



**HAL**  
open science

## Computational assessment of detailed soot formation models in ethylene/air laminar diffusion flames

Sebastián Ruiz, Cesar Celis, Luís Fernando Figueira da Silva

► **To cite this version:**

Sebastián Ruiz, Cesar Celis, Luís Fernando Figueira da Silva. Computational assessment of detailed soot formation models in ethylene/air laminar diffusion flames. 2024. hal-04420383v1

**HAL Id: hal-04420383**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04420383v1>**

Preprint submitted on 26 Jan 2024 (v1), last revised 6 Jun 2024 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

# **Computational assessment of detailed soot formation models in ethylene/air laminar diffusion flames**

Sebastian Ruiz, Cesar Celis<sup>1</sup>

Mechanical Engineering Section, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú  
Av. Universitaria 1801, San Miguel, 15088, Lima, Peru

Luís Fernando Figueira da Silva

Institut Pprime, CNRS, ISAE-ENSMA, Université de Poitiers  
1 avenue Clément Ader, Futuroscope Chasseneuil 86961, France

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author – Tel.: +51 1 626 2000 / 4870  
E-mail address: [ccelis@pucp.edu.pe](mailto:ccelis@pucp.edu.pe) (C. Celis)

## Abstract

To improve the accuracy of soot formation predictions, several physical and chemical models have been developed over the last decades. These models include (i) detailed chemical kinetic mechanisms describing gas-phase chemistry related to combustion processes and reaction pathways leading to large-sized aromatic molecules, which are needed for modeling soot formation, and (ii) detailed soot formation models providing a comprehensive description of soot particle dynamics and interactions with gas-phase chemical species. Accordingly, in this work, two detailed soot formation models, the method of moments (MOM) and the discrete sectional method (DSM) ones, are evaluated in ethylene/air laminar diffusion flames and their corresponding results are compared with experimental measurements. Furthermore, the NBP and KM2 chemical kinetic mechanisms are assessed and compared with each other by examining key chemical species related to soot formation. To compute gas mixture's radiative properties, the WSGG (weighted sum of grey gases) model considering a gray medium is also utilized. Finally, the contributions of the soot precursors known as PAH (polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon) to soot formation are also analyzed. The main results show that the discrepancies in PAH concentrations obtained with different chemical kinetic mechanisms can be significant. In addition, compared to the MOM ones, the DSM results obtained here show a better agreement with experimental data. Finally, the analysis of PAH shows that those with two (A2) to four (A4) aromatic rings impact the most on soot formation modeling. Specifically, contributions of A4 were found to be more significant at lower heights above the burner, whereas A2 was found to be more impactful downstream as the flame develops. Maximum contributions of A2 and A4 to the soot nucleation rate were 66% and 85%, respectively, whereas the maximum summed contribution of PAH with five (A4R5) to seven (A7) aromatic rings accounted for only 13% of the nucleation rate.

*Keywords:* Soot formation, Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, Laminar flames, Chemical kinetic mechanisms, Non-premixed flames.

## Nomenclature

### Variables

$a$	Absorption coefficient
$b$	Soot absorption model constant
$d$	Diameter
$D_s$	Diffusion coefficient
$G_r$	Coagulation source term
$k_B$	Boltzmann constant
$m_c$	Mass of one carbon atom
$M_r$	Moment of order $r$
$n$	Number density function
$N_A$	Avogadro number
$N_{C,P}$	Number of carbon atoms
$R_r$	Nucleation source term
$T$	Temperature
$v$	Velocity
$W_r$	Surface growth and oxidation source term
$Y_{soot,i}$	Section $i$ soot mass fraction

### Greek-letter variables

$\beta$	Collision frequency function
$\gamma$	Sticking coefficient
$\rho$	Density
$\varphi$	Transported scalar
$\Gamma$	Diffusivity

### Abbreviations

CFD	Computational fluid dynamics
DOM	Discrete ordinate method
DSM	Discrete sectional method

HAB	Height above the burner
HACA	Hydrogen-abstraction acetylene-addition
LBL	Line-by-line
LII	Laser-induced incandescence
MOM	Method of moments
MOMIC	Method of moments with interpolative closure
NBKD	Narrow band k distribution
OTA	Optically thin approximation
PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PBE	Population balance equation
PLIF	Planar induced incandescence fluorescence
PSDF	Particle size distribution function
RTE	Radiative transfer equation
UDF	User-defined function
UDS	User-defined scalar
UDM	User-defined memory
URF	Under-relaxation factor
WSGG	Weighted sum of grey gases
SVF	Soot volume fraction

## 1 Introduction

Particulate matter emissions from combustion processes have the potential to significantly change our environment. Soot and the aromatic molecules associated with its formation are well known for their harmful effects on both health and the biosphere [1,2]. However, the formation of soot particles has also practical applications, such as enhancing heat transfer in furnaces and producing carbon-derived nanomaterials [3]. Soot related research is thus motivated by the need to address this substance's negative and positive aspects.

Soot formation is often studied in laminar flame configurations because they are not as experimentally/computationally expensive as turbulent flames, and because they include the physical and chemical phenomena associated with soot particle formation [4]. Accordingly, the modeling of soot formation in laminar flames typically involves the use of a gas-phase chemical kinetic mechanism, a soot formation model, and a radiation one. In recent decades, research on soot formation modeling has focused on developing more accurate and detailed models for each of these three coupled processes.

Chemical kinetic mechanism developments have focused on extending existing kinetic mechanisms to describe larger polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH). For instance, the KAUST Mechanism 2 (KM2) [5] was developed based on a previously developed mechanism including a detailed description of aliphatic species chemistry, and further extended to describe PAH growth pathways in more detail. To reduce the associated computational costs, research on kinetic mechanisms has also focused on reducing the kinetic mechanism accounting for a particular reactive flow configuration [5,6]. Although this may seem contradictory at first, the point of reducing a mechanism is not to neglect the description of large PAH, but rather to cut reaction pathways that are not relevant to the particular reactive flow configuration considered. For instance, Selvaraj et al. [6] developed a kinetic mechanism that initially contained 397 chemical species and reduced it to 99 species while still describing PAH growth up to coronene ( $C_{24}H_{12}$ ). In their work, they reported a relatively good agreement in terms of PAH concentrations when compared to a detailed kinetic mechanism.

State-of-the-art soot formation models, including those based on the method of moments (MOM) or the discrete sectional method (DSM) based ones, involve parameters

related to the morphology of soot particles, such as particle diameter and particle size distribution (PSDF). These models mainly differ in their ability to accurately describe the PSDF. Both model families have been successfully employed to describe the distribution and amount of soot generated in laminar flames. For example, Wang et al. [5] reproduced experimental soot volume fractions for a series of ethylene laminar counterflow flames using a MOMIC (MOM with interpolative closure) model. Additionally, using a DSM model, Zhang and coworkers [7] replicated soot volume fraction measurements for a jet fuel laminar flame. Detailed soot formation models also include the modeling of chain-like structured soot aggregates [8,9]. In MOM models this is usually accomplished by defining the transported moments as a two-variable function, whereas in sectional ones particles and aggregates are discretized and transported in different sections. Additionally, a coagulation mechanism describing the formation of aggregates needs to be included, and the mathematical formulation of the soot formation mechanisms and soot diffusion needs to be adapted [10,11]. Therefore, the modeling of aggregates usually implies a higher level of complexity.

