Studies of premixed and non-premixed hydrogen flames

Okjoo Park\textsuperscript{a}, Peter S. Veloo\textsuperscript{b}, Hugo Burbano\textsuperscript{a}, Fokion N. Egolfopoulos\textsuperscript{a,\textdagger}

\textsuperscript{a}Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1453, USA
\textsuperscript{b}Exponent, Failure Analysis Associates, Los Angeles, CA 90066, USA

\textbf{Abstract}

The hydrogen oxidation chemistry constitutes the foundation of the kinetics of all carbon- and hydrogen-containing fuels. The validation of rate constants of hydrogen-related reactions can be complicated by uncertainties associated with experimental data caused by the high reactivity and diffusivity of hydrogen. In the present investigation accurate experimental data on flame propagation and extinction were determined for premixed and non-premixed hydrogen flames at pressures between \(p = 1\) and 7 atm. The experiments were designed to sensitize the three-body \(H + O_2 + \text{M} \rightarrow HO_2 + \text{M}\) reaction, whose rate is subject to notable uncertainty. This was achieved by increasing the pressure and by adding to the reactants \(H_2O\) and \(CO_2\) whose collision efficiencies are high compared to other species. In the present study, directly measured flame properties were compared against computed ones, in order to eliminate uncertainties associated with extrapolations, as is the case for laminar flame speeds. The measured extinction strain rates exhibit both a positive and negative dependence on pressure with and without weighting with the density, and this non-monotonic behavior is caused by the competition between the \(H + O_2 \rightarrow O + OH\) and \(H + O_2 + \text{M} \rightarrow HO_2 + \text{M}\) reactions as well as \(HO_2\) kinetic pathways as pressure increases. The various kinetic models considered in this investigation did not reproduce equally well the non-premixed flame extinction data with added \(H_2O\). On the other hand, the predicted extinction strain rates were consistent between the various models in the case of added \(CO_2\). Finally, it was shown that the formulation of binary diffusion coefficient pairs including \(H-N_2\) has a first order effect on the prediction of extinction strain rates of non-premixed \(H_2\) flames.

\(\copyright\) 2014 The Combustion Institute. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The study and development of kinetic models for the oxidation of hydrogen has historically been motivated by its hierarchical importance in combustion chemistry. Recent interest in utilizing synthesis gas (syngas) as a fuel for Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) will require the validation of existing \(H_2/CO\) chemical kinetic reaction models at conditions relevant to those encountered in gas turbines. This will require accurate experimental results at elevated pressures and low flame temperatures (e.g., \([1,2]\)). Adding to challenges in accurately modeling syngas oxidation is the possibility of significant \(H_2O\) vapor and \(CO_2\) present in the fuel stream after coal gasification. Nitrogen oxide (NO\textsubscript{x}) mitigation strategies for stationary gas turbines include \(H_2O\) vapor injected into gas turbine combustors or the utilization of exhaust gas recirculation (e.g., \([3–6]\)).

The development of accurate syngas oxidation chemical kinetic models has been the focus of a number of recent investigations (e.g., \([7–12]\)). The kinetics of \(H_2\) oxidation at elevated pressures was recently studied by Burke et al. \([2]\), and a negative pressure dependence of the mass burning rate was derived for flames of \(H_2/oxidizer\) and \(H_2/CO/oxidizer\) at low flame temperatures and pressures between \(p = 1\) and 25 atm. It was shown also that predictions made using the majority of existing models for \(H_2\) oxidation (e.g., \([7–11]\)) fail to predict closely the reported data. Recently, an updated \(H_2/O_2\) kinetic model was developed \([12]\), by incorporating improvements in elementary rate coefficients, in order to provide better predictions of the high-pressure data of Ref. \([2]\). Sheen \([13]\) demonstrated that the inability to predict the data of Ref. \([2]\) stems from the uncertainties inherent in the rate parameters and not from errors in kinetic pathways. Using USC Mech II \([8]\) optimized using the Method of Uncertainty Minimization using Polynomial Chaos Expansion (MUM-PCE) Sheen \([13]\) was able to reproduce the experimental measurements from Burke et al. \([2]\). In Refs. \([2,13]\), the need for additional experimental flame data for \(H_2\) oxidation to better constrain kinetic models is highlighted.
Laminar flame speed, $S_o$, data with accurately quantified uncertainties are also essential in constraining kinetic models. There is a large body of literature $S_o$ results for H$_2$/air flames at atmospheric pressure (e.g., [14–20]). The difficulty with utilizing this data is the large spread in these measurements and the little consensus between $S_o$ values at a fixed equivalence ratio, $\phi$. The principal difficulty encountered in experimental measurements of atmospheric pressure H$_2$/air flames is that, $S_o$'s for such mixtures range from the order of cm/s to m/s. At such large flow field velocities, there is large uncertainty in flow velocity measurements using either particle image velocimetry (PIV) or laser Doppler velocimetry (LDV). Another complicating factor is that the extrapolation of the strained flame velocity to zero stretch, to determine $S_o$, introduces additional uncertainties depending on the extrapolation method. Fuel lean H$_2$/air mixtures have a sub-unity Lewis number (Le) and are thermo-diffusion unstably adding, thus ambiguity to the so-called measured $S_o$'s of fuel lean H$_2$/air flames that cannot physically exist at the zero stretch limit due to cellular instabilities. Positive stretch suppresses cellular instabilities therefore reducing the dimensionality of the system (e.g., [21–23]). Thus, for lean premixed H$_2$/air flames, extinction strain rates, $K_{ext}$'s, measured in the counterflow configuration provide a more meaningful experimental validation for kinetic models compared to $S_o$'s. Dong et al. [24] measured $K_{ext}$'s of premixed H$_2$/air flames and results showed that the sensitivity of $K_{ext}$ to molecular transport could be as large as to kinetics. The first goal of this present study was to provide experimental $S_o$ data for H$_2$ flames with systematically quantified uncertainties. Using a modified O$_2$/N$_2$ oxidizer with a larger N$_2$ dilution ratio relative to air, $S_o$'s of H$_2$/O$_2$/N$_2$ flames at near stoichiometric conditions were measured accurately by avoiding large flow velocities needed to stabilize H$_2$/air flames. Both extrapolated $S_o$'s and the directly measured reference flame speeds, $S_{ref}$'s, were used to evaluate a number of recently developed kinetic models for H$_2$ oxidation. The kinetics of ultra-fuel lean H$_2$/air were investigated further by the measurement of $K_{ext}$'s for the same mixtures.

There exists an extensive literature body of work on the extinction of non-premixed H$_2$ flames of motivated primarily by their relevance to high-speed propulsion applications (e.g., [25–30]). Pellett and coworkers [25–27] determined $K_{ext}$'s of N$_2$ diluted, atmospheric pressure, opposed-jet non-premixed H$_2$ flames.

