Simulating a Homogeneous Charge Compression Ignition engine fuelled with a DEE/EtOH blend
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ABSTRACT

We numerically simulate a Homogeneous Charge Compression Ignition (HCCI) engine fuelled with a blend of ethanol and diethyl ether by means of a stochastic reactor model (SRM). A 1D CFD code is employed to calculate gas flow through the engine, whilst the SRM accounts for combustion and convective heat transfer. The results of our simulations are compared to experimental measurements obtained using a Caterpillar CAT3401 single-cylinder Diesel engine modified for HCCI operation. We consider emissions of CO, CO₂ and unburnt hydrocarbons as functions of the crank angle at 50% heat release. In addition, we establish the dependence of ignition timing, combustion duration, and emissions on the mixture ratio of the two fuel components. Good qualitative agreement is found between our computations and the available experimental data. The performed numerical simulations predict that the addition of diethyl ether to ethanol neither spreads out the combustion nor lowers light-off temperatures significantly, both in accordance with experimental observations.

INTRODUCTION

Homogeneous Charge Compression Ignition (HCCI) combustion provides a promising concept for reducing NOₓ and particulate emissions from internal combustion engines, and achieving high thermal efficiency at the same time. However, a narrow operating window – the range of speeds and loads for stable operation – has so far prevented HCCI engines from being commercialized. Unlike spark ignition (SI) engines, where ignition timing is controlled by triggering a spark, and direct injection (DI) compression ignition (CI) engines, where ignition timing is determined by fuel injection, HCCI engines do not possess any direct control mechanism. Instead, HCCI combustion is governed mainly by chemical kinetics, which implies that alternative means of controlling combustion phasing have to be sought.

Numerous potential strategies have been an active area of research in recent years, such as exhaust gas recirculation, boosting, intake charge heating, variable valve timing, variable compression ratio, (multiple) direct injection, fuel blending/dual fuels, etc. Combinations with other operating modes are also under investigation, such as SI-HCCI-SI transitions, etc.

The motivation for using fuel blends is, among other things, to control ignition timing, to lengthen combustion duration, and to lower intake temperatures, thereby expanding the operating window. Fuel blending is made possible in part by the fuel flexibility of HCCI engines in general, and is of interest not only from the control point of view but also because of environmental considerations. Alternatives to fossil fuels, such as bio-derived fuels, are attracting more and more attention.

In [1] and [2,3], the effects of adding dimethyl ether as an ignition improver to methane were studied experimentally as well as numerically. They also elucidated in detail the chemical mechanism of both fuels and the interaction of the elementary reactions. In [1], limitations of fuel blending are pointed out, in particular the necessity of two fuel storages and the slow response time of the mixture ratio. The latter problem might be mastered by a combination of dual fuels with port/direct injection, thereby making possible vehicular applications.
When blending fuels, the use of components with very different autoignition characteristics is desirable. The higher the octane number difference between the two fuels, the larger the attainable operating range [4]. In [5], an HCCI engine was operated with an iso-octane/n-heptane dual fuel and engine control was improved by varying the octane number. Iso-octane was replaced by ethanol in a subsequent investigation [6] to exploit a higher octane number range.

In [7], relative fuel component consumption in a blend of diethyl ether (DEE) and ethanol (EtOH) has been studied experimentally by means of a 14C tracing technique. Also, numerical simulations using a single-zone model have been performed.

Due to the variety of modifications and potential improvements to be investigated and the cost involved in their experimental setup and testing, computational modeling acquires an important role. Several models have been applied so far, e.g., single-zone models, multi-zone models, CFD, and probability density function (PDF) transport models [8].

The purpose of this work is to apply a PDF-based stochastic reactor model (SRM) employed previously [9-13] to predict experimentally measured emissions. Furthermore, a main aim is to determine to what extent ignition timing and combustion duration can be controlled by altering the mixture ratio, and how the mixture ratio can be used to minimize combustion emissions. The text is structured as follows. In the next section, we briefly describe the mathematical model and sketch how it is solved numerically. Subsequently, we present results of numerical simulations as well as experimental measurements of emissions of CO, CO₂, and unburnt hydrocarbons. In addition, we study the dependence of ignition timing and combustion duration as well as emissions on the mixture ratio of the two fuel blend components. Some conclusions based on the obtained results are drawn in the final section.

THE MODEL

THE EQUATIONS...