Regarding radiation modelling, although detailed models exist for that, such as the line-by-line (LBL) one, which details the radiative properties for the entire spectrum, they are usually not considered when modeling multidimensional flames. This occurs due to the high computational cost that they usually imply. More simplified models are used instead, such as the optically thin approximation (OTA), gray gas models, and narrow band k-distribution (NBKD) based ones [9,12]. The OTA model is only suitable for a certain type of flames where radiation self-absorption is not significant [13]. Global gas radiation models generally have the limitation to be accurate only for specific species concentration ratios and a particular range of pressures and temperatures. Narrow band k-distribution based models are in turn among the most detailed ones, but they also require the use of a detailed radiation database. In these models, to obtain the self-absorption term, the radiation intensity needs to be calculated, which is solved by the radiative transport equation (RTE). There are also several approaches used to solve the RTE, some of which include spherical harmonics (SHM), discrete-ordinate (DOM), and Monte-Carlo statistical methods [12]. In particular, the soot absorption coefficient is usually computed through empirical correlations as function of the soot mass fraction. This definition is only valid however for the Rayleigh regime, which includes small optical dimension

particles only. Therefore, a different approach must be considered when modelling soot aggregates [13].

Computational cost is typically the main concern when modeling soot formation in laminar flames. For instance, a chemical kinetic mechanism requires solving a transport equation for each chemical species, meaning that for a mechanism featuring 100 species, the mechanism will usually require solving 99 or 100 transport equations, depending on the mass conservation approach. Additionally, as highlighted by Quadarella et al. [14], a soot formation model is usually developed by considering a specific chemical kinetic mechanism. This means that, when using soot formation models with different kinetic mechanisms, the soot model parameters often require readjustment. Similarly, different soot formation models involve different computational costs. In particular, MOM-based models generally involve the solution of a few transport equations only, usually between 3 to 6 depending on the MOM variant and on the accuracy needed [15,16]. DSM, in turn, requires a transport equation for each (volume) section considered, whose number typically ranges from 25 to 35, and which doubles when soot aggregation modeling is accounted for [11,17]. Another aspect to consider when selecting a soot formation model is its complexity. Indeed, the MOM with interpolative closure (MOMIC) model has been widely used due to its relative ease of implementation [6,15,18–20].

Nucleation of soot particles is of paramount importance in the modeling of soot formation because it involves the coupling of the gas-phase chemical species and the solid incipient particles. When using MOM or DSM-based models, two approaches employed to model soot nucleation involve (i) the combination of PAH by dimerization, and (ii) the collision and union of PAH of different sizes. Nucleation by dimerization is usually modeled as a two-step process in which the dimerization rate is first determined, and the nucleation rate is computed from both the dimerization rate and the PAH dimer concentration [21]. In turn, the collision and union of PAH follows the ideal gas collision theory formulation for two molecules. Although there is a consensus on the need to consider PAH molecules as soot precursors in soot nucleation modeling [22,23], there is no general agreement on which of these two formulations is the most adequate, and even more so, which particular molecules from the PAH pool must be accounted for. Generally, works using MOM based models [16,20] employ the nucleation formulation given by Blanquart and Pitsch [21], which describes the dimerization process of either pyrene or PAH of different sizes. However, some works employing MOM use as well the



homogenous and heterogenous combination of PAH formulation [19,24,25]. In turn, recent research works using discrete sectional methods usually model the nucleation as the collision and combination of PAH with five aromatic rings [9,11,26,27]. It is also worth noticing here the PAH availability in the chemical kinetic mechanisms employed. For instance, kinetic mechanisms describing PAH growth up to pyrene only limit the nucleation modeling to either the collision or dimerization of pyrene or other relatively small-size PAH [28].

Accordingly, in this work, two detailed soot formation models, MOMIC [29], a particular variant of the MOM based ones, and DSM [30,31] are applied to model ethylene/air laminar diffusion flames and their corresponding results are compared with experimental measurements. The main contributions of this work include the comparisons of both detailed chemical kinetic mechanisms (NBP and KM2) and detailed soot formation models (MOMIC and DSM), as well the analysis of soot precursors, in particular PAH, and their role in determining the level of soot formed in laminar flames. Other contributions of this work relate to the fact that this is the first time that, using user-defined scalars (UDS) and user-defined functions (UDF), these two detailed soot formation models have been implemented in the general-purpose software ANSYS Fluent (Release 23.1). This means that all model details have been first properly formulated and then coded in a programming language readable by the computational tool employed here. The remainder of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the mathematical model utilized here. In Section 3, in turn, the numerical model, including the flame configuration accounted for, is highlighted. Finally, Sections 4 and 5 discuss the main results obtained here and the conclusions drawn from them, respectively.

## **2 Mathematical Formulation**

In this section the flame configuration and the mathematical models used in this work are discussed. More specifically, the transport equations, kinetic mechanisms, soot formation and radiation models required to solve the combustion system and characterize it are briefly described.

## 2.1 Flame Configuration

This work involves the study of an atmospheric pressure laminar ethylene/air diffusion flame. The burner used to characterize this flame, one of the target flames in the Laser-Induced Incandescence (LII) Workshop from 2005, is a Gülder type. This type of burner allows stabilizing a flame that generates relatively high amounts of soot. The burner consists of two coaxial tubes, with the inner tube featuring a diameter of 11 mm for the fuel inlet and the outer one having a diameter of 100 mm for the airflow. The fuel flow rate is 0.1 slpm, whereas the air flow rate is set to 60 slpm. The experimental data used for comparison and validation purposes here was obtained by Jerez et al. [32], in which soot-related properties were measured using simultaneous LII and planar induced fluorescence (PLIF) techniques. A two color pyrometry technique was also used for the measurements of temperature fields.

## 2.2 Governing Equations

Transport equations for mass, momentum, energy and chemical species are solved accounting for both a laminar flow with variable density and a 2-D axisymmetric reference frame. Finite-rate chemistry is employed, meaning that each chemical species mass fraction transport equation is solved. Chemical species' mass diffusivity is computed based on averaged mixture properties following Fick's law. Mixture-averaged viscosity and thermal conductivity are solved based on the mixture temperature and Leonard-Jones parameters of each chemical species. Thermal diffusion, also known as Soret effect, is neglected in this work. In addition, enthalpy transport due to species mass diffusion is accounted for in the energy equation. Finally, gravitational effects are considered in the momentum transport equation.

## 2.3 Chemical Kinetic Mechanisms

Chemical kinetic mechanisms specify, along with their associated thermodynamical and transport properties, the gaseous chemical species and chemical reactions accounted for in the numerical simulations carried out. Two chemical kinetic mechanisms are evaluated here, (i) the one developed by Narawasyamy et al. [33], commonly known as NBP mechanism, and (ii) the Kaust Mech 2 (KM2), developed by Wang et al. [5].

The NBP mechanism was validated for a wide range of fuels, ranging from methane to iso-octane and accounting for both premixed and diffusion laminar flames. This mechanism describes the formation of PAH up to benzo[ghi]fluranthene ( $C_{18}H_{10}$ ), a 5-ringed aromatic molecule.

In turn, the KM2 mechanism features 202 gaseous chemical species and 1351 chemical reactions. In this case, the reaction pathways leading to the formation of benzene are taken from the USCII mechanism [34], which was validated for fuels featuring 1 to 4 carbons in its fundamental structure. Additionally, this kinetic mechanism improves the description of cyclopentadienyl ( $C_5H_5$ ) related reactions, which are important for the formation of non-planar PAH structures. KM2 describes the formation of PAH up to coronene ( $C_{24}H_{12}$ ), a 7-ringed aromatic molecule.

The modeling of soot nucleation in soot formation models is inherently limited by the number and size of the PAH accounted for in the kinetic mechanisms. Therefore, when using the NBP mechanism, modeling of nucleation is usually done by means of benzene ( $C_6H_6$ ), naphthalene ( $C_{10}H_8$ ), or pyrene ( $C_{16}H_{10}$ ) [35,36]. However, when using the KM2 mechanism, soot nucleation considers larger PAH, including benzo[ghi]pyrene (BAPYR), a 5-ringed molecule, coronene (A7), a 7-ringed molecule, and other large-sized aromatic molecules [19].

