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A review of research on the effects of gravity on combustion processes is presented, with an emphasis on a discussion of the ways in which reduced-gravity experiments and modeling has led to new understanding. Comparison of time scales shows that the removal of buoyancy-induced convection leads to manifestations of other transport mechanisms, notably radiative heat transfer and diffusional processes such as Lewis number effects. Examples from premixed-gas combustion, non-premixed gas-jet flames, droplet combustion, flame spread over solid and liquid fuels, and other fields are presented. Promising directions for new research are outlined, the most important of which is suggested to be radiative reabsorption effects in weakly burning flames.

Introduction

Gravity influences many combustion processes, particularly due to buoyant convection which affects transport of thermal energy and reactants to and from the chemical reaction zones. Recently, many experimental and theoretical studies of combustion at microgravity (μg) conditions have been conducted. These studies are motivated by the need to better understand of combustion processes at earth gravity (1g) through the elimination of buoyancy [1-4].

This paper discusses how new understanding of combustion processes has been obtained through μg research, rather than providing a comprehensive review of this rapidly changing field. First, comparisons of time scales for various chemical and transport processes in flames, including buoyancy-induced transport, are given. Next, examples of unexpected results and new understandings obtained through μg research are discussed. These findings are then summarized and future research directions are suggested.

Comparison of Time Scales for Premixed-Gas Combustion

To determine the conditions in which gravity can affect flames, the estimated time scales for chemical reaction \( t_{chem} \), inviscid buoyant convection \( t_{vin} \), viscous buoyant convection \( t_{vins} \), conductive heat loss to walls \( t_{cond} \), and radiant heat loss \( t_{rad} \) are compared. Premixed laminar flames are considered first because of their simplicity. Subsequent sections introduce time scales for other flames.

The chemical time scale is (see Nomenclature) \( t_{chem} = b/Si \), where \( b = \alpha S_i \), thus \( t_{chem} \sim aS_i^2 \). The convective transport time scale is \( d/U \), the characteristic flow length scale, \( U \sim (gd/dp)^{0.5} \) is the buoyant convection velocity, and \( d \) the density change across the flame. Because \( d/p \sim 1 \) for flames, \( t_{vin} \sim (gd/dp)^{0.5} \). For inviscid flow, \( d \) is determined by the apparatus dimensions, for example the burner or tube diameter. For viscous flow, \( d \) cannot be specified independently; instead \( d \sim vU \), thus \( U \sim (gd/dp)^{0.5} \) and \( t_{vin} = d/U \sim (vU)/U \sim (v/d)^{0.5} \). For optically thin radiation, \( t_{rad} \sim T_f/(\rho C_p H(T_f - T_r)) \), thus \( t_{rad} \sim T_f/(\rho C_p H(T_f - T_r)) \).

Two sets of time scales are shown in Table 1, one for near-stoichiometric hydrocarbon-air flames and one for near-limit flames, both at \( P = 1 \) atm. For near-stoichiometric flames \( S_i \sim 0.4 \) m/s, \( T_f \sim 2200 \) K, \( \alpha \sim v \cdot 1.5 \times 10^{-4} \) m/s and \( \alpha \sim 0.56 \) m/s. For near-limit flames, \( S_i \sim 0.02 \) m/s, \( T_f \sim 1500 \) K, \( \alpha \sim v \cdot 1.0 \times 10^{-4} \) m/s and \( \alpha \sim 0.83 \) m/s. For both cases \( g \approx 9.8 \) m/s\(^2\), \( \gamma \approx 1.35 \), \( T_r \approx 300 \) K and \( d \approx 0.05 \) m (a typical apparatus dimension.)

Several observations can be made on the basis of these simple estimates:

1. Buoyant convection is unimportant for near-stoichiometric flames because \( t_{vin} \gg t_{chem} \) and \( t_{vin} \gg t_{cond} \).
2. Buoyant convection strongly influences near-limit flames at 1g because \( t_{vin} \gg t_{chem} \) and \( t_{vin} \gg t_{cond} \).
3. Radiation effects are unimportant at 1g compared to buoyant convection because \( t_{rad} \ll t_{vin} \) and \( t_{rad} \ll t_{vin} \).
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Radiation effects dominate near-limit flames be-
cause \( t_{\text{rad}} = t_{\text{chem}} \), but these effects are only ob-
serve at reduced gravity because of observation 3.

1. The apparatus size \( (d) \) must be larger than about
0.03 m to observe radiation-induced extinction;
otherwise, conduction losses exceed radiative
losses \( (t_{\text{rad}} < t_{\text{chem}}) \).

2. Many radiative loss effects can be studied in
drop-towers (test duration 2–10 s), because these
times are typically larger than \( t_{\text{rad}} \).

3. Because \( t_{\text{chem}} \sim \frac{g}{d^2} \) and \( t_{\text{vis}} \sim \frac{g}{d^3} \), aircraft-based
\( \mu g \) experiments at \( g \approx 10^{-2} \) \( g_0 \) may not provide
sufficiently reduced buoyancy to observe radiative
effects.

4. Because \( t_{\text{vis}} \sim \frac{V/\rho}{P} \sim \frac{1}{P} \) and \( t_{\text{rad}} \sim \frac{1}{P} \), temperature-averaging transport properties:

\[ \frac{1}{P} \text{ is independent of } P, \text{ but at higher } P, \text{ buoyancy effects inter-
fer more strongly with radiative effects.} \]

5. A Reynolds number \( Re_d = Ud/\nu \) for buoyant flow is
estimated as \( (gd)_{1/2}/d^2 \) and \( Gr_d = gdV/\nu^2 \) is a Grashof number. For \( Re_d \approx 10^5 \), thus
\( Gr_d \approx 10^6 \), buoyant flow at \( 1 g \) is generally tur-
bulent, thus, it difficult to obtain steady laminar
flames in large systems at \( 1 g \).

The implications of these observations are dis-
cussed in the following sections. Essentially, any
combustion process where \( t_{\text{chem}} \) or \( t_{\text{vis}} \) exceeds \( t_{\text{rad}} \)
or \( t_{\text{vis}} \) may be affected by gravity and is worthy of \( \mu g \)
investigation.

Premixed Gas Flames

Flammability Limits

The previous section showed that gravity effects are
significant only for mixtures with low \( S_L \), imply-
ing mixtures highly diluted with excess fuel, oxidant,
or inert gas, but sufficient dilution causes flamma-
limits. Thus, gravity effects have significant in-
fuences on near-limit behavior, which is expected
since limits are different for upward, downward, and
horizontal propagation [5].

Practically all flammability limit studies show that burning speed at the flammability limit \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \) is nonzero. Giovanghgi and Smooke [6] have shown
that there is no purely chemical flammability limit
criterion for planar unstretched flames; without
losses, \( S_L \) decreases asymptotically to zero as dilution
increases. Consequently, loss mechanisms such as
those discussed below are needed to explain limit
mechanisms. The resulting predictions of \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \) indi-
cate that \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \) usually depends only weakly on
chemical reaction rate parameters. Thus, limit
mechanisms may be inferred by comparing pre-
dicted and measured \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \) without detailed chemi-
ical knowledge. The mixture composition at the limit
affects \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \) only through \( T_f \); thus, comparing
predicted and measured limit compositions is not
especially enlightening; comparisons of \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \) values
is much more useful. Consequently, this discussion
emphasizes comparisons of predicted and measured
values of \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \).

For upward propagation, Levy [7] showed that the
flame rise speed at the limit \( ( \approx 0.33 \frac{gd}{d^2}) \) is identi-
cal to that of an inviscid hot gas bubble. This re-
lation was later verified for a wide range of tube
inert gas mixtures [8]. Buckmaster and Mikolaitis [9]
how that this minimum rise speed causes hydro-
dynamic strain at the flame tip, which causes ex-
tinguishment for sufficiently low \( S_L \). The predicted
burning velocity of the limit mixture \( (S_{L,\text{lim}}) \) is, after
temperature-averaging transport properties:

\[ S_{L,\text{lim}} = 2.8 \exp \left[ \frac{P}{4} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{Le} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{T_f}{T_0} \right) \right] (d/\nu)^{1/4} \]

(1)

The form of equation 1, \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \sim (gd/\nu)^{1/4} \), can be
obtained by setting \( t_{\text{vis}} = t_{\text{chem}} \).

For downward propagation in tubes, centrifuge
experiments [10] indicate that \( S_{L,\text{lim}} \sim (gd)^{1/3} \), inde-
dent of \( Le \), which is reasonable since downward-
propagating near-limit flames are nearly flat and
unstrained. Experiments [11] and numerical simu-
lations [12] suggest extinction results from sinking
regions of cooling burned gas near the walls over-
taking the flame and blocking it from fresh reactants,
although the \( (gd)^{1/3} \) scaling was not tested in Refs.
[11,12]. The \( (gd)^{1/3} \) scaling can be obtained by setting
\( t_{\text{chem}} = t_{\text{vis}} \), thus

\[ S_{L,\text{lim}} \sim (gd)^{1/3} \]

(2)

Experiments [8] employing varying dilute gases
and pressures confirm the \( (gd)^{1/3} \) scaling and lack of
dependence on tube size, which, together with the
\( (gd)^{1/3} \) scaling mentioned above, supports the proposed
mechanism.

