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A lean combustion model for monolithic catalytic combustors is given. The model, consisting of several semi-global chemical reaction steps in the gas phase and on the surface, is capable of analyzing CO and THC emissions and combustor efficiency in both steady and unsteady states.

In the steady-state model computation presented, the influence of operating and design parameters on the minimum combustor length is studied. Special attention is given to the effect of after-bed gas phase reaction space. Comparison with experimental data by Anderson indicates good agreement in the range of parameters covered.

In the transient analysis, a quasisteady gas phase and a thermallythin substrate are assumed. The combustor response delay is due to the substrate thermal inertia. Fast response is found to be favored by thin substrate, short catalytic bed length, high combustor inlet and final temperatures and, in most cases, small gas channel diameters. The calculated gas and substrate temperature time history at different axial positions provide an understanding of how the catalytic combustor responds to an upstream condition change. The computed results also suggest that the gas residence times in the catalytic bed and in the after-bed space are correlatable with the nondimensional combustor response time. When fast transient responses are required, both steady and unsteady studies have to be made to achieve a meaningful compromising design.

## INTRODUCTION

The operation and the design of catalytic combustors are limited on one end by the high temperature that the catalysts can tolerate and on the other end (low temperature) by the acceptable emission levels of co and unburnt hydrocarbons. The aim of the combustion engineer is to design a compact and durable combustor capable of efficient and clean combustion. Catalytic combustor modeling can contribute to this objective by providing more understanding to the detail processes occurring in the reactor and to serve as a design guidance for minimizing the numbers of experimental tests needed.

There are several steady-state catalytic combustor models in existence (Ablow and Wise, 1979, Cerkanowicz, et al, 1977,Kelley et al, 1977, Kendall et al, 1979) and they show a high degree of success in describing the events occurring in the combustor. In particular, the model by Kelley et at (1977) containing detailed gas phase chemistry for methane/air reactions can predict pollutant emissions. Detailed kinetics, unfortunately, are not yet available for most other practical fuels. Since emission characteristics are important considerations for catalytic combustor design, in the absence of more detailed information, models consisting of several key semi-global chemical steps seem appropriate.

In addition to the emission characteristics, the transient behavior of catalytic combustors is expected to be different from that of a conventional gas turbine burner, due to the large thermal inertia of the substrate. Non-steady operations are obviously important to transportation engines since their power levels have to be changed frequently. Transients may also be a concern with stationary gas turbine applications, since the
ignition/shutdown operation can produce excessive thermal stress or thermal shock if the combustor is not designed or operated properly and the substrate can fail as a result (DeCorso and Car1, 1979).

Typical questions concerning transient operations include the combustor response time, the type of response, the unsteady substrate temperature history and the resultant thermal stress distribution. At the present time, both experiment and theory on transient catalytic combustion are lacking. A model is presented here attempting to analyze the problem theoretically. In Chapter I of this report, the transient combustion model will be formulated and numerical solution will be presented as a parametric study. Since the transient computer code can also yield steady-state results, in Chapter II, a detailed computation of steady states is given and a comparison with Anderson's data is made. As far as the combustion models are concerned, the one in Chapter II has a three-step global gas-phase chemical reaction vs. a two-step one in Chapter II. The reason for using the three-step scheme is discussed in the beginning of Chapter II.

## CHAPTER I TRANSIENT CATALYTIC COMBUSTOR MODEL

## I. 1 Nonsteady Combustion Mode1

Consideration of Time Scales
For a monolithic catalytic combustor with uniform cell distribution in the plane normal to the approaching flow direction, if the combustor wall is well insulated, then the study of the whole reactor can be reduced to the consideration of a single cell unit. Referring to Fig. I.1, each cell unit consists of an open gas channel, the associated substrate volume and an after-bed gas reaction space.


Figure I. 1 Schematic Drawing of One Cell Unit

Considering first the steady-state combustion, the relevant time scales are the gas residence time in the reactor, the heat and mass transfer time between the gas and the solid surface inside the channel and the gasphase and surface reaction times. When a transient is caused by an upstream parameter variation, then the new time scales involved include the input characteristic time, the time for the temperature wave to reach the central plane of the substrate and the time for heating-up (or cooling-down) the substrate.

TableIldefines these characteristic times and their estimated magnitudes. It should be noted that some of the time scales vary along the channel of the reactor bed. For example, the heat/mass transfer time and the substrate heat-up time are shorter at the flow entrance region than those for far downstream, and the ones used in Table I are those based on fully-developed flow profiles. However, the estimation from Table I does serve the purpose of order-of-magnitude comparison. From this table we see that the longest time is the solid heat-up time, being of the order of seconds. If the time scale we are interested in is much greater than the gas residence time ( $\sim 15 \mathrm{msec}$ ), then the gas phase processes (including heat/mass transfer and chemical reactions) can be regarded as in a quasisteady state. If furthermore the substrate half-thickness is smaller than about . 2 mm , then the substrate temperature distribution in the direction normal to the channel axis can be regarded as uniform at any given time. In this limiting case then, a "quasi-steady-gas-phase and thermally-thin-substrate" model is applicable with the only transient process being the substrate heating-up or cooling-down. In the following section, this model will be described in mathematical form.

Quasisteady Gas Phase
Quasisteady gas phase implies that the differential equations for the

Table I. 1 Estimate of Transient Time Scales in Catalytic Monolith Combustor

| Time | Definition | Estimated Magnitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gas residence time in reactor bed | $\left(L^{*} / u_{\text {ref }}^{*}\right)\left(A^{* /} A_{T}^{*}\right)$ | $1-15 \mathrm{msec}$ |
| Gas residence time in after-bed space | $L_{a s}^{*} / u_{\text {ref }}^{*}$ | 0-15 msec |
| Heat/mass transfer time between gas and solid surface in channel | $\frac{1}{N u_{\infty}} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{d \star^{2}}{4 \alpha *(0,0)}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .5-7.5 \mathrm{msec} \text { for } \\ & \mathrm{d}^{*} \leq 3.6 \mathrm{~mm} \end{aligned}$ |
| Chemical reaction times (gas-phase and heterogeneous) |  | Same order of magnitude as gas residence times |
| Time for temperature wave to reach the substrate center plane | $\frac{d \star^{2}}{\alpha_{s}^{*}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5-25 \mathrm{msec} \text { for } \\ & \mathrm{dt} \leq .2 \mathrm{~mm} \end{aligned}$ |
| Substrate heat-up time | $\frac{1}{N u_{\infty}} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{A^{A} \rho \mathrm{~S}^{*} \mathrm{C}^{\star} \mathrm{S}}{\mathrm{k}^{\star}(0,0)}$ | $0.5 \mathrm{sec}-20 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| Transient input time |  | variable, specified |

gas-phase processes are the same as those for the steady state. Only the boundary conditions on the solid surface are different. There are several steady-state catalytic combustor models in existence [Cerkanowicz et al, 1977, Kelly et al, 1977, 1979] and they show a high degree of success in describing the events occurring in the combustor. In particular, the model by Kelley et al (1977) containing detailed chemistry for methane/air reactions can predict pollutant emissions. Detailed kinetics, unfortunately, are not yet available for most other practical fuels. Since emission characteristics are important considerations for catalytic combustor design, in the absence of more detailed information, a model consisting of several key semi-global chemical steps is proposed.

For fuel-1ean catalytic combustion using nitrogen-free hydrocarbon fuels, the $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ emission is negligible because of low flame temperatures. The only pollutants needed to be considered are unburnt hydrocarbons (UHC) and carbon monoxide (CO). For this reason, the two semi-global chemical reactions used in the gas phase are:
(A) $\quad \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}+1 / 2(\mathrm{n}+\mathrm{m} / 2) \mathrm{O}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{n} \mathrm{CO}+\mathrm{m} / 2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}\right]}{\mathrm{d} t^{*}}=-\mathrm{C}_{1}^{*} \mathrm{p}^{\alpha^{\alpha_{1}}}\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}\right]^{\alpha_{2}}\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{\alpha_{3}} \mathrm{~T}^{\alpha_{4}} \exp \left(-\mathrm{E}_{1}^{*} / \mathrm{RT} *\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(B) $\mathrm{CO}+1 / 2 \mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d[\mathrm{CO}]}{d t^{*}}=-\mathrm{C}_{2}^{*} \mathrm{p} *^{\beta_{1}}\left[\mathrm{CO}^{\beta_{2}}\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{\beta_{3}}\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]^{\beta_{5}} \mathrm{~T}^{\beta_{4}} \exp \left(-\mathrm{E}_{2}^{*} / \mathrm{RT} *\right)\right. \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In describing the flow in the reactor channel, we follow previous investigators in using the plug flow approximation. For transient cases, in general, the fluid properties are functions of $x$, the distance along the channel axis and $t$, the time. For example, density of the gas will be
expressed as $\rho(x, t)$. The nondimensional forms of these equations are summarized in the following (subscript * denotes dimensional quantity and without * denotes nondimensional quantities).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Continuity: } \quad \rho u=\hat{\rho}(0, t) u(0, t) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Momentum: $\quad \mathrm{p}=\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{o}, \mathrm{t})$

Energy:

$$
\begin{align*}
\rho u \frac{\partial T}{\partial x}+J_{H}\left(T-T_{S}\right)= & q_{1} Y_{H C}(0,0) w_{1} \\
& +q_{2} Y_{H C}(0,0) w_{2} \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Species:
Hydrocarbon:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho u \frac{\partial Y_{H C}}{\partial x}+J_{D_{1}}\left(\mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{HC}}-\mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{HC}, \mathrm{~s})}=-\mathrm{w}_{1}\right. \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Carbon monoxide:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho \mathrm{u} \frac{\partial y \mathrm{CO}}{\partial \mathrm{x}}+\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{D}_{2}}\left(y_{\mathrm{co}}-y_{\mathrm{co}}, \mathrm{~s}\right)=\mathrm{w}_{1} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{n}}-\mathrm{w}_{2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Oxygen:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{0_{2}}=1-\phi\left(1-y_{\mathrm{HC})}+\frac{1}{2} \quad Y_{\mathrm{CO}} \quad\left(\frac{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{HC}}(0,0)}{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}(0,0)} \frac{\mathrm{W}_{0_{2}}}{W_{\mathrm{CO}}}\right)\right. \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation of state: $\quad p=\rho T$
The reaction rates are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& w_{1}=B_{1} p^{\alpha_{1}}{ }_{\rho}\left(\alpha_{2}+\alpha_{3}\right)_{T^{\alpha_{4}}} \eta_{H C} \alpha_{2} \eta_{O_{2}}^{\alpha_{3}} e^{-\left(E_{1} / T\right)} \\
& w_{2}=B_{2} p^{\beta_{1}} \rho^{\left(\beta_{2}+\beta_{3}+\beta_{5}\right)} T^{\beta_{4}} \quad y_{C O}^{\beta_{2}} \quad y_{O_{2}}^{\beta_{3}} Y_{H_{2} O}^{\beta_{5}} e^{-\left(E_{2} / T\right)} \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

and $Y_{H_{2} \mathrm{O}}(x, t)=\frac{m^{2}}{2} \frac{W_{H_{2} O}}{W_{H C}} \quad Y_{H C}(0,0) \quad\left[Y_{H C}(0, t)-\bigcup_{H C}(x, t)\right]$

The definition of $B_{1}$ and $B_{2}$ can be found in the nomenclature.

In deriving Eqns (5-8), heat conduction and mass diffusion in the axial direction are neglected because the Peclet number based on typical gas velocity ( $>10 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) is much greater than unity [Ablow and Wise, 1979]. The dimensionless lateral heat and mass transfer coefficients $J_{H}$ and $J_{D i}$, in Eqns (5-7) are derived from Nusselt number calculation in entrance flow in a tube of constant surface temperature [Kays, 1966]. Following Kelly et al (1977), a modification is made at the entrance point based on local stagnation flow estimation. The use of entrance flow transport properties, rather than fully-developed constant values, make a great difference in the temperature and species distributions in the flow entrance region.

The above system of equations can also be applied to the after-bed space where only gas-phase reactions occur. This is done by putting $J_{H}$ and $J_{D i}$ equal to zero in Eqns (5-7) and by properly changing the mass flux per unit area in Eq (3) due to area change.

## Unsteady Solid with Thin-Wal1 Substrate

When the substrate wall is thermally thin, the solid temperature can be regarded as a function of axial distance and time only, i.e., $T_{s}(x, t)$. The energy balance of the solid, including the solid surface, results in the following equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{S}^{*} \rho_{S}^{*} C_{S}^{*} \frac{\partial T_{S}^{*}}{\partial t^{*}}-h_{T}^{*} S^{*}\left(T^{*}-T_{S}^{*}\right)=S^{*}\left[q_{3}^{*} J_{3}^{*}+q_{4}^{*} J_{4}^{*}\right] \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

In $E q$ (13) the heat conduction in the axial direction in the solid is neglected in comparison with the heat transfer rate between the gas and solid across the gas channel.