The stochastic reactor model (SRM) we employ is derived from a more general probability density function (PDF) transport model [8] and has been applied previously to HCCI engine simulation [9-13] to predict experimentally measured emissions. The terms on the right hand side represent the various physical processes taken into account by the model, i.e., chemical kinetics, turbulent mixing, piston movement, and convective heat transfer.

The chemical reactions and their heat release including temperature change due to compression and expansion are summarized in the function G(ψ) defined by

\[
G_j(\psi) = \frac{M_j \omega_j}{\rho}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, S
\]

\[
G_{S+1}(\psi) = -\frac{1}{c_v \rho} \sum_{j=1}^{S} c_v M_j \omega_j - \frac{p}{c_v m} \frac{dV}{dt}
\]

which generates the time evolution of the mass fractions and the temperature. Here, \(M_j\) denotes the molar mass, \(\omega_j\) the molar production rate, and \(c_v\) the specific internal energy of the \(j\)th species. \(\rho\) denotes the mass density, \(c_v\) the specific heat capacity at constant volume, \(m\) the total mass, and \(V\) the instantaneous cylinder volume.

For the description of turbulent mixing we use the Interaction by Exchange with the Mean (IEM) model, in which all scalars relax exponentially to their mean value. The mixing intensity is given by \(C_{\phi}/2\tau\), where we set \(C_{\phi}=2\) as recommended in [8], and \(\tau\) denotes the characteristic mixing time. For convective heat transfer we employ a model using Woschni’s heat transfer coefficient \(h_s\) [14].
where $A$ is the available heat transfer area, and $T_w$ is the cylinder wall temperature (assumed to be uniform).

...AND THEIR SOLUTION

The PDF transport equation (2) describing the SRM together with (3) and (4) is solved by a Monte Carlo particle method, in which the PDF is approximated by a notional ensemble of $N_{\text{par}}$ stochastic particles. These particles are not to be confused with physical atoms or molecules, fluid parcels, or zones in a multi-zone approach. They carry no geometric or spatial information whatsoever, but as an ensemble constitute a statistical representation of the PDF. Each particle carries with it only the mass fractions and the temperature, i.e. $\psi_j = (\psi_{1\text{(i)}}, \ldots, \psi_{S\text{(i)}}, \psi_{S+1\text{(i)}}, \ldots, \psi_{S+S\text{(i)}}, T\text{(i)})$. We employ throughout the convention that subscript indices label species, whereas superscript indices in parentheses label particles. The PDF is then represented by

$$f(\psi; t) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{par}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{par}}} \delta(\psi - \psi^{(i)}(t)).$$

(5)

Inserting Eqn. (5) into (1) yields as approximation of mean quantities

$$<\psi_j>(t) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{par}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{par}}} \psi_{j\text{(i)}}(t).$$

In order to make Eqn. (2) accessible to implementation, an operator splitting technique (see for example [15] or [8]) is used so that each of the terms can be treated separately. Standard techniques are applied to each of these terms, except for heat transfer, which is modeled as stochastic jump process. In a heat transfer step, particles are chosen uniformly at random, whose temperature is then adjusted according to

$$T^{(i)} \rightarrow T^{(i)} - \frac{T^{(i)} - T_w}{C_h},$$

(6)

where $C_h$ is a constant controlling the magnitude of the temperature fluctuations.

NUMERICAL STUDY

In this section we report on numerical simulations carried out and compare their results to experimental measurements. Our FORTRAN implementation of the SRM described in the previous section has been coupled to the commercial 1D CFD code GT-Power, so that full cycle simulations can be performed. The CFD code calculates the gas flow through the engine, whilst the SRM accounts for combustion, turbulent mixing, and convective heat transfer during the closed-volume part of the cycle (i.e. from IVC to EVO). The cylinder charge is assumed to be homogeneous in composition and temperature at IVC. The chemical kinetics are solved using the Sandia CHEMKIN II package [16] and a chemical mechanism [17] containing 112 species and 484 reversible reactions, which covers both DEE and ETOL chemistry.

Experiments were conducted using a Caterpillar CAT3401 single-cylinder Diesel engine modified for port-injected HCCI operation. Table 1 lists some of the most important parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bore</td>
<td>137.2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>165.1 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting rod length</td>
<td>261.6 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced volume</td>
<td>2.44 l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compression ratio</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake valve opening</td>
<td>3 CAD ATDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake valve closing</td>
<td>10 CAD BBDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust valve opening</td>
<td>19 CAD BBDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust valve closing</td>
<td>7 CAD BTDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>1800 RPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>EtOH/DEE blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel/air equiv. ratio</td>
<td>0.3-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake pressure</td>
<td>1.7 bar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details on the experimental setup see [7].