Both upward- and downward-limit mechanisms
indicate that \( g \to 0, S_{L,\text{lim}} \to 0 \), implying arbitrarily

TABLE 1
Estimates of time scales for stoichiometric and near-
limit hydrocarbon-air flames at 1 atm pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Scale</th>
<th>Stoichiometric Flame</th>
<th>Near-Limit Flame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry ((( t_{\text{chem}} ))</td>
<td>0.000094 s</td>
<td>0.25 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant, inviscid ((( t_{\text{vis}} ))</td>
<td>0.071 s</td>
<td>0.071 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant, viscous ((( t_{\text{vis}} ))</td>
<td>0.012 s</td>
<td>0.010 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduction to tube wall</td>
<td>0.95 s</td>
<td>1.4 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation ((( t_{\text{rad}} ))</td>
<td>0.13 s</td>
<td>0.41 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
weak mixtures could burn very slowly. However, conductive or radiative losses prevent arbitrarily weak mixtures from burning even at \( g = 0 \). Theoretical predictions of flammability limits to heat losses [13–15] predict a minimum \( T_f \) below which flame propagation cannot occur because chemical reaction rates are much stronger functions of temperature than heat loss rates (exponential vs. algebraic). Consequently, because dilution decreases \( T_f \), dilution increases the impact of losses, leading to flammability limits. For conductive losses, setting \( t_{\text{chem}} = t_{\text{cond}} \) leads to

\[
P_{\text{lim}}^{\text{cond}} = S_{\text{L,} \alpha} d/\alpha = \text{constant}
\]

with experiments [8, 16] and computations [17] indicating \( P_{\text{lim}}^{\text{cond}} \sim 40 \). For radiative losses, setting \( t_{\text{chem}} = t_{\text{rad}} \) leads to [18, 19]

\[
S_{\text{L,} \alpha} = \frac{1}{\rho C_p} \sqrt{\frac{1.2 p A L_f}{T_f}}
\]

For lean-limit \( \text{CH}_4 \)-air mixtures at 1 atm, equation 4 yields \( S_{\text{L,} \alpha} \sim 0.023 \text{ m/s} \), similar to detailed numerical model predictions [20, 21]. Such small \( S_{\text{L,} \alpha} \) are not observed at 1g because of buoyant convection \( (t_{\text{conv}} < t_{\text{rad}}) \) and \( t_{\text{rad}} < t_{\text{chem}} \); equations 1 and 2 yield \( S_{\text{L,} \alpha} \sim 0.033 \text{ and } 0.078 \text{ m/s} \) for upward and downward propagation, respectively. At \( \mu g \), however, predictions of equation 4 compare favorably to experiments in large combustion vessels [19, 22] using varying pressures, fuels, and inert gases. Also, similar results were obtained for \( \text{CH}_4 \)-air mixtures at 1 atm in tubes with \( d = 0.05 \text{ m} \) [23], suggesting these limits are apparatus-independent. Thus, radiative losses may cause flammability limits when extrinsic losses (conduction, buoyant convection, etc.) are eliminated. In this instance, \( \mu g \) experiments enabled observation of phenomena not observable at 1g.

These radiative effects apply only for optically thin gases (i.e., no reabsorption of emitted radiation), which are inappropriate for large systems, high pressures, or mixtures with strongly absorbing material. With this motivation, \( \mu g \) experiments [24] were conducted using lean \( \text{CH}_4 \)-air mixtures seeded with SiC particles. Because solids emit/absorb as black- or gray-bodies, whereas gases radiate in narrow spectral bands, particle-seeded gases emit/absorb more radiation than particle-free gases. Measurements of propagation rates, pressures and postflame thermal decays showed that, consistent with theoretical predictions [25], at low particle loadings the particles increase radiative loss (optically thin conditions), whereas at higher loadings reabsorption of emitted radiation becomes significant, which decreases net radiative loss and augments conductive heat transport.

Even for gases, computations [26] using detailed statistical narrow-band radiation models show that flammability limits are extended considerably with reabsorption (Fig. 1). With gases, however, two mechanisms lead to flammability limits even with reabsorption. One is the difference in composition between reactants and products; if \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) or other radiatively active combustion products are absent from the reactants, radiation from these species that is emitted upstream cannot be reabsorbed by the reactants. Upstream loss occurs via both mechanisms, leading to extinction of weak mixtures. These results suggest that fundamental (domain- and gravity-independent) flammability limits due to radiative losses may exist at \( \mu g \), but these limits are strongly dependent on emission/absorption spectra of reactant and product gases and their temperature dependence and cannot be predicted using gray-gas or optically-thin model parameters.

**Stretched Flames**

Premixed gas flames generally are not flat and steady nor do they propagate into quiescent flows. Consequently, flames are subject to "flame stretch," \( \Sigma = (1/A)(dA/dt) \) [18], which affects \( S_i \) and extinction conditions [18, 27]. At 1g, buoyancy imposes flame stretch comparable to \( t_{\text{chem}} \) or \( t_{\text{rad}} \). At \( \mu g \), weak flame stretch effects that are insignificant at 1g may dominate. One example is expanding spherical flames for which

\[
\Sigma = \frac{1}{A} \frac{dA}{dt} = \frac{1}{4 \pi r^2} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{4 \pi r^4}{1} = \frac{2}{r} \frac{dr}{dt}
\]

For \( Le < 1 \), positive stretch increases \( T_f \) because the increased chemical enthalpy diffusion to the flame front in the form of scarce reactant exceeds the increased thermal enthalpy loss. Because heat release

![Fig. 1. Predicted values of burning velocity and peak flame temperature in \( \text{CH}_4 = (0.21 \text{ O}_2 + 0.49 \text{ N}_2 + 0.30 \text{ CO}_2 \) mixtures under adiabatic conditions, with optically thin radiative losses and including reabsorption effects [26].](image)
corresponds to mum 6 becomes loss, respectively. For the evolution equation for nonadiabatic extinction. The terms in equation 6 represent unsteadiness, as small \( \Omega \) and the burned gas volume (thus radiative loss) decreases. As with curvature-induced stretch, for \( \text{Le} \) less than/greater than unity, moderate hydrodynamic strain increases/decreases \( \Sigma \), but for all \( \text{Le} \), large strain extinguishes the flame [32]. Consequently, \( \mu \) experiments [33] in low-\( \text{Le} \) mixtures (Fig. 3) reveal extinction behavior analogous to spherical flames. For large \( \Sigma \), the short residence time (\( \Sigma^{-1} \)) causes extinguishment (\( \Sigma^{-1} \approx t_{\text{thrm}} \)) along the "normal flame" branch, analogous to nonignition behavior of spherical flames. In contrast, for low \( \Sigma \), the residence time and burned gas volume are large; thus, radiative loss is significant (\( t_{\text{rad}} \approx t_{\text{thrm}} \)), so radiative loss extinguishes the flame along the "weak flame" branch, analogous to SEFs. The optimal \( \Sigma \) (\( \approx 13 \text{ s}^{-1} \)) producing the minimum flammable fuel concentration corresponds to \( \Sigma^{-1} = 0.08 \text{ s} \), which is less than \( t_{\text{thrm}} \) or \( t_{\text{rad}} \), thus, the C-shaped response and the entire weak-flame branch cannot be observed at \( \text{Le} \). The optimal \( \Sigma \) is nearly the same for model and experiment, indicating that loss rates are modeled well, but the computed limit
I several new extinction branches depending on plus the reduced radiative loss at larger nism to reduce radiative loss by flame expanding flames, no flammability extension occurs [34]. (For spherically deficient high tension also occurs for decrease at moderate accurate for weak mixtures. Due to the radiant loss composition is leaner than the experimental limit, suggesting that the chemical mechanism used is inaccurate for weak mixtures. Due to the radiant loss decrease at moderate $\Sigma$, the flammability limit extension also occurs for $Le > 1$, though, for sufficiently high $Le$, no C-shaped response or flammability limit extension occurs [34]. (For spherically expanding flames, no flammability extension occurs for $Le > 1$ because in this case there is no mechanism to reduce radiative loss by flame stretch.)

The combination of nonmonotonic response to $\Sigma$ plus the reduced radiative loss at larger $\Sigma$ causes several new extinction branches depending on $t_{chem}$, $t_{rad}$, $\Sigma^{-1}$, and $Le$ [34,35]. It is uncertain whether these branches are physically observable because they have not been identified experimentally and stability analyses have not been performed.

**Flame Balls**

Over 50 years ago, Zeldovich [36] showed that the steady mass, energy, and species conservation equations admit solutions corresponding to stationary spherical flames, characterized by a flame radius ($r_f$). Fuel and oxygen diffuse from the ambient mixture inward to the reaction zone while heat and combustion products diffuse outward (Fig. 4). Mass conservation requires that the fluid velocity be zero everywhere. The temperature and species mass fraction profiles have the form $c_1 + c_2 r^2$, where $c_1$ and $c_2$ are constants. Corresponding solutions in planar and cylindrical geometry cannot exist because the solution forms $c_1 + c_2 r$ and $c_1 + c_2 \ln(r)$, respectively, are unbounded as $r \to \infty$. Zeldovich [36] and others [37,38] also showed that flame-ball solutions are unstable and thus probably not physically observable, although these solutions are related to flame ignition

Forty years after Zeldovich [36], apparently stable flame balls were accidentally discovered in drop-tower experiments using $H_2$-air mixtures [39] and aircraft-based $\mu g$ experiments using various low-$Le$ mixtures [40]. The $\mu g$ environment facilitated spherical symmetry and prevented buoyancy-induced extinction. For mixtures sufficiently far from flammability limits, expanding spherical fronts composed of many individual cells were observed, whereas for more dilute mixtures, cells that formed initially did not split and instead closed up on themselves to form flame balls. (For still more dilute mixtures all flames eventually extinguished.) It was inferred that flame balls can occur in all near-limit low-$Le$ mixtures; however, the short duration of drop-tower experiments and substantial $g$ fluctuations in the aircraft-based $\mu g$ experiments precluded definite conclusions. Recent space shuttle experiments [41] confirmed that flame balls can exist for at least 500 seconds (the entire experiment duration.) Zeldovich [36] noted that radiative losses might stabilize flame balls; consequently, after their experimental observation, radiative loss effects on flame balls were analyzed [42]. For moderate loss, two solutions branches are predicted (Fig. 5), a strongly nonadiabatic large-radius branch and a nearly-adiabatic small-radius branch. For sufficiently strong losses, no solutions exist, indicating extinction limits. Stability analyses [42] predict that all small flames are unstable to radial disturbances, and large flames with weak loss (far from flammability limits) are unstable to three-dimensional disturbances. Close to extinction limits, the large-radius branch is stable to both disturbances. These predictions are consistent.