The effect of pressure on extinction limits of non-premixed H$_2$ flames has been addressed to a limited extent in available literature (e.g., [28–32]). Papas et al. [28] measured local $K_{ext}$ as a function of H$_2$ dilution between $p = 0.5$ and 1 atm and noted that flame temperatures exhibit a non-monotonic pressure dependence. Recently, Niemann et al. [32] studied the pressure dependence of global extinction limits of non-premixed H$_2$ flames between $p = 1$ and 15 atm. They confirmed the non-monotonic pressure dependence behavior of computed $K_{ext}$'s of non-premixed H$_2$ flames previously observed by Sohn and Chung [30].

The second goal of this study relates to the relative scarcity of $H_2$ flame data at elevated pressures with systematically quantified uncertainties. Extinction limits of non-premixed H$_2$ flames at atmospheric and elevated pressures over a wide range of fuel concentrations were measured and modeled.

Syngas combustion in stationary gas turbines at elevated pressures and in the presence of notable quantities of H$_2$O and CO$_2$ will readily result in the production of the hydroperoxy radicals (HO$_2$). The main source of HO$_2$ is via a three-body main termination reaction between $H$ and $O_2$, H$_2$O, and to a lesser extent CO$_2$, exhibit large charaperon efficiencies when participating in three-body termination reactions. There is a well-known, large uncertainty (e.g., [12,13]) associated with the rate parameter used to express this three-body reaction in existing $H_2$ oxidation models. Adding to this uncertainty is the modeling of the associated collisional efficiency of the three body molecules H$_2$O and CO$_2$. Reducing this uncertainty has driven recent studies with wet H$_2$ flames (e.g., [33–39]).

Seiser and Seshadri [31] studied the influence of H$_2$O addition on the measured global $K_{ext}$ of premixed and non-premixed H$_2$ flames at $p = 1$ atm. They highlighted the need for accurate charaperon efficiency of H$_2$O in three body reactions including $H + O_2 \rightarrow HO_2 + M$, $H + OH + M \rightarrow H_2O + M$, and $H + H + M \rightarrow H_2 + M$. Das et al. [33] investigated the effect of H$_2$O on $S_o$ of H$_2$/CO/air mixtures at $p = 1$ atm in the counterflow configuration, and it was recommended that the rate parameters for H$_2$ + OH $\rightarrow H_2O + H$ need to be revisited. Singh et al. [34] studied the effect of H$_2$O on $S_o$ of syn-gas/air mixtures using spherically expanding flames. Santner et al. [35] studied the effect of H$_2$O dilution on the propagation of spherically expanding flames of H$_2$/oxidizer and H$_2$/CO/oxidizer mixtures at pressures up to $p = 10$ atm., and it was found that the negative pressure dependence of the burning rate shifts to lower pressures with H$_2$O addition.

The final goal of this study was to perform systematic flame experiments by sensitizing important three-body reactions through H$_2$O and CO$_2$ additions and for flame temperatures in the 1000–1400 K range. The present data can be used as targets to constrain kinetic models with emphasis on the main termination reaction involving H$_2$O or CO$_2$, i.e. $H + O_2 + (H_2O/CO_2) = HO_2 + (H_2O/CO_2)$.

2. Experimental approach

The opposed-jet counterflow configuration was used in both the propagation and extinction studies [24,40–50], and the schematics are shown in Figs. 1 and 2 for atmospheric and high-pressure conditions respectively.

In order to determine $S_o$, the axial velocity profile along the system centerline is first measured. The minimum point of the axial velocity profile just upstream of the flame is defined as the reference flame speed, $S_{ref}$, and the absolute value of the maximum velocity gradient in the hydrodynamic zone is defined as the imposed strain, $K$ [40], as shown in Fig. S1 of the supplementary material. Plotting $S_{ref}$ against $K$, $S_o$ could be determined, in principle, by linearly extrapolating $S_{ref}$ to zero imposed strain, i.e., $K = 0$ [40]. In this study the computationally assisted non-linear extrapolation technique to $K = 0$ was utilized [42,43,47].

$K_{ext}$'s of premixed flames were measured using the single-flame configuration by counterflowing fuel/air mixtures against an ambient temperature N$_2$ jet. For H$_2$/air flames, a flame was established at a near extinction condition and the $H_2$ flow rate was slightly reduced for fuel-lean mixtures to achieve extinction and determine $K_{ext}$ (e.g., [50]). For mixtures of H$_2$/air/H$_2$O, a flame was established at a fixed $\phi$ and a given $K$, H$_2$O concentration was slightly increased to achieve extinction and determine $K_{ext}$.

$K_{ext}$'s were measured also for non-premixed $H_2$ flames established by counterflowing an air or air/H$_2$O jet against a H$_2$/N$_2$ jet. H$_2$O was added to the oxidizer jet to sensitize more effectively the main termination reaction compared. Extinction was achieved by slightly decreasing the $H_2$ concentration for dry non-premixed $H_2$ flames. To achieve extinction for wet non-premixed flames, $H_2$O concentration was increased until extinction was observed. Table 2 lists the experimental boundary conditions.

For all studies, the diameter of the burner nozzles ($D$) were, $D = 14$ mm for $K \leq 400$ s$^{-1}$ and $D = 10$ mm for $K > 400$ s$^{-1}$ at atmospheric conditions. The burner separation distance, $L$, was equal to $D$. The experimental boundary conditions are shown in Table 1. Both PIV and LDV were used to quantify accurately flow velocities. The flow was seeded using micron size silicone oil droplets. Figure 1 depicts the schematic of the experimental configuration for premixed $H_2$/air flames at atmospheric pressure conditions that is
integrated to a PIV system. Since H₂ flames are invisible to the naked eye, a shadowgraph technique was utilized to observe the flame.

Experiments in which H₂O (ACS de-ionized reagent grade) was introduced into the gas phase required the use of a vaporization system. The vaporization system consists of a syringe pump, nebulizer, and heated vaporization chamber shown in Fig. 2. H₂O mass flow rates were controlled using high precision syringe pumps; a Harvard Apparatus® PHD 2000 for p = 1 atm experiments and a Chemyx® Nexus 6000 syringe pump for elevated pressure experiments.

Table 1
Experimental configuration and conditions (premixed flames).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₂/(9.5%O₂ + 90.5%N₂)</td>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂/air</td>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10 (Kₑ ≤ 400 s⁻¹)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂/air/H₂O</td>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10 (Kₑ ≤ 400 s⁻¹)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂/CO/O₂/CO₂</td>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10 (Kₑ ≤ 400 s⁻¹)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Schematic of the atmospheric pressure experimental configuration (single flame configuration).

