

CONTROL OF IGNITION AND DETONATION PROCESSES IN REACTIVE GAS MIXTURES BY ADDITIONS OF INERT COMPONENTS

D. A. Tropin

S. A. Khristianovich Institute of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 4/1 Institutskaya Str., Novosibirsk 630090, Russian Federation

Abstract: The paper presents a large-scale theoretical and numerical study of ignition and detonation processes in gas mixtures with dispersed components (porous filters, clouds of inert and reactive particles, and liquid droplets) in order to control explosive processes and prevent and suppress detonation. The influence of inert and reacting particle parameters on the ignition processes of reacting gas mixtures is determined. Limiting particle concentrations for preventing ignition are obtained. The opposite effect of iron and coal particles on ignition processes has been established. A classification of detonation regimes of interaction of detonation waves with inert components has been carried out. Concentration and geometric limits of detonation have been found. Universal criteria for detonation failure have been obtained, linearly linking the diameter and volume concentration of inert components. The invariance of concentration limits upon transition from micro-sized to nanosized inert components has been established. Optimal configurations of inert components leading to complete suppression of cellular detonation have been determined. It has been established that systems of two filters located near the channel walls are optimal for detonation suppression.

Keywords: numerical modeling; cellular detonation wave; inert components; detonation attenuation; detonation suppression

DOI: 10.30826/CE25180208

EDN: NINYDM

Figure Captions

Figure 1 Dependences of the maximum ignition temperature of hydrogen/silane/air mixtures on the volume concentration and diameter of SiO_2 particles: 1 — $2\text{H}_2 + \text{air}$; 2 — $1.6\text{H}_2 + 0.1\text{SiH}_4 + \text{air}$; 3 — $1.2\text{H}_2 + 0.2\text{SiH}_4 + \text{air}$; 4 — $0.8\text{H}_2 + 0.3\text{SiH}_4 + \text{air}$; 5 — $0.4\text{H}_2 + 0.4\text{SiH}_4 + \text{air}$; 6 — $0.5\text{SiH}_4 + \text{air}$; black filled signs — $d = 100 \text{ nm}$; grey filled signs — $1 \mu\text{m}$; and empty signs — $d = 10 \mu\text{m}$

Figure 2 Dependences of the ignition delay time of the methane — air — reacting particles mixture on the initial temperature of the mixture: signs — experiments [25] and lines — calculations (1 — $\text{CH}_4 + \text{air}$; 2 — $\text{CH}_4 + \text{air} + \text{Fe}$, reduced kinetics; and 3 — $\text{CH}_4 + \text{air} + \text{Fe}$, point model)

Figure 3 Dependences of the ignition delay time of the stoichiometric methane–air mixture on the temperature and concentration of coal particles: 1 — $\text{CH}_4 + \text{air}$, $t_{\text{ign}}(\text{CH}_4)$; 2–4 — $\text{CH}_4 + \text{air} + \text{C}$, $d = 26 \text{ MKM}$ (2 — $m_2 = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$, $t_{\text{ign}}(\text{CH}_4)$; and 3 and 4 — $m_2 = 5 \cdot 10^{-4}$: 3 — $t_{\text{ign}}(\text{CH}_4)$; and 4 — $t_{\text{ign}}(\text{C})$)

Figure 4 Dependences of the ignition delay time of coal microparticles in a coal–air mixture (a) and of coal and methane microparticles in a methane–coal–air mixture (b) on temperature: filled signs — experiments [41]; empty signs — calculations; 1 — $t_{\text{ign}}(\text{C})$; and 2 — $t_{\text{ign}}(\text{CH}_4)$

Figure 5 Distributions of normalized velocities of the shock wave (black curves) and combustion front (grey curves) in the channel: signs — experiments (1 — [8]; 2 — [6]; 3 — in the gap; and 4 — in the filter)

Figure 6 Dependences of the normalized critical length of the filter on the volume concentration of filter particles: 1 — $d = 50 \mu\text{m}$; 2 — 100; and 3 — $d = 200 \mu\text{m}$

Figure 7 Critical volume concentration of particles as functions of particle diameter, detonation concentration limits: signs — calculations; curves — approximations; 1 — $0.5\text{SiH}_4 + \text{air}$; 2 — $0.4\text{SiH}_4 + 0.4\text{H}_2 + \text{air}$; 3 — $0.3\text{SiH}_4 + 0.8\text{H}_2 + \text{air}$; 4 — $0.2\text{SiH}_4 + 1.2\text{H}_2 + \text{air}$; 5 — $0.1\text{SiH}_4 + 1.6\text{H}_2 + \text{air}$; and 6 — $2\text{H}_2 + \text{air}$