**Fig. 4. Schematic diagram of a flame ball, illustrated for the case of fuel-limited combustion at the reaction zone. The oxygen profile is similar to the fuel profile except its concentration is nonzero in the interior of the ball. The combustion product profile is identical to the temperature profile except for a scale factor.**

**Fig. 5. Predicted effect of heat loss on flame-ball radius and stability properties [42] showing radially unstable (small) flame-ball solution, radially stable (large) flame-ball solution, and three-dimensional instability for large flame balls.**
with the observed splitting cellular flames away from limits and stable balls close to limits. For Le close to or larger than unity, all flame balls are unstable for any loss magnitude [43], explaining why they are never observed in (for example) CH₄-air mixtures (Le ≈ 0.9) or C₃H₄-air mixtures (Le ≈ 1.7).

Numerical predictions of non-adiabatic flame balls employing detailed chemistry, diffusion, and radiation models [44,45] are qualitatively consistent with these experimental and theoretical results. Still, quantitative agreement has been elusive (Fig. 6) for at least two reasons. First, flame-ball properties are very sensitive to the three-body recombination step

$$H + O_2 + H_2O \rightarrow HO_2 + H_2O$$

whose rate varies widely between different published H₂-O₂ reaction mechanisms. The second reason is reabsorption of emitted radiation in mixtures diluted with radiatively active CO₂ or SF₆. An upper bound on self-absorption of diluent radiation ($a_r \rightarrow \infty$) is assessed by neglecting diluent radiation entirely because as $a_r \rightarrow \infty$, radiative loss from the diluent vanishes and no additional heat transport occurs due to radiation. Agreement between predicted and measured flame radii is much better in this case (Fig. 7), strongly suggesting radiation modeling including reabsorption is needed for accurate predictions in these cases.

A key difference between propagating flames and flame balls is that propagating flames have convective-diffusive zones where temperature and concentration approach their ambient values in proportion to $e^{-\alpha t}$, whereas flame balls have purely diffusive zones where the approach is proportional to $1/t$. Plane flames respond on short time scales $t_{\text{chem}} = \delta^2/\alpha$, whereas the gradual $1/t$ flame-ball profiles produce properties dominated by the far-field length scale $\delta f$, and thus diffusion time scales $(\delta f)^2/\alpha$ [42], typically 100 s. These scales are relevant to stability and extinction limits because they affect the times for radiant combustion products to diffuse to the far-field and indicate large volumes of gas ($\sim \delta^2 f$) where radiative loss affects flame balls. Such large scales are confirmed by space experiments [41] and numerical simulations [44,45]. Droplet and candle flames (discussed later), which have quasi-spherical, diffusion-dominated far-fields, exhibit analogous behavior.

Gaseous Non-Premixed Flames

Stretched Flames

Non-premixed flames, where fuel and oxidant are separated before combustion, are affected by stretch differently than are premixed flames. The most significant difference is that the flame position is determined by the location of stoichiometric mixture fraction, dictated by mixing considerations, rather than being determined by balances between $\Sigma$ and $U$ as in premixed flames. Consequently, non-premixed flames have considerably less freedom of movement. Also, premixed flames have characteristic thicknesses $\delta \sim a/\Sigma$, unrelated to the flow environment, whereas non-premixed flames have only the diffusion length scale $\delta \sim (a/\Sigma)^{1/2}$. With fixed flame location and $\delta$ increasing monotonically with decreasing $\Sigma$, non-premixed flames with radiative loss exhibit only simple C-shaped responses to strain (Fig. 8) [46], with a short residence time extinction branch ($t_{\text{chem}} > \Sigma^{-1}$) and a radiative loss extinction
I
ered by the model, probably axial conductive heat behavior was seen for premixed flames (Fig. 3). This model predicts flames at arbitrarily low flames exist below some value of \(Z\), whereas the lower branch of strained premixed flames (Fig. 3) discussed later. It is also somewhat analogous to the extinction of other types of non-premixed flames dis-
tinction of other types of non-premixed flames dis-
tivity extinction at \(\alpha_g\) due to much larger residence
times. This mechanism also applies to radiative ex-
tration from extinction at \(\alpha_g\), therefore, may exhibit radia-
tively large decreases in

\[ L_f = \frac{U_d d^3}{D} \left( \frac{1}{2Sc^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) \]

\[ t_{jet} = \left( \frac{L_f}{d} \right) \left( \frac{1}{U(y)} \right) \left( \frac{1}{U(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{D} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) \]

\[ L_f \approx \frac{U_d d^3}{D} \left( \frac{1}{2Sc^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) \]

\[ t_{jet} \approx \left( \frac{L_f}{d} \right) \left( \frac{1}{U(y)} \right) \left( \frac{1}{U(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{D} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) \]

Because \(Sc \approx 1\), the scalings of \(L_f\) and \(t_{jet}\) are similar with or without viscosity. Fig. 9 shows measurements of \(L_f\) for CH4 flames [50]. Note that, as the scalings predict, \(L_f/d_j \sim Re = U_d d_j/\nu\) at both \(1g\) and \(\mu g\), and only small differences exist between \(1g\) and \(\mu g\) flame lengths.

All \(\mu g\) studies show larger flame widths \(w\) at \(\mu g\) than \(1g\) due to lower \(U\) and longer \(t_{jet}\) [50]. Also, \(w\) is larger at \(\mu g\) because the temperatures are lower (see below) and \(D \sim T^{\frac{1}{3}}\). Because \(w\) depends on whether \(U\) is accelerating (buoyant jets), constant (nonbuoyant Burke-Schumann flames), or decelerating (nonbuoyant jets), \(w\) is more difficult to predict than is \(L_f\) [2]. The difference between \(1g\) and \(\mu g\) widths decreases as \(Re\) (thus, \(U_d\)) increases (Fig. 10). The nonbuoyant widths increase slightly with \(Re\),

![Fig. 8](image-url)

**FIG. 8** Measured and predicted extinction strain rates for strained non-premixed N<sub>2</sub>-diluted CH<sub>4</sub> versus air counterflow flames at \(\mu g\) showing dual-limit response analogous to premixed flames (Fig. 3).

**TABLE 2** Predicted scalings of flame heights \((L_f)\) and residence times \(t_{jet}\) for non-premixed round-jet and slot-jet flames under momentum-dominated and buoyancy-dominated conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>Flow</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>(L_f)</th>
<th>(t_{jet})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round-jet</td>
<td>Momentum</td>
<td>(U_d d_j^3/D)</td>
<td>(d_j^3/D)</td>
<td>(t_{jet})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round-jet</td>
<td>Buoyant</td>
<td>(U_d d_j^3/D)</td>
<td>((U_d d_j^3/D)\frac{1}{2Sc^{\frac{1}{3}}})</td>
<td>(t_{jet})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slot-jet</td>
<td>Momentum</td>
<td>(U_d d_j^3/D)</td>
<td>(d_j^3/D)</td>
<td>(t_{jet})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slot-jet</td>
<td>Buoyant</td>
<td>((U_d d_j^3/D)\frac{1}{2Sc^{\frac{1}{3}}})</td>
<td>((U_d d_j^3/D)\frac{1}{2Sc^{\frac{1}{3}}})</td>
<td>(t_{jet})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laminar Gas-Jet Flames

A fuel jet issuing into an oxidizing environment is one of the simplest types of flames. Jost [47] and Roper [48] estimated the flame height \((L_f)\) and residence time from jet exit to flame tip \(t_{jet}\) by deter-
mining the height \((y)\) where the transverse diffusion time \((d(y)U(y)/D\) where \(d(y)\) is the stream tube width) equals the convection time \((U(y)y, where \(U(y)\) is the axial velocity). When buoyancy and viscosity ef-
effects are negligible (momentum-controlled jets), \(U(y)\) is constant and equals the jet exit velocity \((U_e)\), whereas when buoyancy effects dominate, \(U(y) \sim (g \rho y)^{1/2}\). In either case, mass conservation requires that \(d(y)^2U(y) = d_j^2U_e\) constant for round jets or \(d(y)U(y) = d_jU_e\) constant for slot jets. The re-

\[ L_f = \frac{U_d d_j^3}{D} \left( \frac{1}{2Sc^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) \]

\[ t_{jet} = \left( \frac{L_f}{d_j} \right) \left( \frac{1}{U(y)} \right) \left( \frac{1}{U(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{D} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) \]

\[ L_f, d_j \approx \frac{U_d d_j^3}{D} \left( \frac{1}{2Sc^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) \]

\[ t_{jet} \approx \left( \frac{L_f}{d_j} \right) \left( \frac{1}{U(y)} \right) \left( \frac{1}{U(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{1}{D} \right) \left( \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) \]

Because \(Sc \approx 1\), the scalings of \(L_f\) and \(t_{jet}\) are similar with or without viscosity. Fig. 9 shows measurements of \(L_f\) for CH4 flames [50]. Note that, as the scalings predict, \(L_f/d_j \sim Re = U_d d_j/\nu\) at both \(1g\) and \(\mu g\), and only small differences exist between \(1g\) and \(\mu g\) flame lengths.