Fig. 2. A schematic of the high-pressure experimental configuration, including the vaporization system.
To assist vaporization, air or N2 were preheated above the boiling temperature of H2O was co-flowed into the vaporization chamber. Additionally, the walls of the vaporization chamber were maintained at least 50 K above the boiling temperature of H2O using a combination of heating tapes, insulation, and thermocouples. The vaporization chamber was connected to the burner using heated and insulated stainless steel tubing. The temperature of the gas was elevated throughout the system to the nozzle exit such that the partial pressure was consistently below the vapor pressure of H2O at the prevailing ambient temperature and pressure.

Overall, the uncertainty in $\phi$ or mole fraction was determined to be no larger than 0.5%. The temperature of the fuel streams, measured at the center of the burner nozzle exit, fluctuated within ±2 °C. The sampling errors in K were determined and their $2\sigma$ standard deviations are indicated with uncertainty bars.

### Table 2

Experimental configuration and conditions (non-premixed flame).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower jet</th>
<th>Upper jet</th>
<th>$p$ [atm]</th>
<th>$T_{lower}$ [K]</th>
<th>$T_{upper}$ [K]</th>
<th>$D$ [mm]</th>
<th>$L$ [mm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>H2/N2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2–7</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air/H2O</td>
<td>H2/N2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

The axial velocity gradient at the burner exit, $x$, for the extinction experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$p$ [atm]</th>
<th>$X_{ref}$</th>
<th>$x$ [s$^{-1}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>10 ± 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>20 ± 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>25 ± 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>30 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>50 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>65 ± 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>35 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>41 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>60 ± 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

Kinetic models used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>USC Mech II [8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>Davis et al. [10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Li et al. [7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>Li et al. + Model I transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Burke et al. [12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

Reaction labels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of reactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R1) H + O2 → O + OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R2) H + O2 + M → HO2 + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R2a) H + O2 + H2O → HO2 + H2O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R2b) H + O2 + CO2 → HO2 + CO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R3) O + H2 → OH + H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R4) H2 + OH → H2O + H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R5) HO2 + H → OH + H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R6) HO2 + H + O2 → O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R7) HO2 + O + O2 → OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R8) HO2 + H → H2 + O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R9) O + H2O → OH + OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R10) H + OH + M → H2O + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R11) H + H → H2 + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R12) CO + OH → CO2 + H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model III is a recently updated H2/O2 model by Burke et al. [12]. Model Ia is the model by Davis et al. [10]. Model II is identical to Model I with the exception of the reaction rate parameter for the chain termination reaction, HO2 + OH → H2O + O2. In Model IIa, the transport parameters and formulation of Model II have been replaced by those of Model I.

The diffusion coefficients for Models I, la, IIa, and III were implemented in the simulations using updated H and H2 diffusion coefficients for several key pairs based on a re-evaluated set of Lennard-Jones parameters by Wang and coworkers [24,60]. The elementary reactions common to all models in Table 4 are listed in a consistent manner in Table 5 to facilitate the proceeding analysis and discussion. Rate parameters and references for the

---

3. Numerical approach

$S_{\phi}^o$'s were computed using the PREMIX code [51,52]. Stretched flames in the counterflow configuration were numerically modeled using an opposed-jet code [53]. The original opposed-jet code has been modified to allow for the simulation of asymmetric boundary conditions [54]. Both PREMIX and opposed-jet codes have been modified to account for thermal radiation from CH4 and CO2, and H2O at the optically thin limit [54,55]. The code is integrated with CHEMKIN [56] and the Sandia Transport [57] subroutine libraries.

$K_{eq}$ is computed by first establishing a vigorously burning flame at a given $K$. $K$ is then increased by increasing the flow velocities at the burner exits to the point of extinction. At the extinction state, the response of any flame property to $K$ is characterized by a turning-point behavior that introduces a singularity, if $K$ is considered as the independent variable (e.g., [58,59]). The opposed-jet code has been modified to capture this singular behavior, and to allow for a more precise determination of $K_{ext}$ [58]. More specifically, a two-point continuation approach is implemented by imposing a predetermined temperature or species mass fraction at two points in the flow field; thus $K$ becomes the dependent variable.

In order to accurately compute $K_{ext}$ and compare against the data, the experimental values of $L$ (e.g., [54]) and the axial velocity gradient at the nozzle exit, $x$ (e.g., [43]) are necessary boundary conditions for all simulations. Egolfopoulos [54] numerically demonstrated that $K_{eq}$ increases with nozzle separation distance as a result of the reduction of the strain rate distribution within the reaction zone. In a recent study by Ji et al. [43], $x$ was also found to have a considerable effect on the numerically determined $K_{ext}$.

The values of $x$ for premixed flames at 1 atm were $15 ± 10$ s$^{-1}$. For non-premixed flames, the values of $x$ are listed in Table 3.

Full multi-component transport coefficient formulations were used in all simulations for $S_{\phi}^o$'s, $S_{\phi,ref}$'s, and $K_{eq}$'s along with the Soret effect. All simulation results are grid independent and utilized approximately 2000 grid points.

Five kinetic models were used to simulate experimental data, which are summarized in Table 4. The first model is the H2/O2 sub-model of USC Mech II [8]. This model will be referred to as Model I hereafter. Model II is the H2/O2 sub-model of Li et al. [7].
elementary reactions listed in Table 4 are tabulated for Models I, II, and III in Tables S1 and S2 of the supplementary material.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Laminar flame speeds of H2/oxidizer mixtures

Figure 3 depicts literature data [14–20,61] and computed $S_0$’s of H2/air mixtures at $p = 1$ atm and unburned mixture temperature, $T_u = 298$ K. The calculations were performed using Models I, II, and III. Between 0.5 ≤ $\phi$ ≤ 1.2 (Fig. 3a) there is reasonably good agreement between all eight sets of experimental data. Within this $\phi$ range there is less than 30 cm/s difference between maximum and minimum measured $S_0$’s that is within 18% of the mean (or nominal) value. The spread between the various experimental measurements significantly increases at larger $\phi$’s as shown in Fig. 3b. For example, at $\phi = 2.6$, there is a 55 cm/s (28%) spread in the measured $S_0$’s. There is much less spread between the numerical calculations of $S_0$ in both Fig. 3a and b relative to experimental results. The $S_0$’s predictions by Models I and II are nearly identical. For 0.5 ≤ $\phi$ ≤ 1.2 Model III’s predictions are in close agreement with those obtained using Models I and II. At larger $\phi$’s, using Model III results consistently in higher $S_0$’s. For all three models, $\phi$ at which $S_0$ peaks is nearly identical, $\phi = 1.75$, which coincides with the experimental observations.

