Bioenergy

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/biombioe

Research paper

Numerical study of water effects on the laminar burning velocity of methanol

Kun Liang

Department of Engineering and Design, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9QT, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Methanol
Laminar burning velocity
Water
Constant volume
Chemical kinetic mechanism
Schlieren imaging

ABSTRACT

Using light alcohols in spark-ignition engines can improve energy security, engine performance and pollutant emissions. Methanol has gained popularity due to its ease in production compared to ethanol. Methanol could absorb water easily. In the present work, the adiabatic laminar burning velocity of methanol containing water is investigated both experimentally and numerically. Numerical simulations using CHEMKIN-PRO were undertaken to predict the burning velocities of six mixtures with different water volume fractions (up to 0.6) from the latest San Diego chemical-kinetic mechanism. The burning velocities of three mixtures with different water volume fractions (up to 0.4) were measured using a constant volume vessel and a Schlieren imaging system for a wide range of temperature (380–450 K), pressure (100–400 kPa) and equivalence ratio (0.7–1.4). Results showed a decrease in burning velocity with pressure and an increase with temperature. Water as a diluent led to reduction of the burning velocity. The chemical-kinetic mechanism over predicts the burning velocity.

1. Introduction

Using light alcohols in spark-ignition engines can improve energy security, engine performance and pollutant emissions. Sustainable liquid alcohols, such as ethanol and methanol, are largely compatible with the existing fuelling and distribution infrastructure and are easily stored in a vehicle [1]. Methanol can be produced from a wide range of renewable sources such as gasification of wood, agricultural by-products and urban waste, in addition to fossil fuels based feedstock (coal and natural gas). For the purposes of energy sustainability and low carbon, methanol has been widely used in spark ignition engines in some countries like China and Iceland, as a single component and blend with gasoline [2]. Due to the high octane rating, high latent heat and low combustion temperatures, the power and efficiency is significantly higher for methanol (and ethanol) compared to gasoline. This is certainly true for highly pressure-charged engines, where aggressive downsizing is possible on these alcohols [3].

Methanol is very hygroscopic and even purified methanol by distillation will absorb water vapour directly from the atmosphere. Water in methanol will further improve the anti-knock rating. However, it dilutes the calorific value of methanol, and may cause phase separation of methanol-gasoline blends. The water is expected to reduce the burning velocity, the flame stability and the flammability range, all of which would be adverse to the performance of the engine.

The laminar burning velocity is a fundamental property of fuel for spark ignition engines, which can also be used to validate the chemical-kinetic mechanism and estimate the turbulent burning velocity. The laminar burning velocity depends on the initial pressure, mixture temperature and equivalence ratio of the unburned mixture.

Many researchers have conducted experimental studies of pure methanol using different methods: (1) constant volume vessel approach has been used by Saeed and Stone [4], Metghalchi and Keck [5], Gulder [6], Liao et al. [7,8], Zhang et al. [9,10], and Beeckmann et al. [11]. Note that [4,7–11] used optical access to the combustion vessel; (2) counter flow flame configuration was used by Davies and Law [12] and Egolfopoulos et al. [13]; (3) Bunsen burner was used by Gibbs and Calcote [14]; (4) heat flux burner was adopted by Sileghem et al. [15] and Vancoillie et al. [16]; (5) meso-scale diverging channel was recently used by Katoch et al. [17]. Constant volume vessel was also used by Ref. [18,19].

Numerical studies of laminar burning velocity has also been widely conducted but not for methanol/water mixtures up to date. CHEMKIN based simulations can be used to predict laminar burning velocity from different reaction mechanisms. The most widely used mechanisms for development of alcohol chemistry are Li et al. [20] and San Diego mechanism [21]. Li et al. [20] presented an updated C1 mechanism for methanol (CH3OH) combustion, which appeared to over predict the burning velocity as shown by Katoch et al. [17]. The San Diego mechanism [21] is being frequently updated by latest published experimental data. The correlations of burning velocity from experiments using constant volume vessel for methanol/water mixtures have been reported by Liang and Stone [22]. Though Katoch et al. [17] states that

E-mail address: kun.liang@sussex.ac.uk.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.11.025
Received 27 September 2017; Received in revised form 28 November 2017; Accepted 29 November 2017
Available online 05 December 2017
0961-9534/

the San Diego mechanism tends to over predict the burning velocity for rich mixture of methanol and air, it is still unknown that how burning velocity varies for methanol when water (H2O) is added as a diluent. Therefore, the capability of this mechanism in modelling methanol/water combustion still needs further validation. This paper presents numerical work on laminar burning velocity using CHEMKIN-PRO [23] in comparison with results from Schlieren imaging analysis that has not been reported in Ref. [22].

2. Computational simulation

The numerical simulations of laminar premised flames were conducted using steady-state, one-dimensional freely propagating laminar flame model in CHEMKIN-PRO. As the adiabatic flame speed was determined from the heat flux method, no radiative heat loss was considered in simulations. The hybrid time-integration/Newton-iteration technique with adaptive meshes and mixture-averaged transport parameters is applied to solve the steady-state mass, species and energy conservation equations of the flames.

A one-dimensional flow with uniform inlet conditions were assumed. The governing conservation equations for the freely propagating flame are as follow:

For continuity: $$\dot{M} = \rho u A \tag{1}$$

where $\dot{M}$ is the mass flow rate, ρ is the mass density, u is the velocity of the fluid mixture and A is the cross-sectional area of the stream tube encompassing the flame normalised by the burner area.