All \(\mu g\) studies show larger flame widths \(w\) at \(\mu g\) than \(1g\) due to lower \(U\) and longer \(t_{jet}\) [50]. Also, \(w\) is larger at \(\mu g\) because the temperatures are lower (see below) and \(D \sim T^{\frac{1}{3}}\). Because \(w\) depends on whether \(U\) is accelerating (buoyant jets), constant (nonbuoyant Burke-Schumann flames), or decelerating (nonbuoyant jets), \(w\) is more difficult to predict than is \(L_f\) [2]. The difference between \(1g\) and \(\mu g\) widths decreases as \(Re\) (thus, \(U_d\)) increases (Fig. 10). The nonbuoyant widths increase slightly with \(Re\),
lowest for lowest results shown in Fig. 10 which show that diffusion alone. This suggestion is supported by the boundary-layer approximations are invalid.

whereas all aforementioned models predict self-similar flame shapes with no effect of $Re$. This may be due to axial diffusion, not considered in these models, which increases mixing over that with radial diffusion alone. This suggestion is supported by the results shown in Fig. 10 which show that $w/d_o$ is lowest for lowest $Re$ ($\approx 20$), where axial diffusion is most significant, but asymptotes to fixed values at high $Re$.

Compared to yellow lg flames, $\mu$ gas-jet flames are more red [49,50], indicating lower blackbody soot temperatures and presumably lower maximum flame temperatures. This occurs because $t_{\text{sc}}$ is larger at $\mu$ and thus radiative loss effects ($t_{\text{sc}}/t_{\text{c}}$) are greater. Drop-tower [51] and space [52] experiments indicate surprisingly large and consistent radiative loss fractions (0.45–0.60) at $\mu$ compared to 0.07–0.09 at lg for various fuels, pressures, $O_2$ mole fractions, and flow rates. Thus, differences in $t_{\text{sc}}$ at lg and $\mu$ result in widely varying characteristics even for flames having nearly the same $L_f$.

Turbulent Flames

In turbulent non-premixed jet flames, $D$ is not fixed but rather is nearly proportional to $u'L_t$. Because $u' \sim U_o$ and $L_t \sim d_o$, $L_t \sim U_o d_o/u'L_t \sim d_o$, for round jets; thus, $L_t$ is independent of $U_o$. This prediction is supported by classical lg experiments [53] as well as recent $\mu$ experiments [54] (Fig. 11). Note that $L_t(\mu)/L_t(lg)$ is practically constant even beyond the transition to turbulent conditions (high $U_o$ and $Re$). Note also that the maximum $Re$ at which flame exists (the “blow-off” limit) is different at lg and $\mu$. This is surprising because blow-off conditions are typically controlled by behavior near the flame base [55], where buoyancy effects are often considered insignificant. This suggests that blow-off is partially affected by convection induced by the buoyant plume far above the jet exit, even at very high $U_o$. One would intuitively conclude that the lg flames should blow-off at lower $U_o$ because buoyant flow would induce higher “effective” $U_o$ which is consistent with Fig. 11. This shows that buoyancy effects are quite ubiquitous even under conditions commonly thought to be unaffected by buoyancy.

---

**Fig. 9.** Measured flame lengths, normalized by jet diameter, as a function of the jet Reynolds number for non-premixed CH$_4$-air jet flames at lg and $\mu$. Data is taken from a variety of sources and compiled in Ref. [50]. The data show a nearly linear relationship between flame length and Reynolds number, with generally longer flame lengths at $\mu$, due to the differences between residence times under buoyancy-driven versus momentum-driven residence times.

**Fig. 10.** Measured flame widths, normalized by jet diameter, as a function of the jet Reynolds number for non-premixed CH$_4$-air jet flames at lg and $\mu$. Data is taken from a variety of sources and compiled in Ref. [50]. The data show larger flame widths at $\mu$ due to the differences between accelerating flow at lg versus decelerating flow at $\mu$. The data also show that, consistent with theoretical predictions, the width is nearly independent of Reynolds number for nonbuoyant conditions, except at low $Re$ where boundary-layer approximations are invalid.

**Fig. 11.** Measured flame heights for non-premixed C$_2$H$_6$-air jet flames at lg and $\mu$ [51] showing transition to turbulence. Note lg flame lengths are shorter than $\mu$ flame lengths, even at very high Reynolds numbers.
FIG. 12. Direct photographs of sooting n-C4H10 non-premixed gas-jet flames at 1g (left) and μg (right) at Re = 42, jet diameter 10 mm, showing evidence of thermophoresis-induced agglomeration at μg. Photographs courtesy of Professor O. Fujita.

Soot Formation Processes

Compared with 1g flames μg gas-jet flames have much greater tendencies to emit soot [49,56], indicating that increases in t_{f,μ} (thus, greater time for soot formation) plus broader regions in which composition and temperature are favorable for soot formation [56,57] outweigh lower temperatures at μg, which decreases soot formation [58]. Recent quantitative measurements [56] show peak soot-volume fractions about twice as high at 1g than 1g for 50% C2H5/50% N2-air flames.

Surprisingly, μg gas-jet flames exhibit "smoke points," corresponding to critical U_{c}, below which soot is consumed within the flame, and above which soot is emitted from the flame [57]. Smoke points are expected for buoyant round-jet flames because t_{μ} = U_{c}^{-1/2}; thus, increasing U_{c} increases the time available for soot formation. But for nonbuoyant flames, t_{μ} ≈ U_{μ}^{-1/2}, suggesting no smoke point should exist. Fully elliptic numerical computations [59] show that, for some circumstances, t_{μ} decreases monotonically with U_{c}, which could explain smoke points for nonbuoyant flames. This behavior was suggested to result from axial diffusion effects [59], but in this case, t_{μ} should asymptote to constant values for large L_{f}, where axial diffusion is negligible. Thus, simple explanations of μg smoke points remain elusive. Residence-time considerations alone may be misleading; soot precursor temperature-composition-time history effects are apparently also important.

With weak convection, thermophoretic forces, which move particles toward lower temperatures, are an important effect. If convection and temperature gradients are in the same direction, the convective and thermophoretic forces may balance at some location. This leads to soot accumulation inside the flame front at μg (Fig. 12) [60], where an annulus of soot accumulation is convected by axial flow through the flame tip. Downstream, for reasons not yet explained, the soot annulus fragments, creating crown-like structures. These effects are only observable at μg where convection velocities are comparable to thermophoretic velocities, (~ 5 mm/s for the conditions of Fig. 12 [60]).

Condensed-Phase Combustion

Droplet Combustion

The first microgravity combustion experiments were isolated fuel-droplet tests conducted by Kumanagi and Isoda [61]. At 1g, experimental measurements of droplet burning rates are compromised by buoyant convection, which destroys the spherical symmetry and induces additional heat and mass transport, which alters burning rates and complicates modeling. Classical theory [62,63] predicts that burning rates for spherically symmetric buoyancy-free droplet burning are given by

$$d_{d}^{3} - d_{f}^{3} = Kt;$$

$$K = (8\lambda/\rho_{f}C_{p}) \ln(1 + B)$$  (8)

In experimental studies, the droplet diameter d_{d} could be fixed by forcing fuel through a porous sphere at rates that balances evaporation, leading to a steady mass burning rate (n) = (π/4)p_{d}K, but most experiments employ fuel droplets where d_{d} decreases with time. Somewhat surprisingly, many fuel-droplet results follow equation 8 well despite unsteadiness, heat losses, soot formation, and water absorption effects discussed below.

As with flame balls, steady solutions exist for spherical droplet flames even in infinite domains, with the flame front located at

$$d_{f} = d_{d} \ln(1 + B)/\ln(1 + f)$$

Whereas flame balls are convection-free, droplet flames exhibit Stefan flow due to fuel vaporization at the droplet surface. Mass conservation dictates that the Stefan velocity decays as 1/r^{2}, causing temperature and concentration profiles to vary with radius in proportion to (1 + B)^{-1/2} rather than 1/r as in flame balls, although these profiles, when normalized by flame radius, are indistinguishable at large r. Unlike flame balls, heat losses are not required for stable droplet flames because the flame location cannot move away from the stoichiometric contour.

The characteristic time scale for droplet combustion is t_{drop} = d_{f}^{2}/\alpha. This leads to two extinction limits [64,65], one for small d_{f} where t_{drop} < t_{chare} and thus fuel and oxidant cannot react before interdiffusing, and one for large d_{f} where t_{drop} > t_{chare} and thus the temperature decrease from radiative loss...
I requires ~100 s to reach steady state even in flame. Indeed, events may occur in flame balls [41], where radiative losses into the far field occur, and these may be significant. This would cause a decrease in thermal energy and radiant combustion products released, and of this, nonsteady effects are significant [68,69].

It can be decreased with increasing fuel droplet diameter, apparently because of increased accumulation of soot and gas-phase radiant species for larger fuel droplets [70].