Most of the literature results in Fig. 3 were determined using the spherically expanding flame technique except for the measurements performed by Egolfopoulos and Law [61], which were determined using the spherically expanding flame technique. It should be noted that it is difficult to perform meaningful comparisons between existing literature results, depicted in Fig. 3, as there is a distinct lack of meaningful quantification of experimental uncertainties for these measurements. Nevertheless, from Fig. 3a and b, it can be observed that the present calculations lie well within the range (or scatter) of experimental results.

A new set of experimental measurements of $S_0$’s of H2/(9.5%O2 + 90.5%N2) mixtures with carefully quantified experimental uncertainties were determined at $T_u = 298$ K and $p = 1$ atm. The percentage of diluent, N2, was determined in order to maintain a maximum $S_{u,ref}$ below 90 cm/s. Reducing $S_{u,ref}$ resulted in a lower propensity for the mixture to flash back and lower Reynolds numbers at the burner exit, thus minimizing flow instabilities and data uncertainty. The $S_0$’s uncertainties in this study were determined by the 2 standard deviations (95.45% confidence) of $S_{u,ref}$’s based on sampling errors in $S_{u,ref}$, and have been systematically quantified by the authors in Ref. [62].

Figure 4a compares literature results [61,63] and numerical calculations for $S_0$’s of H2/(7.7%O2 + 92.3%N2) mixtures at $T_u = 298$ K and $p = 1$ atm. There is closer agreement between the two literature data sets over a wide range of $\phi$’s compared to Fig. 3. For $\phi ≥ 2.0$, the results from Egolfopoulos and Law [61] are generally lower than those from Ref. [63]. Figure 4b compares the present experimental results and numerical calculations for H2/(9.5%O2 + 90.5%N2) mixtures.

Comparing model predictions of $S_0$’s for flames of the two H2/O2/N2 mixtures in Fig. 4a and b, reveals that there are now observable differences between predictions made using all three models. Detailed analysis, presented later in this section, demonstrates that this difference is kinetic in nature and stems from the various treatments of the 3rd body collision efficiency of N2. From Fig. 4b, it can be seen that for $\phi ≤ 2.0$ results obtained using Model
III agree best with the present data. At larger $\phi$’s, calculations using Model II reproduce best the present data. Overall, with increasing diluent fraction in the oxidizer stream, all three models have a tendency to under-predict the measured $S_p$’s.

Sensitivity analysis and computed flame structures highlight the kinetic similarities and differences between H$_2$/air and diluted H$_2$/O$_2$/N$_2$ flames that have a reduced adiabatic flame temperature, $T_{ad}$.

The logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $S_p$ to kinetics for H$_2$/air (Fig. 5a and c) and H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) (Fig. 5b and d) flames at $\phi$ = 1.1 (Fig. 5a and b), and $\phi$ = 1.75 (Fig. 5c and d) are shown in Fig. 5. Comparing the sensitivity coefficients of H$_2$/air and H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) flames reveals that these two sets of mixtures appear to exhibit similar behavior. There is notable sensitivity to the chain branching (R1, R3, and R5), propagating (R4), and termination (R2, R10) reactions for all three models apparent in Fig. 5. The key difference in the sensitivity analysis results between these two flames is in their sensitivity to the main termination reaction, R2. For the H$_2$/air flames considered in this analysis, increasing the rate of R2 has a positive effect on reactivity, whereas for H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) flames, increasing the rate of R2 will have a strongly negative effect on the overall reactivity. To better understand this observation, computed specie mole fraction profiles and reaction rates within these flames are analyzed.

Figure 6 depicts the concentrations of the important radicals H, OH, HO$_2$, and O (Fig. 6a and c) and the reaction rates for R1, R2, and R5 (Fig. 6b and d) for H$_2$/air and H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) flames at $\phi$ = 1.1. Figure 6 clearly demonstrates some of the key differences between these two flames caused by increasing diluent ratio in the oxidizer stream. First, the concentration ratios of HO$_2$/H, HO$_2$:OH, and HO$_2$:O are larger in the H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) flame. Second, there is a change in the reaction rate ratio between R1 and R2. For the H$_2$/air flame, the reaction rate of R1 is greater than R2, whereas the opposite is true for the H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) flame. Finally, the reaction rate of R5 is an order of magnitude lower in the H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) flame compared to the H$_2$/air flame. The differences in the characteristics of the radical pools and elementary reaction rates between these two flames factor into the sensitivity of $S_p$ to R2 observed in Fig. 5. For H$_2$/air flames, approximately 70% of HO$_2$, a large majority of which is produced via R2, is consumed through R5. For the H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) flame the reaction rate of R5 is reduced by an order of magnitude relative to the H$_2$/air flame greatly reducing the net flux of HO$_2$ through this pathway that would produce the highly reactive OH. These results and analysis demonstrate some key differences and similarities between the detailed flame structure for H$_2$/air and H$_2$/oxidizer flames whereby the oxidizer has been diluted relative to air to reduce the overall reactivity of the mixture and make experiments more tractable. An alternative approach to this analysis has been previously presented in Ref. [2]. In Ref. [2] analysis was performed by identifying the explosion limit temperature and subsequently comparing the predicted flame structure. This analysis has been performed and is included as supplementary material.

4.2. Experimental results and numerical calculations of stretched H$_2$/air and H$_2$/($9.5\%$O$_2$ + $90.5\%$N$_2$) flames

There is ongoing debate regarding the value of modeling $S_p$’s vs. modeling non-extrapolated directly measured data. Figure 7a and b compare linear vs. non-linear extrapolation methodologies to...
determine \( S_u \)'s for \( H_2/\text{air} \) and \( H_2/(0.5\%\text{O}_2 + 90.5\%\text{N}_2) \) flames over a range of \( \phi \)'s. Clearly at the conditions depicted in Fig. 7a there is little discrepancy between \( S_u \)'s determined using either extrapolation technique. For the fuel lean mixtures depicted in Fig. 7a, there can be as large as a 10 cm/s difference between linearly extrapolated \( S_u \)'s compared with non-linearly extrapolated \( S_u \)'s. In the present study the \( S_u \) vs. \( K \) data are directly modeled using the opposed-jet code eliminating uncertainties associated with extrapolations similar to Natarajan et al. \[37\].