## 2.4 Soot Modeling

Two different modeling approaches describing the formation of soot sphere particles are compared in this work, (i) the method of moments with interpolative closure (MOMIC) [29] and (ii) the discrete sectional method (DSM) [30,31]. These particular model variants have been considered here because, in addition to their relative ease of implementation, they are representative of different ways used to describe the essence of detailed soot formation mechanisms. In particular, these two soot formation models predict the soot particle size distribution (PSDF), which is relevant to soot formation mechanisms, to determine the soot surface area, the soot surface growth and oxidation. The main differences between the two soot models studied here come from the way in which they both solve the PSDF and model the associated soot formation mechanisms.

Accordingly, first, the method of moments reconstructs the PSDF by determining its statistical moments [37]. In other words, each moment is related to a statistical parameter

of the particle size distribution, i.e., mean, variance, and skewness. The main feature of this model relates to the fact that, to model the PSDF, it usually employs a few moments only. Thus only a few additional transport equations need to be solved. In particular, the MOMIC variant accounted for here uses a Lagrange interpolation for the closure of its source terms. The corresponding transport equation for the  $r$ -th statistical moment is expressed as follows,

$$\nabla \cdot (\rho \bar{v}) M_r = \nabla \cdot (\rho D_s \nabla M_r) + \frac{dM_r}{dt}, \quad (1)$$

where  $M_r$  is the  $r$ -th statistical moment of the soot PSDF,  $D_s$  is the diffusion coefficient for laminar flames, and  $\frac{dM_r}{dt}$  is the  $r$ -th statistical moment source term. Following the work by Zimmer and Pereira [38], a constant value of  $10^{-6} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^2$  is considered for  $D_s$ . Source terms are defined in turn in terms of the soot formation mechanisms,

$$\frac{dM_r}{dt} = R_r + G_r + W_r, \quad (2)$$

where  $R_r$ ,  $G_r$ , and  $W_r$  are the nucleation, surface growth, and oxidation source terms, respectively. Particularly, the soot particle nucleation is modeled here as the collision and union of pyrene (A4) molecules as follows,

$$R_0 = \gamma \sqrt{\frac{4\pi k_B T}{m_C N_{C,P}}} (dN_A)^2 [PAH]^2, \quad (3)$$

$$R_r = 2N_{C,P} R_{r-1}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the sticking coefficient,  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant,  $T$  is the temperature,  $m_C$  the mass of a single carbon atom,  $N_{C,P}$  the number of carbon atoms in the PAH,  $N_A$  the Avogadro number, and  $[PAH]$  is the PAH mole concentration. Notice that the sticking coefficient accounts for a collision efficiency between soot precursors [21]. Soot surface growth and oxidation mechanisms are modeled here based on the hydrogen abstraction acetylene addition (HACA) mechanism, using the Arrhenius parameters proposed by Appel et al. [39]. The formulation of these source terms is described in detail in the work by Frenklach and Wang [40]. Empirical parameters used in the referred formulation include the steric factor, which accounts for the fraction of active sites available for chemical reactions in the soot particle surface, and a collision efficiency for the OH

oxidation process [39]. Previous analyses of these empirical parameters showed that the sticking coefficient (related to collision efficiency) directly affects the quantity of soot formed, whereas the steric factor can affect the soot volume fraction fields [41]. Accordingly, in order to match the experimental peak values, both  $\gamma$  and steric factor are prescribed here as being equal to 0.001 and 1, respectively.

The second model considered, discrete sectional method (DSM), computes the PSDF by directly dividing it into a finite number of sections, where a transport equation is solved for each section. In this work, each section is represented by its mean particle volume so the transport equations solved take the form, in terms of soot mass fraction,

$$\nabla \cdot (\rho \bar{v}) Y_{soot,i} = \nabla \cdot (\rho D_s \nabla Y_{soot,i}) + \dot{\omega}_{soot,i}, \quad (5)$$

where  $Y_{soot,i}$  stands for the soot mass fraction of section  $i$ ,  $D_s$  is the diffusion coefficient, and  $\dot{\omega}_{soot,i}$  is the soot mass fraction section source term. This source term is defined in turn as,

$$\dot{\omega}_{soot,i} = \rho_s (\delta_{1,i} \dot{Q}_{i,nuc} + \dot{Q}_{i,SG} + \dot{Q}_{i,Ox} + \dot{Q}_{i,Cond} + \dot{Q}_{i,Coag}), \quad (6)$$

where  $\rho_s$  is the soot density and  $\dot{Q}_{i,nuc}$ ,  $\dot{Q}_{i,SG}$ ,  $\dot{Q}_{i,Ox}$ ,  $\dot{Q}_{i,Cond}$ , and  $\dot{Q}_{i,Coag}$  correspond to the nucleation, surface growth, oxidation, condensation, and coagulation source terms, respectively.  $\delta_{1,i}$  is in turn the Kronecker delta function, meaning that the nucleation source term is only introduced in the first section [42].

Similar to the MOMIC, each section source term in the DSM is defined in terms of the soot formation mechanisms. Indeed, when using the NBP mechanism, the nucleation and condensation modeling is performed using pyrene, whereas, when using KM2, nucleation and condensation source terms are modeled based on PAH of different sizes, ranging from phenanthrene (A2) to coronene (A7). More specifically, in the DSM, accounting for the PAH listed in Table 1, the nucleation and condensation source terms are defined respectively as,

$$\dot{Q}_{1,nuc} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{PAH}} \sum_{k=j}^{N_{PAH}} \gamma V_{PAH} \sqrt{\frac{4k_B T}{m_{PAH}}} (dN_A)^2 [PAH]_j [PAH]_k, \quad (7)$$

$$\Delta\dot{Q}_{i,cond} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{PAH}} \gamma_{cond} V_{PAH,j} ([PAH]_j N_A) \int_{V_i}^{V_{i+1}} \beta_{i,PAH} n(V) dV, \quad (8)$$

where  $V_{PAH}$  and  $d$  are the total volume and diameter of the two colliding PAH, respectively.  $N_{PAH}$  is the total number of PAH considered in nucleation and  $m_{PAH}$  is the reduced mass of the two colliding PAH. Additionally, in Eq. (8),  $\gamma_{cond}$  is the condensation collision efficiency, set to 1 here,  $\beta_{i,PAH}$  is the collision frequency function, and  $n(V)$  is the presumed profile of the soot number density, whose definitions are available in [43]. Like the MOMIC model, to describe the soot surface reaction mechanisms, the DSM also uses a HACA formulation. The same Arrhenius parameters given by Appel et al. [39] are also utilized in this case. Finally, the empirical parameters include as well a sticking coefficient, a steric factor, and a OH oxidation collision efficiency, which are set to the same values as in the MOMIC model.

Table 1. PAH species accounted for in the inception of soot particles.