Two semi-global catalytic surface reactions are assumed. They are
(C) $\quad \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}+\left(\mathrm{n}+\frac{\mathrm{m}}{4}\right) \mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{nCO}_{2}+\frac{\mathrm{m}}{2} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$
with the corresponding surface reaction rate $\mathrm{J}_{3}^{\star}$ given by

$$
J_{3}^{*}=C_{3}^{*}\left[C_{n} H_{m}\right]_{s} e^{-E_{3}^{*} / R T_{s}^{*}}
$$

and (D) $\mathrm{CO}+\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{CO}_{2}$
with $J_{4}^{*}=C_{4}^{*}\left[\mathrm{CO}_{s} e^{-E_{4}^{*} / R T}{ }_{s}^{*}\right.$

In surface reaction ( C ), the hydrocarbon is oxidized to form' $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, not CO such as in gas-phase reaction (A). This is based on the present available experimental evidence in oxygen-rich systems, only $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, not CO , is found on or close to the catalytic surface [Schwartz et al, 1971, Anderson, 1976 and Marteney, 1979].

Eq (13) is non dimensionalized by first defining a proper reference time scale $\tau^{*}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau^{*} \equiv \frac{1}{N u_{\infty}} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{A_{S}^{*} \rho_{S}^{*} C_{S}^{*}}{k^{*}(0,0)} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& t \equiv t^{*} / \tau^{*} \\
& r_{n k} \equiv \frac{N u_{x}}{N u_{\infty}} \frac{k^{*}}{k^{*}(0,0)} \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

Eq (13) becomes

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\partial T_{s}}{\partial t}-r_{n k}\left(T-T_{s}\right)=B_{3} Y_{H C}(0,0) q_{3} \rho \mathcal{Y}_{H C, s} \exp \left(-E_{3} / T_{s}\right) \\
+B_{4} Y_{H C}(0,0) q_{4} \rho \mathcal{Y}_{C O, s} \exp \left(-E_{4} / T_{s}\right) \tag{18}
\end{gather*}
$$

Neglecting transient accumulation on the surface, the surface hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& r_{\mathrm{nk}}\left(y_{\mathrm{HC}}-y_{\mathrm{HC}, \mathrm{~s}}\right)=\frac{1}{\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{e}_{1}}\right)^{2 / 3}} \mathrm{~B}_{3} \rho y_{\mathrm{HC}, \mathrm{~s}} \exp \left(-\mathrm{E}_{3} / \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{s}}\right)  \tag{19}\\
& r_{\mathrm{nk}}\left(y_{\mathrm{CO}}-y_{\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{~s}}\right)=\frac{1}{\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{e}_{2}}\right)^{2 / 3}} \mathrm{~B}_{4} \rho y_{\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{~s}} \exp \left(-\mathrm{E}_{4} / \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{s}}\right) \tag{20}
\end{align*}
$$

## Initial and Boundary Conditions

The system of equations (3-12, 18-20) needs initial and boundary conditions. Initial conditions (at $t=0$ ) are required for $T_{S}$, ( $\left.\mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{HC}}\right)_{S}$ $\left(y_{\mathrm{CO}}\right)_{\mathrm{s}}$ as a function of x and upstream boundary conditions (at $\mathrm{x}=0$ ) should be specified for $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{HC}}, \mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{CO}}, \mathcal{Y}_{02}, \mathrm{~T}, \mathrm{p}$ and $u$ as a function of time. These conditions depend on the types of transient input which can vary with engine designs and mode of operations. In the present paper, a simple start-up transient is investigated, ie. catalytic combustor response to a step-wise fuel injection.

The substrate temperature at time $t=0$ is specified. This temperature can be the result of external heating of the substrate, say, by a torch. The fuel and air are then supplied at upstream. The model is intended to describe the events from $t=0$ to the final steady state. Mathematically, the conditions used are

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{x}, 0)=\text { specified } \\
& y_{\mathrm{HC}, \mathrm{~s}}(\mathrm{x}, 0)=0 \\
& y_{\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{~s}}(\mathrm{x}, 0)=0 \\
& \mathrm{~T}(0, \mathrm{t})=1 \\
& y_{\mathrm{HC}}(0, \mathrm{t})=1  \tag{21}\\
& y_{\mathrm{CO}}(0, t)=0 \\
& y_{02}(0, t)=1 \\
& \mathrm{p}(0, \mathrm{t})=1 \\
& \mathrm{u}(0, t)=1
\end{align*}
$$

## Numerical Solution Procedure

Although most dependent variables in this problem are function of both x and t which, in general, results in partial differential equations, the assumption of quasisteady gas phase and thermally thin substrate greatly simplifies the mathematical property of the system and results in a simpler solution procedure.

The gas-phase differential equations (5-7) have only first derivative in $x$ with $t$ as a parameter, the solid equation (18) has only derivative in $t$ with $x$ as a parameter; therefore, they can be integrated at each time ( $t$ ) or position ( $x$ ) as ordinary differential equations using Runge-Kutta method. The procedure is started by first integrating Eqns (5-7) forward in $x$ from upstream to the end of combustor for $T, \mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{HC}}, \mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{CO}}$ using the solid surface
quantities specified by the initial conditions, then Eq (18) is integrated for one time step $(\Delta t)$ to find $T_{s}(x, \Delta t)$ and Eqns $(19,20)$ are solved algebraically to find $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{HC}, \mathrm{s}}(x, \Delta t)$ and $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{s}}(x, \Delta t)$. These surface quantities are substituted back to Eqns (5-7) to start another cycle of integration. Steady-state and transient solutions are obtained using the same code. The computational time ranges from $10-50$ seconds in a VAX-11 computer. The numerical scheme is an efficient one and it is suitable for parametric studies.

## I. 2 Computed Results

## Steady State

Selected steady-state results will be presented first to facilitate the discussion on the transient response. Specifically, the relative importance of the catalytic bed length and the after-bed-gas-phase-reaction distance will be shown. In previous theoretical models, emphasis was placed on the combustion inside the catalytic bed only. The contribution of gasphase reactions in the downstream space after the bed has been demonstrated in the experiments by $T$ 'ien and Anderson (1979) and Anderson (1980). Utilization of the pure gas-phase reactions in the downstream of the monolith to replace a portion of the catalytic bed will be shown to be crucial in reducing the catalytic combustor transient response time.

Table I. 2 lists the values of chemical kinetic constants for reactions A to $D$ used in this ohapter. The hydrocarbon fuel chosen is propane. Semiglobal kinetics for hydrocarbon and CO oxidation are from Edelman (1969) and Dryer and Glassman (1973) respectively, with the pre-exponential factors

Table I. 2 Chemical Kinetic Constants for Chapter I
Reaction (A) Reaction (B) Reaction (C) Reaction (D)

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
C_{1}^{*}=1.5 \times 10^{5} & C_{2}^{*}=0.71 \times 10^{14} & C_{3}^{*}=2.5 \times 10^{3} \\
\alpha_{1}=0.3 & B_{1}=0 & C_{4}^{*}=10^{5} \\
\alpha_{2}=0.5 & E_{3}^{*}=10 & E_{4}^{*}=17.8 \\
(\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole})
\end{array} \quad \begin{aligned}
& \alpha_{3}=1 \\
& \alpha_{4}=1
\end{aligned}
$$

adjusted. The activation energies for reactions $C$ and $D$ are obtained from the data of Marteney (1979) and Kuo and Morgan (1971) respectively with adjusted pre-exponential factors. It should be noted that the surface reaction rates contain information on catalyst type and loading density as well as the washcoat properties.

The design parameters considered are $\mathrm{d}^{*}$, channel hydraulic diameter, $A^{*} / A_{T}^{*}$, the percentage of open area (or equivalently, $A^{*} / A_{S}^{*}$, the ratio of open-to-close areas), $L^{*}$, the catalytic bed length and $L_{\text {as }}^{*}$, after-bed gas-phase reaction length. The minimum catalytic combustor length required to reach the emission goal in steady-state operations is denoted using the subscript EG. The emission goal is chosen to be $1.64 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{kg}$ of fuel for UHC and 13.6 $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}$ of fuel for CO [Anderson, 1977]. The operating parameters include p *, the pressure, $T_{i n}^{*}$, combustor inlet temperature, $T_{a f}^{*}$, adiabatic flame temperature (or equivalently the fuel/air equivalence ratio $\phi$ ) and $U_{\text {ref }}^{*}$, the reference velocity of the approach gas upstream of the reactor bed.

Fig. I. 2 gives the profiles for one sample calculation. In this case, the propane fuel is oxidized quickly on the catalyst surface upon entering into the reactor channel and resulting in a high surface temperature, the gas temperature is raised by heat transfer from the substrate, gas-phase oxidation of propane is accelerated to form $C O$, and $C O$, in turn, is oxidized by both gas-phase and surface reactions to $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. Actually, two cases are shown in Fig.I.2. In one case, the reactor bed length is 4 cm , in the other, 8 cm . When the bed length is cut short at 4 cm , the surface oxidation reactions for the hydrocarbon fuel and $C O$ stop there. This results in a higher $C O$ concentration as shown by the dotted curve. The hydrocarbon curve


Figure I. 2 Detailed steady-state profiles showing the effect of catalytic bed length. Operating conditions: $\mathrm{p}^{*}=3 \mathrm{~atm}, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{in}}^{*}=1000^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$, $u_{\text {ref }}^{*}=10 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}, \phi=0.15, d *=1.8 \mathrm{~mm}$ and $A^{*} / A_{T}^{*}=\frac{\text { in }}{.667}$.
also shows a difference after 4 cm but the difference is too small to be shown clearly in this figure. The gas temperature is also lower in a portion of the combustor for the 4 cm case.

Fig. I. 3 gives the combustor residence time required to reach the emission goal vs. the residence time in the catalytic bed. The "catalytic bed residence time", $t_{b}^{*}$, is defined by $L^{*} A^{*} / U_{r e f}^{*} A_{T}^{*}$, where $U_{r e f}^{*}$ is the gas velocity upstream of the bed and the gas velocity inside the catalytic channel at the channel entrance is $U_{r e f}^{*} A_{T}^{*} / A^{*}$, due to the area change. To be exact, the gas residence time in the bed should be $\int_{0}^{L^{*}} 1 / U^{*} d x^{*}$ since the gas velocity in the channel, $U^{*}$, is changing continuously downstream due to the heat release. However, since $U^{*}(x)$ is not known until the solution is achieved, the catalytic bed residence time, $t_{b}^{*}$, as defined in Fig.I. 3 is a good reference quantity and it is with this understanding when we use the terms of "bed residence time" and "combustor residence time".

Referring to the curve and the calculated points corresponding to $T_{i n}^{*}=1000 \mathrm{~K}$ in Fig.I. 3 we see that the residence times provide an excellent correlation for different values of $U_{r e f}^{*}, L^{*}, A^{*} / A_{T}^{*}$ and the required $L_{\text {as }}^{*}$ to reach emission goals. As the catalytic bed residence time, $t_{b}^{*}$, increases, the total combustor residence time required to reach emission goals, $t_{E G}^{*}$, first decreases sharply and then levels off. The two other curves in Fig. I. 3 give the effects of different combustor inlet temperatures. Higher inlet temperature required lower combustor residence time to reach emission goals for a fixed catalytic bed residence time. At 1200 K inlet temperature, no catalytic element is needed; emission goals can be reached in an acceptable gas residence time for a plug flow combustor without flame stabilizer $\left(t_{b}^{*}=o\right.$ and $T_{E G}^{*}=14$ seconds). This has been verified by the recent


Fig. I. 3 Minimum total combustor gas residence time for reaching emission goals ( $t_{E G}^{*}$ ) vs. reactor bed residence time ( $t_{b}^{\star}$ ) as a function of combustor inlet temperature in steady-state operation. $p^{*}=3 \mathrm{~atm}$, $d *=1.8$ mond $T_{a f}^{*}=1370 \mathrm{~K}$.
experimental results of Anderson (1980b). Anderson's study also suggested the correlation using gas residence times (1980a).

## Transient Response

One of the major concerns of the catalytic combustor application to transportation gas turbine engines is that the response time might be long. The computed transient results to be presented are combustor response to a stepwise increase of fuel flow rate (zero to a fixed value). Its purpose is to guide the search for "fast-response" catalytic combustor designs.