Figure 8a–f depict the \( S_u \) as a function of strain rate for a subset of the experimental results for \( H_2/\text{air} \) and \( H_2/(0.5\%\text{O}_2 + 90.5\%\text{N}_2) \) flames at \( \phi = 0.32, 0.35, 0.45, 1.10, 1.75, \) and 2.40 respectively. For the \( \phi < 1 \) cases depicted in Fig. 8a–c, there is a notably large gradient (i.e., large Markstein length) in the \( S_u \) vs. \( K \) data. For \( \phi > 1 \), Fig. 8e and f show that there is a much weaker dependence of \( S_u \) to \( K \) relative to the aforementioned fuel lean cases (smaller Markstein lengths). This is to be expected as \( \phi > 1 \) mixture result in more vigorously burning flames that are less sensitive to stretch than the weaker burning \( \phi < 1 \) flames. Additionally, as mentioned in the Introduction, for \( \phi < 1 \) \( H_2/\text{air} \) mixtures \( L_e < 1.0 \) and thus the overall reactivity increases with (positive) stretch.

Figure 8a–f also compare numerical calculations using Models I, II, and III against the present directly measured data. At all \( \phi \)'s considered, the present models reproduce to a very high degree the Markstein lengths in the experimentally determined \( S_u \) vs. \( K \) data. This is as expected since it has been demonstrated (e.g., \[42,47\]) that the balance of momentum and heat, upstream of the preheat zone where \( S_u \) is determined, should not depend, to the first order, on kinetics or transport of the chemical kinetic model. This agreement also provides confidence in the underlying physical model used in the numerical formulation of the opposed-jet. Results obtained using Model I consistently under-predict the measured \( S_u \), while for very fuel lean (\( \phi = 0.35 \)) and very fuel rich (\( \phi = 2.4 \)) conditions, Model II provides good agreements with the present data. Between \( 0.35 < \phi < 2.1 \), calculations using Model II under-predict the measured \( S_u \). Calculations using Model III under-predict the data for the \( \phi = 0.32, 0.35, \) and 0.45 cases. Model III predicts a much stronger positive effect of increasing \( \phi \) on the reactivity of \( H_2/\text{oxidizer} \) mixtures compared with Models I and II. Therefore, computed \( S_u \)'s using Model III under-predict the data for the leanest case (Fig. 8a) and over-predict them for the richest case (Fig. 8f).

4.3. Extinction limits of premixed fuel lean \( H_2/\text{air} \) flames

Figure 9 compares the measured and computed \( K_{\text{ext}} \)’s for premixed \( H_2/\text{air} \) flames in the \( 0.28 \leq \phi \leq 0.35 \) range. There is excellent agreement between the experimental and computed results using Model II for all \( \phi \)'s considered. Predicted \( K_{\text{ext}} \)’s by Models I and III are identical, and 20–55% lower than the predictions by Model II.

The overall trends between experimental and computed \( K_{\text{ext}} \)’s of premixed \( H_2/\text{air} \) flames are identical to the trends observed in Fig. 8a (\( \phi = 0.32 \)) and 8b (at \( \phi = 0.35 \)). That is, Model II reproduces the experimental results, and predictions made using Models I and III are identical but notably under-predict the experimental results. This is a different trend compared to that seen in Fig. 3a. Specifically, for \( \phi \)'s of \( H_2/\text{air} \) flames, Model III exhibits the strongest reactivity, and computed \( \phi \)’s of Models I and II are identical and lower than Model III. This demonstrates that some of the kinetic pathways are sensitized at extinction differently compared to propagation, since extinction limits probe kinetic regimes for ultra-lean premixed flames for which propagation studies of fundamental value are not feasible due to cellular instabilities.

Figure 10 depicts the logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) to reaction rate coefficients computed using Models I, II, and III for \( H_2/\text{air} \) flames at \( \phi = 0.28 \). There is notable sensitivity to the chain propagation R4, chain termination R2, and chain branching R1 reactions for all three models. Additionally, there is large
to dissociate into OH + O before collision with any third body (e.g., [12]). The branching ratios, R2:R1, for Models I and III are almost identical for M = H2O and Models II and III have strong agreement in predictions for the case of M = N2. Model II has, overall, the lowest ratio of R2:R1, especially for M = H2O, resulting in increased overall reactivity for calculations of fuel lean flames. The reactivity of ultra-lean mixtures predicted by all three models follows closely the trends shown in Fig. 11.

Compared to R1, there exists notable uncertainty in the rate constants of R2. This is especially the case for the 3rd body collisional efficiency of H2O. Models II and III use the same value for the low pressure limit rate coefficient for R2 proposed by Michael et al. [65] but have changed the centering factor 3rd body efficiency of H2O [2]. Between Models II and III, the centering factor was changed from 0.8 to 0.5 and the collisional efficiency of H2 relative to N2 in R2 has been assigned a value of 11.89, 11.0, and 14 for Models I, II, and III respectively. The result of this analysis is that although Model I uses a different rate constant for R2 [10,66] compared to Models II and III, the resulting overall reaction rate for R2 between Models I and III are nearly identical. This explains the similar predictions using Models I and III, as shown in Fig. 9. Models I and III adopt the high pressure limit rate coefficient expression of R2 proposed by Troe [66]. In Model I, the pre-exponential Arrhenius factor has been optimized by a factor of 1.1. In Model II, the high-pressure limit rate constants were taken from Ref. [67].

4.4. Extinction limits of 'wet' premixed H2/air flames

The results shown in Fig. 12 illustrate the effect of H2O addition on the extinction of premixed H2/air flames. A H2/air jet is co-flowed against a N2 jet with H2O added to the H2/air jet. Experiments in Fig. 12 were performed at $\phi = 0.38$, $p = 1$ atm, and $T_{\text{amb}} = 343$ K. The x-axis indicates the mole fraction of H2O in the H2/air/H2O mixture. The agreements between the data and numerical predictions are consistent with the results of Fig. 9 for premixed ultra-lean H2/air flames. That is, predictions using Model II are in excellent agreement with the data and the computed $K_{\text{ext}}$ using Models I and III are consistently lower than the data.

To understand better the effect of H2O as a third body molecule, the main termination reaction was separated into R2 and R2a, 

$$H + O_2 + M \rightarrow HO_2 + M \quad (M \neq H_2O) \quad (R2)$$

$$H + O_2 + H_2O \rightarrow HO_2 + H_2O. \quad (R2a)$$

The logarithmic sensitivity coefficients of $K_{\text{ext}}$ of H2/H2O/air flames to kinetics computed using Model I, are shown in Fig. 13. At $X_{H_2O} = 0.17$, the $K_{\text{ext}}$ sensitivity to R2a is larger compared to R1 suggesting that these data can be used as targets to constrain the uncertainty associated with the collisional efficiency of H2O. H2O dissociation, upstream of the flame, is not important under the conditions considered.

4.5. Extinction limits of non-premixed H2 flames

Figure 14a depicts the experimental and computed $K_{\text{ext}}$'s as a function of H2 mole fraction, $X_{H_2}$, in the H2/N2 jet for non-premixed counterflow H2 flames with unburned fuel stream temperature, $T_{\text{fuel}}$ = 298 K, oxidizer stream temperature, $T_{\text{amb}} = 298$ K, and $p = 1$ atm.