PAH species	Formula
Naphtalene (A2)	C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>8</sub>
Acenaphtylene (A2R5)	C <sub>12</sub> H <sub>8</sub>
Pyrene (A4)	C <sub>16</sub> H <sub>10</sub>
Cyclopenta[cd]pyrene (A4R5)	C <sub>18</sub> H <sub>10</sub>
Benzo(a)pyrene (Bapyr)	C <sub>20</sub> H <sub>12</sub>
Benzo(ghi)perylene (Bghiper)	C <sub>22</sub> H <sub>12</sub>
Coronene (A7)	C <sub>24</sub> H <sub>12</sub>

## 2.5 Radiation Modeling

The radiation model used in this work to solve the radiative transfer equation (RTE) is the discrete ordinate method (DOM). DOM discretizes the RTE in a finite number of direction vectors in the angular space for which the radiation intensity is computed. A

gray gas-based approach is considered in this work, where scattering phenomena are neglected, and equivalent radiation properties through the entire spectrum are computed. More precisely, the weighted sum-of-gray-gases (WSGG) model [44] is used to compute the gas mixture's emissivity and absorption coefficients. When using the WSGG model, fictitious gases are used to represent the mixture radiation effects, whose model coefficients are calculated based on the concentration of the participating species, that is CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O, and the temperature of the medium. The soot absorption coefficient is in turn determined as

$$a_s = b_1 \rho Y_s \cdot [1 + b_T(T - 2000)], \quad (9)$$

where  $\rho$  is the gas mixture density,  $Y_s$  the soot mass fraction,  $T$  the temperature, and  $b_1$  and  $b_T$  are model coefficients set equal to 1232.4 m<sup>2</sup>/kg and 4.8E-4 K<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. Finally, the total absorption coefficient is obtained as the sum of both the gas mixture and soot absorption coefficients. Both DOM and WSGG models have been used in previous works where it has been shown that they predict relatively well radiative heat transfer and temperature distributions [45, 46].

### 3 Numerical Model

In this section, the numerical model used to predict soot formation in the particular laminar flame accounted for here is described. First, the computational domain and mesh are specified. Then, the solver and numerical schemes utilized here are highlighted. Finally, the implementation of soot models carried out in this work is briefly described.

#### 3.1 Computational domain and Mesh refinement

The computational domain geometry and the initial computational mesh were generated using the ANSYS Design Modeler and ANSYS Meshing modules, respectively. As highlighted in Fig. 1, the computational domain is delimited in the radial direction by the burner's outer diameter, resulting in a radius of 50 mm. In the axial direction, in turn, to permit the development of the duct boundary layer and the flame, a sufficiently extended domain height of 150 mm was accounted for. The initial

computational mesh featured about 20,000 elements, where fine elements were located near the burner walls and the flame centerline, and over the burner surface.




Fig. 1 2-D axisymmetric computational domain, boundary conditions, and refined computational mesh.

Mesh refinements were next carried out by mesh adaptations based on gradients of specific gaseous chemical species mass fractions scaled by their maximum field value [47]. The values for the scaled gradients of acetylene ( $C_2H_2$ ) and hydroxyl (OH) mass fractions both corresponded to 0.01. These values were chosen to refine the flame reactive zone shown in Fig. 1. Adapting the computational mesh based on these two chemical species allowed an adequate mesh refinement on both fuel and oxidizer sides of the flame. Mesh coarsening was not performed in this work. Finally, mesh independence analyses were carried out accounting for one and two levels of refinement, comparing the concentration profiles of minor chemical species present in soot formation processes, i.e.,  $C_2H_2$ , OH, and HCCO. The first level of mesh refinement consisted of approximately 50,000 elements, with the smallest element being about 60  $\mu m$  in size. The second level of refinement in turn featured around 90,000 elements and the smallest element was about 30  $\mu m$  in size. Maximum discrepancies found between the results with the initial mesh and the one with the first level of refinement were about 50 K for temperature and 20%



for OH molar concentration. Additionally, the maximum discrepancies between the meshes with the first and second levels of refinement was only 3 K for temperature and 0.2% for [OH]. Thus, the mesh considered for the simulations performed here has one level of refinement only.

### 3.2 Solver and Numerical Schemes

The set of transport equations governing the reacting flow in this work was solved using the CFD (computational fluid dynamics) software ANSYS Fluent (Release 23.1). Chemistry models used here included the NBP [33] and KM2 [5] chemical kinetic mechanisms, implemented through the ANSYS Fluent Chemkin package. The stiff chemistry was solved using the Chemkin CFD solver, considering ideal gas formulations and average-mixture diffusion. The DOM model used in this work was discretized in a 4x4 angular grid, corresponding to a total of 64 directions, which, according to a previous work [45], provides a reasonable resolution. Soot formation models, MOMIC, and DSM transport equations were implemented through user-defined scalars (UDS). Following previous works [35,48], three (3) additional transport equations, each of them corresponding to a particular low-order statistical moment, were employed in the MOMIC model, whereas thirty (30) transport equations, each of them corresponding to a soot volume section, were used in the DSM one. As highlighted in Section 3.3, the diffusion parameters and source terms for these models were implemented through user-defined functions (UDF). Regarding numerical schemes, a coupled method was used, with a second-order scheme utilized for the remaining transport equations. Finally, under-relaxation factors (URF) were used in the implementation of the soot models studied here to contribute to the stability and convergence of the numerical simulations. Specifically, URF values of 0.8 and 0.5 were employed for MOMIC and DSM, respectively.

### 3.3 Soot Model Implementation

To either modify existing numerical models or to add new ones, ANSYS Fluent allows the creation and usage of user defined functions (UDF) based on C as programming language and predefined macros. For instance, additional transport equations can be constructed following the structure,

$$\nabla \cdot (\rho \bar{v}) \varphi_k = \nabla \cdot (\Gamma_s \nabla \varphi_k) + S_{\varphi_k}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\varphi_k$  is the transported scalar,  $\Gamma_s$  the diffusivity, and  $S_{\varphi_k}$  the transport equation source term. The particular soot formation models accounted for in this work have been implemented using these software features. The diffusion coefficient used by default in ANSYS Fluent's MOMIC model is the one employed for turbulent flames, defined as the ratio between the effective diffusion coefficient and the turbulent Prandtl number ( $\mu_{eff}/\sigma_t$ ). So, in this work, besides the modification introduced in the diffusion coefficient to properly model laminar flames, the evaluation of model parameters, such as the steric factor and sticking coefficient, and the selection of the chemical gas-phase species participating in the soot models source terms, were carried out through UDF. More specifically, to fully implement the soot models, user-defined scalars (UDS) were used to define the number of additional transport equations solved in the numerical simulations carried out here. In addition, the diffusion coefficient  $D_s$  and the source terms for each of the transport equations specified in Eqs. (2) and (6) were defined separately in different UDF. Following Roy et al. [49], to avoid solution divergence issues when using the MOMIC model, a limiting threshold for its oxidation source term was utilized to ensure the monotonicity of the statistical moments. This threshold for the ratio between moments M1/M0 was set to 32 here, which corresponds to the minimum number of carbon atoms in an incipient soot particle. In addition, following the work described in [50], the DSM model source terms were linearized to both improve solution stability and avoid negative sectional volume fractions. The modification of radiation properties was also implemented through a UDF, where the soot absorption coefficient was defined according to Eq. (9).

Similarly, sink and source terms for the chemical species mass fractions consumed and generated during the soot formation processes were also considered via UDF. Finally, to monitor and post-process the implemented model variables and parameters, user defined memories (UDM) were also employed within the UDF.

As highlighted in the ANSYS Fluent Customization Manual (Release 23.1), the equations transported here were solved in a sequential order. First, the mass and momentum transport equations were computed, followed by the solution of the species mass fractions and energy equations. UDF source terms related to these equations, for instance species sinks and source terms, were called next. The additional transport

equations, including UDS, were then solved. Finally, properties including those defined via UDF were updated accordingly.

## 4 Results and Discussions

The main results obtained in this work, in terms of chemical species mass fractions and molar concentrations, flame temperature, and soot volume fraction, are presented and discussed in this section. The influence on the referred results of chemical kinetic mechanisms and soot formation models are particularly assessed. Soot precursors are also analyzed in the final part of this section.