Some indication of the order of magnitude of the response time can be obtained from the definition of the characteristic time $r^{*}$ as defined in Eq (16). Small $\tau *$ requires small thermal inertia, $A{ }_{S}^{*} \rho_{S}^{*} C_{S}^{*}$. If the substrate density and heat capacity are fixed, small $\tau^{*}$ can be achleved with small solid crossectional area $A_{s}^{*}$, see Fig.I. 1 for definition of $A_{s}^{*}$. It should be noted that there are other parameters such as catalytic bed length and channel diameter which will influence the response time and they are not contained in $\tau^{*}$. This will be discussed later as we see the computed results.

The combustion efficiency at the end of the combustor will be used to characterize the combustor response time. There are two ways to define the combustion efficiency. One is the so-called "carbon-balanced" efficiency, $\eta_{C B}$ [Anderson, 1975], where the combustion inefficiency is measured by the emission levels of $C O$ and $U H C$ and the energy carried away by them. The other efficiency is the ordinary one defined by the enthalpy rise across the combustor divided by the chemical energy available. If the gas specific heat is approximated as a constant, this efficiency, $\eta_{T}$, is given by ( $\left.\mathrm{T}^{*}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{in}}^{*}\right) /\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{af}}^{*}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{in}}^{*}\right)$ where $\mathrm{T}^{*}$ is measured at the same location as the efficiency. For a perfectly insulated catalytic combustor in steady state,
$\eta_{C B}$ and $\eta_{T}$ are the same. However, the two are different in transient operations when there is a thermal lag in the substrate.

For the following transient calculation, the initial surface temperature condition is given by $T_{S}(x, 0)=1$, see Eq (21). For $1000^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ inlet temperature, two bed lengths, 4 cm and 8 cm , are chosen for the transient calculation and efficiency is evaluated at their individual minimum combustor lengths according to Fig.I.3. Fig.I.4 shows the combustion efficiencies as a function of non-dimensional time. Looking at the curves for $\eta_{T}$ (efficiency based on temperatures), the shorter bed (4 cm) combustor has a faster response than that of the longer bed ( 8 cm ). If we take the time for $\eta_{T}$ to reach $80 \%$ as an indication of characteristic response time, for the 4 cm bed, $t_{C h}=1.5$ and for the 8 cm bed, $t_{c h}=2.5$; namely, the response time of 4 cm bed combustor is only $60 \%$ of that of the 8 cm bed combustor. From the consideration of steady-state operation alone, one would choose the 8 cm catalytic bed since, as can be deduced from Fig. I. 3, this produces the shortest required combustor length (11 cm). However, combining transient and steady-state considerations, the 4 cm bed combustor may be a better choice as its response time is $60 \%$ of that of the 8 cm bed, with the total combustor length only slightly longer.

To understand why longer reactor bed results in a longer response time, surface and gas temperature distributions are plotted in Fig. T. 5 as a function of time. From the substrate temperature distribution we see that during start-up transient, the solid temperature is higher in the flow entrance region as a result of higher mass transport and surface reaction rates. Comparing the solid and gas temperature histories for the case when catalytic bed length is 8 cm , we see that at $t=0.5$, the solid is


Fig. I. 4 Combustion efficiencies as a function of time during start-up transient. $p^{*}=3 \mathrm{~atm}, \phi=0.15$ and $A^{*} / A_{T}^{*}=.667$.


Fig.I. 5 Gas and substrate temperature history during transient start-up for two bed lengths. Same operating and design parameters as those in Fig.I. 4.
transfering heat to the gas in the upstream region in the bed. At $x^{*}=3.5 \mathrm{~cm}$, the gas temperature becomes higher than the substrate temperature, heat is then transferred from the gas to the solid in the down-stream portion of the reactor channel. If the heat loss rate is greater than heat generation rate due to gas phase reactions, then the gas temperature will drop as shown in Fig.I.5. If we cut the reactor bed short at 4 cm , a portion of this heat loss can be eliminated and the downstream gas temperature ( $\mathrm{x}^{*}>4 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) will be higher as indicated by the dotted curves in Fig.I.5. This explains why a shorter reactor bed can have a faster response.

More computation of the response time dependence on the catalytic bed length, gas velocity and combustor inlet temperature is shown in Fig. I. 6 . As will be shown later, the nondimensional transient response also correlates well with the gas residence times in the reactor bed and the after-bed space. Therefore the results will be presented using residence times rather than length and velocity. In Fig.I.6, the adiabatic flame temperature, pressure, channel diameter, open area fraction and $L_{c}^{*} U_{\text {ref }}^{*}$ are held constant. The solid line in Fig. I. 6 gives the response time if the reactor-bed-gas-residence time is the minimum to reach emission goals in steady-state operations. When the combustor inlet temperature is increased, the minimum required reactor-bed-residence time is decreased and the combustor response time is shortened drastically. If a more conservative design is used, i.e. longer bed residence time than is required, the combustor response time is increased for a fixed inlet temperature. The increase is very slight in the beginning when the bed residence time is close to the optimum value but becomes larger as the bed residence time increase further. This implies that a sonservative


Fig.I. 6 Nondimensional response time ( $n_{T}$ goes to $80 \%$ ) as a function of combustor inlet temperature and ${ }^{\mathrm{T}}$ reactor bed residence time. $L_{c}^{*} / U_{\text {ref }}^{*}=15 \mathrm{msec}, T_{a f}^{*}=1370 \mathrm{~K}, A^{*} / A_{T}^{*}=.667, d^{*}=1.8 \mathrm{~mm}$ and $\mathrm{p}^{*}=3 \mathrm{~atm}$.
design with reactor bed length somewhat longer that that of the optimal one will not greatly increase the combustor response time.

Fig.I. 7 gives the nondimensional response time as a function of channel hydraulic diameter and flame temperature. For all the calculations in Fig.I. 7 the residence time in the catalytic bed, $t_{b}^{*}$, is held constant at 1 milisecond and the residence time in the after-bed space, $t_{a s}^{*}$, is 13.5 miliseconds. The computation for 1370 K and 1590 K includes different combinations of $\mathrm{L}^{*}$, $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{as}}^{*}$, $U_{\text {ref }}^{*}$ and $A^{*} / A_{S}^{*}$ and it can be seen from Fig.I. 7 that the nondimensional response time correlates well with the residence times. It can, therefore, be concluded that the primary influence of the catalytic bed and after-bed lengths, the approaching gas velocity and the open area percentage is contained in the gas residence times in the catalytic bed and in the after-bed space for both steady and transient operations.

Fig. I. 7 also shows that for a given flame temperature, the nondimensional response time increases with decreasing channel diameter $\mathrm{d}^{*}$. This, however, does not necessarily mean that the dimensional response time increases with decreasing $d^{*}$. If the open area percentage (or equivalently $A^{*} / A_{S}^{*}$ ) is fixed, decreasing $d^{*}$ decreases $f_{s}^{*}$ which is used in the reference time scale as defined in $E q$ (16) and the dimensional response time may actually decrease. Table I. 3 gives selected dimensional response times for ceramic and Kanthal metal alloy substrates using the computed results from Fig.I.7. It can be seen that in general the dimensional response time decreases with decreasing channel diameter but the amount of decrease vanishes when the channel diameter becomes too small. In special cases such as the 1590 K flame temperature case, the response time actually reaches a minimum and increases with further diameter decrease.


Fig. I. 7 Computed nondimensional catalytic combustor response time correlation with gas residence times for various channel diameters and flame temperatures. $p^{*}=3 \mathrm{~atm}, t_{b}^{\star}=1 \mathrm{msec}$, $t_{\text {as }}^{*}=13.5 \mathrm{msec}, T_{\text {in }}^{*}=1000 \mathrm{~K}$.


If the gas residence times and channel diameter are held constant, varying the open area percentage (or $A * / A_{S}^{*}$ ) changes the dimensional response time by a factor of $A_{S}^{*} / A^{*}$. This is the direct consequence of the correlation between nondimensional response time and residence times as just discussed. Large open area percentage (or thin substrate), therefore, favors fast response.

FigI. 7 indicates higher flame temperature shortens the response time for large diameter channel but flame temperature makes little difference in response time for very small diameter channels as all curves converge.

CHAPTER II STEADY STATE COMPUTATION AND COMPARISON WITH EXPERTMINTS
II.1 Three-step Semi-global gas-phase Chemical Reactions

Gas phase reaction studies between hydrocarbons and air in lean mixtures have shown (Dryer and Glassman, 1978) that the hydrocarbon fuel first decomposes into a number of lower hydrocarbons with the simulataneous formation of some water vapor. The combination of these "pyrolysis" steps results in an almost isothermal region after which $C 0$ is formed and temperature begins to rise. The carbon monoxide is then oxidized and the reactions are completed. These kinetic studies are very useful for the development of semi-global kinetic schemes.

Two recent catalytic combustion models, by Bracco et al (1980) and T'ien (1980), have utilized the gas phase semi-global modeling concept. The study by T 'ien was actually for transient response but a quasisteady gas phase was assumed. The gas phase reactions consist of two semi-global steps; the hydrocarbon reacts with oxygen to form CO and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and CO then reacts with oxygen to form $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. On the surface, both hydrocarbon and co react with oxygen to form $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and or $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The steady-state prediction of that model agrees qualitatively with the experimental trend of CO and hydrocarbon emissions, but a quantitative comparison has not been made. From a pure gas phase reaction point of view, two-step semi-global scheme predicts too high a level of CO in the initial pyrolysis region even though the $C O$ peak level and the decay curve can be made to agree with the experimental data by kinetic parameter adjustment. This early $C O$ appearance problem can be alleviated to a certain
extent by increasing the number of appropriate semi-global gas reaction steps. In the work by Bracco et al (1980), for example, a three-step reaction scheme was used for propane oxidation. Propane $\left(\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{8}\right)$ was assumed to form $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ first, $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}$ to CO next and then CO to $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$.

For most practical fuels, the pyrolysis intermediates are numerous, and a dominant intermediate species may or may not exist. Since in high inlet temperature operations ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{in}}^{*}>800^{\circ} \mathrm{K}$ ), the catalytic combustor length required is limited by the emission level of CO , not hydrocarbons (Anderson, 1980a), it seems reasonable to develop a scheme which gives the correct CO characteristics without being tied down by the uncertain nature of the hydrocarbon intermediates.

In this chapter, the steady-state computation will be based on a threestep gas-phase kinetic scheme. The semi-global reactions are:
(A') $\quad C_{n} H_{m} \rightarrow C_{n} H_{m}^{(p)}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d\left[C_{n} H_{m}\right]}{d t^{\star}}=-C_{0}^{*} p^{\star \gamma_{1}}\left[C_{n} H_{m}\right]^{\gamma_{2} T^{\star \gamma_{3}}} \exp \left(-E_{0}^{\star} / R T^{*}\right) \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

(A")

$$
\begin{align*}
& C_{n} H(p)+\frac{1}{2}\left(n+\frac{m}{2}\right) 0_{2} \rightarrow n C 0+\frac{m}{2} H_{2} 0 \\
& \left.\frac{d\left[C_{n} H_{m}^{(p)}\right]}{d t^{*}}=-C_{1}^{*} p^{*}{ }_{1} r_{1} C_{n} H_{m}^{(p)}\right]^{\left(\alpha_{2}\right.}\left[O_{2}\right]^{\alpha} 3 T^{\alpha^{\alpha}} 4 \exp \left(-E_{1}^{*} / R T *\right) \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

(B) $\mathrm{CO}+\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{CO}_{2}$

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d[C O]}{d t^{\star}}=- & C_{2}^{\star} \mathrm{p}^{\star \beta_{1}}[\mathrm{CO}]_{2}^{\beta_{2}}\left[\mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{\beta} 3\left[\mathrm{H}_{2} O\right]^{\beta} 5_{5} T_{4}^{* \beta_{4}} x \\
& \exp \left(-E_{2}^{\star} / R T^{\star}\right) \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

In reaction (A'), Eq. (22), the original hydrocarbon fuel forms the "pyrolyze hydrocarbon", $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(\mathrm{p})}$, in an isothermal reaction. The "pyrolyzed hydrocarbon" then reacts with oxygen to form $C 0$ and $H_{2} O$ in reaction ( $A^{\prime \prime}$ ). In reaction ( $B$ ), $C O$ is oxidized to $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. The introduction of reaction ( $\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$ ) serves to decrease the amount of early CO appearance as found using the two-step mode 1. The identity of $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(\mathrm{P})}$ is of no great consequence for the purpose of this modeling work, if the mass diffusion coefficient is properly evaluated. For convenience, in the present calculation we take $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(\mathrm{P})}$ to have the same $n$ and $m$ as the original fuel.