MODEL CALIBRATION

Before the model can be used to predict quantities of interest, each of its parameters needs to be fixed. Many of these, such as the compression ratio for instance, are determined by the engine specification or the particular operating condition chosen (see Table 1). We employed precisely the values given in Table 1, except for the intake pressure which we fixed at 1.18 bar. Some parameters are experimentally more difficult to quantify, such as the mixing time $\tau$, or specific to our model, such as the constant $C_h$ which governs temperature fluctuations (see Eqn. 6), which often means there is no data available. There are also purely numerical parameters, such as the particle number $N_{\text{par}}$, most importantly, and one has to make sure that predictions do not depend on any of the numerical parameters. Once model parameters have been determined, they are kept constant for the remainder of the study.

For calibration, we used experimentally measured pressure profiles at known operating conditions using pure EtOH as fuel. Model parameters for which there is no information available are adjusted such that simulated profiles coincide with experimental ones as accurately as possible. Due to the considerable number of model parameters, many parameter sets exist (in fact a
submanifold of the parameter space) which fit a given set of experimental profiles. For this reason it is helpful for the modeler to have available several curves for which only one parameter varies. Figure 1 shows two simulated pressure curves which agree well with the experimentally measured profiles. Note that the only parameter which is different for the two cases is the inlet temperature, all other parameters are identical.

Figure 1: Calibration of model parameters by means of in-cylinder pressure profiles (for pure EtOH).

As a result of these initial studies, we opted for \( C_{\text{in}} = 20 \), a cylinder wall temperature of \( T_{\text{w}} = 400 \) K, and a mixing time of \( \tau = 20 \) ms. We decided to use \( N_{\text{par}} = 100 \) particles throughout, since little change in predicted quantities could be observed for higher values. Furthermore, we performed multiple cycle simulations in order to establish that the simulation had reached steady state. During these tests we found in addition that the influence of 5% trapped residual gas (internal exhaust gas recirculation) on CA50 and emissions was small (i.e. both chemically and thermally).

EMISSIONS

The calibrated model was used to predict the dependence of emissions of CO, CO\(_2\), and unburnt hydrocarbons (HC) on CA50, which is defined as the crank angle at which 50% of the cumulative heat release occurs. Experimentally as well as in our simulations, CA50 was varied by altering the inlet temperature, but the fuel/air equivalence ratio \( \Phi \) was kept constant at a value of 0.4.

In order to describe the fuel composition, we introduce the quantity \( \Lambda \) which denotes the liquid volume fraction of DEE used for preparing the DEE/EtOH mixture, i.e. \( \Lambda = V_{\text{DEE}}/(V_{\text{DEE}} + V_{\text{EtOH}}) \). For example, \( \Lambda = 25\% \) means 250 ml of DEE for every 750 ml of EtOH. \( \Lambda = 0 \) corresponds to pure EtOH, \( \Lambda = 1 \) to pure DEE. This capital \( \Lambda \) is not to be confused with the air/fuel equivalence ratio \( \lambda = 1/\Phi \). Note that in a first approximation, the mass fraction of DEE in the fuel mixture roughly equals \( \Lambda \), with at most a few percent deviation.

Figure 2: Emissions of CO as function of CA50 (for \( \Lambda = 25\% \)) with inlet temperatures.

Figure 3: Emissions of CO\(_2\) as function of CA50 (for \( \Lambda = 25\% \)) with inlet temperatures.
Figures 2, 3, and 4 show emissions (mole fractions) of CO, CO$_2$, and unburnt hydrocarbons respectively as functions of CA50 for $\Lambda=25\%$. Both experimental measurements and simulation results are shown. In all three cases, the general trend is correctly predicted with satisfactory agreement. Furthermore, the following observations can be made. For large values of CA50 (roughly greater than 8 CAD), CO (Fig. 2) and unburnt hydrocarbons emissions (Fig. 4) are rising sharply, whereas CO$_2$ (Fig. 3) emissions are dropping. This agrees with expectation since for increasing values of CA50 combustion proceeds less and less to completion. We attribute the fact that this occurs earlier numerically than experimentally to the experimental (and computational) uncertainty associated to CA50 of the order of a few degrees. For values of CA50 smaller than 8 CAD, CO (Fig. 2) and unburnt HC emissions (Fig. 4) are clearly underpredicted. We believe this is due to the fact that the model takes into account neither crevices nor a thermal boundary layer, both of which are significantly colder than the bulk and hence contribute substantially to CO and HC emissions.