For energy: $$\dot{M}\frac{dT}{dx} - \frac{1}{c_p}\frac{d}{dx}\left(\lambda A\frac{dT}{dx}\right) + \frac{A}{c_p}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\dot{\omega}_k h_k W_k \tag{2}$$

where x is the spatial coordinate, T is the temperature, c_p is the constant-pressure heat capacity of the mixture, λ is the thermal conductivity of the mixture, $\dot{\omega}_k$ is the molar rate of production by chemical reaction of the kth species per unit volume, h_k is the specific enthalpy of the kth species, and W_k is the molecular weight of the kth species.

For species: $$\dot{M}\frac{dY_k}{dx} + \frac{d}{dx}(\rho A Y_k V_k) - \mathrm{A}\dot{\omega}_k W_k = 0 \tag{3}$$

where Y_k is the mass fraction of the kth species and V_k is the diffusion velocity of the kth species.

For equation of state: $$\rho = \frac{P\overline{W}}{RT} \tag{4}$$

where $\overline{W}$ is the mean molecular weight of the mixture and R is the universal gas constant.

The computation domain was set from -2 cm to 10 cm to ensure the boundaries sufficiently far from the flame itself so that there was negligible diffusion of heat and mass through the boundary. The relative gradient and curvation parameters for the grid refinement are set to be 0.1 to ensure that the number of grids were over 150 for each condition. This number proved sufficient in rendering the simulation as grid-independent. The fixed-flame coordinate system is established by explicitly constraining the gas temperature to stay at the initial fixed value at one grid point in the computational domain.

For the pre-mixed laminar flame speed model in CHEMKIN-PRO, chemistry set components required include thermochemical data, gas-phase chemistry (chemical reactions and rate parameters) and transport data. For the present work, the latest San Diego mechanism pulished on 2016-12-14 [21] was employed, which has 57 species and 247 elementary reactions. The chemistry set of the mechanism was created in 'Pre-Processing'. A total number of 504 computational simulations were conducted in CHEMKIN-PRO. Table 1 listed the test conditions for methanol/water mixture. In 'C1-Inlet' of the model, equivalence ratio and fractions of each species can be defined along with mass flow rate. The burning velocity by using CHEMKIN-PRO is thus named as 'CHEMKIN-PRO' for comparison with 'Schlieren' results. The equivalence ratio is the ratio of the fuel-to-air ratio to the stoichiometric fuel-to-air ratio. Equivalence ratio over 1 means rich mixture.

Table 1
Simulation conditions of burning velocity for methanol/water mixtures.

Water volume fraction	Initial pressure (kPa)	Initial temperature (K)	Equivalence ratio
0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6	100, 200, 400	300, 380, 450	0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1.0, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4

3. Optical measurement

3.1. Constant volume vessel and Schlieren imaging system

The constant volume vessel method is capable of exploiting the increase in pressure and the resulting increase in unburned gas temperature. Values of the burning velocity can be calculated for multiple temperatures and pressures from a single experiment as the pressure rise causes an isentropic temperature increase in the unburned gas. Therefore, the burning velocity can be determined from the pressure trace inside the combustion bomb (shown in Fig. 1a) by assuming a smooth spherical flame front and an appropriate combustion mode. The details of the bomb have been reported by Liang and Stone [22].

A Schlieren imaging system was adopted for the purpose of imaging the flame front to determine flame speed in the initial stages of combustion and also for detection of cellularity in the later stages of combustion when the pressure rise is more significant. The Schlieren system for this work is a folded z-type arrangement shown in Fig. 1b. The system uses two oppositely tilted off-axis spherical mirrors to produce the collimated beam. Increasing pressure results in a change in density across the flame front and the flame front thickness, both of which affect the density gradient and hence the darkness of the detected Schlieren edge. The illumination source used is a 1 W green Prolight Power Star/O LED. The pressure vessel had a pair of windows with 40 mm diameter along the optical axis (see Fig. 1a) to allow the Schlieren imaging system. The Schlieren images were recorded using a Photron 1024 PCI high speed camera with a 512*512 pixel resolution, allowing a frame rate of 3000 frame per second (fps). The measured flame speed can be then used to determine the laminar burning velocity for validating the numerical simulation described in Section 2.

A total of 144 experiments were conducted over a wide range of initial temperatures (380 K and 450 K), pressures (100 kPa, 200 kPa and 400 kPa) and equivalence ratios (0.7–1.4) for 3 methanol/water blends (W0, W20, and W40). W0 is pure methanol. W20 and W40 mean water volume fractions of 0.2 and 0.4, respectively.

The propagation speed of a spherical flame can be derived from the flame radius versus time as below:

$$S_f = \frac{dr}{dt} \tag{5}$$

where r is the radius of the flame recorded by Schlieren imaging.

The flame stretch rate can be calculated as

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{A}\frac{\mathrm{d}A}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{2dr}{rdt} \tag{6}$$

where A is the area of the flame surface.

Removing the stretched flame speed data affected by ignition energy and electrodes during the early stage of flame development gives a linear correlation line for the stretched flame speed and the flame stretch rate as shown in the Fig. 2. The unstretched flame speed S_s is found by extrapolating back to the case of zero stretch ($\alpha = 0$). It can be seen that the effect of the stretch rate on the burning velocity is not significant.

The unstretched laminar burning velocity u_l can then be calculated according to