Corresponding to the reactions given by Eqs. (22-24), the species equations are:

Original Hydrocarbon:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho u \frac{d y_{H C}}{d x}+J_{D_{1}}\left(y_{H C}-y_{H C, s}\right)=-w_{o} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

"pyrolyzed" Hydrocarbon:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho u \frac{d \mathcal{Z}_{H C}^{(p)}}{d x}+J_{D 1}\left(\mathcal{Y}_{H C}^{(p)}-\mathcal{Y}_{H C, s}^{(p)}\right)=w_{0}-w_{1} \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

Carbon monoxide:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{ou} \frac{d y_{C O}}{d x}+J_{D_{2}}\left(y_{C O}-y_{C O, s}\right)=w_{1} c_{n}-w_{2} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

0xygen:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}=1-\phi\left(1-y_{\mathrm{THC}}\right)+\frac{1}{2} \quad y_{\mathrm{CO}}\left(\frac{Y_{\mathrm{HC}}(0) W_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}}{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}(0)} \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{CO}}\right) \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
y_{T H C}=y_{H C}+y_{H C}^{(p)}
$$

The reaction rates are given by
$w_{0}=B_{0} p^{\gamma_{1} \rho^{\gamma_{2}} T^{\gamma_{3}}} \mathcal{y}_{H:}^{\gamma_{2}} \exp \left(-E_{0} / T\right)$
$w_{1}=B_{1} p^{\alpha_{1}}\left(\alpha_{2}+\alpha_{3}\right)_{T^{4}} y_{H C}^{\alpha_{2}} y_{0_{2}}^{\alpha_{3}} \exp \left(-E_{1} / T\right)$
$w_{2}=B_{2} p^{\beta_{1}}\left(\beta_{2}+\beta_{3}+\beta_{5}\right) T^{\beta_{4}} y_{C O}^{\beta_{2}} \mathcal{Y}_{0}^{\beta_{3}} Y_{H_{2} 0}^{\beta_{5}} \quad \exp \left(-E_{2} / T\right)$
and
$Y_{H_{2} 0}(x)=\frac{m}{2} \frac{W_{H_{2} O}}{W_{H C}} Y_{H C}(0) \quad\left[y_{T H C}(0)-y_{T H C}(x)\right]$

Three global catalytic surface reactions are assumed to occur on the surface. They are:
(C') $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}+\left(\mathrm{n}+\frac{\mathrm{m}}{4}\right) \mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{nCO}_{2}+\frac{\mathrm{m}}{2} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$
with the corresponding surface rate $J_{3}^{\star}$ given by

$$
J_{3}^{\star}=C_{3}^{\star}\left[C_{n} H_{m}\right]_{s} \exp \left(-E_{3}^{\star} / R T_{s}^{*}\right)
$$

(C') $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}^{(p)}+\left(n+\frac{m}{4}\right) \mathrm{O}_{2} \rightarrow n \mathrm{CO}_{2}+\frac{m}{2} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$
with $J_{4}^{\star}=C_{3}^{\star}\left[C_{n} H_{m}^{(p)}\right]_{S} \exp \left(-E_{3}^{\star} / R T_{S}^{*}\right)$
(D) $\mathrm{CO}+\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{CO}_{2}$
with $J_{5}^{\star}=C_{4}^{\star}[C O]_{S} \exp \left(-E_{4}^{\star} / R T_{S}^{*}\right)$

Other equations are similar to those in Chapter I. The steady solution is obtained from the transient combustion code as discussed in Chapter I.

## II. 2 Computed Results

The design parameters of a catalytic combustor include the catalytic bed length, the after-bed reaction distance, the channel hydraulic diameter, the open area percentage, the catalyst variables (catalyst type, loading density, washcoat type) and staging arrangements (graded cell, for example). The operating parameters include inlet temperature and pressure, the approaching (reference) mixture velocity, the fuel/air equivalence ratio or the adiabatic flame temperature and fuel types. An exhaustive parametric study will not be practical for this report. Instead, selected computations are presented. Since emphasis is placed on automotive gas turbine application, we are most interested in higher inlet temperature, above atmospheric pressure and high reference velocity operations with thin substrate and large open area percentage design. The total combustor length (bed plus after-bed) required to meet the emission goal ( $13.6 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{Co} / \mathrm{kg}$ fuel, $1.64 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{THC} / \mathrm{kg}$ fuel) as a function of these parameters is the main output of the model calculation.

The chosen fuel is No. 2 Diesel which was used by Anderson (1977a, 1978, 1980a). Its hydrogen-carbon atom ratio is 1.8 with $27.55 \%$ aromatics. The molecular weight is taken to be 138 for the purpose of estimating the diffusion coefficient which is assumed to vary as one over the square root of molecular weight. Other properties can be found in Anderson (1977a). The catalytic combustor used for reference calculation is the one by Matthey Bishop which was also described by Anderson (1980a) (MBI-2.5 and MBI-5.4). The values of kinetic parameters are listed in Table II.1. Expressions in Reactions $A^{\prime \prime}$ to $D$ are taken from Edelman and Fortune (1969), Dryer and Glassman (1973), Marteney (1979) and Kuo and Morgan (1971) respectively, all with adjusted pre-exponential

Table II. 1 Chemical Kinetic Constants
(for Chapter II)

| Reaction ( ${ }^{\prime}$ ) | Reaction ( ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ ) | Reaction (B) | Reactions (C') ( $\mathrm{C}^{\prime \prime}$ ) | Reaction (D) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}^{*}=1.6 \times 10^{6}$ | $C_{1}^{\star}=1.8 \times 10^{5}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}_{2}^{\star} \mathrm{p}^{\beta} 1 \\ & (\text { at } 3 \mathrm{~atm}) \end{aligned}$ | $C_{3}^{*}=1.5 \times 10^{4}$ | $c_{4}^{*}=10^{5}$ |
| $\gamma_{1}=0$ | $\alpha_{1}=0.3$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}_{3}^{*}=10 \\ & (\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E}_{4}^{\star}=17.8 \\ \left(\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{c} a 1 / \text { /mole }}\right. \end{gathered}$ |
| $r_{2}=0.5$ | $\alpha_{2}=0.5$ | $\beta_{2}=1$ |  |  |
| $\gamma_{3}=0$ | $\alpha_{3}=1$ | $\beta_{3}=0.25$ |  |  |
|  | $\alpha_{4}=1$ | $\beta_{4}=0$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{O}}^{\star}=34 \\ & (\mathrm{kca1} / \mathrm{mole}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E}_{1}^{*}=24 \\ & (\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & B_{5}=0.5 \\ & E_{2}^{*}=40 \\ & (\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

factors. The calculated results are not very sensitive to catalytic kinetic parameters indicating mass transfer dominates the surface reactions. The choice of gas-phase hydrocarbon oxidation kinetic constants deserves some explanation, since kinetic rates for No. 2 Diesel fuel are hard to find. Ignition delay times as a function of initial temperature, however, do exist for long chain and cyclic hydrocarbons (Dryer and Glassman, 1978, Edelman, 1978), which are the ingredients of the Diesel fuel. The ignition delay time of No. 2 Diesel is assumed to be the arithmetic mean of its ingredients. Model calculations are then performed for pure gas phase reactions and the ratio of calculated hydrocarbons disappearance times as a function of initial temperature is taken to be proportional to the ratio of ignition delay times as indicated in Fig. II.1. This provides some measure for the correct temperature dependence in the gas kinetic parameters for the diesel fue1. The use of "hydrocarbon disappearance time" in this comparison reflects the difficulty of identifying ignition time in the theoretical study. The pre-exponential factor in reaction (B) is adjusted to fit the CO decay data of Anderson (1980a).

The model calculations for the catalytic combustors will be presented next. Effects of Catalytic Bed Length, Downstream Reaction Distance, Reference Velocity and Adiabatic Flame Temperature

Figure II. 2 shows the detailed profiles of two cases; one with a 5-cm bed and the other with a $2.5-\mathrm{cm}$ bed. If we look at the $5-\mathrm{cm}$ case first, we see when mixture enters into the reactor channel, the fuel is quickly consumed on the surface by catalytic reaction, the surface temperature starts from a low value $\left(T_{S}=1.106\right)$, due to the fast heat and mass transfer rates at the entrance region, and rises sharply away from the channel entrance. The gas


Fig. II. 1 Comparison of temperature dependence for the computed disappearance time (nondimensional) of Diesel No. 2 fuel with Ignition Delay Data (Edelman, 1978). Reference time is taken at 1200 K .


Fig. II. 2 Computed temperature and species profiles for two similar catalytic combustors with different bed lengths, $A^{*} / A_{T}^{*}=0.93$ and $d^{*}=1.382 \mathrm{~mm}$.
temperature begins to rise due to the heat transfer from the substrate and when $T$ reaches 1.15 , gas-phase reaction is initiated and the hydrocarbon fuel is converted to the "pyrolyzed hydrocarbon,", which is equal to the difference between $\mathcal{Y}_{\text {THC }}$ (total hydrocarbon) and $\mathcal{y}_{H C}$ (original hydrocarbon). At the same time, $C O$, which is produced only in the gas-phase, begins to rise. The carbon monoxide in turn is consumed by both gas-phase and surface reactions to form $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ until the bed exit is reached. After the exit, CO is consumed by gas-phase reaction only so a slope discontinuity of the $C O$ curve occurs at $x^{*}=5 \mathrm{~cm}$. Similar discontinuity can be found in temperature and hydrocarbons, although in the latter case, it is not very apparent. If at the bed exit the gas temperature is high enough, the gas-phase reaction will continue at a high rate and adiabatic flame temperature is reached at $x^{*}=12 \mathrm{~cm}$. As shown in Fig. II.2, a CO peak occurs when its production and oxidation rates become equal.

If the catalytic bed is cut short at 2.5 cm . as shown in Fig. II. 2 , the total hydrocarbon ( $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{THC}}$ ) oxidation rate decreases suddenly at the bed exit ( 2.5 cm ) due to the absence of surface reaction. Since the gas temperature is not yet high enough, the gas-phase reaction downstream proceeds slowyly as shown by the slower increase of gas temperature. Because a larger fraction of the hydrocarbon fuel has to be consumed in the gasphase reaction, higher $C O$ peak occurs and the total combustor length required to reach the emission goal is accordingly longer than the case with longer catalytic bed.

It was shown in Chapter $I$ that the effects of catalytic bed length, after-bed distance, gas velocity and open area percentage could be correlated using reference gas residence times in the reactor bed and in the after-
bed space. For a fixed open area fraction, this correlation is simplified and can be expressed by the ratios of lengths over the reference velocity as given in Fig. II.3. For a fixed "gas residence time" in the bed ( $L^{*} / \mathrm{U}_{\text {ref }}^{*}$ ), there is a corresponding minimum combustor residence time ( $L_{E G}^{*} / U_{r e f}^{*}$ ) for emissions goals to be satisfied. Although the residence time correlation is natural for gas-phase reactions, it is less obvious for surface reactions. The validity of this type of correlation is independent of the gas kinetic schemes used as illustrated here and in Chapter I where two-step kinetics and different sets of catalytic parameters were employed.

Fig. II. 3 shows that as the catalytic bed length increases, the required combustor length decreases. This may lead one to choose a design which is all reactor bed without the downstream gas reaction space. However, as discussed in Chapter $I$, in many catalytic combustor applications (e.g., transportation engines), a fast combustor response is required. Longer reactor bed results in a longer response time due to the larger substrate thermal inertia. Therfore, certain compromises may have to be made between steady and nonsteady considerations. Take Fig. II.3, for example, one may want to choose a bed residence time of 4 milliseconds instead of 6 milliseconds. This increases the total combustor length by $15 \%$ but reduces the response time by $30 \%$. As the inlet temperature becomes higher, as preferred by the automotive gas turbine design, the required reactor bed will be drastically reduced, leaving most reactions to occur in the gas-phase. A shorter reactor bed also decreases the pressure loss.

The importance of downstream gas-phase reactions has been recognized by Anderson as demonstrated in much of his work (Anderson, 1977b, 1980a, T'ien and Anderson, 1979). Figure II. 4 compares the model calculation with his recent data (Anderson, 1980a) on CO emission index as a function of downstream


Fig. II. 3 Computed "residence time" correlation: total residence time in combustor (bed plus after-bed) to reach emission goals vs. residence time in catalytic beds.


Fig. II. 4 CO emission index vs. adiabatic flame temperature: comparison of model calculation with Anderson's data (1980a).
reaction distance and adiabatic flame temperature. Figure II. 5 compares the minimum operating flame temperature vs. the downstream reaction distance for two bed lengths and two velocities. The comparison between the model and data is reasonably good within the range of parameters varied.

The appearance of $C O$ peak as indicated in Fig. II. 2 has been reported in previous experimental work (T'ien and Anderson, 1979, Bracco et al, 1980).