Numerical calculations were performed using Models I, II, and III. For $X_{H_2} < 0.16$, Model II accurately reproduces the data similarly to the premixed flame results shown in Figs. 9 and 12. With increasing $X_{H_2}$, Model II slightly over-predicts the data. At $X_{H_2} > 0.175$ Models I and III predictions agree well with the experimental results.
Figure 14b depicts the experimental and computed $K_{\text{ext}}$'s for 'wet' non-premixed H$_2$ flames. The experimental conditions for these flames are $X_{\text{H}_2}/N_2 = 0.17$, $T_{\text{H}_2/O_2} = 298$ K, $T_{\text{air/O}_2} = 353$ K, and $p = 1$ atm. As in Figs. 12 and 14a, using Model II provides the best agreements with the data while using Models I and III the data are under-predicted.

4.6. Pressure effects on extinction limits of non-premixed H$_2$ flames

Figure 15 depicts the experimental and computed $K_{\text{ext}}$'s for non-premixed H$_2$ flames for $p = 1$, 4, and 7 atm, $T_{\text{H}_2/O_2} = 298$ K, and $T_{\text{air/O}_2} = 298$ K). Numerical calculations were performed using Models I, Ia, II, and III. As stated earlier, Model Ia is nearly identical to Model I with the exception of the rate constants of R6. Calculated $K_{\text{ext}}$'s using Models I, Ia, and III are identical at $p = 1$ atm. For all three conditions namely $p = 1$, 4, and 7 atm, using Model II results in the largest $K_{\text{ext}}$'s. Predicted $K_{\text{ext}}$'s using Model II are in good agreement with the data at $p = 1$ atm, as discussed in the previous section, but notably over-predict, by a factor of two, the data at $p = 4$ and 7 atm. It is apparent from these results that Model II is unable to capture the pressure dependence. Additional simulations were performed using Model II with a H$_2$O collision efficiency of 14.0 (from Model III) with a center-broadening factor of 0.5 [2]. The results predicted that $K_{\text{ext}}$ will decrease 5% from the original result at $p = 4$ atm, but it is still 38% larger than predictions using Model III and 60% higher than the experimental values. There are minor differences between computed $K_{\text{ext}}$'s using Models I and III at all pressures. There is good agreement between calculations using Models I, Ia, and III and experimental results at $p = 4$ atm. At $p = 7$ atm, calculations using Models I and III over-predict the data but predictions using Model Ia are in excellent agreement with the data. Clearly, the pressure dependence is best captured by Model Ia relative to the other three models considered.

The only difference between Models I and Ia is in the rate expression of R6, which has been established to increase in importance with pressure (e.g., [68]). The rate constant for R6 in Model Ia is expressed by the combination of two Arrhenius forms [unit: cm$^3$ mol$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$]:

---

Figure 8. Experimental and computed reference flame speeds for H$_2$/air and H$_2/(9.5\%O_2 + 90.5\%N_2)$ mixtures at $\phi = 0.32, 0.35, 0.45, 1.1, 1.75,$ and 2.4 at $T_0 = 298$ K and $p = 1$ atm. Lines: simulations using Models I ( ), II ( ), and III ( ). Symbols: present experimental data.
The first term in the above rate expression is from Keyser [69] with the original pre-exponential factor optimized by a factor of 0.82. This portion of the rate represents the low temperature portion of the rate constant. The second term in the above rate expression of R6 is from Hippler et al. [70] and represents the intermediate and high temperature regimes. Model I uses a combination of four Arrhenius forms developed by Sivaramakrishnan et al. [68],

\[ k_{R6} = 1.41 \times 10^{15} \tau^{-1.76} \exp \left( \frac{-26.900}{RT} \right) + 5.37 \times 10^{10} \tau^{-16.72} \exp \left( \frac{-32.900}{RT} \right) + 2.51 \times 10^{12} \tau^{2} \exp \left( \frac{-40,000}{RT} \right) + 10^{136} \tau^{-40} \times \exp \left( \frac{-34.800}{RT} \right) \]

\( T \): temperature, K; \( R \): universal gas constant, cal mol\(^{-1}\) K\(^{-1}\).

The first term in the above rate expression is from Keyser [69] with the original pre-exponential factor optimized by a factor of 0.82. This portion of the rate represents the low temperature portion of the rate constant. The second term in the above rate expression of R6 is from Hippler et al. [70] and represents the intermediate and high temperature regimes. Model I uses a combination of four Arrhenius forms developed by Sivaramakrishnan et al. [68],

\[ k_{R6} = (2.375 \times 10^{13})(T^0) \exp \left( \frac{500}{RT} \right) + (10^{36})(T^0) \exp \left( \frac{-17,330}{RT} \right) \]

Models II and III use only the singular rate constant expression developed by Keyser [69]:

\[ k_{R6} = 2.89 \times 10^{17} \tau^{0} \exp \left( \frac{497}{RT} \right) \]

Although replacing R6 in Model I with the expression from Model Ia improves the data predictions at elevated pressures, this is not the case for Models II and III. Simply replacing R6 in Models II and III with the rate parameter for R6 from Model Ia does not result in...
improved predictions. Each elementary reaction in a H₂–O₂ system is tightly coupled with significant sensitivities of global flame phenomena. The challenges associated with the determination of the R6 rate constants stem from the lack of consistent experimental results and its unusual apparent temperature dependence (e.g., [71,72]). To parameterize correctly the non-Arrhenius expression for R6 over a wide range of conditions, additional experimental data are needed.

In Fig. 16, \( K_{\text{ext}} \)'s are depicted as a function of pressure for a fixed condition. The pressure range is between \( p = 1 \) and 7 atm and the calculations were made using Models I, II, and III. Calculations using Model II are not shown as its performance in Fig. 15 precludes it. Experimentally, \( K_{\text{ext}} \) increases with pressure up to \( p = 3 \) atm. Above \( p = 3 \) atm, \( K_{\text{ext}} \) decreases with pressure. For all experimental conditions depicted in Fig. 16 only calculations using Model Ia are in excellent agreement with the data. Models I and III capture the pressure dependence of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) but over-predict the reactivity above \( p = 2 \) atm.

A more fundamental approach, however, is considering the variation of the density-weighted extinction strain rate \( \rho_{\text{u}} K_{\text{ext}} \) as a function of pressure [73–75], where \( \rho_{\text{u}} \) is the unburned mixture density. Law [74] and Birkan and Law [75] used a chain mechanism model to demonstrate the importance of the branching-termination coupling in flame modeling and its influence predicting...
pressure dependence. From the Damköhler number definition, the relevant strain rate was demonstrated to be \( \rho K \) instead of \( K \) [74]. This has also been demonstrated for the pressure dependence of the mass burning rates of CH\(_4\)/air flames (e.g., [76]), H\(_2\)/air flames (e.g., [2,77]), and \( \rho K \)'s of non-premixed CH\(_4\) flames (e.g., [73,74]).