In experiments, K is not constant as the quasi-steady model (equation 8) predicts, but rather decreases with increasing $d_{lb}$ (Fig. 13) [70]. This suggests that nonsteady effects, specifically the diffusion of thermal energy and radiant combustion products into the far field, may be significant; this would cause changing radiative loss over time. Analogous behavior occurs in flame balls [41], where radiative losses occur near extinction conditions, depletion of oxygen (leading to extinction) was much more significant in the smaller combustion chamber used in the methanol/dodecanol experiments. Such behaviors are found in methanol flames, where extinction diameters depend substantially on $d_{lb}$ due to water absorption during combustion.

Finally, in recent space experiments, flame oscillations with amplitudes comparable to the mean flame diameter have been observed [76]. The oscillation amplitude grew with time with extinction typically occurring after eight cycles. The oscillation frequency was approximately 1 Hz. Cheatham and Matalon [65] predicted oscillations of roughly the correct frequency in droplet flames of pure fuels under near-extinction conditions when the reactant Lewis numbers are sufficiently high. To date, oscillations have been reported for methanol/dodecanol (80/20 mass fraction) bicomponent droplets burning in air; it is uncertain whether oscillations also occur in pure fuels. Moreover, $\mu\gamma$ experiments in O$_2$-He atmospheres [67], with much higher $Le$, did not exhibit oscillations. One possible explanation is that droplet support fibers were used in Ref. [76] but not Ref. [67]. The fiber could increase convective and radiative losses, which discourage oscillations [65]. Another explanation is that, because oscillations occur only near extinction conditions, depletion of oxygen (leading to extinction) was much more significant in the smaller combustion chamber used in the methanol/dodecanol experiments. Such oscillatory instabilities are discussed further in the following section.

Candle Flames

An excellent example of the differences between $\lambda g$ and $\mu\gamma$ flames is seen in perhaps the most common and familiar of all combustion processes—candle flames. At $\lambda g$, candle flames are supported by air...
symmetric droplet flames and roughly hemispherical tions, however, the differences between spherically bers. Their predicted oscillation frequencies (0.7- with radiative loss at sufficiently high Lewis num-
ber, which are not strictly spherical, can behave similarly. Space experiments [77, 78] indicate that candle flames can be steady for \( > 45 \) min, with flame shapes typically hemispherical (Fig. 15). Eventually, the flames always extinguished, whereas the spherical flame model predicts that the flame would burn indefinitely. Protective screens used in the experiments may have limited the \( \mathrm{O}_2 \) supply, eventually allowing sufficient \( \mathrm{O}_2 \) depletion to cause extinction.

Before extinction, the candle-flame edge frequently advanced and retreated periodically. The oscillation amplitude increased over time, and on one retreating cycle, the entire flame extinguished. With larger wicks (thus, larger flame diameters), oscillations started spontaneously, whereas with smaller wicks, oscillations occurred only when solid objects were placed near the flame. Only a few cycles before extinction were observed in the Spacecab experiments [77], whereas hundreds of cycles were observed in the Mir experiments [78]. This is probably because the protective screen was much more permeable in the Mir experiments, thereby decreasing the \( \mathrm{O}_2 \) depletion rate and maintaining the flame at near-extinction conditions much longer.

At least two possible explanations for these oscillations have been advanced. Cheatham and Matalon [65] showed that, near extinction, oscillatory instabilities occur in spherically symmetric droplet flames with radiative loss at sufficiently high Lewis numbers. Their predicted oscillation frequencies (0.7-1.4 Hz) are comparable to experimental observations, however, the differences between spherically symmetric droplet flames and roughly hemispherical candle flames were noted [55]. Alternatively, Buckmaster [79] showed that the flame “edge” separating burning and nonburning regions of non-premixed flames exhibit oscillatory behavior at (for quasi-stationary edges) \( Le > 1 + S ( \beta ( \bar{h} ( T_r - T_s ) + \bar{T}_s ))) \sim 2 \) when \( Le \) for the other reactant is unity. \( Le \approx 1 \) for \( \mathrm{O}_2 \) in \( \mathrm{N}_2 \), but \( Le \) for fuel vapors is probably closer to 2; thus, edge-flame instabilities could explain the observed oscillations. While neither instability mechanism has been definitively linked to the candle-flame experiments, both predict greater propensities for oscillation with greater heat losses, which is consistent with the observation that oscillations occur near extinction.

Flame Spread over Solid Fuel Beds

Flame spread over solid fuel beds is typically classified as opposed-flow, where convection opposes flame propagation, or concurrent-flow. Because upward buoyant flow opposes flame spread, \( \lg \) downward flame spread is opposed-flow, whereas upward flame spread is concurrent-flow. At \( \mu\ell \) without forced flow, flame spread is always opposed-flow because the flame spreads toward the fresh oxidant with a self-induced velocity equal to the spread rate (\( S_f \)). At \( \lg \), self-induced convection is negligible because buoyancy-induced flows are typically \( (g\rho_{\ell}^{\frac{1}{3}}) = 0.10 \) m/s \( \gg S_f \). Very few concurrent-flow flame spread have been conducted at \( \mu\ell \) [80]; consequently, this section focuses on opposed-flow spread.

\( S_f \) is estimated by equating the conductive heat flux to the fuel bed \( (= \lambda (\Delta \mathbf{W})(T_f - T_s)) \), where \( \delta = \alpha / \mathbf{U} \) is the thermal transport zone thickness and \( \mathbf{U} \) is the opposed-flow velocity (forced, buoyant and/or self-induced), to rate of fuel bed enthalpy increase \((= \rho_c C_p T_r (T_r - T_s) \mathcal{W} S_f))\). Assuming mixing-limited reaction (infinite-rate chemistry), for thermally thin fuels, where heat conduction through the solid is negligible, \( S_f \) is predicted to be \[ S_f = \frac{\pi}{4} \frac{\rho_C C_p r_1}{\mu\ell} (T_r - T_s) \] (9)

Note that \( S_f \) is independent of \( U \) and \( P \). For thermally thick fuels, where heat conduction through the solid fuel dominates, \( r_1 \) is the thermal penetration depth into the solid, estimated by equating the conductive heat flux to the fuel bed to the heat flux through the fuel \((= \lambda (\Delta \mathbf{W})(T_r - T_s) / r_1))\), where the subscript \( r \) refers to the direction normal to the fuel surface. This leads to the exact solution \[ r_1 = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda (T_f - T_s) / \beta} = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda (T_f - T_s) / \beta} \alpha \lambda (T_f - T_s) \mathcal{W} S_f \] \[ \Rightarrow S_f = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda (T_f - T_s) / \beta} \mathcal{W} S_f \] (10)

Note that, unlike the thin-fuel case, for thick fuels \( S_f \sim U^P \).

**FIG. 15.** Direct photographs of candle flames at \( \lg \) and \( \mu\ell \), showing impact of buoyant flow on flame shape [77].
FIG. 16. Minimum mole percent O\textsubscript{2} in N\textsubscript{2} supporting flame spread over a thin solid fuel bed, as a function of the opposed flow velocity (U) [83], showing dual-limit behavior, that is, residence-time limited extinction at high U and radiative loss extinction at low U.

Dual-limit extinction behavior is observed in μg flame-spread experiments (Fig. 16) [83]. The time for thermal energy to diffuse across the convection-diffusion zone (t\textsubscript{diff}) is \( \delta U = \alpha U^2 \), thus, high-U extinction occurs when \( t_{\text{diff}} < t_{\text{chem}} \) or \( \bar{U} > (\alpha t_{\text{chem}})^{1/2} \) and radiative extinction occurs when \( t_{\text{diff}} > t_{\text{rad}} \) or \( \bar{U} < (\alpha t_{\text{rad}})^{1/2} \). (Surface radiative loss may also be important, particularly at moderate and higher U [84].) Interestingly, the minimum O\textsubscript{2} concentration supporting combustion (X\textsubscript{O\textsubscript{2,lim}}), and thus the greatest hazard, corresponds to \( U \approx 0.1 \text{ m/s} \), which is lower than buoyant convection at 1g, and might correspond to ventilation drafts in manned spacecraft.

A radiative loss parameter can be defined as \( H = \frac{t_{\text{rad}}}{t_{\text{rad}} + t_{\text{chem}}} = \frac{\alpha U^2 t_{\text{chem}}}{t_{\text{rad}} + t_{\text{chem}}} \). Because \( H \sim U^{-2} \), \( S_f \) is lower at \( \mu g \) where \( U \) is lower and thus \( H \) is higher. Experiments [85] (Fig. 17) show that an imposed forced flow at \( \mu g \) increases \( S_f \) because \( \bar{U} \) (sum of forced flow and \( S_f \)) increases and thus \( H \) decreases, whereas at higher \( U \) (whether buoyant or forced), \( S_f \) decreases as the high-U limit is approached. For 21% O\textsubscript{2} or lower, the infinite-rate chemistry prediction of equation 9, \( S_f \sim U^0 \), is never achieved. Only at 30% O\textsubscript{2} is \( T_f \) high enough that this condition is achieved.

Because \( \alpha \sim P^{-1} \) and \( t_{\text{rad}} \sim P^0 \), \( H \sim P^{-1} \), thus for thin fuels, \( S_f \) should increase with \( P \) toward the ideal (adiabatic) value (equation 9). This is confirmed by quiescent thin-fuel space experiments [86,87], which show \( S_f \) increasing from 3.2 to 5.9 mm/s as \( P \) increases from 1.0 to 2.0 atm with fixed O\textsubscript{2} mole fraction (0.50). For these conditions, \( H \) decreases from 24 to 3.5, thus even at the highest \( P \), radiative effects are probably still important. This is consistent with computations [86] that predict \( S_f = 12 \text{ mm/s} \) (almost independent of \( P \)) for adiabatic conditions for this fuel/atmosphere combination.