## Effects of Inlet Temperature and Pressure

Figure IT. 6 shows the computed combustion efficiency as a function of adiabatic flame temperature for three inlet temperatures and two pressures at three different downstream locations. For a fixed pressure and adiabatic flame temperature, higher inlet temperature results in a higher efficiency at all three downstream positions. This is consistent with the experimental trend found by Anderson (1978) . With higher inlet temperature, the gasphase reaction is initiated earlier which results in a higher efficiency at a fixed location. However, as more residence time is given to the mixture, the difference in efficiency diminishes as can be seen from curves at different locations in Figure II.6.

From Fig II.6, for inlet temperature of 1000 K , the combustion efficiency at 3 atm is always higher than that at 6 atm. This is because of the faster mass diffusion rate at lower pressure. For 1100 K inlet temperature, however, a portion of the 6 atm efficiency curve is higher than that of the 3 atm case as can be seen in Fig. II. $6(\mathrm{~b}$ ) and (c). This reversal phenomenon was first reported by Anderson (1978) who suggested that this was due to the competition between gas-phase and surface reactions. This model calculation


Fig. II. 5 Minimum operating flame temperature (to reach emission goals) vs. downstream reaction distance: comparison of model calculation with Anderson's data (1980a).


Fig. II. 6 Combustion efficiency vs. adiabatic flame temperature for different inlet temperature and pressure at three downstream locations.
supports this interpretation. High temperature and pressure support fast gas-phase reactions, but high pressure also retards surface reaction through slower mass diffusion rate. Taking the case of 1100 K inlet temperature and 1320 K adiabatic flame temperature for example: at the bed exit, the 6 atm case has a lower efficiency than the 3 atm case because inside the reactor channel, surface reaction dominates. At downstream distance of 5 cm , the 6 atm case still has lower efficiency. But at 10 cm downstream, the two efficiencies become equal and at 15 cm downstream 6 atm has a higher efficiency. Since only gas-phase reaction exists in the after-bed space, the efficiency reversal occurs when the gas-phase reactions overpower the upstream influence of surface reactions.

A transient model of monolith catalytic combustor is presented in this work. The model assumes a quasisteady gas phase and a thermally-thin solid with the substrate thermal inertia responsible for the combustor response time delay. In the gas-phase treatment, several quasi-global chemical reactions are assumed which are capable of describing $C O$ and unburnt hydrocarbon emissions in fuel-lean operations. By neglecting heat conduction along the flow direction in the gas and the solid in high speed approaching flows, the system of differential equations describing the combustor transient is simplified and Runge-Kutta integration scheme is applicable. The resulting computation scheme is highly efficient in computational time and is suitable for parametric calculation for both steady states and transients.

In the steady-state computation presented, the influence of selected operating and design parameters on the minimum combustor length is studied. Special attention is given to the effect of after-bed gas phase reaction space. Comparison with the data by Anderson indicates that the model is able to describe all the salient features found in the experiments including the appearance of $C O$ peak and the efficiency reversal phenomena at high inlet temperature and pressure. Quantitative agreement with $C 0$ emission data is possible if a certain degree of rate constants adjustment is made.

The model computation also suggests that for determining the condition of achieving the steady-state emission goals, the gas residence times in the catalytic bed and in the after-bed space are the similarity parameters absorbing the influence of catalytic bed and after-bed lengths, the gas velocity and the open area fraction of the catalytic element. Likewise, the nondimensional
response time and the gas residence times are the proper similarity parameters in transient operations. A consequence of this is that the dimensional response time is proportional to the substrate crossectional area $A_{S}^{*}$ (all other parameters fixed) and so a thin substrate is necessary for fast response.

The computed time history provides an understanding of how a catalytic combustor responds to an upstream condition change. The leading edge of the substrate is the first to respond to an upstream variation, say, a change of fuel flow rate. The leading edge is closer to the source of variation and the mass transfer rate is higher in the flow entrance region of the gas channel. As a result, the surface fuel concentration is perturbed first which, through the surface reaction, produces a surface temperature change. Heat transfer across the flow channel then causes the gas temperature to vary and this disturbance propagates downstream by convection. Since, the downstream part of the substrate always responds to the upstream substrate temperature variation, it is not difficult to see from the above description that a combustor with a longer catalytic bed residence time will take a longer time to reach a new equilibrium state.

The model calculation also shows that higher combustor inlet temperature and adiabatic flame temperature shorten the response time. Smaller channel hydraulic diameter usually results in a faster response but there are exceptions. Since the requirements for faster transient response do not always coincide with the optimal steady-state design conditions, for applications where transient characteristics are important, both steady and transient studies have to be made simultaneously so that a good compromising design can be found.
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## Nomenclature

| A* | crossectional area of one gas channel |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{\delta}}^{\boldsymbol{*}}$ | substrate cross-sectional area associated with one gas channel, see Fig. 1 |
| $\mathrm{A}_{\text {* }}{ }_{\text {N }}$ | $=A^{*}+A_{S}^{*}$, total crossectional area of one cell unit |
| $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ | $=\frac{L^{*}}{U^{\star}(0)} \frac{1}{\rho^{*}(0)} \frac{1}{\gamma_{H C}(0)} C_{0}^{\star} p^{\star}(0)^{\gamma_{1}} \rho^{*}(0)^{\gamma_{2}} T^{*}(0)^{\gamma_{3}} Y_{H C}^{\gamma_{2}}(0) W_{H C}^{\left(1-\gamma_{2}\right)}$ |

$B_{1}=\frac{L^{\star}}{U^{*}(0,0)} \frac{1}{\rho^{*}(0,0)} \frac{1}{Y_{H C}(0,0)} C_{1}^{*} P_{(0,0)}^{\alpha_{j}} \rho_{(0,0)}^{\left(\alpha_{2}+\alpha_{3}\right)} T_{(0,0)}^{\alpha_{4}} \underset{Y_{H C}}{(0,0)}{ }_{Y_{02}}^{\alpha_{2}}(0,0)$ $\times W_{H C}\left(1-\alpha_{2}\right) W_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}^{-\alpha_{3}}$
$B_{2}=\frac{L^{*}}{U^{*}(0,0)} \frac{1}{\rho^{*}(0,0)} \frac{1}{Y_{H C}(0,0)} C_{2}^{\star} p^{*}(0,0)^{\beta_{1}} \rho_{\rho *(0,0)}^{\left(B_{2}+\beta_{3}+\beta_{5}\right)} T^{*}(0,0) Y_{H C}^{\beta_{4}} Y_{2}^{\beta_{2}}(0,0)$ $\times Y_{02}^{\beta_{3}}(0,0) \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{CO}}^{\left(1-\beta_{2}\right)} \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{O} 2}^{-\beta_{3}} \mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}}^{-\beta_{5}}$
$B_{3}=C_{3}^{\star} d^{*} / \alpha^{*} W_{H C}{ }^{N u_{\infty}}$
$\mathrm{B}_{4}=\mathrm{C}_{4}^{*} \mathrm{~d} * / \alpha * \mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{CO}} \mathrm{Nu}_{\infty}$
$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}}=\mathrm{n} \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{CO}} / \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{HC}}$
$C_{5}^{\star} \quad$ specific heat of substrate
gas specific heat
catalytic monolith combustor channel equivalent diameter
half thickness of the substrate
activation energy
mass consumption rate of hydrocarbons per unit surface area through reaction (C)
$J_{4}^{X} \quad$ mass consumption rate of $C 0$ per unit surface area through reaction (D)
$J_{D i}=J_{H}\left(\operatorname{Le}_{i}\right)^{2 / 3}$
$J_{H}=4 N u_{x}\left(\alpha^{*}(0,0) / d \star^{2}\right)(L \star / u \star(0,0)(k \star / k *(0,0)$

| k* | heat conductivity of the sas |
| :---: | :---: |
| L* | catalytic bed length |
| $L_{\text {as }}^{\star}$ | length of after-bed downstream gas phase reaction space |
| $L_{\text {c }}^{\text {* }}$ | total combustor length (catalytic reactor length plus after-bed downstream gas reaction distance) |
| $L_{\mathrm{E} G}^{\star}$ | total combustor length (catalytic bed plus after-bed space) required to meet emission goals |
| $\mathrm{Le}_{1}$ | Lewis number for hydrocarbon gas in air |
| $\mathrm{Le}_{2}$ | Lewis number for $C 0$ in air |
| m | number of hydrogen atom in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{Hm}_{\mathrm{m}}$. |
| n | number of carbon atom in $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}$ |
| $\mathrm{Nu}_{x}$ | Nusselt number at $x$ |
| $\mathrm{Nu}_{\infty}$ | Nusselt number for fully developed flow |
| $p$ | $p \star / p *(0,0)$, nondimensional pressure |
| $\mathrm{q}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{q}_{1}^{*} / \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{T} \mathrm{T}^{(0,0)}$, nondimensional heat of combustion per unit mass of $C_{n} H_{m}$ in reaction $A$ |
| $9_{2}$ | $\mathrm{q}_{2}^{\star} / \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\star} \mathrm{T}^{\star}(0,0)$, nondimensional heat of combustion per unit mass of $C O$ in reaction $B$ |
| $\mathrm{q}_{3}$ | ```q*/C*T T* (0,0), nondimensional heat of combustion per unit mass of C }\mp@subsup{\textrm{C}}{\textrm{m}}{``` |
| $\mathrm{q}_{4}$ | ```q*/C_& T* (0,0), nondimensional heat of combustion per unit mass of CO in reaction D, same as q}\mp@subsup{q}{2}{``` |
| $r_{n k}$ | see Eq. (17) |
| S* | circumferential length of one channel crossection ( $=\pi d *$ ) |
| T | $T * / T *(0,0)$, nondimensional gas temperature |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | $T_{3} / T *(0,0)$, nondimensional substrate temperature |



```
\alpha* thermal diffusivity of gas
\mp@subsup{\alpha}{i}{}}\quad\mathrm{ rate exponent, see Eqs (1) and (23)
B rate constant, see Eq. (22)
Bi rate exponent, see Eqs (2) and (24)
\gammai rate exponent, see Eq (22)
    p* gas density
    p* substrate density
\tau* characteristic substrate heat-up time, see Eq. (16)
#
\etaT combustion efficiency based on temperature difference
[] concentration, g-mole/c.c.
Subscript
s surface
Superscript
dimensional quantity
```


## APPENDIX I <br> LISTING OF COMPUTER PROGRAMS FOR CHAPTER I

The numerical computations were performed using an interactive VAX 11/780 computer. FORTRAN language was used in writing the main program (e.g. IGNITION. FOR; 17) and the data program (e.g. BLOCK. FOR; 31). They were then compiled to form the objective programmes (e.g. IGNITION. OBJ; ** and BLOCK. OBJ; **). The two objective programmes were then linked together to form an executable program (e.g. IGNITION. EXE; 10). In performing a calculation, only the executable is needed.

The BLOCK program stores most of the data which are not likely to be changed from one calculation to the other, while the most frequently varied input data will be read in in each computer run. If the data stored in the BLOCK program are to be changed, the FORTRAN BLOCK program has to be modified (edited), re-compiled and linked with the main program to form a new executable program.

In the following, the FORTRAN programmes (IGNITION. FOR; 17 and BLOCK. FOR; 31) are listed together with a sample calculation showing input and output data.

The IGNITION program is presently set up to perform the start-up transient. With minor modification, it can read in any prescribed initial condition and to calculate the corresponding unsteady response. Given enough computational time, the IGNITION program will also result in the steady-state profiles.

More detailed instrictions (for IGNITION. FOR; 17):

1. The number of grid points used should be less than 300 . If more than 300 points are needed, line 600 has to be changed.
2. Read-in data (lines 10900-12300):

XPHI $=\phi=$ fue1-air equivalence ratio
$\mathrm{TI}=\mathrm{T}(0,0)=$ upstream, initial temperature (K)
XPI $=P(0,0)=$ upstream, initial pressure (Atm.)
UIUS $=U_{r e f}=$ upstream (outside of the bed) initial gas velocity (m/s)
XLS $=$ reference length (m), suggested to use 0.1 m ( 10 cm )
$D S=d^{*}=$ channel hydraulic diameter ( $m$ )
AOAS $=A^{*} / A_{S}^{*}=$ open-to-close area ratio
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{X}}=$ nondimensional step size in X (space). It is
nondimensionalized by XLS. So if XLS $=0.1 \mathrm{~m}$ and $D X=0.01$, dimensional step size is 0.001 m or 1 mm .

DT $=$ nondimensional time step size
TMAX = maximum nondimensional time allowed for computation
IPRINT $=$ time interval for printing out transient profiles.
For example, if $D T=.01$ and $\operatorname{IPRINT}=25$,
Output will be printed out every $t=0.25$.
$N=$ number of grid points (in $X$ direction) in the catalytic bed. The nondimensional catalytic bed length is given by ( $\mathrm{N}-1$ ) x ( DX ). For example, if $N=51, \mathrm{DX}=.01$, then the nondimensional bed length is equal to 0.5 . If $\mathrm{XLS}=.1 \mathrm{~m}$, then the dimensional bed length is .05 m ( 5 cm ).