Figure 8 Normalized detonation velocity in a hydrogen–air mixture as a function of the volume concentration of inert particles. Comparison of one-dimensional (empty signs) and two-dimensional (filled signs) calculations (crossed out signs — detonation failure): 1 — $d = 100 \mu\text{m}$; 2 — $10 \mu\text{m}$; 3 — $1 \mu\text{m}$; and 4 — $d = 100 \text{ nm}$

Figure 9 Triple point trajectories ($m_2 = 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$): (a) $d = 100 \text{ nm}$; and (b) $d = 1 \mu\text{m}$. Propagation of attenuated detonation wave

Figure 10 Triple point trajectories: $d = 100 \mu\text{m}$ and $m_2 = 10^{-4}$. Propagation of attenuated detonation wave

Figure 11 Critical volume concentration of particles as a function of particle diameter. Comparison of one-dimensional and two-dimensional calculations: 1 — planar detonation wave; 2 — cellular detonation wave; 3 — calculation [44]; 4 — calculations [45]; and 5 — experiment [46]

Figure 12 Normalized detonation velocity in a hydrogen–air mixture as a function of volume concentration. Comparison of detonation suppression efficiency by particle clouds (empty signs) and droplet curtains (filled signs) (crossed out signs — detonation failure): 1 — $d = 50 \mu\text{m}$; 2 — 100; and 3 — $d = 200 \mu\text{m}$

Figure 13 Critical lengths of droplet curtain (1, $\text{BR} = 1$), particle cloud (2, $\text{BR} = 1$), and filter (3 — $\text{BR} = 1$; and 4 — $\text{BR} = 0,16$) as functions of diameter

Acknowledgments

The study was supported by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation No.21-79-10083, <https://rscf.ru/project/21-79-10083/>, and also within the framework of the state assignment of ITAM SB RAS (state registration No.124021400037-4).

