

Accurate Estimates of Fine Scale Reaction Zone Thicknesses in Gas Phase Detonations

Joseph M. Powers (powers@nd.edu)
Samuel Paolucci (paolucci@nd.edu)

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

43rd AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit
Reno, Nevada

10-13 January 2005



UNIVERSITY OF
NOTRE DAME

Motivation

- Detailed kinetics models are widely used in detonation simulations.
- The finest length scale predicted by such models is usually not clarified and often not resolved.
- Tuning computational results to match experiments without first harmonizing with underlying mathematics renders predictions unreliable.

Partial Review

- Westbrook, *Combust. Sci. Tech.*, 1982.
- Shepherd, *Dynamics of Explosions*, 1986.
- Mikolaitis, *Combust. Sci. Tech.*, 1987.
- Oran, *et al.*, *Combust. Flame*, 1998.
- Paolucci, *et al.* *Combust. Theory Model.*, 2001.
- Hayashi, *et al.*, *Proc. Combust. Institute*, 2002.
- Law, *et al.*, *J. Propul. Power*, 2003.
- Powers and Paolucci, *AIAA Journal*, to appear.

Model: Reactive Euler Equations

- one-dimensional
- steady
- inviscid
- detailed Arrhenius kinetics
- calorically imperfect ideal gas mixture

Model: Reactive Euler Equations

$$\begin{aligned}\rho u &= \rho_o D, \\ \rho u^2 + p &= \rho_o D^2 + p_o, \\ e + \frac{u^2}{2} + \frac{p}{\rho} &= e_o + \frac{D^2}{2} + \frac{p_o}{\rho_o}, \\ \frac{dY_i}{dx} &= f_i \equiv \frac{\dot{\omega}_i M_i}{\rho_o D}.\end{aligned}$$

Supplemented by state equations and the law of mass action.

Reduced Model

Algebraic reductions lead to a final form of

$$\frac{dY_i}{dx} = f_i(Y_1, \dots, Y_{N-L})$$

with

- N : number of molecular species
- L : number of atomic elements

Eigenvalue Analysis of Local Length Scales

Local behavior is modelled by

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Y}}{dx} = \mathbf{J} \cdot (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{Y}^*) + \mathbf{b}, \quad \mathbf{Y}(x^*) = \mathbf{Y}^*,$$

whose solution has the form

$$\mathbf{Y}(x) = \mathbf{Y}^* + \left(\mathbf{P} \cdot e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}(x-x^*)} \cdot \mathbf{P}^{-1} - \mathbf{I} \right) \cdot \mathbf{J}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{b}.$$

Here $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ has eigenvalues λ_i of Jacobian \mathbf{J} in its diagonal.

The length scales are given by

$$l_i(x) = \frac{1}{|\lambda_i(x)|}.$$

Computational Methods

- A standard ODE solver (DLSODE) was used to integrate the equations.
- Standard IMSL subroutines were used to evaluate the local Jacobians and eigenvalues at every step.
- The Chemkin software package was used to evaluate kinetic rates and thermodynamic properties.
- Computation time was typically two minutes on a 900 *MHz* Sun Blade 1000.


Physical System

- Hydrogen-air detonation: $2H_2 + O_2 + 3.76N_2$.
- $N = 9$ molecular species, $L = 3$ atomic elements, $J = 19$ reversible reactions.
- $p_o = 1 \text{ atm}$.
- $T_o = 298 \text{ K}$.
- Identical to system studied by both Shepherd (1986) and Mikolaitis (1987).