NAS $=$ number of grid points (in X-direction) in the downstream after- $b$ space. The length of the downstream distance can be calculated in a similar manner as in the above.
C.1, $\mathrm{C} 2, \mathrm{C} 3, \mathrm{C} 4=\mathrm{C}_{1}, \mathrm{C}_{2}, \mathrm{C}_{3}, \mathrm{C}_{4}$ (See Table I.2)
$\mathbf{I T}=$ interval in $X$ for printout. For example, if $\mathbf{D X}=0.01$
$I T=5$, the printout will be at $X=0,0.05,0.1,0.15, .$. . etc.
3. Those data which are not read in will be defined by the BLOCK program.
4. Some Symbol Definitions:
$\mathrm{PR}=$ Prandt1 number of air
REY = Reynolds number based on channel diameter and upstream velocity
ES, $S=E_{1} *, E_{2} *, E_{3} *, E_{4}^{*}$ (See Table I.2)
$E, S=E_{1}, E_{2}, E_{3}, E_{4}$
$\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{S}=\mathrm{C}_{1} *, \mathrm{C}_{2}{ }^{*}, \mathrm{C}_{3}{ }^{*}, \mathrm{C}_{4}{ }^{*}$ (See Table I .2 )
$\mathrm{GC}=$ gas constant (joule/kg K)
XLEW1 = Lewis number for $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{m}}$ in mixture
XLEW2 $=$ Lewis number for CO in mixture
ROI $=$ initial, upstream (I.U.) gas density ( $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ )
XKI = I.U. gas heat conductivity (cal/m sec K)
$\mathrm{CP}=$ specific heat of gas at constant pressure (cal/kg K)
ALPHA = I.U. gas diffusivity ( $\mathrm{m}^{2} / \mathrm{sec}$ )
$T S=T_{S}$
$\mathrm{YFS}=\boldsymbol{y}_{\mathrm{HC}, \mathrm{s}}$
$\mathrm{YCS}=y_{\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{s}} \quad \mathrm{YO}=y_{\mathrm{O}_{2}}$
$\mathrm{YF}=\boldsymbol{y}_{\mathrm{HC}} \quad$ TMAX $=$ Maximum time for computation
$\mathrm{YC}=\boldsymbol{y}_{\mathrm{CO}}$
5. Output data (1ines 40300 to 42200 )

The following quantities are printed out as a function of axial distance and time:

Nondimensional gas and surface temperatures, Emission indices ( $x 1000$ ) of hydrocarbon fuel and $C O$ (both in the gas phase and on the surface) and carbon-balanced and thermal efficiencies.


```
IGNITION,FOR:I7
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
200 \\
300 \\
30
\end{array}
\] & \(\stackrel{C}{C}\) & CHEMICAL REACIICN 4, CO + \(\mathrm{C} 2=\mathrm{CO2}\) (SOLIC SURFACE) \\
\hline +400 & c & \\
\hline 8500 & C & ES1 = ACTIVATICA ENERGY FCR FEACTICN 1 (CAL/MOLE) AETC. \\
\hline 8600 & C & C1 = PKEEXPONENIIAL FACTCF (CIMENSICNAL) FTP REACTICN1, EIC \\
\hline 8700 & C & WHC, "CU = MCLECULAR WEJGHIS FOR CNHM, CU \\
\hline 8800 & C & G1S E HEAT OF CCMGUSTION FOR PEACTICN 1 (CAL/G OF CNHM) \\
\hline 9900 & C & \(025=\) HEAT OF CCMRUSTIONFOR REACTICN 2 (CAL/G CFFCC) \\
\hline 9000
9100 & C & GS = HEAT OF CCMEUSTICA FOF REACTION 3 (CAL/G DF CNHM) \\
\hline 9200 & C & \(X N=\) THE NUMEEF OF CAFPCKS IN CNHN \\
\hline 9300 & C & XM = THE NUMREF OF HYCRDGEN IN CNHM \\
\hline 9400 & C & \\
\hline 9500 & C & \\
\hline 9600 & C & \\
\hline 9700 & & QS \(=015+\) Q2S*XN*WCC/WHC \\
\hline 9800 & C & \\
\hline 9900 & \({ }^{C}\) & **\#\#\#\#\#\# CATALYTIC bEL PARAMETERS \#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#***** \\
\hline 10000 & C & \\
\hline 10100 & C & \(X L S=\) BED LENGTH (M) \\
\hline 10200 & c & DS = CHANNEL HYCRAULIC DIAMEIER (M) \\
\hline 10300 & C & SOA = CIRCUMFERENTIAL LENGTH CIVIDEC BY CHANNEL AREA. \(=4 / \mathrm{DS}(1 / \mathrm{M})\) \\
\hline 10400 & C & AOAS = RATIO OF UPENTO CLOSEL AREAS \\
\hline 10500 & C & CSS = HEAT CAPACITY CF SUBSTRATE (CAL/KG/K) \\
\hline 10600 & C & ROS \(=\) LENSITY CF SUBSTRATE (KG/M3) \\
\hline 10700 & c & \\
\hline 10900 & & FEAC (5,10) XPHI \\
\hline 11000 & & REAL \((5,10)\) II \\
\hline 11100 & & REAL ( 5,10\() \times\) ( 5 \\
\hline 11200 & & REAC (5,10) UIUS \\
\hline 11300 & & REAL ( 5,10 ) XLS \\
\hline 11400
11500 & & REAC \((5,10)\) DS \\
\hline 11600 & & REAL \((5,10)\) DX \\
\hline 11700 & & REAE \((5,10)\) CT \\
\hline 11000 & & REAL ( 5,10 ) TMAX \\
\hline 11900
12000 & & READ ( 5,8 ) IPRINT \\
\hline 12000
12100 & & REAC \((5,8)\) N \\
\hline 12100
12200 & & REAL (5,8) NAS \\
\hline 12200
12300 & & REAC (5,*) C1, C2,C3,C4 \\
\hline 12300
12400 & & KEAL \((5,8)\) IT \\
\hline 12400
12500 & &  \\
\hline 12600 & & NPNAS \(=N+\) NAS \\
\hline 12700 & C & \\
\hline 12800 & C &  \\
\hline 12900 & C & TI = INITIAL UFSTREAM (1.U.) TEMPERATURE (K) \\
\hline 13000 & C & UI \(=\) I.U. VELCCIIY (M/S) \\
\hline 13100 & C & XPI = I.U. PRESSURE (ATM.) \\
\hline 13200 & C & RCI = I. GAS CENSIIY (KG/M3) \\
\hline 13300
13400 & C & YFI = I U U MASS FRACIION OF HC \\
\hline 13400
13500 & \(\stackrel{C}{C}\) & YCI
YOI
I
I \\
\hline 13600 & C & XPhi = UPSTREAN HC/O2 EQUIVALENCE RATIO \\
\hline 13700 & C & \\
\hline 13800 & C & \\
\hline 13900 & & UI \(=\) UIUS* (1.04, OAS)/AOAS \\
\hline 14000 & & XMU \(=0.000001458 * S 0 R T(T I) /(1,0+110.4 / T I)\) \\
\hline 14100
14200 & & YFI = WHC*X「HI/29. \(\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { ( }\end{array}\right.\) \\
\hline 14200 & & XLE* \(=1.3 *\) SORT ( 29.1 WHC) \\
\hline 14300
14400 & &  \\
\hline 14400
14500 & & XLE123 =xLEw1**-667 \\
\hline 14500 & C & XLE223-xLEW2***667 \\
\hline 14700 & & XLCU \(=\) XLS/UI \\
\hline 14800 & C & \\
\hline 14900 & C &  \\
\hline 15000 & C & \\
\hline 15100
15200 & C & \\
\hline 15200
15300 & \(\stackrel{C}{C}\) & XKI = HEAT CONCUCTIVITY OF GASAT I.U. (CAL/M/SEC/K) \\
\hline 15400 & C & ALPHA = I. U. GAS THERMAL DIFFUSIVITX (M 2 (SEC) \\
\hline 15500 & C & GCEGAS CONSTANT FOR GAS MIXTURE (JOULE/KG/K) \\
\hline 15600 & C & XLEW1 \(=\) LEWIS NUMBER FOR CNHM IN MIXTURE \\
\hline 15700 & C & XLEW2 = LEWIS NUMBER FOR CO IN MIXTURE \\
\hline 15800 & C & \\
\hline 15900
16000 & C & \\
\hline 16000
16100 & & XKI=.003+.000013*TI \\
\hline 16100
16200 & & ROI \(=\times\) PI/GC/TI \\
\hline 16200 & & ALPHA \(=\) XKI/RCI/CP \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```






DIMENSION TS (300) YFS (300) YCS(300)
CCMMCN /ACTI/ES1,ES2,ES3,ES4
COMNGYAMOLEOY WHC. WCC. WC2, WH2O

COMMCN SUPST, YCI YOI
DATA ES1,ES2,ES3,ES4/24000.040000. 10000..17800.1

DATA XN, XM, Q1S,G2S/3;:8ikisiovo.is
DATA YCI YOIMO
DATA TSO
ERD

Example calculation:



```
010400%
```



```
HIIAEFTIE FLAME TEMF = 1.443EEC
FIIIEE FLAME TEMF(K) = 1443.6E195
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ES, S= & \(0.84000005+05\) & \(0.40000000 \mathrm{E}+05\) &  & 4.178000 \\
\hline OLOE + 05 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```




```
0000E+06
```



```
-0@1E0!0
FOI, XKI, CF, FLFHA = 1.059EE1 0.016000 E85.0000000.5E982E-04
    SF| = =.00000
    LH= 0.0066E67
    E1S, FE'S: = 0. 36601332E+05 0.34534906E+09
E1, EE: B%. E4 = 0. 20E19805E+0.5 0.19078E40E+09 0.46881531E+03 0. 29468%91E+0.5
INITIFL CONIITIDNS (TE)
0.10000E+01 0. 10000E+01 0.10000E+01 0. 10000E+01 0.10000E+01 0.10000E +01 0. 10100E
+01 0.10000E+01 0.10000E+01 0.10000E+01
INITIAL CONDITIDNS (YFS)
0.00000E + 00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00, 0.00000E+00 0.00000E
+00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E +00 U.00000E +00
INITIRL CDNDITIDNS (YCS)
0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+000 0.00000E+00 0. 00000E
+00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00
```


GH TEMFERFTUFE ST

$+010.10451 E+01$ 0. $10451 E+01$ 0. $10447 E+01$

$+018.10604 E+010.1065 E+010.10647 E+01$

SOLII TEMFERATURE (TSY
$0.11390 E+010.10786 E+010.10631 E+010.1054 E E+01 \quad 0.10477 E+0110.104 E 7 E+01 \quad 0.10384 E$

CNHM MASS FFAETIUN (YF)

```
0.10000E+01 0.8E811E+00 0.7E848E+00 0.64850E+00 0.58054E+00 0.5E141E+00 0.4EG3%E
+00 0.42307E+00 0.38150E+00 0.34400E+00
```



```
+00 0. E7871E+00 0. 27100E+00 0. E63E4E+00
```


$\mathrm{YCO}=$


$0.73834 E-010.87 E 81 E-010.10073 E+00 \quad 0.11418 E+000.127 E E E+0010.14103 E+1010.15440 E$
$+100.16772 E+000.18098 E+10010.19417 E+00$

SUFFFEE HE MHES FRACTIDN ©FE

$+0010.1098 E+000.99795 E-010.90590-01$
YCDCSURFACE =


- 01 O. 126ċE-01 0.1363EE-01 0.14440E-01
$x_{2} \mathrm{H}$

$+010 . \tilde{c} 1536 E+010 . \tilde{E} 1464 E+110.21403 E+01$
EFFICIENCY(CAFBDN-EFLANCE)
$0.00000 E+00 \quad 0.16939 E+00 \quad 0.26670 E+00 \quad 0.34465 E+00 \quad 0.41086 E+010 \quad 0.46852 E+0010.52939 E$
$+000.56464 E+00 \quad 0.60544 E+00 \quad 0.64237 E+00$
$0.65279 E+000.65718 E+0010.66163 E+000.66614 E+000.67071 E+000.67534 E+00 \quad 0.68004 E$
$+000.68480 \mathrm{E}+000.68963 \mathrm{E}+000.69452 \mathrm{E}+00$
$0.69949 E+00 \quad 0.70453 E+00 \quad 0.70964 E+00 \quad 0.71482 E+00 \quad 0.72008 E+00 \quad 0.72541 E+010$
EFFICIENCY (TEMFERATURE)
$0.00000 E+00 \quad 0.62838 E-01 \quad 0.79086 E-01 \quad 0.88607 E-01 \quad 0.94669 E-01 \quad 0.9847 P E-01 \quad 0.1006 E E$
$+00 \quad 0.10160 E+000.10161 E+000.10085 E+00$
$0.10409 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.10848 \mathrm{E}+000.11292 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.11743 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.12200 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.12663 \mathrm{E}+0 \mathrm{0} 0.1313 \mathrm{OE}$
$+000.13609 E+00 \quad 0.14092 E+00 \quad 0.14582 E+00$
$0.15079 E+000.15582 E+000.16093 E+00 \quad 0.16611 E+00 \quad 0.17137 E+00 \quad 0.176 .70 E+190$

| TIME = | 0.4 06mbit | KDIINT $=$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## GAE TEMFEFATUFE CT