References

1. Yang, H. N., J. H. Chen, H. J. Chiu, T. J. Kao, H. Y. Tsai, and J. R. Chen. 2017. Leak and explosion from an underground pipeline in Kaohsiung, Taiwan. *Loss Prevention Bulletin* 257:1–13.
2. McLain, A. G., C. J. Jachimowski, and R. C. Rogers. 1983. Ignition of $\text{SiH}_4\text{--H}_2\text{--O}_2\text{--N}_2$ behind reflected shock waves. NASA Technical Paper 2114.
3. Jachimowski, C. J., and A. G. McLain. 1983. Chemical kinetic mechanism for the ignition of silane/hydrogen mixtures. NASA Technical Paper 2129.
4. Petersen, E. L., and M. W. Crofton. 2002. Ignition and oxydation of dilute silane–oxydizer mixtures behind reflected shock waves. AIAA Paper No. 2002-3875.
5. Tropin, D. A., and A. V. Fedorov. 2017. Ignition of a two-fuel hydrogen–silane mixture in air. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 53(1):1–7. doi: 10.1134/S0010508217010014.
6. Radulescu, M. I., and J. H. S. Lee. 2002. The failure mechanism of gaseous detonations: Experiments in porous wall tubes. *Combust. Flame* 131(1-2):29–46.
7. Bivol, G. Y., S. V. Golovastov, and V. V. Golub. 2016. Attenuation and recovery of detonation wave after passing through acoustically absorbing section in hydrogen–air mixture at atmospheric pressure. *J. Loss Prevent. Proc.* 43:311–314.
8. Bivol, G. Y., S. V. Golovastov, and V. V. Golub. 2018. Detonation suppression in hydrogen–air mixtures using porous coatings on the walls. *Shock Waves* 28(5):1011–1018.
9. Wolanski, P., J. C. Liu, C. W. Kauffman, J. A. Nicholls, and M. Sichel. 1988. The effect of inert particles in methane–air detonation. *Archivum Combustionis* 8(1):15–32.
10. Fomin, P. A., and J.-R. Chen. 2009. Effect of chemically inert particles on thermodynamic characteristics and detonation of a combustible gas. *Combust. Sci. Technol.* 181(8):1038–1064.
11. Gottiparthi, K. C., and S. Menon. 2012. A study of interaction of clouds of inert particles with detonation in gases. *Combust. Sci. Technol.* 184(3):406–433.
12. Shafiee H., and M. H. Djavarehshkian. 2014. CFD simulation of particles effects on characteristics of detonation. *Int. J. Computer Theory Engineering* 6(6):466–471.
13. Pinaev, A. V., A. A. Vasil'ev, and P. A. Pinaev. 2015. Suppression of gas detonation by a dust cloud at reduced mixture pressures. *Shock Waves* 25(3):267–275.
14. Nikolaev, Y. A., and P. A. Fomin. 1984. A model for stationary heterogeneous detonation in a gas–droplet mixture. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 20(4):447–455.
15. Frolov, S. M., and B. E. Gel'fand. 1991. Shock wave attenuation in a channel with porous walls. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 27(6):742–747.
16. Belikov, V. V., G. V. Belikova, V. M. Goloviznin, V. N. Semenov, L. P. Starodubtseva, and A. L. Fokin. 1995. Suppression of detonation in hydrogen–air mixtures. *High Temp.* 33(3):449–454.
17. Nigmatulin, R. I. 1978. *Osnovy mekhaniki geterogennykh sred* [Fundamentals of mechanics of heterogeneous media]. Moscow: Nauka. 336 p.
18. Fedorov, A. V., and D. A. Tropin. 2013. Modeling of detonation wave propagation through a cloud of particles in a two-velocity two-temperature formulation. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 49(2):178–187.
19. Tropin, D. A., and I. A. Bedarev. 2021. Problems of detonation wave suppression in hydrogen–air mixtures by clouds of inert particles in one- and two-dimensional formulation. *Combust. Sci. Technol.* 193(2):197–210.
20. Tropin, D. A., and S. A. Lavruk. 2022. Physicomathematical modeling of attenuation of homogeneous and heterogeneous detonation waves by clouds of water droplets. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 58(3):327–336.
21. Boiko, V. M., V. P. Kiselev, S. P. Kiselev, A. N. Papyrin, S. V. Poplavskii, and V. M. Fomin. 1996. Interaction of a shock wave with a cloud of particles. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 32:191–203.
22. Filippov, A. V., and D. E. Rosner. 2000. Energy transfer between an aerosol particle and gas at high temperature ratios in the Knudsen transition regime. *Int. J. Heat Mass Tran.* 43(1):127–138.
23. Sundaram, D. S., V. Yang, and V. E. Zarko. 2015. Combustion of nano aluminum particles (review). *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 51(2):173–196.
24. Khmel, T. A., and A. V. Fedorov. 2018. Modeling of plane detonation waves in a gas suspension of aluminum nanoparticles. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 54(2):189–199. doi: 10.1134/S0010508218020089.