Neither N\textsubscript{2} nor O\textsubscript{2} emit thermal radiation; thus, for flames in O\textsubscript{2}-N\textsubscript{2} atmospheres, only H\textsubscript{2}O and CO\textsubscript{2} combustion products radiate significantly. For these cases, typically \( a_{\bar{U}} \sim 1.2 \text{ m} \) \( \delta \) and thus, radiative transfer is optically thin (negligible reabsorption). When \( a_{\bar{U}} \gg 1 \), reabsorption effects cannot be neglected. With reabsorption, some radiation is not lost and may augment conduction to increase \( S_f \) above that without radiation. This behavior is seen experimentally [88] using strongly emitting/absorbing CO\textsubscript{2} and SF\textsubscript{6} diluents (Fig. 18), where \( S_f \) is higher and X\textsubscript{O\textsubscript{2,lim}} is lower at \( \mu g \) than at 1g, whereas the opposite (conventional) behavior is found in nonradiant diluents (not shown). These data indicate that, for nonradiating diluents, \( \mu g \) is less hazardous because X\textsubscript{O\textsubscript{2,lim}} is higher at \( \mu g \) than at 1g (0.21 vs. 0.16

Fig. 17. Flame-spread rate over a thin solid fuel bed as a function of the opposed-flow velocity (U), for three values of the mole percent O\textsubscript{2} [85], showing dual-limit response. Note that the infinite-rate kinetics prediction [81,82] that the spread rate is independent of U is only satisfied at O\textsubscript{2} mole fractions higher than that in air.
When \( u_0 \) is the smolder front velocity and \( a_0 \) the solid thermal diffusivity, \( \delta(t) \) is nearly the same as \( \delta \) in adiabatic flames. Thus, the \( \mu \) flames mentioned above have probably benefited substantially from lateral \( O_2 \) influx, especially for lower pressures and \( O_2 \) mole fractions, where \( \delta W = a S_0 W \) is largest. In fact, \( S_0 \) might be higher at smaller \( W \) due to lateral \( O_2 \) influx. Space experiments using cylindrical fuel rods are planned to examine truly two-dimensional spread.

Recently, a surprising observation of fingering fronts was found in space experiments using paper samples treated to inhibit flaming combustion but allow smoldering propagation (Fig. 19) [91]. Fingering was observed at \( \mu \) when \( U < 50 \text{ mm/s} \), whereas smooth fronts were observed at \( 1 \mu \) for all \( U \). This was proposed [91] to result from limited \( O_2 \) mass transport at \( \mu \) with low \( U \), which caused the \( O_2 \) consumption regions to become localized spots instead of continuous fronts. This proposition does not explain why heat conduction does not smooth out potential fingers as it does (for example) in premixed-gas flames with \( Le > 1 \). The following alternative explanation is proposed here. Gas-phase heat transport occurs on the length scale \( \delta \sim a/\mu \), and solid-phase transport occurs on the scale \( \delta = a_0/\mu \), where \( \mu \) is the smolder front velocity and \( a_0 \) the solid thermal diffusivity. Oxygen transport occurs only through the gas phase on the scale \( D_{O_2}/U = a/\mu \sim \delta \). Radiative loss can suppress heat transport through the gas, but no corresponding effect on \( O_2 \) transport can occur. Thus, at low \( U \), the effective \( Le \) is \( a_0/\delta \ll 1 \). At higher \( U \) or at \( 1 \mu \), \( \delta \) is smaller, gas-phase heat transport dominates, and radiative effects are weaker; thus, the effective \( Le \) is \( a/\delta \sim 1 \).

These assertions are consistent with estimates [91];
of the relative importance of gas-phase and solid-phase transport. Both premixed [27,39] and non-premixed [92,93] flames with effective Le < 1 exhibit diffusive-thermal instabilities that cause fingering patterns, whereas for Le ≥ 1, the fronts are stable. This explanation is also consistent with Ig experiments [94] on horizontal fuel beds burning in oxidant channels of adjustable vertical height. At small heights or low U, fingering similar to Fig. 19 was observed. In this case, conductive loss to the channel ceiling causes suppression of gas-phase heat transfer. Apparently, in both cases, the key factor is suppression of gas-phase heat transfer while allowing solid-phase heat transfer, which reduces the effective Le (though this factor was not mentioned in Ref. [91] or Ref. [94].)

Flame Spread over Liquid Fuel Pools

Flame spread over liquid fuels encompasses practically all solid-fuel flame spread phenomena discussed above, plus liquid-phase flow effects. Typically, T_{\text{f}} - T_{\text{c}} is smaller for liquid than solid fuels, thus S_{f} is higher. Also, if T_{\text{c}} - T_{\text{f}} is small, some fuel pre vaporization occurs even at T = T_{\text{c}}, thus partially premixed gas-phase combustion phenomena may occur. Because of the fuel surface temperature gradient upstream of the flame, surface tension gradients are produced that cause the surface layer to move upstream (away from the flame), which increases S_{f}. At Ig, this heated liquid layer must lie near the surface, whereas at μg, no limitation exists.

Experiments at Ig, summarized in [95], show that at low fuel temperatures, the average S_{f} is small (typically 10 mm/s) and the spread alternates between a fast "jump" velocity and a slow "crawl" velocity. At higher fuel temperatures, S_{f} is faster and steady. For the conditions exhibiting pulsating spread at Ig, μg flame spread cannot be maintained, whereas for the conditions exhibiting uniform spread at Ig, steady spread is also exhibited at μg [96]. Pulsating spread has never been observed at μg. No definitive explanation for these observations has been advanced. For the conditions exhibiting pulsating spread at Ig and no spread at μg, flame spread is still different at Ig and μg when forced flows comparable to buoyancy-induced convection (U = 0.50 m/s) are imposed (Fig. 20) [97]. Specifically, Ig spread is almost unaffected by the imposed flow, but μg spread is steady with S_{f} being lower (~15 mm/s) than either the Ig jump velocity (~100 mm/s) or crawl velocity (~22 mm/s).

Detailed numerical modeling [98] predicts pulsating spread at μg for the conditions of Fig. 20 and values of S_{f} much closer to the measured Ig S_{f}. Remarkably, if thermal expansion is artificially suppressed, good agreement between the model and μg experiments is found. It is proposed [97] that this agreement results from three-dimensional effects; specifically, in the experiment, flow induced by thermal expansion is relaxed in the lateral dimension, whereas the two-dimensional model does not permit this. That three-dimensional effects might dominate is surprising considering that, for this flame, δW/αUW ~ 0.02, thus, δ ≪ W. Also, this hypothesis does not explain why pulsating flame spread is observed at Ig but not μg. Consequently, in the case of liquid-fuel flame spread, μg experiments have identified limitations in our current understanding of combustion processes at Ig.

Recommendations for Future Studies

Reabsorption Effects

The μg studies described here suggest new unresolved issues and opportunities for further improvements in understanding. Perhaps the most important are the effects of reabsorption of emitted radiation, including both reabsorption by the emitting gas and, in two-phase combustion, absorption by the condensed phase. All radiative effects discussed above are critically dependent on the degree of reabsorption. To study reabsorption effects requires radiatively active diluents (CO_{2}, SF_{6}), high pressures and/or large systems. All of these conditions lead to higher Gr_{d} at Ig and thus turbulent flow. Hence, μg
experiments enable study of reabsorption effects without the additional complications due to turbulence.

Reabsorption effects are important not only to μg studies but also to combustion at high pressures and in large combustors. For example, at 40 atm, typical of premixed-charge internal combustion engines, \( \alpha \approx 10^{-3} \, \text{m}^{-1} \), thus \( \alpha^{-1} \approx 0.045 \, \text{m} \), for stoichiometric combustion products. Because this length scale is comparable to cylinder radii, reabsorption effects within the gas cannot readily be neglected. Simple estimates [59] indicate radiative loss may influence flame quenching by turbulence in lean mixtures. Similarly, reabsorption cannot be neglected in atmospheric-pressure furnaces larger than \( \alpha^{-1} \approx 2.2 \) m. Moreover, many combustion devices employ exhaust-gas or flue-gas recirculation; for such devices, the unburned mixtures contain significant amounts of absorbing CO₂ and H₂O.

Although reabsorption of emitted radiation could affect practically all types of flames reviewed here, to date, reabsorption effects have been studied only for propagating premixed-gas flames [24,26], flame balls [45], and flame spread over thermally thin fuels [88]. All have shown substantial differences from optically thin behavior. Two examples of effects expected for other flames are given below.

Reabsorption effects could be substantially more important for droplet combustion than for flame spread over solid fuels because for droplets, the Stefan flow severely limits heat conduction to the droplet surface. This is why heat release (\( B \)) affects burning rates (\( K \)) only weakly (logarithmically) (equation 8). Radiative transfer is unaffected by the Stefan flow. Equation 8 is readily extended to include surface radiative flux (\( q_s \)).

\[
\Omega = \ln\left(1 + \frac{B}{1 - R/\Omega}\right), R = \frac{q_s d_C}{2L_c}, \Omega = \frac{K_{\text{eff}} C_F}{8A}
\]  
(11)

Figure 21 shows the predictions of equation 11. (Although equation 11 has apparently not been presented previously, numerical studies [100,101] have shown qualitatively similar predictions. Moreover, these studies show that typical radiative absorption lengths for liquid fuels at relevant wavelengths are on the order of 1 mm, thus large droplets could absorb most incident radiation.) For spherical shells of radiant combustion products having thickness \( \delta \ll d_F \), \( q_s \approx \delta \), then for typical values \( B = 8.5, A = 2 \times 10^6 \, \text{W/m}^2, \delta = 10 \, \text{mm}, d_F = 5 \, \text{mm}, C_p = 1400 \, \text{J/kgK}, \lambda = 0.07 \, \text{W/mK}, \) and \( L_c = 400 \, \text{kJ/kg} \), equation 11 predicts \( R = 0.63 \) and \( \Omega/R_{\text{eff}} = 1.11 \); thus, moderate effects of radiative transfer are expected. For droplets in radiatively active diluents such as CO₂, the effect could be much stronger. Using the P1 approximation, for a sphere of unit emissivity in an infinite gray gas, \( q_s = \left(4/\pi + 3 \right) \alpha P_1(T^4 - T'4) \) [102]. Using volume-averaged properties \( T = 1000 \, \text{K} \) and \( P_{1(1)} = 20 \, \text{m} \), \( R = 18 \) and thus \( \Omega/R_{\text{eff}} = 8.0 \), indicating radiation dominates heat transport. As discussed later, at high pressures radiative effects may prevail even in O₂–N₂ atmospheres.