 $+010.10843 E+010.10845 E+010.10841 E+01$
 $+010.11065 E+010.11097 E+010.1112 \mathrm{EE}+01$
$0.11161 E+01$ 0. 11194E+01 1.11EcEE+01 0.11E6EE+01 0.11EG7E+01 0.113GEE+01
SOLII TEMFERFTURE (TS)
 +01 O. 10FE'E $010.1066 T E+010.10 E 17 E+01$

CNHM MAES FRACTIDN CYF

```
0. 10000E+01 0. 80758E+00 0.70137E+00 0.61707E+00 0.54601E+000.48467E+00 0. 43108E
+00 0. 38%85E+0010.34185E+00 0.30438E+U0
0. 己'89E5E+00 0. 2790EE+00 0. E68E3E+00 0. 25851E+00 0. 24813E+00 0. ESTGSE+00 0.EET19E
+000.2166EE+100 0. E0E 09E+00 0.19550E+00
0. 18489E+000.174天9E+00 0.16370E+000.15314E+00 0.14264E+00 0.13EE1E+00
```

    \(\mathrm{y}: \mathrm{D}=\)
    


$+0018.2869 E+000 . E 379 E+000.25040 E+00$


SIFFACE HE MASS FRAC:TIDN CYFS



```
YCDCSURFACE)=
```

 -01 0.13661E-01 0.15024E-01 0.16140E-01
$\therefore \mathrm{XIH}$



## EFFICIENCY (CARBON-EALANCE)

$0.00010 E+000.18954 E+000.29281 E+00 \quad 0.37440 E+00 \quad 0.44306 E+00 \quad 0.50236 E+00 \quad 0.55425 E$ $+000.60008 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.64109 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.67788 \mathrm{E}+00$
$0.68968 E+000.69592 E+000.70227 E+000.70873 E+000.71531 E+000.7 E 200 E+00 \quad 0.72882 E$ $+010.73577 E+000.74284 E+000.75003 E+00$
$0.75736 E+00 \quad 0.76481 E+000.77240 E+000.78011 E+000.78795 E+000.79591 E+00$

## EFFICIENCY(TEMPERATURE)

$0.00000 E+00 \quad 0.11074 E+00 \quad 0.14304 E+00 \quad 0.16233 E+00 \quad 0.17485 E+000.18292 E+000.18775 E$ $+00 \quad 0.19010 E+00 \quad 0.19058 E+00 \quad 0.18953 E+00$
$0.19407 E+000.20031 E+00 \quad 0.20666 E+00 \quad 0.21312 E+00 \quad 0.21970 E+00 \quad 0.22640 E+000.233 E E$ $+000.24016 E+000.24723 E+00 \quad 0.25443 E+00$
$0.26175 E+000.26921 E+000.27679 E+000.28451 E+000.29234 E+000.30031 E+010$

```
TIME= 0.5959959e kDUNT= 61
```


## GAS TEMFEFATURE ©T

```
0.10000E+01 0.10ES7E+01 0.10848E+01 0. 10979E+01 0. 11067E+01 0.111ETE+01 0.111EEE
+01 0.11188E+01 0.11198E+01 0.11197E+01
0.11EESE+01 0.11E6EE+01 0.11301E+01 0.11340E+01 0.113EOE+01 0.114E1E+01 1.114ESE
+010.11506E+01 0.11550E+01 0.11594E+01
```



```
GQLIII TEMFERFTLIEE (TS)
0.12E.35E+01 0.12134E+01 0.11791E+01 0.11EP8E+01 0.11419E+01 0.11289E+01 0.11179E
+01 0.11088E+01 0.11011EE+01 0.10940E+011
```


## CNHM MASS FEFCCTIDN (YF)





``` \(+100.1 E 074 E+000.14739 E+000.13416 E+100\) \(0.1 \overline{109 E}+000.10825 E+000.95689 E-01 \quad 0.8347 \mathrm{EE}-01 \quad 0.71675 \mathrm{E}-01 \quad 0.60388 \mathrm{E}-01\)
```

$\mathrm{CD}=$
 $-010.9043 \mathrm{EE}-010.96435 \mathrm{E}-010.10054 \mathrm{E}+00$



SURFACE HC MASS FRACTIDN CYFS,



## YCDSURFACE $=$

 $-010.13980 \mathrm{E}-01 \quad 0.15 \mathrm{E} 16 \mathrm{E}-01 \quad 0.1698 \mathrm{BE}-01$

## ※.JH

$0.1167 \mathrm{TE}+0 \mathrm{E} \quad 0.32865 \mathrm{E}+01 \quad 0.27628 \mathrm{E}+01 \quad 0.2548 \mathrm{E}+01 \quad 0.24291 \mathrm{E}+01 \quad 0.23501 \mathrm{E}+01 \quad 0.22915 \mathrm{E}$


## EFFICIENCY (CARBDN-EALANCE)

$0.00000 \mathrm{E}+000 . \bar{c} 0056 \mathrm{E}+000.30840 \mathrm{E}+000.39329 \mathrm{E}+000.46453 \mathrm{E}+000.52586 \mathrm{E}+000.57930 \mathrm{E}$ $+000.62632 E+000.66817 E+00 \quad 0.70543 E+00$ $0.71900 E+000.72746 E+000.73610 E+000.74495 E+000.75400 E+00 \quad 0.76325 E+010$ 0.77ET1E $+00 \quad 0.78238 E+00 \quad 0.79225 E+00 \quad 0.80231 E+00$ $0.81256 \mathrm{E}+000.8 \mathrm{E} 298 \mathrm{E}+000.83354 \mathrm{E}+000.84421 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.85495 \mathrm{E}+000.86571 \mathrm{E}+00$

EFFIC:IENCY(TEMPERATURE)
$0.00000 \mathrm{E}+000.14356 \mathrm{E}+000.19111 \mathrm{E}+000.22064 \mathrm{E}+000.24056 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.25404 \mathrm{E}+000.26275 \mathrm{E}$ $+000.26777 E+000.26994 E+00 \quad 0.26975 E+00$
$0.27609 \mathrm{E}+000.28455 \mathrm{E}+000.29320 \mathrm{E}+000.30204 \mathrm{E}+000.31109 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.32034 \mathrm{E}+0010.32980 \mathrm{E}$ $+00 \quad 0.33947 E+00 \quad 0.34934 E+00 \quad 0.35940 E+00$ $0.36 .965 E+00 \quad 0.38001 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.39063 \mathrm{E}+000.40130 \mathrm{E}+000.41204 \mathrm{E}+000.4 \mathrm{c} 280 \mathrm{E}+00$

EAG TEMFERFTUFE CT
 $+010.11490 \mathrm{E}+11 \mathrm{0} 1151 \mathrm{E} \mathrm{E}+01 \mathrm{0} .11519 \mathrm{E}+01$




SDLII TEMFERATURE TS:



ENHM MASS FRFCTIDN CYF

```
0.10000E+01 0.78985E+0010.67457E+00% 0. 58E86E+00 0.50547E+0000.43878E+000 0. 3808EE
+10 0. 35013E+00 0. 2ESS1E+00 0. 24ESEE+00
```



```
+00 0. 11038E+00 0.94950E-01 %. 80069E-01
0.658TGE-01 0.525G9E-01 0.40EcEE-01 0. EF146E-01 0.19511E-01 0.11553E-01
```

    \(\because C O=\)
    
$-110.10609 E+000.11328 E+000.117 G 8 E+00$


$0.30918 E+0040.3070 E+000.3063 E+000.29913 E+000.88799 E+000.2730 E E+00$

SUFFALE HC MASS FEACTIDN (TFSS


$Y C D(S U R F F C E)=$
 - 01 !. 137g9E-01 0.15599E-01 0.17119E-01
$\therefore \mathrm{AH}$



EFFICIENCY (CAREDN-ERLANCE)

```
0.00000E+00 0. 20682E+000 0.31813E+00 0.40586E+000.47956E+00 0.54301E+00 0.598こ5E
+00 0.64679E+00 0.68985E+00 0.72798E+00
0.74366E+00 0.75469E+00 0. 766013E+00 0.77768E+00 0.78965E+00 0.80193E+00 0.81450,0E
+00 0.82733E+00 0.84038E+00 0.85359E+00
0.86686E+010 0.88009E+00 0.89312E+00 0.90578E+00 0.91784E+00 0.92905E+00
```


## EFFICIENCY (TEMPERATURE)

```
\(0.00000 E+000.16600 E+000.22721 E+000.26670 E+000.29434 E+000.31389 E+000.32731 E\) \(+000.33593 E+00 \quad 0.34078 E+00 \quad 0.34242 E+00\) \(0.35100 E+00 \quad 0.36203 E+00 \quad 0.37337 E+00 \quad 0.38503 E+00 \quad 0.39700 E+000.40928 E+0010.4 E 185 E\) \(+000.43468 E+00 \quad 0.44773 E+00 \quad 0.46093 E+00\)
\(0.47421 E+000.48744 E+00 \quad 0.50047 E+0010.51313 E+00 \quad 0.52519 E+000.53639 E+010\)
```



```
GHS TEMFERFTUFE IT
```


$+010.11755 E+010.1179 E E+01 \quad 0.11811 E+01$

+01 0. 1E300E 011 0. 1z401E+01 0. 1c470E+01

SOLII TEMFERATLIEE (TS)

$+010.11778 E+01$ 0.11ETOE+01 0.115EEE+01

## ENHM MASS FRACTIDM (YF)

```
0.10000E+01 0.78602E+00 0.66774E+00 0.57313E+00 0.49291E+00 0.4E358E+00 0. 363c5E
+00 1. 310501E+100 0. 264ECE +00 0. 2こ`86E+00
```



```
-01 0.66901E-01 0.510E5E-01 0. 36667E-01
0. 24163E-01 0.13877E-01 0.61870E-0E 0.14578E-0E 0.00000E+00 0.00000E+00
    MCD=
```




```
1.15912E+00 0.18804E+010 0. 21403E+00 0. E'3668E+00 0. 25556E+000 0.ET025E+010 0. E803SE
```



SUFFACE HC MASS FRFCTIDN GYS)

-01 0.60191E-01 0.5こ984E-01 0.46E8SE-01
YCD(SUFFACE) =


$\therefore \mathrm{BH}$

$+010.23678 E+01$ 0. $230 \% 7 E+01 \quad 0.23641 E+01$
EFFIC:IENC:Y (CARRON-BFI_ANCE)
$0.00000 E+0010.21052 E+000.32445 E+000.41456 E+000.49049 E+000.55600 E+000.61311 E$
$+000.66335 E+000.70785 E+000.74710 E+00$

$+000.87100 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.88690 \mathrm{E}+00 \quad 0.90246 \mathrm{E}+00$
$0.91733 E+00 \quad 0.93112 E+00 \quad 0.94335 E+00 \quad 0.95355 E+100.96121 E+0010.96721 E+00$
EFFICIENCY (TEMPERRTURE)
$0.00000 E+00 \quad 0.18145 E+00 \quad 0.25441 E+00 \quad 0.30314 E+00 \quad 0.33837 E+00 \quad 0.36422 E+00 \quad 0.38283 E$
$+000.39570 E+00 \quad 0.40395 E+00 \quad 0.40818 E+00$
$0.41940 E+000.43332 E+000.44770 E+000.40253 E+000.47778 E+00 \quad 0.49339 E+00 \quad 0.50925 E$
$+00 \quad 0.52523 E+000.54113 E+00 \quad 0.55669 E+00$
$0.57156 E+000.58535 E+000.59758 E+000.60778 E+000.61546 E+010.62146 E+00$

## APPENDIX II

## LISTING OF COMPUTER PROGRAMS FOR CHAPTER II

The computer programs for Part II (steady state) are quite similar, in structure, to those in Part $I$. In addition to using a three-reactions scheme as discussed in the text of Part II, only the final results are printed out (no intermediate transient).