25. Tropin, D.A., A.V. Fedorov, O.G. Penyazkov, and V.V. Leshchevich. 2014. Ignition delay time in a methane–air mixture in the presence of iron particles. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 50(6):632–640. doi: 10.1134/S0010508214060021.
26. Fedorov, A.V., A.V. Shul'gin, and D.A. Tropin. 2014. Raschet fiziko-khimicheskikh prevrashcheniy v smesi metan – zheleznye chastitsy [Calculation of physical and chemical transformations in a mixture of methane and iron particles]. *Vestnik NGU. Ser. Fizika* [NSU Bulletin. Ser. Physics] 9(4):74–79.
27. Tropin, D.A., and A.V. Fedorov. 2018. Physicomathematical modeling of ignition of a heterogeneous mixture of methane, hydrogen, and coal microparticles. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 54(6):664–672.
28. Tropin, D.A., and E. S. Bochenkov. 2020. Influence of inert particles on the ignition processes of hydrogen–silane–air mixtures. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energ.* 45(35):17953–17960.
29. Tien, J. H., and R. J. Stalker. 2002. Release of chemical energy by combustion in a supersonic mixing layer of hydrogen and air. *Combust. Flame* 131(3):329–348.
30. Bedarev, I. A., K. V. Rylova, and A. V. Fedorov. 2015. Application of detailed and reduced kinetic schemes for the description of detonation of diluted hydrogen–air mixtures. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 51(5):528–539.
31. Bedarev, I. A., and A. V. Fedorov. 2006. Comparative analysis of three mathematical models of hydrogen ignition. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 42(1):19–26. doi: 10.1007/s10573-006-0002-1.
32. Fedorov, A. V., D. A. Tropin, and I. A. Bedarev. 2010. Mathematical modeling of detonation suppression in a hydrogen–oxygen mixture by inert particles. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 46(3):332–343. doi: 10.1007/s10573-010-0046-0.
33. Bedarev, I. A., K. V. Rylova, and A. V. Fedorov. 2015. Application of detailed and reduced kinetic schemes for the description of detonation of diluted hydrogen–air mixtures. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 51(5):528–539. doi: 10.1134/S0010508215050032.
34. Bedarev, I. A., V. M. Temerbekov, and A. V. Fedorov. 2019. Simulating the regimes of oblique detonation waves arising at detonation initiation by a small-diameter projectile. *Thermophys. Aeromech.* 26(1):59–68. doi: 10.1134/S0869864319010062.
35. Bedarev, I., and V. Temerbekov. 2021. Estimation of the energy of detonation initiation in a hydrogen–oxygen mixture by a high velocity projectile. *Therm. Sci.* 25(5B):3889–3897.
36. Westbrook, C. K., and P. A. Urtiew. 1983. Use of chemical kinetics to predict critical parameters of gaseous detonation. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 19(6):753–766.
37. Tropin, D. A., and A. V. Fedorov. 2014. Physicomathematical modeling of detonation suppression by inert particles in methane–oxygen and methane–hydrogen–oxygen mixtures. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 50(5):542–546. doi: 10.1134/S0010508214050098.
38. Britten, J. A., J. Tong, and C. K. Westbrook. 1990. A numerical study of silane combustion. *23rd Symposium (International) on Combustion*. Pittsburg, PA: The Combustion Institute. 195–202.
39. Tropin, D. A., and A. V. Fedorov. 2015. Physicomathematical modeling of ignition and combustion of silane in transient and reflected shock waves. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 51(4):431–438. doi: 10.1134/S001050821504005X.
40. Tropin, D. A., and A. V. Fedorov. 2016. Calculation of flammability limits of silane–oxygen and silane–air mixtures. *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 52(1):40–44. doi: 10.1134/S0010508216010056.
41. Leshchevich, V. V., O. G. Penyazkov, and S. Yu. Shimchenko. 2016. Vosplameneniye metanovozdushnoy smesi v prisutstvii ugol'noy pyli pri temperaturakh 800–1200 K [Ignition of methane/air mixture in the presence of the coal dust under temperatures 800–1200 K]. *Goren. Vzryv (Mosk.) — Combustion and Explosion* 9(3):29–35.
42. Ng, H. D., M. I. Radulescu, A. J. Higgins, N. Nikiforakis, and J. H. S. Lee. 2005. Numerical investigation of the instability for one-dimensional Chapman–Jouguet detonations with chain-branching kinetics. *Combust. Theor. Model.* 9(3):385–401.
43. Tang-Yuk, K. C., J. H. S. Lee, H. D. Ng, R. Deiterding, and X. Mi. 2023. The re-initiation of cellular detonations downstream of an inert layer. *P. Combust. Inst.* 39(3):3127–3135.
44. Xu, Y., P. Zhang, Q. Meng, S. Li, and H. Zhang. 2023. Transmission of hydrogen detonation across a curtain of dilute inert particles. *Combust. Flame* 254:112834.
45. Vasil'ev, A. A., A. V. Pinaev, A. A. Trubitsyn, A. Y. Grachev, A. V. Trotsyuk, P. A. Fomin, and A. V. Trilis. 2017. What is burning in coal mines: Methane or coal dust? *Combust. Explo. Shock Waves* 53(1):8–14.
46. Poplavski, S. V., A. V. Minakov, A. A. Shebeleva, and V. M. Boyko. 2020. On the interaction of water droplet with a shock wave: Experiment and numerical simulation. *Int. J. Multiphas. Flow* 127:103273.
47. Chen, Z., B. Fan, and X. Jiang. 2006. Suppression effects of powder suppressants on the explosions of oxyhydrogen gas. *J. Loss Prevent. Proc.* 19(6):648–655.
48. Xu, Y., M. Zhao, and H. Zhang. 2021. Extinction of incident hydrogen/air detonation in fine water sprays. *Phys. Fluids* 33(11):116109.

Received November 30, 2024

After revision January 27, 2025

Accepted February 4, 2025

Contributor

Tropin Dmitry A. (b. 1986) — Candidate of Science in physics and mathematics, senior research scientist, S. A. Khristianovich Institute of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 4/1 Institutskaya Str., Novosibirsk 630090, Russian Federation; d.a.tropin@itam.nsc.ru