### 4.1 Chemical Kinetic Mechanisms Related Results

As highlighted in Section 2.3, two gas-phase chemical kinetic mechanisms, NBP and KM2, have been used in this work. Thus, this section compares, in terms of chemical gaseous species concentrations, the results obtained with these two kinetic mechanisms. The set of results shown in this section corresponds to those obtained using the more detailed models evaluated in this work, the DSM soot formation model and the DOM radiation one. The chemical species considered for comparison purposes here are the ones present in the soot formation models assessed in this work and that are available in both NBP and KM2 kinetic mechanisms. The distributions and peak values of these species are crucial to assess the differences between the two kinetic mechanisms, and to identify the possible source of discrepancies in the soot levels that could be obtained when using these kinetic mechanisms.

Accordingly, Fig. 2 shows molar concentrations of aromatic species A1, A2, and A4, which correspond to benzene, naphthalene, and pyrene, respectively. These aromatic species selected from the PAH species pool are illustrated here because they are the most frequently used PAH when modeling soot nucleation and condensation, as described in Eqs. (7) and (8). From Fig. 2 it can be seen that discrepancies between the molar concentration fields obtained with the two mechanisms increase as the aromatics become larger. In particular, the largest discrepancies are related with the pyrene molar concentration fields. Specifically, from Fig. 2(c), the field obtained using NBP shows a higher molar concentration in a flame region farther away from the burner, whereas the

KM2 pyrene field shows a peak at a lower height above the burner. Notice as well that the discrepancies in the peak values, which are about 32%, 82%, and 94% for A1, A2, and A4, respectively, also increase as the PAH molecules become larger.




Fig. 2 Molar concentrations (kmol/m<sup>3</sup>) obtained using the NBP and KM2 chemical kinetic mechanisms. (a) Benzene (A1), (b) naphthalene (A2), and (c) pyrene (A4).

Similarly, Fig. 3 shows the molar concentration of the chemical species C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub> and OH often present in the soot formation mechanisms of surface growth and oxidation, respectively. From this figure it can be observed first that the chemical species fields

obtained using these two mechanisms seem to be quite similar. A closer look at Fig. 3(a) indicates however that the  $C_2H_2$  peak values obtained with the studied mechanisms present discrepancies of about 18%. Contrarily, regarding the OH molar concentration, the associated peak values are almost indistinguishable, which suggests a high similarity between both kinetic mechanisms in the flame oxidizer rich region.




Fig. 3 Molar concentrations (kmol/m<sup>3</sup>) obtained using the NBP and KM2 chemical kinetic mechanisms. (a)  $C_2H_2$  and (b) OH.

The observed discrepancies between the results obtained using the NBP and KM2 kinetic mechanisms are somehow expected because they describe the pathways to PAH growth in different ways. For instance, the formation and consumption of A4 is described by 6 reactions in the NBP mechanism [33], whereas in the KM2, 34 reactions are directly associated with the formation of A4 [5]. The results in this section suggest that, depending on the chemical kinetic mechanism employed for this particular configuration, the use of relatively large PAH species in soot modeling would indeed lead to different soot levels.

## 4.2 Soot Formation Related Results

Temperature and soot volume fraction related results obtained using the two detailed soot formation models accounted for here are first discussed in this section. This is complemented with soot formation rates corresponding to the different soot formation

mechanisms accounted for. In the numerical simulations performed to obtain the numerical results discussed in this section, the most detailed chemistry and radiation models accounted for in this work, the KM2 kinetic mechanism and the DOM radiation model, have been utilized along with the two soot formation models considered here.

#### 4.2.1 Temperature and Soot Volume Fraction

The experimental results obtained by Jerez et al. [32] are used here as a reference to compare the temperature and soot volume fraction (SVF) numerical ones obtained in this work using the studied detailed soot formation models, namely the method of moments with interpolative closure (MOMIC) and the discrete sectional method (DSM). Additionally, previous numerical results obtained with a sectional method model [32] are also included here for comparison purposes. Notice that temperature and SVF profiles are discussed here because soot particles effectively absorb and emit radiation, which has a strong impact on flame temperature. SVF in turn allows analyzing the soot distribution in the flame. The experimental flame height ( $H$ ) is defined here according to [32] as the axial ( $Z$ ) position where  $\text{CH}^*$  self-emitted chemiluminescence is observed. Thus, the radial temperature and soot profiles shown in this section, at a normalized height of  $Z/H = 0.6$ , correspond to a  $Z$  position of 18.96 mm.

Accordingly, Fig. 4 shows the temperature profiles obtained with the MOMIC and DSM soot formation models and those available [32]. As shown in Fig. 4(a), both MOMIC and DSM soot models reproduce the experimental centerline profile relatively well, with the profile obtained with DSM model being closer to the experimental one. Discrepancies over the centerline between the experimental peak values and the numerical ones are about 58 K and 2 K, for the MOMIC and DSM, respectively, which are within the flame temperature measurement uncertainty of 290K [32]. From Fig. 4(b) it is observed in turn that, relative to the experimental data, the temperature radial profiles obtained numerically here are slightly shifted to a higher radial position, being the MOMIC profile the furthest away from the experimental curve. Discrepancies between the experimental and numerical temperature peak values along the radial profile are 25 K and 59 K, for the MOMIC and DSM models, respectively. Additionally, it is observed from Fig. 4 (a) and (b) that, when compared to previous numerical results obtained using a sectional soot model, but with different gas phase chemical kinetic and radiation models

[32], both axial and radial temperature profiles obtained with the DSM evaluated here are in better agreement with the experimental data.




Fig. 4 Temperature profiles (a) along the flame centerline  $Z$  and (b) over a radial direction  $R$  at the position  $Z/H=0.6$ . Square symbols correspond to the experimental data [32], whereas dash-dot, dash, and dot lines correspond to numerical results.

Similarly, Fig. 5 shows the axial and radial profiles of soot volume fraction obtained experimentally and from the MOMIC and DSM numerical simulations carried out. A glance at Fig. 5(a) indicates that none of the detailed soot formation models properly predict the amount of soot formed along the flame centerline. However, among all the evaluated models, the DSM leads to a SVF peak value that is the closest to the experimental one. Relative to the experimental SVF peak value, along the flame centerline, the DSM and MOMIC models produce discrepancies of about 1.6 and 2.3 ppm, respectively. Additionally, Fig. 5(b) shows that the SVF MOMIC radial profile is shifted to a higher radial position, whereas the DSM model correctly predicts the SVF peak position along the radial direction evaluated here. These results highlight that the soot volume fraction predictions heavily depend on the soot formation model employed. It is worth noticing here that the two soot models studied in this work use different empirical parameters and specific formulations for the soot formation mechanisms, which may account for the differences observed in the obtained results. The obtained numerical results also indicate that, for the type of flame configuration considered here, the DSM model predicts soot formation more accurately. However, the amount of soot generated

over the center of the flame is underpredicted even with this model, so there is still room for further improvements.




Fig. 5 Soot volume fraction profiles (a) along the flame centerline  $Z$  and (b) over a radial direction  $R$  at  $Z/H=0.6$ . Square symbols correspond to the experimental data [32], whereas dash-dot, dash, and dot lines correspond to numerical results.

#### 4.2.2 Soot Formation Rates

Since they directly affect the level of soot formed in flames, to qualitatively and quantitatively characterize the different soot production and sink rates, taken as source terms in Eq. (5), soot formation rates are analyzed in this section. For this analysis, the KM2 kinetic mechanism and the DSM soot formation model are employed. This is done because their associated numerical results present the best agreement with the experimental data (see Section 4.2.1).