Since charge inhomogeneities (particularly in temperature) are crucial for correctly predicting emissions, we have tested the dependence of emissions on the mixing model by replacing IEM with the Euclidian Minimal Spanning Tree (EMST) model [18]. In contrast to IEM, the EMST model takes into account localness in composition space, which means that a stochastic particle mixes preferentially with particles which are close to it in composition. We found only minor differences between the two models. This can be explained by the fact that inhomogeneities are mild compared to non-premixed situations (like Diesel engines or diffusion flames), where it has been shown that the mixing model can drastically affect calculation results [19,20].

**MIXTURE RATIO OF THE FUEL COMPONENTS**

In this subsection we study numerically the dependence of ignition timing, combustion duration, and CO, CO$_2$, and HC emissions on the mixture ratio $\Lambda$ of the two fuel components DEE and EtOH. The prime quantity to be controlled by the mixture ratio in order to achieve stable engine operation is the ignition timing.

Figure 5 depicts the dependence of CA50 on the mixture ratio of the fuel components. In this figure and all the following ones, three curves each at constant inlet temperature are shown, one at $T_{in}=410$ K at constant fuel/air ratio $Y_f/Y_a \approx 0.043$ (corresponding to $\Phi=0.4$), one at $T_{in}=420$ K at constant $Y_f/Y_a$, and one at again $T_{in}=410$ K but constant $\Phi$. Raising the temperature by 10 K advances ignition by 3 to 4 CAD. At constant $Y_f/Y_a$, $\Phi$ varies by about 20% for $\Lambda$ between zero and unity because of the different stoichiometry of the two fuel components. In any case, it is evident that the more DEE is added to EtOH the earlier the mixture ignites, which is to be expected, since DEE is known to be more reactive than EtOH.

Figure 6 shows the combustion duration as function of the mixture ratio $\Lambda$. We define combustion duration as $CA90-CA10$, that is, the difference between the crank angles at 90% and 10% cumulative heat release. As expected, raising the temperature reduces combustion duration appreciably, by between 1 and 4 CAD. In contrast to ignition timing, for combustion duration it does make a difference whether the fuel/air ratio or the fuel/air equivalence ratio $\Phi$ is kept constant. In further tests we
established that ignition timing and combustion duration are both much more sensitive to changes in inlet temperature than to changes in $\Phi$.

Figure 6: Simulated combustion duration (CA90-CA10) as function of the DEE/EtOH mixture ratio $\Lambda$.

Figures 7, 8, and 9 display emissions of CO, CO$_2$, and unburnt HC respectively as functions of the mixture ratio $\Lambda$. Concerning CO emissions (Fig. 7), all three curves reflect to some extent the variation of CA50 with $\Lambda$ (cf. Figs. 5 and 2). Nonetheless, one can conclude that replacing some EtOH with DEE does improve ignitability of the mixture. Also, as expected, raising the temperature assists combustion and hence promotes consumption of CO. For the CO$_2$ emissions curves shown in Fig. 8, CA50 is practically constant (cf. Figs. 5 and 3). However, in this case maintaining $Y_f/Y_a$ can be quite misleading in the sense that it appears to suggest that a higher proportion of DEE increases CO$_2$ emissions. This is put into perspective by the curve for constant $\Phi$, which also demonstrates that introducing a small fraction of DEE (as with CO, Fig. 7) helps combustion to proceed towards completion. Hydrocarbon emissions (Fig. 9) once again show that for sufficiently low temperatures small quantities of DEE can induce light-off. Whether $Y_f/Y_a$ or $\Phi$ is kept constant seems to be irrelevant (at least in the considered temperature range) for higher values of $\Lambda$, in contrast to CO$_2$ (Fig. 8). Note, however, that for small values of $\Lambda$ there is also some variation of CA50 with $\Lambda$ involved, such as the large values of HC emissions for small $\Lambda$ at $Y_f/Y_a =$const., $T_{in}=410$ K (cf. Figs. 5 and 4).
Figure 9: Simulated emissions of unburnt hydrocarbons as function of the DEE/EtOH mixture ratio $\Lambda$.