Flame spread over thermally thick fuel beds in quiescent atmospheres at \( \mu g \) is typically considered inherently unsteady [59], however radiative transfer to the fuel bed could enable steady spread. If the flame is modeled by an isothermal volume with dimensions \( \delta \times \delta \times W \), radiation induces a radiative flux \( \delta^2 W = \alpha (\delta^2 S)^2 W \) that augments the conductive flux \( \delta (\delta W)/(T_f - T) \). Equating this total heat transfer to \( \rho \dot{C}_F \tau(T_f - T) \delta W \) yields

\[
S_f = \left(\frac{4\pi \delta^2 W}{\alpha \delta (T_f - T)} - \frac{1}{\delta (T_f - T)}\right)^{1/2}
\]  
(12)

which vanishes without gas radiation (\( \alpha = 0 \)). Thick-fuel space experiments in O₂–CO₂ or O₂–SF₆ atmospheres could be employed to check for steady spread and test the accuracy of equation 12.

Whereas optically thin radiation modeling is reasonably straightforward, modeling of spectrally dependent emission and absorption is challenging because local fluxes depend on the entire radiation field, not just local scalar properties and gradients. Some relevant computations have employed gray-gas models [74], but recent studies [26,103] show that these methods are probably inaccurate because of the wide variation in spectral absorption coefficients with temperature, species, and wavelength. Comparisons of various radiative treatments for small one-dimensional non-premixed flames have been made [103]. Comparisons for larger, multidimensional systems would be valuable. Moreover, recent studies of μg soot formation [52,56,57] may enable improved modeling of soot radiation at \( \mu g \).

**High-Pressure Combustion**

All practical combustion engines operate at pressures much higher than atmospheric. The impact of buoyancy for premixed gases scales as \( P_{1(1)} \sim (\alpha/\delta^2)^2 \sim P_{1(1)}^{-4/3} \), where \( n \) is the overall reaction order (\( S_n \sim P_{1(1)}^{-1} \)). Because, typically, \( n \approx 4/3 \) for weak mixtures [104], where buoyancy effects are most important, the impact of buoyancy increases with pressure. Also, as discussed earlier, radiation effects are more difficult to assess at higher pressure due to increased interference from buoyant transport. Nevertheless, few high-pressure μg combustion experiments have been performed. High-pressure droplet combustion experiments [105] revealed substantial but different increases in \( K \) with \( P \) at 1g and μg. Radiative effects were not discussed but could have been important, because in equation 11,
merous investigations of round-jet flames at \( L_f \) and residence times \( t_r \) for buoyant and non-buoyant gas-jet flames. Currently, it is unknown whether slot-jet flames at \( \mu \)g would exhibit smoke points or whether this information could be used to explain smoke points in \( \mu \)g round-jet flames. Because \( L_f \) depends on \( g \) for buoyant slot-jet but not round-jet flames, \( L_f \) should be quite different at \( L_f \) and \( \mu \)g for slot-jets but not round-jets. Residual accelerations in aircraft \( \mu \)g experiments will be more problematic for slot-jet than round-jet flames because \( t_{pu} \sim g^{-1/2} \) for buoyant round-jet flames whereas \( t_{pu} \sim g^{-1/3} \) for slot-jet flames.

There has been little investigation of blow-off behavior of laminar gas-jet flames at \( \mu \)g. Dual-limit behavior might occur for flames of fixed-mass flow rate but varying \( d_\ell \), with short residence time extinction at small \( d_\ell \) (\( t_{ext} \sim d_\ell/\tau \)) and radiative extinction at large \( d_\ell \) (thus, large \( t_{pu} \)). Experiments should be conducted by diluting the fuel rather than increasing \( U_0 \) to obtain blow-off without transition to turbulence. In this way, dual-limit behavior has been observed at \( L_f \) with short residence time and conductive loss (to the burner rim) extinction branches.

**Quasi-Steady Spherical Diffusion Flames**

As discussed previously, comparing predicted radiative extinction limits of droplet flames to experiments is problematic because quasi-steady conditions may not be obtained, because extinction occurs for sufficiently large droplet and flame diameters, but the droplet diameter decreases throughout its life. Numerical models can account for transient effects, but the multidimensional ignition process is difficult to model quantitatively. Comparisons of droplet experiments and computations to corresponding results obtained using fuel-wetted porous spheres would be most interesting. The fuel should be forced through the porous sphere at slowly increasing rates until extinction occurs when \( d_\ell > (d_{pu})^{1/3} \), thus obtaining truly quasi-steady extinction. Long \( \mu \)g durations would be required to establish steady diffusion-dominated far-field temperature and composition profiles (thus, steady radiative loss). Some preliminary results have been obtained in aircraft experiments [108] but were severely compromised by the residual \( g \) levels. Candle flames are similar to wetted porous spheres, though without true spherical symmetry or any means to control or measure the instantaneous \( d_\ell \).

A simpler related experiment employs porous spheres through which gaseous fuel is forced at prescribed \( m \), resulting in a flame diameter \( d_\ell \sim \frac{mC_p}{2\pi\alpha_0(1 + f)} \). Some drop-tower experiments using this configuration have been reported [109,110], although steady-state conditions were not obtained due to short \( \mu \)g durations. Steady-state behavior appears unlikely given the \( m \) (thus, air consumption rates) and chamber sizes employed to date; near-wall

---

**Three-Dimensional Effects**

In earlier sections, effects of lateral heat and mass transport on flame spread were discussed. To assess three-dimensional effects, \( \mu \)g experiments with varying fuel bed width (\( W \)) are needed. Complementary three-dimensional modeling using codes such as those developed by NIST [106], extended to include gas-phase radiation, would be instructive. An approximate but much less expensive approach would be to incorporate volumetric terms \( \frac{6\mu(T(x, y) - T_\ell)}{W^2} \) and \( 6\mu(T(y, z) - T_\ell)/W^2 \), where \( x \) and \( y \) are the coordinates parallel and perpendicular to the fuel bed, into the two-dimensional model to account for lateral heat losses and lateral diffusion of each species \( i \).

Another three-dimensional effect is found in the development of flame balls from ignition kernels. Currently, it is known that large flame balls are linearly unstable to three-dimensional disturbances for weak loss (Fig. 5), but the transition from splitting flame balls to stable flames is not well understood, nor can the number of flame balls produced from an ignition source be predicted. Modeling using three-dimensional premixed flame codes [107] is needed.

**Gas-Jet Flames**

Table 2 shows predicted scalings of flame lengths \( L_f \) and residence times \( t_{pu} \) for buoyant and non-buoyant round-jet and slot-jet flames. Despite numerous investigations of round-jet flames at \( \mu \)g, no

---

**Fig. 21.** Predicted effect of radiative heat transport coefficient \( R \) on droplet burning rate constant referenced to the value without radiative transport, showing importance of absorption of radiation at the droplet surface on the resulting burning rate. \( B = 3 \) and \( B = 5.5 \) are characteristic of methanol and heptane, respectively, burning in air.

- The only pressure-dependent factor is \( q_e \sim A \sim P^1 \), thus in Fig. 21, \( R \sim P \). (For most flames, length scales decrease with increasing \( P \), which would decrease radiative effects; but for droplet flames, \( d_\ell \) depends only on stoichiometry \([75,76]\).) Consequently, further assessment of radiative effects in high-pressure droplet combustion and other types of flames appears warranted.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( R = q_e C_p / 2kL )</th>
<th>Normalized burning rate ( a ) of ( \mu )g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**In Aircraft Experiments**

In aircraft experiments, \( L_f \) is proportional to the chamber size, though without available data on chamber sizes. Illustrated in Fig. 21 is a way to incorporate volumetric terms into the two-dimensional model to account for lateral heat losses and lateral diffusion of each species \( i \).
The discrepancies result largely from differences in mixtures away from extinction limits very faithfully.

These chemical models predict smaller balls than experimental uncertainty or unaccounted heat losses. The discrepancy seems larger and caner flammability limits than experimental observations. The best models [21,26] predict higher $S_L$ and leaner flammability limits than experimental observations [22,33,113]. The discrepancy seems larger than experimental uncertainty or unaccounted heat losses could explain. In contrast, the $H_2$-air flame balls [45] and $Ig$ strained premixed $H_2$-air flames [114], these chemical models predict smaller balls, lower $S_L$, and richer flammability limits than experiments. These chemical models predict $S_L$ in mixtures away from extinction limits very faithfully. The discrepancies result largely from differences in rates for $H + O_2 + M$ reactions, particularly the Chaperon efficiencies of various $M$ species [45]. These reactions are extremely important in near-limit flames due to competition between chain-branching and chain-inhibiting steps near limits [21] but are much less important away from limits. Further scrutiny of the rates for these reactions at intermediate temperatures (1100–1400 K) would be welcomed.