Accordingly, from left to right, Fig. 6 shows the soot production rates corresponding to nucleation, surface growth, and PAH condensation, and the sink rates associated with oxidation and coagulation. It is possible to observe from Fig. 6 the way in which the different soot formation mechanisms prevail in different regions of the flame. That is, nucleation and condensation are more important around the center of the flame, whereas surface mechanisms, i.e., surface growth and oxidation, are more important over the flame wing. It is also worth noticing here the different magnitudes of the soot formation mechanisms. For instance, surface growth and condensation are within the same order of



magnitude, whereas soot nucleation is about three orders of magnitude smaller. This means that most of final soot formed in the flame comes from the soot formation mechanisms that occur at the particle surface. Owing to its relatively small rates, nucleation might not appear to be significant initially for soot formation. This is not necessarily true however. Because nucleation is only accounted for in the first volume section, it determines the number of soot particles that are initially formed and, thus, it also plays a crucial role in the amount of soot that is finally formed.




Fig. 6 Distribution of soot formation rates ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^3\text{s}$ ) obtained using the DSM soot formation model and KM2 gas phase kinetic mechanism.

### 4.3 Soot Precursors Analysis

In this section, to assess their influence on soot formation, PAH considered as precursors to soot formation are analyzed. First, following [32], PAH grouped by their number of rings are compared to planar laser induced fluorescence (PLIF) experimental measurements. And then PAH are compared with each other in terms of their relative contribution to the soot nucleation rate [51]. The results shown in this section were obtained using the KM2 chemical kinetic mechanism and the DSM soot formation model.

Since direct measurements of PAH concentrations are not available for the studied flame, PAH groups are instead associated with a detected PLIF signal measurement at a characteristic wavelength [32]. Specifically, PAH groups containing 1, 2 and 3 aromatic rings are associated with the signals detected at 340 nm. In turn, signals at 400 nm are

associated with PAH groups containing 3 and 4 aromatic rings. Finally, the PLIF signal at 550 nm is associated with 5-ring aromatic molecules. Notice that each PAH group here consists of the most abundant PAH molecules found for the flame configuration utilized here, which are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. PAH groups and chemical species.

PAH Group	Formula
R1	A1, A1C <sub>2</sub> H, A1C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> , C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub> CH <sub>2</sub>
R2	A2, A2C <sub>2</sub> H, C <sub>9</sub> H <sub>8</sub> , C <sub>9</sub> H <sub>7</sub>
R3	A3, A2R5, A3C <sub>2</sub> H
R4	A4, A3R5, PYC <sub>2</sub> H, CHRYSEN
R5	BAPYR, BEPYREN, A4R5

Accordingly, Fig. 7 (a), (b) and (c) show axial profiles of the normalized PLIF measurements and normalized sum of mass fractions obtained numerically (NUM) of each PAH group corresponding to wavelengths of 340, 400 and 550 nm, respectively. Notice that Each profile is normalized by the maximum field value at each wavelength [32]. In addition, Fig. 8 (a) and (b) show radial profiles of normalized measurements and numerical results corresponding to wavelengths 340 and 400 nm, respectively. Notice, that the radial profiles shown here are located at a normalized height of  $Z/H = 0.3$ , corresponding to a  $Z$  position of 9.48 mm. From this set of results, it can be first observed that, overall, the numerical results obtained here are in good agreement with the experimental data.

From Fig. 7 (a), although the numerical simulation performed here reproduces the normalized peak position at about  $Z = 10$  mm, it fails to reproduce the slope of the decreasing part of the curve. As it can be seen from Fig. 8 (a) as well, the largest difference found corresponds to the numerical radial profile at 340 nm, where the curve is shifted to a higher radial position. From figures 7 (a), (b) and (c) it can also be seen that the numerical results obtained here have a similar behavior to those also obtained numerically by Jerez et al. [32], that used a different chemical kinetic mechanism, i.e. the DLR [52].

Therefore, along the centerline the influence of the choice of the gas phase kinetic mechanism is important for the high molecular weight PAH only. However, Fig 8 (a) and (b) indicate that the opposite is observed for the radial PAH behavior.




Fig. 7 Normalized mass fraction axial profiles for wavelengths (a) 340 nm (b) 400 nm and (c) 550 nm. Square symbols correspond to the experimental data [32], whereas dash, and dot lines correspond to numerical results.




Fig. 8 Normalized mass fraction radial profiles at  $Z/H = 0.3$  for wavelengths (a) 340 nm and (b) 400 nm. Square symbols correspond to the experimental data [32], whereas dash, and dot lines correspond to numerical results.

To further explore the relative PAH contribution to soot inception, Fig. 9 shows the contribution of PAH to the soot nucleation rate along the flame centerline. From this figure it is noticed that, at lower HAB (heights above the burner), pyrene (A4) is the PAH species that produces (through nucleation) the largest amount of soot, with contributions up to 85%. As the flame develops, the influence on soot nucleation of naphthalene (A2) and acenaphthylene (A2R5) increases. Indeed, first A2 reaches a maximum contribution to nucleation of 66% and then A2R5 accounts for 70% of the nucleation rate. Fig. 9 also highlights that larger PAH molecules, such as A4R5, PYC2H, BAPYR, and A7, have little impact on soot formation for this type of flame configuration. For instance, at a HAB of 20 mm (along the flame centerline), these PAH molecules reach a maximum contribution to the soot nucleation rate of only 13%. Additionally, Fig. 10 shows the PAH contribution to soot nucleation rate along a radial direction (HAB = 2 mm). For this particular height, it can be seen as well that, close to the centerline, A4 accounts for most of the nucleation rate, and as the flame expands most of the nucleation rate is mainly due to both A2 and A2R5.




Fig. 9 PAH normalized contribution to soot nucleation rate over the flame centerline.




Fig. 10 PAH normalized contribution to soot nucleation rate over a radial direction at the position Z = 2 mm.

Finally, to examine the role of three different PAH groups as soot precursors, Fig. 11 shows the corresponding soot volume fraction profiles along the flame centerline and

along a radial direction. To obtain these results, three numerical simulations were carried out considering different groups of PAH in the nucleation and condensation processes, defined in Eqs. (7) and (9). The PAH considered for this analysis are listed in Table 1, which are grouped according to their size [25]: (i) two to seven-ringed PAH (A2-A7), (ii) two to five-ringed PAH (A2-A4R5), and (iii) two to three-ringed PAH (A2 and A2R5). The results shown in Fig. 11 emphasizes that, excluding A5-A7 PAH from the group of soot precursor species, the amount of soot formed decreases by 0.02% only. In addition, when A4 and A4R5 are also excluded, the amount of soot formed decreases by 0.2%. These findings further confirm the observations made from the results shown in Fig. 9, where two to three-ringed PAH molecules, namely naphthalene and acenaphthylene, account for most of the soot generated by soot nucleation and condensation processes when the KM2 mechanism is used. These results also highlight that a complete soot nucleation formulation must indeed contain PAH of different sizes, mainly those with two to four aromatic rings. And that considering, for instance, only one of these PAH for the soot inception process could lead to an even further underprediction of SVF peak values.




Fig. 11 Influence of soot precursors on soot volume fraction profiles (a) along the flame centerline  $Z$  and (b) over a radial direction  $R$  at  $Z/H = 0.6$ . Long dash, dash, and dot lines correspond to PAH groups with (i) two to seven, (ii) two to four and (iii) two to three aromatic rings, respectively.

## 5 Conclusions

In this work, two detailed soot formation models (MOMIC and DSM) were evaluated in laminar flames and the obtained results were compared with available experimental data. As part of the assessments carried out here, first, the NBP and KM2 chemical kinetic mechanisms were compared to each other accounting for the main chemical species taking part in soot formation processes, namely  $C_2H_2$ , OH, A1, A2, and A4. For relatively small species like  $C_2H_2$  and OH, it was observed that the results obtained with both mechanisms are similar, but, as the studied species grow in molecular size, the discrepancies between the mechanisms related results increase. The relative discrepancies in peak molar concentrations obtained with the two evaluated kinetic mechanisms were indeed about 32%, 82%, and 94% for A1, A2, and A4, respectively. These discrepancies may come from the different chemical species and reaction pathways accounted for in each mechanism, which suggest that using different kinetic mechanisms in soot formation modeling would indeed produce different soot fields.