All the diagrams in this subsection indicate that adding relatively small quantities of DEE (up to about 30%) has relatively large effects, whereas increasing $\Lambda$ beyond 30% has comparatively little impact. The emissions diagrams (Figs. 7, 8, and 9) have in common that both fuel/air ratio and inlet temperature can have significant influence. However, under the conditions studied, for $\Lambda \geq 30\%$ emissions seem almost independent of the inlet temperature, but can be very sensitive for $\Lambda < 30\%$.

Based on Figs. 7 and 9, it is legitimate to say that adding DEE to EtOH lowers light-off temperatures, as a consequence of the greater reactivity of DEE.

Furthermore, we considered the time dependence of the fuel component consumption. As noted in [7], DEE is consumed slightly earlier (in our tests by less than 3 CAD), but this exhibits little dependence on the mixture ratio.

CONCLUSION

We have performed numerical simulations of an HCCI engine fuelled with a blend of EtOH and DEE using a stochastic reactor model (SRM). We compared the results of our simulations to experimental measurements obtained using a Caterpillar CAT3401 single-cylinder Diesel engine modified for HCCI operation. We studied emissions of CO, CO$_2$ and unburnt HC as functions of the crank angle at 50% heat release. Not only were the general trends correctly predicted, but also reasonable qualitative agreement with experiments could be achieved. However, the model needs to be extended to include crevices and/or a thermal boundary layer for further improvement of the calculation results. Additionally, in order to investigate the potential of DEE/EtOH blending for expanding the HCCI operating window, we established the dependence of ignition timing, combustion duration, and CO, CO$_2$, and HC emissions on the mixture ratio of the two fuel components. We found that several of these quantities under certain conditions are quite sensitive with respect to intake temperature. The performed numerical simulations predict that the addition of DEE to EtOH accelerates combustion as a consequence of the greater ignitability of DEE. Ignition timing and combustion duration can be controlled to some extent by adjusting the mixture ratio of the fuel components, but this is simply due to the different reactivity and consequently the different light-off temperatures of DEE and EtOH. However, there is no indication of a non-trivial interaction between the two reaction mechanisms, in contrast to what has been found for DME/methane mixtures [1-3].
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DEFINITIONS, ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS
A Available heat transfer area
ABDC After Bottom Dead Center
ATDC After Top Dead Center
BBDC Before Bottom Dead Center
BTDC Before Top Dead Center
CA50 Crank Angle at 50% heat release
CAD Crank Angle Degree
CFD Computational Fluid Dynamics
Ce Constant governing mixing intensity
Ch Stochastic heat transfer fluctuation constant
CI Compression Ignition
cv Specific heat capacity at constant volume
DEE Diethyl Ether
DI Direct Injection
E Specific internal energy of jth species
EMST Euclidian Minimal Spanning Tree
EIOH Ethanol
EVO Exhaust Valve Opening
f Probability density function (PDF)
F Mass density function (MDF)
G Function governing chemistry and temperature source terms in PDF transport equation
HC Hydrocarbon
HCCI Homogeneous Charge Compression Ignition
hg Woschni's heat transfer coefficient
IEM Interaction by Exchange with the Mean
IVC Inlet Valve Closure
m Total mass of cylinder charge
MDF Mass Density Function
Mj Molar mass of jth species
Npar Number of stochastic particles
p Instantaneous in-cylinder pressure
PDF Probability Density Function
RPM Revolutions Per Minute
S Number of chemical species
SI Spark Ignition
SRM Stochastic Reactor Model
T Instantaneous in-cylinder temperature
Ti Instantaneous in-cylinder temperature
T(1) Temperature of ith stochastic particle
Tin Inlet temperature (upstream of intake valves)
T_W Cylinder wall temperature
U Function determining heat transfer
V Instantaneous cylinder volume
Yf/Ya Fuel/air ratio (mass fraction of fuel/mass fraction of air)
Yj Mass fraction of jth species

GREEK SYMBOLS
δ Dirac delta distribution
Φ Fuel/air equivalence ratio
λ Air/fuel equivalence ratio
Λ Mixture ratio of fuel components
ρ Mass density
τ Turbulent mixing time
ψj jth scalar in PDF transport equation
ω Chemical source terms (molar production rates)