Detailed Kinetics Model


j	Reaction	A_j	β_j	E_j
1	$H_2 + O_2 \rightleftharpoons OH + OH$	1.70×10^{13}	0.00	47780
2	$OH + H_2 \rightleftharpoons H_2O + H$	1.17×10^9	1.30	3626
3	$H + O_2 \rightleftharpoons OH + O$	5.13×10^{16}	-0.82	16507
4	$O + H_2 \rightleftharpoons OH + H$	1.80×10^{10}	1.00	8826
5	$H + O_2 + M \rightleftharpoons HO_2 + M$	2.10×10^{18}	-1.00	0
6	$H + O_2 + O_2 \rightleftharpoons HO_2 + O_2$	6.70×10^{19}	-1.42	0
7	$H + O_2 + N_2 \rightleftharpoons HO_2 + N_2$	6.70×10^{19}	-1.42	0
8	$OH + HO_2 \rightleftharpoons H_2O + O_2$	5.00×10^{13}	0.00	1000
9	$H + HO_2 \rightleftharpoons OH + OH$	2.50×10^{14}	0.00	1900
10	$O + HO_2 \rightleftharpoons O_2 + OH$	4.80×10^{13}	0.00	1000
11	$OH + OH \rightleftharpoons O + H_2O$	6.00×10^8	1.30	0
12	$H_2 + M \rightleftharpoons H + H + M$	2.23×10^{12}	0.50	92600
13	$O_2 + M \rightleftharpoons O + O + M$	1.85×10^{11}	0.50	95560
14	$H + OH + M \rightleftharpoons H_2O + M$	7.50×10^{23}	-2.60	0
15	$H + HO_2 \rightleftharpoons H_2 + O_2$	2.50×10^{13}	0.00	700
16	$HO_2 + HO_2 \rightleftharpoons H_2O_2 + O_2$	2.00×10^{12}	0.00	0
17	$H_2O_2 + M \rightleftharpoons OH + OH + M$	1.30×10^{17}	0.00	45500
18	$H_2O_2 + H \rightleftharpoons HO_2 + H_2$	1.60×10^{12}	0.00	3800
19	$H_2O_2 + OH \rightleftharpoons H_2O + HO_2$	1.00×10^{13}	0.00	1800

Mole Fractions versus Distance




- significant evolution at fine length scales $x < 10^{-3}$ cm.
- results agree with those of Shepherd.

Temperature Profile




- Temperature flat in the post-shock induction zone $0 < x < 2.6 \times 10^{-2} \text{ cm}$.
- Thermal explosion followed by relaxation to equilibrium at $x \sim 10^0 \text{ cm}$.

Eigenvalue Analysis: Length Scale Evolution




- Finest length scale:
 $2.3 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}$.
- Coarsest length scale
 $3.0 \times 10^1 \text{ cm}$.
- Finest length scale similar to that necessary for numerical stability of ODE solver.

Influence of Initial Pressure




- Induction zone length and finest length scale are sensitive to initial pressure.
- Finest length scale **three orders of magnitude** smaller than induction zone length.

Verification: Comparison with Mikolaitis



- Lagrangian calculation allows direct comparison with Mikolaitis' results.
- agreement very good.


Grid Convergence



- Finest length scale must be resolved to converge at proper order.
- Results are converging at proper order for first and second order discretizations.

Numerical Stability

- Discretizations finer than finest physical length scale are numerically stable.
- Discretizations coarser than finest physical length scale are numerically unstable.



Examination of Recently Published Results

Ref.	$l_{ind} (cm)$	$l_f (cm)$	$\Delta x (cm)$
Oran, <i>et al.</i> , 1998	1.47×10^{-1}	2.17×10^{-4}	3.88×10^{-3}
Jameson, <i>et al.</i> , 1998	2.35×10^{-2}	4.74×10^{-5}	3.20×10^{-3}
Hayashi, <i>et al.</i> , 2002	1.50×10^{-2}	1.23×10^{-5}	5.00×10^{-4}
Hu, <i>et al.</i> , 2004	1.47×10^{-1}	2.17×10^{-4}	2.50×10^{-3}
Powers, <i>et al.</i> , 2001	1.54×10^{-2}	2.76×10^{-5}	8.14×10^{-5}
Fedkiw, <i>et al.</i> , 1997	1.54×10^{-2}	2.76×10^{-5}	3.00×10^{-2}
Ebrahimi and Merkle, 2002	5.30×10^{-3}	7.48×10^{-6}	1.00×10^{-2}
Sislian, <i>et al.</i> , 1998	1.38×10^{-1}	2.23×10^{-4}	1.00×10^0
Jeung, <i>et al.</i> , 1998	1.80×10^{-2}	5.61×10^{-7}	5.94×10^{-2}

All are under-resolved, some severely.

Conclusions

- Detonation calculations are often under-resolved, by as much as four orders of magnitude.
- Equilibrium properties are insensitive to resolution, while transient phenomena can be sensitive.
- Sensitivity of results to resolution is not known *a priori*.
- Numerical viscosity stabilizes instabilities.
- For a repeatable scientific calculation of detonation, the finest physical scales must be resolved.

Moral

You either do detailed kinetics with the
proper resolution,

or

you are fooling yourself and others, in
which case you should stick with
reduced kinetics!