Regarding the soot formation models, the numerical results obtained here showed that, in terms of temperature profiles, both models can reproduce the experimental data within the uncertainty range. SVF results showed in turn that the numerical predictions carried out with both detailed soot models over the flame centerline are not in good agreement with the magnitude of soot measured experimentally. Indeed, discrepancies of about 2.3 and 1.6 ppm were obtained in this case with the MOMIC and DSM models, respectively. It also was observed that, although both soot models capture the magnitude of the soot generated over a measured radial profile, the SVF profile obtained with the MOMIC model was shifted to a radial position, whereas the DSM one correctly reproduced the experimental maximum value. From these results, it is concluded that the DSM model reproduces better the soot experimental data for this flame. Nonetheless, to properly reproduce the amount of soot generated over the flame centerline, this DSM models needs further improvements, which is underscored by the assessment of the rates of the soot formation mechanisms. Indeed, nucleation and condensation are important in the central region of the flame, whereas surface growth dominates over the flame wing. This suggest that the soot underestimation over the flame centerline carried out by the soot models studied here may be originated from the underestimation of the nucleation

and condensation source terms, which in turn depend on the PAH precursors concentration and a sticking coefficient.

Finally, the influence of different soot precursors on soot formation was evaluated by means of their contributions to the soot nucleation rate. From the results obtained in the referred assessments, it can be concluded that relatively small-sized PAH, ranging from naphthalene (A2) to pyrene (A4), are the PAH that impact the most on soot formation. More specifically, contributions of A4 were found to be more significant at lower heights above the burner, whereas A2 and A2R4 were found to be more impactful downstream as the flame develops. Maximum contributions of A2, A2R5, and A4 to the soot nucleation rate were 66%, 70%, and 85%, respectively, whereas the maximum summed contribution of PAH with five (A4R5) to seven (A7) aromatic rings accounted for only 13% of the nucleation rate. SVF evaluations considering different PAH groups in the nucleation formulation also confirmed that A2 and A2R5 account for most of the soot generated by PAH.

## **6 Acknowledgements**

This work has been supported by CONCYTEC-FONDECYT (PROCIENCIA) (Peru), Contract No. 415-2019-2019-FONDECYT. During this work Luís Fernando Figueira da Silva was on leave from the Pontificia Universidade Catolica de Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio, Brazil). For the purpose of Open Access, a CC-BY public copyright license has been applied by the authors to the present document and will be applied to all subsequent versions up to the Author Accepted Manuscript arising from this submission.

## **7 Conflict of Interest Statement**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.



## 8 References

[1]R. Niranjana and A.K. Thakur, The toxicological mechanisms of environmental soot (black carbon) and carbon black: Focus on Oxidative stress and inflammatory pathways, *Front. Immunol.* 8 (2017).

[2]T. Bourdrel, M.A. Bind, Y. Béjot, O. Morel and J.F. Argacha, *Effets cardiovasculaires de la pollution de l'air*, *Arch. Cardiovasc. Dis.* 110 (2017), pp. 634–642.

[3]C.M. Long, M.A. Nascarella and P.A. Valberg, Carbon black vs. black carbon and other airborne materials containing elemental carbon: Physical and chemical distinctions, *Environ. Pollut.* 181 (2013), pp. 271–286.

[4]M. Kholghy, M. Saffaripour, C. Yip and M.J. Thomson, *The evolution of soot morphology in a laminar coflow diffusion flame of a surrogate for Jet A-1*, *Combust. Flame* 160 (2013), pp. 2119–2130.

[5]Y. Wang, A. Raj and S.H. Chung, A PAH growth mechanism and synergistic effect on PAH formation in counterflow diffusion flames, *Combust. Flame* 160 (2013), pp. 1667–1676.

[6]P. Selvaraj, P.G. Arias, B.J. Lee, H.G. Im, Y. Wang, Y. Gao et al., *A computational study of ethylene-air sooting flames: Effects of large polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons*, *Combust. Flame* 163 (2016), pp. 427–436.

[7]T. Zhang, L. Zhao, M.R. Kholghy, S. Thion and M.J. Thomson, Detailed investigation of soot formation from jet fuel in a diffusion flame with comprehensive and hybrid chemical mechanisms, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 37 (2019), pp. 2037–2045.

[8]M.E. Mueller, G. Blanquart and H. Pitsch, *Hybrid Method of Moments for modeling soot formation and growth*, *Combust. Flame* 156 (2009), pp. 1143–1155.

[9]N.A. Eaves, Q. Zhang, F. Liu, H. Guo, S.B. Dworkin and M.J. Thomson, *CoFlame: A refined and validated numerical algorithm for modeling sooting laminar coflow diffusion flames*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 207 (2016), pp. 464–477.

[10]Q. Zhang, H. Guo, F. Liu, G.J. Smallwood and M.J. Thomson, Modeling of soot aggregate formation and size distribution in a laminar ethylene/air coflow diffusion flame with detailed PAH chemistry and an advanced sectional aerosol dynamics model, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 32 (2009), pp. 761–768.

- [11] A. Veshkini, S.B. Dworkin and M.J. Thomson, Understanding soot particle size evolution in laminar ethylene/air diffusion flames using novel soot coalescence models, *Combust. Theory Model.* 20 (2016), pp. 707–734.
- [12] S. Valencia, S. Ruiz, J. Manrique, C. Celis and L.F.F. da Silva, *Soot modeling in turbulent diffusion flames: review and prospects*, *J. Brazilian Soc. Mech. Sci. Eng.* 43 (2021).
- [13] M.F. Modest and D.C. Haworth, *Radiative Heat Transfer in Turbulent Combustion Systems: Theory and Applications*, 1st ed. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [14] E. Quadarella, J. Guo and H.G. Im, A consistent soot nucleation model for improved prediction of strain rate sensitivity in ethylene/air counterflow flames, *Aerosol Sci. Technol.* 56 (2022), pp. 636–654.
- [15] R.S. Mehta, D.C. Haworth and M.F. Modest, An assessment of gas-phase reaction mechanisms and soot models for laminar atmospheric-pressure ethylene-air flames, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 32 (2009), pp. 1327–1334.
- [16] A. Wick, M. Frenklach and H. Pitsch, Systematic assessment of the Method of Moments with Interpolative Closure and guidelines for its application to soot particle dynamics in laminar and turbulent flames, *Combust. Flame* 214 (2020), pp. 450–463.
- [17] T. Blacha, M. Di Domenico, P. Gerlinger and M. Aigner, Soot predictions in premixed and non-premixed laminar flames using a sectional approach for PAHs and soot, *Combust. Flame* 159 (2012), pp. 181–193.
- [18] A. Dasgupta, S. Roy and D.C. Haworth, *Detailed computational modeling of laminar and turbulent sooting flames*, *ACM Int. Conf. Proceeding Ser.* (2014).
- [19] Y. Wang, A. Raj and S.H. Chung, Soot modeling of counterflow diffusion flames of ethylene-based binary mixture fuels, *Combust. Flame* 162 (2015), pp. 586–596.
- [20] J. Guo, P. Selvaraj, H.G. Im, Y. Tang and V. Raman, *An analysis of soot formation pathways in laminar coflow ethylene flames at higher pressures*, AIAA Scitech 2020 Forum. Orlando, FL, 2020.
- [21] G. Blanquart and H. Pitsch, *A joint volume-surface-hydrogen multivariate model for soot formation*, in *Combustion Generated Fine Carbonaceous Particles*, H. Bockhorn, A. D’Anna, A.F. Sarofim and H. Wang, eds., KIT Scientific Publishing, 2009, pp. 437–463.