Catalytic Combustion

Catalytic combustion holds promise for reduced emissions and improved fuel efficiency in many combustion systems [111,112]. Because catalysis occurs at surfaces, it is inherently multidimensional and/or unsteady, requiring reactant transport to the surface and heat and products transport from the surface. Although boundary-layer approximations can be invoked, probably the only truly one-dimensional steady catalytic configuration is a spherical surface immersed in nonbuoyant quiescent premixed gas—a "catalytic flame ball." In this case, $r_f$ is fixed but the surface temperature $T_s$ and fuel concentration $Y$ are unknown. These are related through the energy conservation (including surface radiation) and diffusion equations to obtain the surface reaction rate in moles per second ($\Theta$):

$$\Theta(Y, T_s) = \rho D \sigma_Y \left(1 - \frac{Y}{Y_s}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_Y (T_s^4 - T_e^4)}{\lambda (T_s - T_e)}\right)$$

where $\varepsilon_s$ is the surface emissivity and properties with the subscript s are evaluated at $T = T_s$. By varying $r_f$, $Y$, pressure, and diluent gas, $\Theta(Y, T_s)$ can be inferred from equation 13 and the measured $T_s$. Of course, conditions must be unfavorable for initiation of propagating flames or flame balls that stand off from the surface.

Chemical Models

An important contribution of $\mug$ combustion experiments has been improved understanding of extinction processes, which are inherently related to finite-rate chemistry. To obtain closure between experiments and computations, accurate chemical models are needed. For lean premixed hydrocarbon-air flames, most models [21,26] predict higher $S_L$ and leaner flammability limits than experimental observations [22,33,113]. The discrepancy seems larger than experimental uncertainty or unaccounted heat losses could explain. In contrast, the $H_2$-air flame balls [45] and $Ig$ strained premixed $H_2$-air flames [114], these chemical models predict smaller balls, lower $S_L$, and richer flammability limits than experiments. These chemical models predict $S_L$ in mixtures away from extinction limits very faithfully. The discrepancies result largely from differences in rates for $H + O_2 + M$ reactions, particularly the Chaperon efficiencies of various $M$ species [45]. These reactions are extremely important in near-limit flames due to competition between chain-branching and chain-inhibiting steps near limits [21] but are much less important away from limits. Further scrutiny of the rates for these reactions at intermediate temperatures (1100–1400 K) would be welcomed.

Conclusions

Our understanding of combustion fundamentals has been broadened by $\mug$ experiments into regimes not previously explored. In particular, these experiments have helped integrate radiation into flame theory. Although flame radiation has long been recognized as an important heat-transfer mechanism in large fires [115], its treatment has largely been ad hoc because of the difficulty of predicting soot formation. Also, large-scale fires at $Ig$ are inevitably turbulent, leading to complicated flame-flow interactions. Small-scale $\mug$ flames are laminar, often soot-free, and have significant influences of radiation. As a result of radiation effects, both premixed and non-preamixed flames have exhibited dual-limit extinction behavior, with residence time-limited extinction at high strain, or curvature and radiative loss-induced extinction at low strain or curvature. The high-strain limit is readily observed at $Ig$ when forced flow is absent, buoyant flow causes this strain. For weak mixtures, these limits converge, but the convergence and the entire low-strain extinction branch can only be seen at $\mug$. This dual-limit behavior is observed for stretched and curved premixed-gas flames, strained non-preamixed flames, isolated fuel droplets, and flame spread over solid fuels. Besides radiative effects, $\mug$ studies have enabled observation and clarification of numerous other phenomena, for example, thermophoresis effects in soot formation, spherically symmetric droplet burning, diffusion-controlled premixed flames (flame balls), and flame instabilities in droplets and candle flames. Considering the rapid progress made recently, further advances are certain to occur. It is hoped that this report on the current state of understanding will help motivate and inspire such advances.

Nomenclature

- $a_p$: Planck mean absorption coefficient
- $A$: flame surface area
- $B$: transfer number (chemical enthalpy generation/enthalpy needed for fuel evaporation)
- $C_p$: stoichiometric molar ratio of fuel to air
- $C_p$: constant-pressure heat capacity
characteristic flow-length scale or tube diameter
\( d \)
droplet flame diameter
\( d_f \)
droplet diameter
\( d_A \)
droplet initial diameter
\( d_{in} \)
jet exit diameter (round jets) or slot width (slot jets)
\( D \)
mass diffusivity
\( E \)
overall activation energy of the heat-release reactions
\( f \)
stoichiometric fuel to air mass ratio
\( g \)
acceleration of gravity
\( h \)
heat transfer coefficient in a cylindrical tube = \( 16\beta/\delta^2 \)
\( H \)
radiative loss parameter for flame spread = \( t_{\text{rad}}/t_{\text{flu}} = \alpha U^3 t_{\text{flu}} \)
\( K \)
droplet burning rate constant (equation 8)
\( L_f \)
flame length for gas-jet flame
\( L_t \)
turbulence integral scale
\( L_v \)
latent heat of vaporization of liquid fuel
\( Le \)
Lewis number (\( \alpha/D \) = thermal diffusivity/reactant mass diffusivity)
\( n \)
mass burning rate
\( M \)
fuel molecular weight
\( P \)
pressure
\( r \)
radial coordinate
\( R \)
scalled flame radius (eq 6); radiation parameter (eq 11)
\( R_g \)
gas constant
\( Re \)
jet Reynolds number = \( U_d d / v \)
\( S_f \)
flame spread rate over solid fuel bed
\( S_L \)
promised laminar burning velocity
\( S_{L_{\text{lim}}} \)
burning velocity at the flammability limit
\( Sc \)
Schmidt number = \( \nu/D \)
\( t_{\text{chem}} \)
chemical time scale
\( t_{\text{diff}} \)
thermal diffusion time scale = \( \alpha U^2 \)
\( t_{\text{drag}} \)
droplet flame time scale = \( d_f / \alpha \)
\( t_{\text{enu}} \)
viscous buoyant transport time scale
\( t_{\text{rad}} \)
residence time of non-premixed jet flame
\( t_{\text{flu}} \)
radiative loss time scale
\( T \)
temperature
\( T_{\text{ad}} \)
adiabatic flame temperature
\( U \)
turbulence intensity
\( U_c \)
convection velocity
\( U_y \)
local axial velocity in counterflow configuration
\( U_e \)
jet exit velocity
\( w \)
gas-jet flame width
\( W \)
solid fuel bed width
\( y \)
alinear coordinate
\( Y \)
fuel mass faction
\( \alpha \)
thermal diffusivity
\( \beta \)
nondimensional activation energy = \( E R_T/\beta \)
\( \gamma \)
flame thickness
\( \lambda \)
thermal conductivity
\( \Lambda \)
radiative heat loss per unit volume = \( -4\sigma d(T_f^4 - T^4) \)
\( \nu \)
kineamatic viscosity
\( \rho \)
density
\( \tau \)
fuel bed half-thickness (thin fuel) or thermal penetration depth (thick fuel)
\( \sigma \)
Stefan-Boltzmann constant
\( \Sigma \)
flame stretch rate

Subscripts
\( d \)
droplet surface condition
\( f \)
flame front condition
\( s \)
solid-fuel or solid-surface condition
\( v \)
solid- or liquid-fuel vaporization condition
\( \infty \)
ambient conditions
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2504 INVITED PLENARY LECTURE

In your presentation, you credited the computational demonstration of the result on the absence of a flammability limit in adiabatic flames to Giovangigli and Snooke [1]. This result was first obtained in 1988 [2]. You might like to amend the citation suitably.

REFERENCES


Author’s Reply. In this earlier paper by the questioner and his collaborators [2], it was shown that the solutions of the unsteady planar one-dimensional adiabatic premixed flame equations do not predict any flammability limit for lean CH₄-O₂-N₂ mixtures—the burning velocity decreases asymptotically to zero as the mixture strength is decreased. In Snooke and Giovangigli (Ref. [1] of the comment), the steady version of these equations was solved for CH₄-air and H₂-air mixtures, and a similar conclusion was reached. Both are important findings, because it is possible in principle that unsteady effects could suppress limits of steady flames or cause limits to occur for mixtures that are flammable as steady flames. Together they show that one must identify loss mechanisms of the appropriate magnitude to explain flammability limits, which was one of the key points of my presentation.

J. P. Gore, Purdue University, USA. You seem to have drawn a conclusion based on your time-scale analysis that “radiation is not important at 1 g.” For combustion under high-pressure conditions, for fires (large and small), and for all flames as far as high activation energy reaction steps are involved, radiation can be potentially important. Could you please re-examine and clarify your conclusion regarding radiation not being important at 1 g?  

Author’s Reply. Certainly radiation is an important mechanism of heat transfer in flames even at 1 g—large...
Industrial furnaces and boilers depend almost entirely on radiative transfer. The same is true of many large accidental fires, e.g., in buildings over liquid fuel pools. The message I intended to convey was that the radiation transport time scale is longer than the buoyant transport time scale at earth gravity, and thus radiation does not play an important role on local flame structure and extinction conditions at earth gravity compared to the role that buoyant convection plays. Even on the large scale, however, buoyancy is probably a more dominant transport mechanism at 1 g—while a building fire would be very different with buoyancy but no radiation, imagine how different it would be with radiation but no buoyancy!