More Detailed Instruction (for CALYl. FOR; 75):

1. Read-in data (lines 10400-11475):

XPHI $=\phi=$ fuel-air equivalence ratio
$T I=T(0,0)=$ upstream, initial temperature (K)
$\mathrm{XPI}=\boldsymbol{p}(0,0)=$ upstream, initial pressure (Atm.)
UIUS $=U_{\text {ref }}=$ upstream (outside of the bed) initial gas velocity (m/s)

XLS $=$ reference length ( m ) , suggested to use 0.1 m ( 10 cm )
$D S=d *=$ channel hydraulic diameter ( $m$ )
AOAS $=A^{*} / A_{s}^{*}=$ open-to-close area ratio
DXX = nondimensional step size in $X$ (space) inside the catalytic bed. It is nondimensionalized by XLS. So if $\mathrm{XLS}=0.1 \mathrm{~m}$ and $\mathrm{DX}=0.01$, the dimensional step size is 0.001 m or 1 mm .

XAS $=$ ratio of step sizes between downstream and inside-bed regions. For example, (XAS) $x$ (DXX) is the integration step size in $X$ - direction in the downstream space. DT $=$ nondimensional time step size, recommended to be 0.2 or 0.1 for steady calculations.

TMAX = maximum nondimensional time allowed for computation. It should be large enough to allow the steady state to be reached. For bed length less than $5 \mathrm{~cm}, \operatorname{TMAX}=$ 8.001 is suggested, for bed length between $5-12 \mathrm{~cm}$, TMAX $=12.001$ is suggested.
$N=$ number of grid points (in $X$ direction) in the catalytic bed. The nondimensional catalytic bed length is given by ( $N-1$ ) $x$ ( $D X$ ). For example, if $N=51, D X=.01$, then the nondimensional bed length is equal to 0.5 . If $\mathrm{XLS}=.1 \mathrm{~m}$, then the dimensional bed length is .05 m ( 5 cm ).
NAS = number of grid points (in X - direction) in the downstream after-bed space. The length of the downstream distance can be calculated in a similar manner as in the above.

IT = interval in X for printout. For example, if $\mathrm{DXX}=.01$, IT $=5$, the printout will be at $X=0,0.05,0.1,0.15$, etc. ...
$\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{C} 2, \mathrm{C} 3, \mathrm{C} 4=\mathrm{C}_{1}, \mathrm{C}_{2}, \mathrm{C}_{3}, \mathrm{C}_{4}$ (See Table I) IPUTIN = 1 (always)
2. Output data (1ines $37000-38586$ ):

The following quantities will be printed out as a
function of downstream distance:
Gas and solid temperatures, Emission indices (x1000) for the original hydrocarbon, pyrolyzed hydrocarbon, total hydrocarbon and CO in the gas phase, the original hydrocarbon and CO at the wall and the combustion efficiency.

If TMAX is large enough, the above printuats are the steady-state profiles.



```
CALY1.FOR:75
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 14200 & ALPHA \(=1 . \cup 1\) GAS THERMAL UIFFUSIVITY \\
\hline 14300 & GCEGAS CONSTANT FOH GAS MIXTUFE (JCJLE/KG/K) \\
\hline 14400 & XLEW1 = LEWIS NUNHEH FCK CNHM IN MIXIURH \\
\hline 14500 & XLEN2 = LEWIS NUNGER FOH CO IN MIXTURE \\
\hline 14000 & \\
\hline 14700 & \\
\hline 14750 & \(\mathrm{XkI}=.003+.000013\) \% T \\
\hline 14800 & HO1 \(=\times H 1 / G C / T I\) \\
\hline 14900 & ALPHA = XKI/RCI/CP \\
\hline 15000 & REY \(=\) UIUS*DS\#RCI/XMU \\
\hline 15100 & REY UIUS DS* \\
\hline 15200 & TE DESCRIHE CHEMICAL REACTION RATE EXPUESSIONS \\
\hline 15300 & TO DESCRIEE CHEMICAL REACTICN RATE EXPKESSIONS \\
\hline 15350 & REACIION O (GAS FHASE ISOTHERMAL PYRCLYSIS) \\
\hline 15375 & D(CNHM)/DT SSS (CNHM)/EXP (EO/RI) \\
\hline 15400 & REACTION 1 ( GAS PHASE \\
\hline 15500 & D(CNHM)/DT SSSXF**.3*T*SORT(YHC)\#YC2/EXP(E1/RT) \\
\hline 15600 & \\
\hline 15700 & REACTION 2 (GAS FHASE) \\
\hline 15800 & D(CO)/DI \$ P**BIA1*CO**ETA2*O2**BTA3*T**BTA4*H2O**PTA5/EXP(E2/RT) \\
\hline 15900 & \\
\hline 16000 & REACTIUN 3 (SCLIE SURFACE) \\
\hline 16100 & D(CNHM)/DT \$SSYHCS/EXF(E3/RT) \\
\hline & \\
\hline 16300 & REACIION 4 (SOLIC SURFACE) \\
\hline 16400 & D(CC)/DT SSS YCCS/EXP(E4/RT) \\
\hline 16500
16600 & \\
\hline 16600
16700 & to evaluate kinetic raie constants. \\
\hline 16750 & \(B 0=C O * X L O U *(W H C / R O I / Y F I) * *(1,-G A M A)\) \\
\hline 16800 & B1SS \(=\) C1*SORT \((W H C) / W C 2 / S G K T(1000)\). \\
\hline 16900 & B1S = B1SS\#XPI**.3*RCI\#SORI(RCI)*TI*SQRI (YFI) \# YOI \\
\hline 17000 & B1 = XLUU*B1S/RCI/YE1 \\
\hline 17100 & B235= BTA \(2+\) ¢TA \(3+\) EIA \\
\hline 17150 & C2M=C2*1000*** (1.-日235) \\
\hline 17200 &  \\
\hline 17300 & E2SEE2SS*XPI**ETA1*ROI**B235*TI**BTA4*YFI**BIA2*YOI**BTA3 \\
\hline 17400 & B2 \(=\) E2S*XLOU/RCI/YFI \\
\hline 17500 & \\
\hline 17900 & B \(3=C 3 * D S /\) ALPHA/wtic/3.66 \\
\hline 17950 & B4=C4*DS/ALPHA/hCO/3.60 \\
\hline 18000 & \(01=Q 1 S / C P / T 1\) \\
\hline 18100 & \(02=U 2 S / C P / T I\) \\
\hline 18200 & \(Q=O S / C F / T 1\) \\
\hline 18250 &  \\
\hline 18275 & TABCM=TAB*TI \\
\hline 18287 & \(E O=E S 0 / 1 I / 1.987\) \\
\hline 18300 & \(E 1=E S 1 / T I / 1.967\) \\
\hline 11400 & E2= ES2/71/1.987 \\
\hline 18500 & E3= ES3/II/1.987 \\
\hline 18600 & E4EES4/TI/1.987 \\
\hline 18700 &  \\
\hline 18800 & ******\#\#************************* \\
\hline 18900 & \\
\hline 19000 & WRITE ( \({ }^{6} \mathrm{~L}^{21)}\) N NAS \\
\hline 19100 & WRITE (6,20) TMAX \\
\hline 19200 & WRITE \((6,15)\) YCI, XFI, XPHI \\
\hline \[
19300
\] & WRITE (6, 71\()\) UIUS \\
\hline \[
19400
\] &  \\
\hline 19500
19600 &  \\
\hline 19600
19650 &  \\
\hline 19675 & WFITE(6,410) TAECM \\
\hline 19700 & WRITE (6,403)ESO, ESI EES2,ES3, ES 4 \\
\hline 19800 & WRITE 6,47\() E 0, E 1, E 2, E 3, E 4\) \\
\hline 19900 &  \\
\hline 19950 &  \\
\hline 20100 & WRITE (6,49) ROI, XLEWI'XKI, CE, XLPHAS \\
\hline 20200 & WRITE (6:401) XFI XKI, CF, ALPHA \\
\hline 20300 & WRIIE (6,43) XLCU \\
\hline 20400 & WRITE (6,44) BIS, B2S \\
\hline 20500 & WRITE(6,45)B0, 81, B2, B3, P4 \\
\hline 21100 & \\
\hline 21200 & \\
\hline 21300 &  \\
\hline 21400
21500 & \\
\hline 21500
21600 & \# \(\ddagger\) \#\#\#\#\#* UPSTREAM CONDITIONS \\
\hline 21600
21650 & \(Y F(1)=1\).
\(Y E(1)=0\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```



```
CALY1.FOR:75

```

BLOCK.FOR;2%12-AFR-1981 23:33:05.76
100
200
300
400
600
700
100
900
1100
1150
1175
1200
1400
1500
1600
1700
1800
1900
1950
2000
2100
block Data
DIMENSION IS(300), YFS(300), YCS(300), YFS(300)
COMMCN ACTI/ESO, ESI,ES2,ESZ, ESA
XM, WC WU2. mH20

```

```

COMNGN JTH2Y, CEEGC\& XPR
COMMCN /UPST/XSYIS,YGI,YES
COMNCN ABI2345/ETAI, ETAZ, BIA3, ETA4, EIAS
DATA ESO,ES1,ES2,ES3,ES4/34000., 24000.,40000.,10000..17800.1

```


```

DATA CF,GC,XPR/2ESiz2. YCI, YOI/OE-3,0.7

```

```

DATA GAMA/U.5/', YES/300*1.,300*0.,300*0., 300*0.,
END

```

\section*{Example calculation:}
```

\$ FUN CHLY1.ENE:G1
.1EE
10%%.
O
15.
.1
.00138%
13.EG
.01 1.
. }
8.001
5
10
5
1.6EE 1.8ES . F4E14 1.SE4 1.EE
1
HD. DF GRIII FOINT =
E
Red_in data {}{\begin{array}{l}{\phi}<br>{T1}<br>{XP1}<br>{UIUS}<br>{XLS}<br>{DS}<br>{AOAS}<br>{DXX,XAS}<br>{DT}
TMA`: = E.00100040

```

```

0000%
AFPFDACH YEL = 15. DODOD
CHFNNEL YEL SI.U.` = 1E.1286.7

| 01 $1=$ | 18.7964916 | Q ${ }^{\prime}=$ | 8.4736843 | I $1 \times$ \% $=$ | 0.01010400 | IIT $=$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | 1010000

TI. FR. REY, ALĖUL, ADHS = $1000.000000 .70000 \quad 529.01978 \quad 0.17199 \quad 13$
.29000
AIIAFATIC: FLFIME TEMF = 1.408440
ADIAB FLRME TEMF (k) = 1408.44019

```

```

FYFOLYZEI CNHM GYE

```

```

-01 !. 4E90EE-01 0.4704EE-01 0.4EEE7E-01

```



```

+00 0.00000E +00 10, 00000E +00 0, 01000EE+00
0. 60000E +00
TOTAL ENHM G＇THC：

```



``` \(+00 \quad 0.00000 E+000.00000 E+00 \quad 0.00000 E+00\)
```




``` O．DOMO
```

```
YCD =
```

```
YCD =
```




```
-01 %. E9093E-01 0.114ETE+0! !. 140EEE+0!
```

```
-01 %. E9093E-01 0.114ETE+0! !. 140EEE+0!
```




```
+0!0.15E31E+00 0.1254EE+00 0.987EGE-01
```

```
+0!0.15E31E+00 0.1254EE+00 0.987EGE-01
```




```
-01 0.1 E996E-01 0.10017E-01 サ.F71EEE-0E
```

-01 0.1 E996E-01 0.10017E-01 サ.F71EEE-0E
!.5c417E-@ご
!.5c417E-@ご
SLIRFACE HI: MASS FRACTIDN GYFE

```
SLIRFACE HI: MASS FRACTIDN GYFE
```




```
0.6:348EE-nE
YEDSSIRFACE: =
```



```
-目 0.4アご8EE-0こ 0.60816E-0゙ 0.744こ0E-0ご
1. 8E.843E-0E
XIH
```



```
+01 0.31189E+01 0.31556E+01 0.319EZE+01
1. 32"83E+01
EFFICIENC：Y（CAFEUN－BALANCE）
\(0.00000 E+00 \quad 0.23405 E+00 \quad 0.33119 E+00 \quad 0.40983 E+00 \quad 0.47854 E+00 \quad 0.54072 E+010 \quad 0.59893 E\) \(+000.65439 E+000.70766 E+000.75908 E+00\) \(0.80872 E+0010.83963 E+400.86864 E+0010.89865 E+000.92571 E+0010.94197 E+010.9590 E\) \(+1010.96273 E+1000.97047 E+000.97674 E+(10)\) \(0.98178 E+000.98578 E+000.98894 E+00 \quad 0.99142 E+00 \quad 0.99335 E+00 \quad 0.99486 E+00 \quad 0.99603 E\) \(+000.996 .94 E+00 \quad 0.99764 E+000.99818 E+00\) \(0.99860 E+00\)
```


*For sale by the National Technical Information Service, Springfield. Virginia 22161
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