Figure 17 depicts \( \rho K \)'s of non-premixed CH\(_4\) flames as a function of pressure for \( X_{\text{CH}_4} = 0.14 \). From Fig. 17 it can be seen that the negative pressure dependence shifts to \( p = 5 \) atm. The turning point is still captured by Model Ia and is shifted to higher pressures, i.e. \( p = 6 \) and 7 atm for Models III and I respectively. The phenomena of the negative effect of pressure on the overall reactivity have been reported and discussed in number of previous studies (e.g., [2,29,30,32,73,76]).

Sohn and Chung [30] and most recently Niemann et al. [32] have discussed the negative pressure dependence of extinction limits of non-premixed H\(_2\) flames; the former study [30] primarily expanded upon the work by Balakrishnan et al. [78]. In Refs. [30,32] these phenomena are explained by defining a crossover temperature, \( T_c \). When the maximum (peak) flame temperature at extinction, \( T_{\text{f,max,E}} \) is above \( T_c \) the magnitude of the rate for R1 is larger than R2, as a result there will be a positive dependence of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) on pressure. Conversely, when \( T_{\text{f,max,E}} \) is below \( T_c \), R2 has a larger rate compared to R1 and increasing pressure will retard reactivity. In Refs. [30,32] it has been shown that \( K_{\text{ext}} \) first increases and then decreases with pressure. The pressure at the turning point corresponds to the pressure at which \( T_c > T_{\text{f,max,E}} \). This phenomenon corresponds to the turning point pressure dependence of \( \rho K \) and not \( K_{\text{ext}} \) as shown in Fig. 18. Figure 18 depicts the computed \( T_{\text{f,max,E}} \) and \( T_c \) as a function of \( p \) using Models I, Ia, and III. \( T_c \) is identical for Models I and Ia because rate parameters for R1 and R2 are same for both models. For \( X_{\text{H}_2} = 0.14 \), \( T_c > T_{\text{f,max,E}} \) occurs at \( p = 5 \) atm for Model I and Ia and \( p = 4 \) atm for Model III. Model Ia has a predicted turning point of \( \rho K_{\text{ext}} \) at \( p = 5 \) atm as shown in Fig. 17.

To understand better the kinetics involved in the phenomena modeled in Figs. 15–17 the sensitivity of \( K_{\text{ext}} \) to kinetics for a \( X_{\text{H}_2} = 0.14 \) non-premixed H\(_2\) flame was computed using Model Ia at various pressure conditions and is depicted in Fig. 19. At \( p = 1 \) atm the chain branching R1 and R3, and chain propagation R4 reactions involving H, O, and OH dominate the sensitivity spectrum. At \( p = 3 \) atm, reactions involving HO\(_2\) are increasingly sensitized. Conversely, the sensitivities to R3 and R4 substantially decrease. At \( p = 5 \) atm, the rate ratio of R2 to R1 has significantly increased compared to \( p = 1 \) atm.

The primary cause for the pressure dependence of \( \rho K_{\text{ext}} \) is the competing consumption pathways of H between R1 and R2. The
results of Fig. 19 illustrate that reactions involving HO2 become increasingly rate limiting at elevated pressures. In Fig. 20, H concentration decreases but HO2 concentration is notably higher relative to H with increasing pressure. Higher HO2 concentration, as a result, leads to increased flux through R5 and R8 that compete with R1 for the consumption of H. The chain branching R5 is the dominant HO2 consumption pathway. OH concentration also decreases with increasing pressure; however R9 plays an increasingly important role in OH generation at elevated pressures. Although R5 is still the dominant pathways for both HO2 consumption and OH generation at increasing pressures, it gradually decreases in importance in favor of the chain terminating R6, as shown in Figs. 19 and 21. Furthermore, the consumption pathway of O through R9, which competes with R3, notably increases with increasing pressure, which has been previously discussed by Santner et al. [35]. Increased flux through R9 reduces H production and increases the importance of the chain terminating R6.

Figure 21a and b compares the mole fractions of H and HO2 computed using Models I and Ia. Although H concentrations are similar for both models, Model Ia results in less HO2 compared to Model I at elevated pressures. Differences in R6 result in notable differences in HO2 radical pools at elevated pressures.

Figure 21c and d compares computed reaction rates for reactions involving HO2 against R1 and R2 in a XH2 = 0.14 non-premixed H2/N2–air flames at near extinction conditions using Models I and Ia. Model I results in a smaller net rate of R6 than Model Ia. Comparing p = 2 atm and 6 atm, it can be seen clearly that differences caused by R6 are more profound at elevated pressures. In Model I, HO2 is consumed to a much larger degree via R5 at 6 atm compared to Model Ia. Sheen [13] concluded that there is a significant coupling between R2, with H2O as the third body, and R6 that has a strong effect on the ability of H2/CO models to accurately capture the pressure dependency of the mass-burning rate.

In Fig. 22a predictions using Model Ia are compared against data for XH2 = 0.135, 0.140, and 0.145. As XH2 decreases, the pressure at which turn over occurs shifts to lower pressures. Model Ia captures closely the experimental results and trends. Figure 22b
and •, is that in the CO/H₂ as the oxidizer and H₂/N₂ = 298 K and of non-premixed flames as the third mixture. All experiments were performed in the H₂/N₂ for various !, II ( ), and Ia ( ) exceeding consumption pathways including R6. Sheen [13] discussed ¼ ¼ ¼ ¼ > 2500 K. was removed. This also allowed for the presence of notably large, flames with H₂ as a function of pressure for various mixture was varied from 0.32 to 0.43 in the H₂ for the importance of R6 to accurately capture the transition to negative pressure dependence. In addition, Sheen noted that constraining the uncertainty in R6 would have the largest impact in reducing the model uncertainties. Clearly ρ_Kext of non-premixed H₂ flames provides good targets to minimize the uncertainty associated with R6.

4.7. Pressure effects on extinction limits of 'wet' non-premixed H₂ flames

Figure 23 depicts the experimental and computed Kext’s for a non-premixed H₂ flames with H₂O added to the oxidizer stream at X_H₂ = 0.15, p = 4 atm, T_H₂/N₂ = 298 K, and T_air/H₂O = 393 K. The x-axis values correspond to the mole fraction of H₂O in the oxidizer stream. Predictions obtained using Model II show good agreement with current experimental data at p = 1 atm but notably over-predict the data at p = 4 atm. Predictions using Models I and III slightly under-predict the data at p = 1 atm but provide good agreements at p = 4 atm. Predictions using Model Ia under-predict the data to a larger degree compared to Models I and III at elevated pressures. Comparing the trends between numerical calculations observed in Fig. 15 with those in Fig. 23 it becomes clear that the same set of kinetics is sensitized in both types of flames.