- [22] H. Jin, J. Guo, T. Li, Z. Zhou, H.G. Im and A. Farooq, Experimental and numerical study of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon formation in ethylene laminar coflow diffusion flames, *Fuel* 289 (2021), pp. 119931.
- [23] J.W. Martin, M. Salamanca and M. Kraft, *Soot inception: Carbonaceous nanoparticle formation in flames: Soot inception*, *Prog. Energy Combust. Sci.* 88 (2022).
- [24] P. Selvaraj, P.G. Arias, B.J. Lee, H.G. Im, Y. Wang, Y. Gao, S. Park, S. Sungwoo, S. Mani, T. Lu, S. H. Chung, , *A computational study of ethylene-air sooting flames: Effects of large polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons*, *Combust. Flame* 163 (2016), pp. 427–436.
- [25] J. Guo, Y. Tang, V. Raman and H.G. Im, Numerical investigation of pressure effects on soot formation in laminar coflow ethylene/air diffusion flames, *Fuel* 292 (2021), pp. 120176.
- [26] A. Jerez, J.L. Consalvi, A. Fuentes, F. Liu and R. Demarco, Soot production modeling in a laminar coflow ethylene diffusion flame at different Oxygen Indices using a PAH-based sectional model, *Fuel* 231 (2018), pp. 404–416.
- [27] C. Lou, Z. Li, Y. Zhang and B.M. Kumfer, Soot formation characteristics in laminar coflow flames with application to oxy-combustion, 227 (2021), pp. 371–383.
- [28] V. Chernov, M.J. Thomson, S.B. Dworkin, N.A. Slavinskaya and U. Riedel, *Soot formation with C1 and C2 fuels using an improved chemical mechanism for PAH growth*, *Combust. Flame* 161 (2014), pp. 592–601.
- [29] M. Frenklach, *Method of moments with interpolative closure*, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 57 (2002), pp. 2229–2239.
- [30] S.P. Roy, *Aerosol-dynamics-based soot modeling of flames*, Ph. D. thesis. The Pennsylvania State University, 2014.
- [31] C.A. Hoerlle, *Modelling of soot formation based on the Discrete Sectional Method: CO2 effects and coupling with the FGM technique*, Ph. D. Thesis. Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2020.
- [32] A. Jerez, J.J. Cruz Villanueva, L.F. Figueira da Silva, R. Demarco and A. Fuentes, *Measurements and modeling of PAH soot precursors in coflow ethylene/air laminar diffusion flames*, *Fuel* 236 (2019), pp. 452–460.
- [33] K. Narayanaswamy, G. Blanquart and H. Pitsch, *A consistent chemical mechanism for oxidation of substituted aromatic species*, *Combust. Flame* 157 (2010), pp. 1879–1898.

- [34] H. Wang, X. You, A. Joshi, S. Davis, A. Laskin, F. N. Egolfopoulos, C. K. Law, USC Mech Version II. High-Temperature Combustion Reaction Model of H<sub>2</sub>/CO/C<sub>1</sub>-C<sub>4</sub> Compounds. Available at [http://ignisusc.edu/USC\\_Mech\\_II.htm](http://ignisusc.edu/USC_Mech_II.htm).
- [35] A. Wick, M. Frenklach and H. Pitsch, Systematic assessment of the Method of Moments with Interpolative Closure and guidelines for its application to soot particle dynamics in laminar and turbulent flames, *Combust. Flame* (2020).
- [36] A. Abdelgadir, I.A. Rakha, S.A. Steinmetz, A. Attili, F. Bisetti and W.L. Roberts, *Effects of hydrodynamics and mixing on soot formation and growth in laminar coflow diffusion flames at elevated pressures*, *Combust. Flame* 181 (2017), pp. 39–53.
- [37] S. Rigopoulos, *Modelling of Soot Aerosol Dynamics in Turbulent Flow*, *Flow, Turbul. Combust.* 103 (2019), pp. 565–604.
- [38] L. Zimmer and F. Pereira, *Limitations of simplified models to predict soot formation in laminar flames*, *J. Brazilian Soc. Mech. Sci. Eng.* 42 (2020).
- [39] J. Appel, H. Bockhorn and M. Frenklach, Kinetic modeling of soot formation with detailed chemistry and physics: Laminar premixed flames of C<sub>2</sub> hydrocarbons, *Combust. Flame* 121 (2000), pp. 122–136.
- [40] M. Frenklach and H. Wang, Detailed mechanism and modeling of soot particle formation, in *Soot Formation in Combustion*. Springer Series in Chemical Physics, H. Bockhorn, ed., Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1994, pp. 165–192.
- [41] S. Ruiz, R.S. Valencia Ramírez, C. Celis and L.F. Figueira da Silva, *Parametric Study of Empirical Constants Used in Soot Formation Models Based on Interpolative Closure Methods of Moments*, 19th Brazilian Congr. Therm. Sci. Eng. Bento Gonçalves, RGS, 2022.
- [42] K. Netzell, H. Lehtiniemi and F. Mauss, Calculating the soot particle size distribution function in turbulent diffusion flames using a sectional method, *Proc. Combust. Inst.* 31 I (2007), pp. 667–674.
- [43] F. Gelbard, Y. Tambour and J.H. Seinfeld, *Sectional representations for simulating aerosol dynamics*, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* 76 (1980), pp. 541–556.
- [44] T.F. Smith, Z.F. Shen and J.N. Friedman, *Evaluation of coefficients for the weighted sum of gray gases model*, *J. Heat Transfer* 104 (1982), pp. 602–608.
- [45] L. Mazzei, S. Puggelli, D. Bertini, D. Pampaloni and A. Andreini, *Modelling soot production and thermal radiation for turbulent diffusion flames*, *Energy Procedia* 126 (2017), pp. 826–833.

- [46] F. França, A. Ziemniczak, L.G. Pires Rodrigues, L. Domingues Lemos and F. Pereira, *Comparison of different WSGG approaches in numerical simulation of a non-premixed turbulent methane-air flame*, 16th Brazilian Congr. Therm. Sci. Eng. Vitoria, ES, 2016.
- [47] L. da Costa Ramos, L.F. Figueira da Silva, F. Di Meglio and V. Morgenthaler, *Modeling of Pulsating Inverted Conical Flames : a Numerical Instability Analysis*, Combust. Theory Model. 26 (2022), pp. 260–288.
- [48] M.D. Smooke, R.J. Hall, M.B. Colket, J. Fielding, M.B. Long, C.S. McEnally et al., *Investigation of the transition from lightly sooting towards heavily sooting co-flow ethylene diffusion flames*, Combust. Theory Model. 8 (2004), pp. 593–606.
- [49] S.P. Roy, P.G. Arias, V.R. Lecoustre, D.C. Haworth, H.G. Im and A. Trouvé, *Development of high fidelity soot aerosol dynamics models using method of moments with interpolative closure*, Aerosol Sci. Technol. 48 (2014), pp. 379–391.
- [50] S. V. Patankar, *Numerical Heat Transfer and Fluid Flow*, 1st ed. Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, 1980.
- [51] J. Guo, Y. Tang, V. Raman and H.G. Im, Numerical investigation of pressure effects on soot formation in laminar coflow ethylene/air diffusion flames, Fuel 292 (2021), .
- [52] N. Slavinskaya, A. Mirzayeva, R. Whitside, J.H. Starke, M. Abbasi, M. Auyelkhanzy et al., *A modelling study of acetylene oxidation and pyrolysis*, Combust. Flame 210 (2019), pp. 25–42.