4.8. CO₂ third body effects on premixed H₂/O₂ flames

The goal of these experiments is to sensitize the extinction limits to the main termination reaction involving CO₂ as the third body collisional molecule, i.e.,

$$\text{H} + \text{O}_2 + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{CO}_2.$$  (R2b)

The complication in achieving such a system is the large concentration of H₂O. Typically the sensitivity to R2a will overwhelm any sensitivity to R2b. Secondly, performing experiments using air as the oxidizer will result in large sensitivities to the main termination reaction involving N₂. To overcome these two complications the extinction limits of H₂/CO/CO₂/O₂ flames was experimentally determined and compared with numerical calculations. In order to minimize the sensitivity three body reactions involving H₂O, the H₂:CO ratio was adjusted such that chain branching was achieved while simultaneously minimizing H₂O production. By using O₂ as the oxidizer (instead of air), sensitivity to three body reactions involving N₂ was removed. This also allowed for the presence of notably large quantities of CO₂.

The results are shown in Fig. 24 and the reported mole fraction of CO₂ is that in the CO/H₂/O₂/CO₂ mixture. All experiments were performed at T_ad = 298 K and p = 1 atm. The first series of experiments was for H₂/CO = 0.15, ϕ = 0.45, and the mole fraction of CO₂ in the H₂/O₂/CO/CO₂ mixture was varied from 0.32 to 0.43 (Fig. 24a). The second series of experiments was for H₂/CO = 0.05, ϕ = 0.23, and the mole fraction of CO₂ in the H₂/O₂/CO/CO₂ mixture was varied from 0.07 to 0.35 (Fig. 24b), with 1700 < T_ad < 2500 K.
There is excellent agreement between predictions obtained using Models I and II and the data.

Figure 25 depicts the sensitivity analysis of $K_{\text{ext}}$ for kinetics. For $\text{H}_2/\text{CO/O}_2$ flames there is notable sensitivity to $\text{CO}$ oxidation via $\text{R12}$. Additionally, there is notable negative sensitivity to $\text{R2b}$. Although there are slight differences between the rate parameters for these two aforementioned reactions, their net reaction rates are identical.

4.9. Effect of binary diffusion coefficients on extinction limits of non-premixed $\text{H}_2$ flames

Figure 26 compares the experimental and computed $K_{\text{ext}}$’s for two sets of non-premixed $\text{H}_2$ flames using Models II and IIa. Model II uses a different formulation for its transport parameters when compared to Models I and III. Models I and III implement the transport parameters developed by Wang and coworkers [8, 24, 60]. In the trial model, Model IIa the transport parameters of Model II were replaced by those used in Models I and III. Figure 26a and b compare computed $K_{\text{ext}}$’s using Model II and Model IIa to the data for selected non-premixed $\text{H}_2$ flames. In both cases, using Model IIa results in lower $K_{\text{ext}}$’s by 10–20% compared to Model II, and which are in closer agreement with the data.

To better understand the results of Fig. 26, Fig. 27 compares the $\text{H}_2/\text{O}_2/\text{CO}/\text{CO}_2$ flames with $\text{CO}/\text{H}_2 = 0.05$ at $\phi = 0.23$, $T_u = 298$ K, and $p = 1$ atm computed using Model I.
observation from this figure is the positive sensitivity of the $K_{\text{ext}}$ to $D_{H,N_2}$ and its negative sensitivity to $D_{H,N_2}$. Increasing $D_{H,N_2}$ leads to a larger net flux of reactant, $H_2$, into the reaction zone therefore increasing reactivity and making the flame more resistant to extinction. Conversely, increasing $D_{H,N_2}$ leads to a net ‘loss’ of H from the reaction zone making the flame less resistant to extinction [24]. It is important to note that this is not always the case. For example, in Ref. [24] it was observed that in the case of vigorously burning $H_2$ flames the sensitivity of extinction to $D_{H,N_2}$ is positive.

In summary, in Model II the $D_{H,N_2}$ is lower compared to Model Ila resulting in a larger H radical pool within the reaction zone and thus increased resistance to extinction.

5. Concluding remarks

Although the oxidation of hydrogen has been extensively studied, there exist notable discrepancies between data sets and kinetic model predictions for propagation and extinction of hydrogen flames. Additionally, there remain significant uncertainties in the individual rate expressions in $H_2$ kinetic models. In the present study a wide range of fundamental flame data for premixed and non-premixed hydrogen flames were with well-quantified uncertainties were determined, and can be used toward constraining the uncertainties of kinetic models.

The first part of this study focused on premixed $H_2$/oxidizer flames. It was observed that there exists a large variation in existing literature laminar flame speeds of $H_2$/air flames. To better resolve this issue, the laminar flame speeds of $N_2$-diluted $H_2$ flames were measured in the counterflow configuration. The extra inert dilution was implemented in order to reduce the mixture reactivity and increase thus the experimental accuracy. Although these data are useful for model validation, there are differences in the detailed flame structure between $N_2$-diluted and $H_2$/air flames. Furthermore, in order to alleviate any ambiguities caused by extrapolation methodologies to zero stretch, directly measured reference flame speeds at various strain rates were compared against computed results.

To probe the kinetics of ultra-lean $H_2$/air flames that are thermo-diffusionaly unstable at the limit of zero stretch, extinction strain rates of premixed $H_2$/air flames were investigated. The ratio of rates of the main branching ($H + O_2 \rightarrow H + OH$) to main termination ($H + O_2 + M \rightarrow HO_2 + M$) reactions dictated the ability of the kinetic model to reproduce experimental results. To supplement these results, extinction strain rates of non-premixed $H_2$ flames were measured at atmospheric and elevated pressures. The computed results did not capture the pressure dependence satisfactorily. While the aforementioned competition between the main branching and termination reactions controls to great extent the extinction behavior, the chain terminating reaction $HO_2 + OH \rightarrow H_2O + O_2$ was determined also to play an important role at elevated pressures.

Experiments were designed also to specifically to sensitize three-body reactions involving $H_2O$ and $CO_2$ as the third body. Such data are needed to constrain the large uncertainty in three-body termination reactions.

Finally, the importance of accurately formulating and modeling binary diffusion coefficients and their effect on the prediction of flame propagation and specialty extinction has been demonstrated through detailed numerical calculations and sensitivity analysis.
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